## HIGHER EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY ESSAYS ON SERVICE-LEARNING AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT JOHN SALTMARSH AND EDWARD ZLOTKOWSKI

Higher Education and Democracy

# Higher Education and Democracy

Essays on Service-Learning and Civic Engagement

John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski



TEMPLE UNIVERSITY PRESS Philadelphia TEMPLE UNIVERSITY PRESS Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122 www.temple.edu/tempress

Copyright © 2011 by Temple University All rights reserved Published 2011

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Higher education and democracy : essays on service-learning and civic engagement / John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski, [editors].

p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4399-0037-6 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-4399-0039-0 (electronic)
1. Education, Higher—Social aspects.
2. Education, Higher—Political aspects.
3. Democracy and education.
4. Education and state.
5. Political participation.
I. Saltmarsh, John A., 1957- II. Zlotkowski, Edward A., 1944-

LB2322.2.H512 2011 378'.015—dc22

2010024828

✤ The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992

Printed in the United States of America

 $2\quad 4\quad 6\quad 8\quad 9\quad 7\quad 5\quad 3\quad 1$ 

To Russ Edgerton and Gene Rice, with deep appreciation for their wisdom and insight in advancing service-learning, civic engagement, and the public purposes of higher education

#### Contents

Acknowledgments	xi
INTRODUCTION Putting into Practice the Civic Purposes of Higher Education John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski	1
SECTION I General Need	
Introduction R. Eugene Rice	9
1 Social Crises and the Faculty Response Edward Zlotkowski	13
2 The Civic Promise of Service-Learning John Saltmarsh	28
SECTION II Antecedents	
Introduction Keith Morton	35
3 Education for Critical Citizenship: John Dewey's Contribution to the Pedagogy of Community Service-Learning	
John Saltmarsh	41
4 Addams, Dewey, and Day: The Emergence of Community Service in American Culture <i>John Saltmarsh (with Keith Morton)</i>	55

SE	CTION III Service-Learning Pedagogy	
	Introduction Donna Killian Duffy	75
5	Does Service-Learning Have a Future? Edward Zlotkowski	79
6	Pedagogy and Engagement Edward Zlotkowski	95
7	Academic and Civic Engagement Edward Zlotkowski	120
	CTION IV Service-Learning in the Curriculum: e First Year	
	Introduction John N. Gardner	131
8	Service-Learning and the First-Year Student Edward Zlotkowski	137
9	Service-Learning and the Introductory Course: Lessons from across the Disciplines <i>Edward Zlotkowski</i>	154
10	Getting Serious about Service: Civic Engagement and the	
	First-Year Experience Edward Zlotkowski	169
	CTION V Service-Learning in the Curriculum: e Disciplines	
	Introduction KerryAnn O'Meara	183
11	Mapping New Terrain: The American Association for Higher Education's Series on Service-Learning in the Academic Disciplines <i>Edward Zlotkowski</i>	187
12	The Disciplines and the Public Good <i>Edward Zlotkowski</i>	201
	Opportunity for All: Linking Service-Learning and Business Education <i>Edward Zlotkowski</i>	218
14	Emerson's Prophecy John Saltmarsh	238
SE	CTION VI Engaged Departments	
	Introduction Kevin Kecskes	251
15	The Engaged Department in the Context of Academic Change Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh	257
16	Characteristics of an Engaged Department: Design and Assessment John Saltmarsh (with Sherril Gelmon)	266
SE	CTION VII The Engaged Campus	
	Introduction Barbara A. Holland	281
17	Indicators of Engagement John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski (with Elizabeth L. Hollander)	285

18 Minority-Serving Institutio	ons as Models Edward Zlotkowski	303
19 Community Colleges as M	odels Edward Zlotkowski	
(with Donna Killian Duffy ar	ıd Robert Franco)	311
20 A New University with a S	oul John Saltmarsh	318
SECTION VIII Over a Dec	ade Later	
Introduction Ira Harkavy		323
ē	larging the Circle of Service-Learning wski (with Nicholas Longo and	
James Williams)		329
22 Engagement and Epistemol	logy John Saltmarsh	342
CONCLUSION Looking Back, L	ooking Ahead: A Dialogue	
John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski		354
References		367
Contributors		389
Index		391

#### Acknowledgments

This book has been a broadly collaborative effort, involving many colleagues—faculty, staff, students, and community partners—who have shaped our thinking over the years and who have pushed us to deepen the civic dimensions of community-engaged work. Collaborators include our colleagues at Campus Compact during the years from 1998 to 2005, particularly those involved directly with the work of the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study (ISAS): Morgan Darby, Kerri Heffernan, Steve Jones, Abby Kiesa, Sara Long, Nicholas Longo, Jennifer Meeropol, and Josh Stearns. Through our ISAS endeavors, we have also had the opportunity to work with colleagues on campuses across the country and to learn from them as they enacted civic engagement in their classes and in local communities.

We also gratefully acknowledge the individuals who contributed as coauthors to a number of the essays in this book: Donna Killian Duffy, Robert Franco, Sherril Gelmon, Elizabeth L. Hollander, Nicholas Longo, Keith Morton, and James Williams.

For their assistance with Chapter 17, we thank Erin Swezy, Richard Cone, and Keith Morton, who provided institutional examples of engagement activities, and Brooke Beaird and Kerri Heffernan, who offered critical insights as a result of their thoughtful reading of the essay.

Special thanks go to those colleagues who wrote the introductions to the eight sections of the book, providing invaluable perspectives on the corresponding chapters and adding their eloquent voices to the work at hand: Donna Killian Duffy, John N. Gardner, Ira Harkavy, Barbara A. Holland, Kevin Kecskes, Keith Morton, KerryAnn O'Meara, and R. Eugene Rice. We are indebted to them not only for their contribution to the book but for all that they have taught us.

Other individuals who helped to make this book possible include Jim Anker, who, while still publisher at Anker Press, encouraged the early genesis of this project; Ravi Lakshmikanthan, who doggedly tracked down citations and permissions; Patti Clayton, who provided timely, insightful feedback that reshaped the contours of the book and improved it greatly; and Micah Kleit, our editor at Temple University Press, who encouraged the project and has been a pleasure to work with.

Finally, we thank our families for supporting our work and for gracefully allowing us the time we needed to travel to countless campuses and meetings both across the country and around the globe. Their belief that our work could make a contribution to the common good was a major source of strength. For John, this book would not have been possible without the understanding and love of his wife, Jill, and their sons, Josh and Jay. For Edward, the same holds true for his wife, Ellen, and their son, Gavriel.

### Introduction Putting into Practice the Civic Purposes of Higher Education

John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski

he civic engagement movement has been a palpable presence in the American academy since at least the mid-1990s. To be sure, momentum for this movement began to build at least ten years before that, with the founding of the Campus Opportunity Outreach League (COOL) in 1984 and Campus Compact in 1985. The movement's first important academic service-learning resource, Jane Kendall's *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Public and Community Service* (Kendall 1990), was published by the National Society for Experiential Education in 1990.

Still, it was not until the second half of the 1990s that momentum around academic service-learning and civic engagement in general began to coalesce into a recognizable movement. That movement has come remarkably far in a short period of time. Ten years ago, only a handful of colleges and universities had made a serious commitment to the scholarship of engagement. In many disciplines, community-based teaching and learning were still regarded as fringe phenomena, and standard peerreviewed journals published little engaged scholarship. Today, at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century, all three of these circumstances have changed. The Carnegie classification system for higher education, begun in 1970 to provide descriptive data on institutional identity, expanded in 2006 to include a "Community Engagement Classification" to accommodate the hundreds of higher education institutions seeking recognition for their engagement efforts. Campus Compact's 2007 survey (the latest available online) indicated that 72 percent of its 1,144 member campuses offered discipline-specific service-learning courses (with an average of thirty-six service-learning courses of some kind per institution). The Compact also found, "A stunning 85% of responding campuses report[ed] rewarding community-based research or service-learning in faculty review, tenure, and/or promotions—more than a threefold increase over the past 5 years" (http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/about/statistics/2007/service\_statistics.pdf).

Statistics can, of course, be misleading. The fact that so many schools claim to offer service-learning courses says nothing about either the quality of the students' civic learning experience or the value of such courses to the community. Research also indicates that while campuses report rewarding engaged scholarly work, few have revised promotion and tenure policies in ways that explicitly value such work (Saltmarsh et al., 2009). Indeed, there has been some concern over the last few years that the civic engagement movement has actually stalled, that for all the indications of engaged scholarship appearing in faculty data reports, civic engagement remains a shallow, if no longer peripheral, academic phenomenon. While the civic engagement movement has succeeded in *challenging* what "counts"-or what should "count"-in teaching, learning, and research, it has not succeeded in *chang*ing what counts (Saltmarsh, Harltey, and Clayton, 2009; Saltmarsh and Hartley, forthcoming 2011). With its well-honed skills of accommodation, the academy has found a way to recognize civic and community engagement without actually embracing their implications. Like so much in contemporary American culture, what we now have are business as usual and business as usual lite.

Whether or not this is a fair critique, whether the movement has stalled or its proponents are too impatient, whether we should see the glass as half full or half empty, the following collection of essays will not resolve. However, by bringing together in a single place texts that helped clarify and facilitate national civic engagement and service-learning initiatives between approximately 1996 and 2006, we believe this collection may be useful in helping us better understand some of the ideas, strategies, and initiatives that have been central to the civic engagement movement as we know it today. Such an understanding, in turn, may be useful in considering how the energies and needs of the movement have changed and how today's civic engagement proponents can best position themselves to ensure its future growth. Just as John Dewey believed that democracy must be born anew in every generation, with education as its midwife, so we believe civic engagement in higher education must be regularly "born anew," with attention to changing circumstances and contemporary needs as its midwife.

A second purpose we have in publishing this collection is to reclaim the significance of service-learning as central to operationalizing the civic purposes of higher education. Hence, we position service-learning as a core academic effort, that is, an activity belonging to the primary systems and structures of higher education—departments, curricula, and activities that constitute the faculty domain. In this way, service-learning locates our faculty roles within a framework that consciously links civic renewal with education for democratic participation and functions as "the leading edge of an academic 'glasnost' to create democratic, engaged, civic universities" (Benson, Harkavy, and Hartley 2005, 191). Indeed, unless service-learning is positioned in this way, it can all too easily drift into a default version of itself and become solely a means to teach disciplinary course content. As Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and Matthew Hartley warned in 2005: "If research on service-learning conceptualizes learning outcomes and acceptance by disciplines as ends, rather than as means to larger educational and societal ends, the service-learning to just another technique, method, or field" (191). Thus, for us, service-learning is itself a mid-wife to the civic renewal of higher education.

Staking out such a position is more difficult than might at first appear. One of the "breakthroughs" of the current civic engagement movement was its ability to transition from the community service focus that characterized much of the engagement of the late 1980s and early 1990s to activities that were increasingly recognized as a legitimate form of scholarship. Without this transition, the movement would probably have already disappeared, another example of the thirty-year "service" cycle that Arthur Levine (1994) referred to just before that transition began to gain momentum. But embracing academic legitimacy as a key strategic goal was genuinely controversial, and the core of that controversy turned on the question, at what price? To give just a single example, it may seem only logical that one would want to be able to draw on faculty and students from a variety of disciplines in partnering with the nonacademic community, but for some the very idea of organizing in a way that recognized the legitimacy of disciplinary units and cultures was inherently problematic. Such individuals argued the disciplines were themselves a large part of the problem. What was needed was a strategy that bypassed them, not one that recognized them. In the end this was not the position most of those working in and for civic engagement adopted, and today most people would acknowledge the richness of the resources individual disciplines and broad disciplinary areas like the arts or engineering contribute to public problem-solving. And yet, as we have already acknowledged, the danger remains that discipline-based activities can all too easily collapse back into a kind of technical engagement that lacks any recognizably civic dimension.

During the years when most of these essays were written, we, their authors, were fortunate to find ourselves in positions where we could both observe and influence some of the more far-reaching civic engagement initiatives of the period. Decisions about strategies, tactics, and priorities, about the creation and the allocation of resources, were debated at hundreds of meetings in which we participated. These essays reflect our collaborative work during the time that one of us, John Saltmarsh, directed the national project on Integrating Service with Academic Study at Campus Compact and the other, Edward Zlotkowski, served as a Senior Scholar with the project while continuing as a faculty member at Bentley University. Saltmarsh came to Campus Compact in 1998 from a faculty position at Northeastern University where he had helped establish a service-learning program that he directed from 1994 to 1996. He had spent a sabbatical year (1996 to 1997) at Providence College, teaching and writing at the Feinstein Institute for Public and Community Service, an innovative unit led by Rick Battistoni and Keith Morton that offered students a major and minor in Public and Community Service Studies through a curriculum that incorporated service-learning throughout, from the introductory course to the senior, year-long capstone. A two-year professional leave from Northeastern University turned into seven years at Campus Compact focused on broadening and deepening service-learning and civic engagement nationally.

In 1995 Edward Zlotkowski became a senior associate at the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), primarily to serve as general editor of what eventually became a twenty-one-volume series on service-learning and the academic disciplines (1997–2006). AAHE had secured funding for the first six volumes in this series from the Atlantic Philanthropies with the understanding that revenue earned by those publications would be used to finance the additional volumes. Mobilized in part by this project—the largest publishing venture in the association's history—AAHE soon became the most important general higher education organization committed to exploring the scholarship of engagement. For almost ten years Zlotkowski was centrally involved in this exploration.

After the AAHE series had been launched, the association's president, Russ Edgerton, left to become the new director of the higher education program at the Pew Charitable Trusts. In 1998 Pew awarded Campus Compact a grant that allowed it, among other things, to name Zlotkowski its first senior faculty fellow (beginning in 1999) and in that capacity to work with Saltmarsh on some of the initiatives already identified above. Thus, thanks to their positions at the Compact and AAHE, Saltmarsh and Zlotkowski were able to work together on many of the key projects that helped define the civic engagement movement in the last years of the twentieth and the first years of the twenty-first century.

From a contemporary perspective, much of that period can be characterized as focused on creating constituency-specific resources. The launching of *Service-Learning across the Disciplines* signaled a move to link civic and community engagement not just to general and generic institutional activities but specifically to the work of faculty in and through the academic areas in which they were trained. Furthermore, because a central part of the strategy surrounding this effort was to use the individual volumes to launch a dialogue with the relevant disciplinary culture in and through that discipline's professional association(s), the series had a catalytic effect beyond the concepts and models it made available in print. Indeed, such discipline-oriented thinking helped to pave the way for the next specific constituency targeted: the academic department. Again, it was Russ Edgerton who, in his capacity as director of higher education programs at Pew, played a key role in both conceptualizing and funding this strategy.

Other initiatives represented in this volume speak to a similar logic of resource differentiation and development. For example, the Indicators of Engagement project documented in several of the essays began as an attempt to map the full spectrum of ways in which campuses become linked to the local community. However, it quickly became clear that one size would not fit all and that it would be useful to identify some of the *distinctive* ways in which different kinds of institutions—two-year schools, minority-serving colleges and universities, public comprehensives, and others—went about the partnering process. The section in this collection that focuses on first-year programming represents still another example of this strategy, as does the introduction to *Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership* (Zlotkowski, Longo, and Williams 2006), which addresses the role of student leaders.

It is gratifying to note that many of the initiatives called for in this collection have long since been launched and, in many instances, have achieved considerable success. It was for this reason that we decided to provide each essay with a framing statement that, in many instances, not only clarifies the circumstances under which the essay was written but also speaks briefly to related undertakings. Indeed, to ensure that the reader is able to see each essay in a wider context, especially in the light of subsequent developments, we have invited leaders in the civic engagement movement to contribute introductions that put the essays and issues in each of the book's sections into some kind of larger historical and/or philosophical perspective.

To be sure, one cannot understand the contemporary civic engagement movement simply by tracing a fixed set of themes and concerns. As we have already indicated, the priorities that have shaped the movement over the past twenty-five years have themselves changed over time. Thus, the shift from generic community service to distinctly academic forms of engagement that began to take place in the mid-1990s was itself followed by other, no less important conceptual shifts. By the first few years of the new century, even the term "service-learning" had begun to seem inadequate to what the movement needed. We refer here not to the still unresolved debate about the connotations of the word "service," but to the need for a term that would open the door to a wider range of options for civically engaged work. Hence, the current preference for "civic engagement" as a way of characterizing what it means for both individuals and academic units to focus on knowledge production for the common good.

In fact, even the term "civic engagement"—as widely used as it has become—has under some circumstances yielded to other formulations like "engaged campus" and/or "civic learning." However, what all these more recent formulations have in common is their insistence on the distinctly *civic* dimension of engaged work, and it is perhaps in this area that our own thinking has evolved the most. Despite the emphasis we felt we needed to place on winning recognition for the academic legitimacy of engaged work, we probably underestimated the ease with which strictly disciplinary considerations could inhibit the growth of a broader civic awareness as well as the awkwardness many faculty would feel when faced with the task of incorporating into their work an *explicit* concern for the civic.

Perhaps one could best characterize our thinking at this point as operating on two broad, complementary levels. On the first, we see engaged work not only as natural to the knowledge-production process but as necessary for that process to achieve maximum effectiveness. In this regard we align ourselves with researchers from Donald Schön (1983, 1987) through Andrew Van de Ven (2007) who have recognized the intrinsic logic of linking theory and practice and thus have laid the foundation for a new epistemology (Schön 1995). The scholarship of engagement in its teaching-learning modality—i.e., service-learning—mirrors much of what Robert Barr and John Tagg (1995) describe in their seminal article on the need for higher education to shift from a teaching to a learning paradigm. Academically rigorous service-learning is not just compatible with good teaching and deep learning; it is one of the most effective forms such teaching and such learning can take. Thus, much of what the research on student academic engagement and student success and persistence suggests coincides closely with best service-learning practice.

The same can be said for engaged research. It is not just that engaged research has value. Along with our colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania, we would argue that engaged research is *superior* research. As Benson, Harkavy, and John L. Puckett argue, "Working to solve complex, real-world problems *is the best way to advance knowledge and learning, as well as the general capacity of individuals and institutions to advance knowledge and learning*" (2007, 85, emphasis added). Both engaged teaching and learning and engaged research inherently reflect much of what we have learned about the knowledge production and knowledge dissemination process from researchers in a wide range of disciplines, including neurobiology, cognitive psychology, philosophy of science, and anthropology. (For an excellent introduction to this convergence of research findings, see Theodore Marchese, "The New Conversations About Learning" [1997].)

However, on a second level, we have come to see not only that engaged disciplinary work merits full academic validation as an exceptionally effective form of scholarship in all its forms but also that such work possesses an *inherently* civic dimension. In other words, just as we argued in the 1990s that community-based work falls naturally within the spectrum of valuable disciplinary activities, so we would now argue that drawing out the civic, as

distinct from the technical, dimension of such work should be seen as *intrinsic* to the disciplinary activities in question.

Typically, "engagement" is understood as discipline-based work (a course assignment, a research project, an internship, field work, a clinical placement, and so on) that occurs in a nonacademic community (local, national, global). This perspective often leads to an engaged activity's being labeled "community engagement." However, as Dewey pointed out, the simple fact that engagement takes place in a community context does not necessarily render that engagement *civic* in the full sense of the word. When one refers to the *civic* dimensions of engagement, one's use of the term should also imply a set of public, democratic, and political (though not necessarily partisan) dimensions. This is the position our own work has evolved toward. Thus, we view civic engagement as "a subset of community involvement" that is "defined by location as well as process (it occurs not only in but also *with* the community)" (Bringle, Hatcher, and Clayton 2006, 258).

The implications of this distinction are substantial. They include, for example, the recognition that "civic engagement develops partnerships that possess integrity and that emphasize participatory, collaborative, and democratic processes (e.g., design, implementation, assessment) that provide benefits to all constituencies, and thus, encompass service to the community" (Bringle, Hatcher, and Clayton 2006). In other words, civic engagement must be intentional about working within "the norms of democratic culture ... determined by the values of inclusiveness, participation, task sharing, lay participation, reciprocity in public problem solving, and an equality of respect for the knowledge and experience that everyone contributes to education and community building" (Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton 2009, 6). In adopting this position we have been strongly influenced by the work of scholars like William Sullivan (1995) and Albert Dzur (2008), who have cogently argued that there is a public dimension inherent in the best professional work, indeed, that separating out civic considerations from technical expertise does a disservice to the very concept of professionalism in its fullest, richest sense. We begin to address this issue explicitly only in some of the more recent essays.

The organizing logic of this book is quite straightforward. The twenty-two essays have been grouped into sections on (1) the need for civic engagement in contemporary higher education, (2) the historical roots of civic engagement, (3) service-learning as a pedagogy, (4) service-learning and the first-year experience, (5) service-learning in the disciplines, (6) the engaged department, (7) the engaged campus, and (8) future trends in civic engagement. Thus the book progresses from the general and the contextual to specific practices embodied in ever-larger academic units, concluding with observations on the future of the civic engagement movement. The fact that the essays are organized thematically rather than chronologically still results in relatively tight

temporal groupings, with only one exception (the section on service-learning in the disciplines). For the most part, the texts printed here have not been substantially revised, though many references have been updated and minor stylistic improvements have been made.

There are, of course, many dimensions of the scholarship of engagement that these essays do not discuss, or do not discuss in depth. We recognize that this collection offers only two perspectives and a limited set of experiences vis-à-vis civic engagement in higher education. The partnering process, assessment, community-based research, and the ever-increasing importance of international work all deserve far more attention than they receive here. Nevertheless, it is our hope that the material these essays do cover will prove to be sufficiently interesting to stimulate both further thought and more effective action. We would also like to think that, in its own way, the collection makes a small but useful contribution to reform in the academy as well as the development of a more vibrant and sustainable democracy.

## SECTION I General Need

#### Introduction

**R.** Eugene Rice

he essays drawn together in this book come from an incredibly fertile and imaginative period in the recent history of American higher education. They also reflect the best work of two of the most energetic and insightful leaders of that time. John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski bring together what is often divided and lost in an academy that is too highly specialized and driven by competitive prestige rankings of one type or another.

At the opening of the twentieth century there was widespread confidence—expressed in our rhetoric, at least—that America's colleges and universities would play a pivotal role in the development of the nation. "Building the democracy" was seen as a primary function of higher learning in America. The pursuit of knowledge and the development of a vital, modern democracy were seen as explicitly interrelated. No one said this more forcefully than Harvard's President Eliot who, in 1908, proclaimed:

At bottom most of the American institutions of higher education are filled with the modern democratic spirit of serviceableness. Teachers and students alike are profoundly moved by the desire to serve the democratic community. . . . All the colleges boast of the serviceable men they have trained, and regard the serviceable patriot as their ideal product. This is a thoroughly democratic conception of the function. (Veysey 1965, 227–228) Following World War II, American universities expanded, dramatically becoming—among much else—broadly inclusive and diverse. They are now struggling with what it means to be openly participatory civic colleges and universities in this radically different context—a rich mosaic of institutions that can support and nurture a pluralistic democracy while being called upon to share the challenges of global leadership.

Toward the latter part of the twentieth century, the divisions—the serious disconnections—plaguing American higher education had become widely apparent. The authors of these essays represent a broad-based effort to reintegrate colleges and universities with the larger purposes of the society. As thoughtful scholars and caring practitioners—a rare blend—Zlotkowski and Saltmarsh began to address the growing separation between theory and practice, intellectual substance and organizational process, disciplinary structure and institutional needs, and the university and the enlarging circle of diverse community partners. They and the associations in which they provided leadership became key resources for those who were interested in realigning faculty priorities and institutional mission, and who were struggling with the place of academic knowledge in addressing the problems of the broader community.

The division within colleges and universities that most troubles Zlotkowski and Saltmarsh is the growing split between knowledge and commitment. Robert Bellah, renowned Berkeley sociologist, sees American culture and the universities at a critical turning point. He writes, "The radical split between knowledge and commitment that exists in our culture and in our universities is not ultimately tenable. Differentiation has gone about as far as it can go. It is time for a new integration" (1991, 257).

Zlotkowski identified this condition in the first section of the collected essays as a "social crisis." As director of the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, American Association for Higher Education, I had asked Ed to give the keynote speech to open the tenth annual conference. This national conference was entitled "Knowledge for What? The Engaged Scholar." It was the first conference following the tragedy of September 11, 2001. Ed begins by speaking eloquently about the vacuity of the professional commitments of the American professoriate and to the distance that had developed between academic priorities and civic concerns. In their response to this national disaster faculty, by and large, failed to make a connection between their academic commitments and responsibilities, on the one hand, and their personal feelings about this tragedy, on the other.

In their impressive efforts to relate academic knowledge to public imperatives both Ed and John stand out as scholars in their separate academic fields—literature and history. Throughout their work they draw on the substance of their disciplines and fully integrate that knowledge base into their examination of the civic role of the university. It is significant that they demonstrate in their own work what they are calling for. In describing the growth of programs that in the decades of the nineties were designed to go beyond the mere accumulation of knowledge, Zlotkowski used the words of the poet Shelley in pointing to "the imaginative appropriation and utilization of what we know." In Zlotkowski's vigorous effort to spread service learning from campus to campus across America—what I have publicly referred to as his "Johnny Appleseed role" in the service learning movement—Ed often used examples from literature courses he was teaching. As is often noted in reference to his work, if you can integrate service learning into a course on Shakespeare, you can do it virtually anywhere in the curriculum.

John Saltmarsh's commitments and his faithful adherence to John Dewey's admonition that democracy is a learned activity are deeply grounded in his professional identity as a historian. You cannot read John's essays in this collection without being reminded of his important intellectual biography *Scott Nearing: The Making of a Homesteader* (1991). The quest for integration, integrity, and the critical tie between learning and democracy runs throughout his essays.

In reading these essays of Zlotkowski and Saltmarsh and reflecting on their leadership roles in American higher education, and also knowing of their close friendship, one is immediately reminded of C. Wright Mills's now classic essay "On Intellectual Craftsmanship," where he speaks of the most admired scholars as those who "do not split their work from their lives" (1959, 195). For Mills, the disassociation of work and life, knowledge and commitment, scholarly inquiry and community that he found among his academic colleagues was intolerable; as he put it, "Scholarship is a choice of how to live, as well as a choice of a career" (196). Throughout their lives and work, John and Ed call for a sense of integrity, of wholeness, and of connection.

The growth of service-learning, the active pedagogical advancements, and the ties to civic engagement documented and explored in this collection of essays could not have taken place apart from the generative context prevalent in this country during the years immediately surrounding the turn of the twenty-first century.

Most of the "high impact educational practices" identified by George Kuh from the National Survey of Student Engagement (2008) are identified in Zlotkowski's (2002) essay that follows. These engaged collaborative practices developed and blossomed in the decade between 1995 and 2005 and could not have emerged without the convergence of a robust associational life, strong foundation support, and extraordinary intellectual leadership emanating from that unusual time period. The strength of the American Association for Higher Education and Campus Compact, especially, provided a place for institutions and individuals to collaborate in advancing these emerging practices. Foundation support of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Atlantic Philanthropies, and the Pew Charitable Trusts, among others, was critical. The leadership of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, first under Ernest Boyer and then Lee Schulman, was indispensable. The work of other intellectual leaders became visible and

was built upon at virtually the same time—Frank Newman, Donald Schön, Russ Edgerton, Parker Palmer, Ernest Lynton, Ira Harkavy, and William Sullivan are examples. The college and university provosts who supported the reform agenda—too numerous to list—also helped make the developments of this period possible. References to this broad spectrum of work permeate the essays that follow.

#### A New Prototype of Excellence

What Zlotkowski and Saltmarsh do for us in the first section of this book is to prod us to move ahead, with special emphasis on service-learning and civic engagement. What I hear them calling for is a new prototype of excellence to drive a newly engaged civic university forward.

In higher education, we are reminded at every turn of the significance of the research university as a model of excellence to which we ought to aspire. It is now the prototype of the "world-class university" when projected on a global scale. The other model that has been with us since colonial times is the liberal arts college with its steadfast focus on student learning and development. Both prototypes are persuasive and widely influential and have been institutionalized with varying success.

During the recent period covered in the essays of this book much has been accomplished. Advances have been made in service-learning, civic engagement, pedagogical reform, and the first-year experience. A radically different epistemology has been articulated, and new organizational procedures have been proposed. The next step now is to bring all this extraordinary work together into a new, integrated prototype of excellence, a distinct alternative to what dominates our work at present. In the first section of this volume, Zlotkowski and Saltmarsh set the stage for this alternative vision of what is possible in their thoughtful integration of service-learning and democratic promise.

# Social Crises and the Faculty Response

Edward Zlotkowski

This essay began as a keynote address. In the fall of 2001 the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) invited Cornel West to give the keynote at its January 2002 Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards (FFRR). The theme of that conference was the scholarship of engagement, and the conference promised to be an important event in the growing civic engagement movement. FFRR was arguably AAHE's most intellectually exciting conference, and West had emerged as an important public intellectual, using his considerable rhetorical skills to push the academy in a more engaged direction. Unfortunately, two months before the conference date, health issues forced him to cancel. The conference no longer had a keynote speaker.

At that time I was just wrapping up my work as editor of AAHE's twenty-one-volume series on service-learning and had become Campus Compact's first senior faculty fellow. I was certainly a known quantity. Still, I was surprised when Gene Rice, the guiding spirit behind FFRR, asked me if I would be willing to fill in for West. On one level, of course, I knew nothing I could do or say could make up for West's absence—I

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Social Crises and the Faculty Response," *Journal of Public Affairs* 6 (2002): 1–18. Copyright © Missouri State University 2002. Used with permission. (A version of this essay was presented to the American Association for Higher Education Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, Phoenix, Arizona, January 24–27, 2002.) had neither his intellectual stature nor his moral authority. Still, I had been an influential actor in AAHE's ever-deeper commitment to the scholarship of engagement, and, if nothing else, the choice possessed its own internal logic.

The title of both the keynote and the essay it eventually became derives from my experience of the way in which many academics responded to the events of 9/11. For the most part, I had found this response disappointing. Like the rest of the population, academics were horrified and deeply saddened by what happened on the morning of September 11. Their response, however, seemed to me largely unconnected to their professional identity. They were personally moved and shared their private grief with students and colleagues, but in few of the responses I heard or read did they seem to draw on their professional identities. Indeed, not infrequently they spoke of the appropriateness of their putting aside those identities in favor of some more generic response.

Certainly this was understandable. The horrific death of so many innocent people spoke to something on a core human level in all of us. Still, while I respected and shared this basic human resonance, it seemed to me there were insights and consolations, ways of framing and understanding, rooted in our professional commitments, that could—and should—have found greater public voice. It was as though the tragedy of 9/11 was, among other things, a "teachable moment"—not in any pedantic or simplistically explanatory sense—that went unrecognized. In the context of our democracy, I wanted the most educated among us to have something more to say, to profess, to help their students and their fellow citizens to make sense of what had happened.

The widespread professional silence that greeted 9/11 was not an isolated phenomenon. The academy had been moving away from immediate relevance for a long time—perhaps since the early years of the twentieth century, certainly since the turmoil of the 1960s. The academic response to that September morning simply demonstrated how far we had come in distancing academic priorities from public concerns. It was for this reason that I tied my "substitute keynote" to this event. On the occasion of AAHE's single most important conference on the scholarship of engagement, I wanted to suggest just how deeply we needed such a scholarship.

Shortly after the conference and my keynote, John Saltmarsh was invited to guest-edit a special "supplemental" issue of the Journal of Public Affairs focused on "Civic Engagement and Higher Education." John asked me if I would be willing to turn the keynote into the issue's lead essay. I was happy to do so, especially since so many of the other contributors to that volume were people with whom I had worked closely and who shared my sense of civic urgency.

## The Academic Challenge of September 11, 2001

On September 11, I was in my office, following the events unfolding in New York and Washington, when, like many other faculty nationwide, I received from the dean an e-mail (Hadlock 2001):

Most of the faculty I have talked to agree that we will find various benefits for the discussion of today's events in classes tomorrow, [on] Wednesday, and on Thursday. Students who typically see teachers as presenters of narrow material in a narrow discipline have much to learn from witnessing our concern for the issues raised by this tragedy, sharing things we do not ordinarily take the occasion to share. I therefore would encourage every faculty person to make an effort to raise these issues for discussion in class since there is no single discipline that owns the subject of human tragedy, nor is there any faculty member who would not have valuable points to share in his or her classes from his or her disciplinary perspective.

Two days later, another message came, this time from the president (Morone 2001), referring back to earlier messages like the dean's and reporting that he had received several faculty e-mails describing "wonderful sessions" dealing with Tuesday's attacks. Unfortunately, he went on to note, he had also received many student e-mails expressing disappointment that their professors had barely mentioned what had happened before launching into "scheduled lectures." This disturbed him: "Our job as educators today and tomorrow and for quite some time to come is to help our students as best we can make sense of this, and for every discipline surely, there are connections that can and should be made between the tragedy our students are living through and the subjects we teach." I would suggest that for every faculty member able to respond effectively to the tragedy of 9/11, there were many more who found those events outside and unrelated to their spheres of professional competence. They may have attempted to respond *personally*, but a professional response and a personal response, as the literature on the scholarship of engagement makes clear, are two very different things. I suggest that one of the most important academic lessons of 9/11 is that our ability to respond to public events professionally is woefully underdeveloped.

Take, for example, one English professor's published account of his response (Howard 2001):

Word began to circulate that classes would be canceled, a rumor that the administration soon confirmed. As we started to pack up for the day, we heard there were bombings all over Europe. In four hours the world had gone insane.

That night I sat down to prepare for class with the television blaring in the background. After a while the coverage seemed to blend into one tragic loop that just replayed itself over and over, and I dreaded going to class on Wednesday. . . . Professionalism upholds the importance of the job over the personal concern. In spite of whatever feelings you might be experiencing or the distractions you might be facing, the job must take precedence. And personal preoccupations should always take a backseat to performance in the task at hand. But humanity also demands expression and acknowledgment of feeling over logic and analysis.

My heart was in my throat when I stood before my students and started to speak. It was not business as usual and to deny what had happened would be absurd. And so, instead of trying to lecture to my students, or dictate to them, or ignore what had happened, I talked with them and they talked with me. Later as I walked down the hallway looking in on other classrooms, I saw and heard pretty much the same thing. Professors comforting students and students comforting professors. In spite of the fears and concerns and anxieties we had, we would be back for another day, and hopefully, we as professors would go on to complete our lesson plan. And for the most part be able to stay true to our course outlines. And our students would return to class and finish their normal work. And hopefully they would graduate and move on to other classes and other students would take their place, and we could put this nightmare behind us and get on with our lives.

What makes this account of professional "betrayal" even more telling is the fact that the class in question was focused on the stories of Edgar Allan Poe. That even the work of Poe—let alone set theory or tax accounting—should have seemed utterly unconnected to what had taken place suggests just how far the academy has come in disengaging its self-understanding from public concerns.

## Socially Responsive Knowledge and the Future of the Academy

Can the academy remain a vital social institution if the best it can provide, in the face of great public challenges, is personal comfort? Several years ago, a group of faculty affiliated with the Lowell Bennion Center at the University of Utah (1998) proposed that higher education is, in fact, responsible for three kinds of knowledge: foundational, professional, and socially responsive. Although most schools have been willing to invest major resources in trying to achieve excellence in either one or both of the first two, their commitment to the third leaves much to be desired. And yet, it is the third that should now be at the center of our attention.

Why does the task of educating our students to be good citizens now require that we pay far more attention to socially responsive knowledge? To begin with, the needs that now challenge our society are significantly different than those that we academics faced in the past. Large-scale problems of the physical environment, health, homelessness, and underemployment have taken the forefront of our attention as never before. Moreover, changes in the demography of the nation and attendant issues of cultural, religious, and ethnic diversity, changes in family structures and lifestyles, and the globalization of the economy and political systems force us as academicians to no longer assume that we can perform our role without paying close attention to the impact of that role on the communities that surround us. And these questions simply cannot be addressed only by instilling traditional and professional knowledge in our students. (University of Utah 1998, J-5)

Nor, the statement goes on to point out, can the concerns identified here be addressed just by "providing opportunities for volunteer service.... The transmittal of socially responsive knowledge must be integrated broadly into the entire educational enterprise" (University of Utah 1998, J-5). The fact that it has not has led Russ Edgerton (1997), former president of the AAHE, to conclude that, if by quality education one understands an ability to teach "the literacies needed for our changing society" (38), contemporary American higher education is simply not passing the test.

Why this should be so becomes clear when one looks at what Gene Rice (1996) has called "the assumptive world of the academic professional"—the beliefs governing the academy as we have known it over the past half century. These include the assumption that research, "maintained by peer review and professional autonomy" and "pursued for its own sake," is the "central professional endeavor and the focus of academic life" (8–9). This central endeavor, organized into disciplines whose national associations largely determine academic reputations, favors specialization over interconnection and acknowledges the validity only of cognitive truth. Such an assumptive world leaves little room for nonacademic concerns or noncognitive expertise. In it the complex multidisciplinary problems of society find little resonance.

Although Rice himself is the first to acknowledge the continuing dominance of this set of beliefs, he also points out how over the last few years that dominance has become less absolute as other values and perspectives have begun to push themselves to the surface. Indeed, even so effective and articulate a spokesperson for mainstream assumptions as Clark Kerr (1963/1994) has testified to this phenomenon. Kerr, who in the mid-1960s had foreseen a bright future for what he called the "multiversity"—the academy as alpha and omega of knowledge, had by the early 1990s significantly revised his earlier vision. From that later perspective he could write that, in 1963,

I was generally optimistic about the workings of the knowledge process.... I shared the confident belief that the progress *of* knowledge leads to progress *through* knowledge.

[Now in] the 1990s, I have more reservations.... New knowledge, like addictive drugs, can have bad as well as good effects. And new knowledge has limits to its curative effects.... Knowledge is not so clearly all good, and certainly not the one and only "one good." The university, consequently, needs to be more careful in what it does and less arrogant about what it claims it can do. So many of us should have realized all of this more fully so much earlier. We were too euphoric. (155)

Indeed, over the course of the 1990s, we have seen a remarkable growth in programs designed to facilitate a shift from the mere accumulation of knowledge to what the poet Shelley might have called an imaginative appropriation and utilization of what we know. We have seen the founding and flourishing of the Corporation for National Service as well as the COPC (Community Outreach Partnerships Centers) program coming out of Housing and Urban Development. We have seen the phenomenal growth of Campus Compact from a few hundred members to over 1,000 institutions. We have seen the publication of the AAHE series on service and the academic disciplines (Zlotkowski 1997-2006)-a series that has helped prepare the way for many similar kinds of publications. We have seen the disciplinary associations begin to take on the work of engagement, from major initiatives at the National Communication Association to more limited but nonetheless significant developments in the sciences and the humanities. Associations organized by institutional type—associations such as the American Association of Community Colleges, the Council of Independent Colleges, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the private historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) working through the United Negro College Fund—all have mounted engagement efforts designed to redefine higher education in a post-Cold War world.

#### Technology and the Legacy of Positivism

As I look at where we are today, as I think of the hundreds of campuses I have visited and the thousands of faculty with whom I have worked, I am, in fact,

confident that with the leadership of many national and regional higher education associations, we have begun to move in the direction of a new educational paradigm. But I also see a fundamental threat to this development-a threat that many would just as soon ignore or deny. Nowhere is that threat more clearly captured than in a March 2000 piece by Arthur Levine called, ironically, "The Soul of a New University." Here Levine, at one time a powerful proponent of community-based teaching and learning, calls on higher education to recognize the "convergence of knowledge-producing organizations" such as television and publishing and to join them in creating an array of technology-based knowledge delivery systems that will make the contemporary place-bound campus obsolete. This idea, that educational renewal can be achieved through the creation and utilization of new technological tools, I find no more convincing than the idea that increased oil drilling will solve our energy problems or that a computer in every household will lead to a rebirth of democracy. And yet, there are at present many who would make technology and its uses the key to higher education's future.

In a 2001 issue of *Change* (Spence 2001), there appeared a piece that so clearly identifies what is wrong with traditional teaching that one wishes it were mandatory reading for all college and university faculty. However, as trenchant as this critique is, it nonetheless leads its author to a conclusion more disquieting than encouraging:

We are hovering on the edge of a transformation of undergraduate education from practice based on habits, hearsay, and traditions to a science-based practice similar to the transformation of medicine in the 20th Century. We can find examples of the education of the future in charter schools, in the learning software designed by [X] and his associates, in the tutorials designed by [Y], in [a] math emporium . . . in the multimedia work of [university Z]. (19)

I think it is not coincidental that technology as the fulcrum of educational change so often looks explicitly to the corporate sector for models and leadership. Americans have as ingrained a habit of seeing the private sector as an all-purpose strategy as they have of longing for a technological fix. But the lack of public purpose that affects so much of the contemporary academy will hardly be addressed through measures that render it more—rather than less—like those forces that have been themselves powerful engines of social fragmentation.

Alexander Astin (2000), former director of UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute, has written eloquently about the ways in which a market mentality has allowed elite institutions to make the underprepared student someone else's problem. Russ Edgerton (1997) has described how competitive forces have conspired to impede the adoption of progressive pedagogies and new research methods. Like technology, market forces may indeed have an important role to play in the design and evolution of a new, engaged academy. But they cannot in and by themselves renew it; they cannot constitute its "soul." For, as Donald Schön (1995) has argued, a new approach to teaching and learning, a truly new pedagogy, demands a new underlying epistemology, and thus, no advance in delivery mechanisms linked to, indeed, based upon the current epistemology can get us where we need to go. Only a scholarship of engagement can play this role.

The reason for this is quite simple: the scholarship of engagement actually redefines the way in which knowledge is produced. Far from simply signifying an application of what is already known, it derives what is known from the engagement process itself. This is what Schön (1995) refers to as "knowing in action," and it contrasts sharply with the currently prevailing norm of "technical rationality" (29). No one has more clearly identified the many ways in which the latter—a largely unexamined legacy of late nineteenth-century positivism—has succeeded in informing how we see the world than has Harry Boyte (2000) at the University of Minnesota. In a recent article called "The Struggle against Positivism," Boyte notes:

Positivism structures our research, our disciplines, our teaching, and our institutions, even though it has long been discredited intellectually. . . . Positivism structures patterns of evaluation, assessment, and outcome measures. . . . It sustains patterns of one-way service delivery and the conceptualization of poor and powerless groups as needy "clients," not as competent citizens. It infuses funding patterns for government "interventions" to fix social problems. It shapes the market, the media, health care, and political life. Professionals imagine themselves outside a shared reality with their fellow citizens, who are seen as "customers" or "clients," objects to be manipulated or remediated. (50)

As a result, professionals, especially academic professionals, imagine themselves outside any shared public reality, instead seeing their fellow citizens either as recipients of academic expertise or as objects to be studied and manipulated. Furthermore, as Parker Palmer (1987) has reminded us, epistemologies are important not simply because they give rise to a certain kind of scholarship or pedagogy. They also lead to a certain quality of life. In other words, "the *way* we know has powerful implications for the *way* we live. . . . Every epistemology tends to become an ethic, and . . . every way of knowing tends to become a way of living" (22, original emphasis).

It is, for this reason, not surprising that the mode of knowing that now dominates American higher education—a mode Palmer characterizes as "objective, analytical, experimental"—has left us as a community "fragmented and exploitable by [the] very mode of knowing" we profess. "We make objects of each other and the world to be manipulated for our own private ends" and wind up with something that resembles "a *trained* schizophrenia" (22, original emphasis). Thus, the corollary to our lack of public academic engagement is a private spiritual malaise, with many faculty experiencing a loss of both the idealism and the sense of community that brought them into higher education in the first place. Younger scholars tell us of their mounting disappointment and frustration as prevailing norms drive them into isolated pursuits and fragmented lives. Is it any wonder that conference sessions on the spiritual dimensions of our professional life are often packed to overflowing?

We must, in short, look to another way of understanding the "soul" of a new academy—or, as Frank Newman (2000), one of the founders of Campus Compact, put it, another way to "save the soul" of the one we have. According to Newman, the market forces currently impinging on higher education could very well erode the special place it has historically held in our society.

Over the long history of higher education, universities and colleges both state-owned and private—have held a privileged position because they have focused on the needs of society rather than self-gains. They have in turn been given special responsibilities. As higher education becomes more closely linked with for-profit activities and market forces, its special status is endangered. Under the assault of new competitive pressures, the protected status of higher education is eroding. (2)

Many faculty are, of course, aware of these pressures and their corrosive effects. Unfortunately, however, many also see as the only alternative "a determination to 'stay just as we are'" (16). But the status quo they would embrace and maintain has not only lost much of its guiding vision and social justification; it has also absorbed too much of the "instrumental individualism" (Sullivan 2006: 21ff.) those market forces represent. It is, in short, too inherently compromised, too morally unsure of itself, to offer effective resistance to the siren call of "for-profit activities and narrow uses of technology" (Newman 2000: 16).

#### Strategic Suggestions

In one of his last public statements, "The Scholarship of Engagement" (1996), Ernest Boyer, the individual who helped set so much of the contemporary academy's agenda, implicitly signaled his awareness of the necessity of moving beyond discrete reforms to a new animating vision. For it was here that he introduced the phrase "scholarship of engagement," and although at first the phrase seems to be more or less interchangeable with "scholarship of application," the phrase he used for applied research in *Scholarship Reconsidered:*  *Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), a close reading of the text will show that, unlike the latter, the former does not so much identify one of several legitimate forms of scholarly activity as it does suggest a context within which the entire academy should function.

Here, then, is my conclusion. At one level, the scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers, and to our cities....

But, at a deeper level, I have this growing conviction that what's needed is not just more programs, but a larger purpose, a larger sense of mission, a larger clarity of direction in the nation's life... Increasingly, I'm convinced that ultimately, the scholarship of engagement also means creating a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other, helping to enlarge what anthropologist Clifford Geertz describes as the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life for all of us. (19–20)

How, then, do we now seize the moment? How do we act on our recognition that "the assumptive world of the academic professional" is no longer capable of meeting the challenges facing American higher education in the twentyfirst century? How do we proceed to build something that allows us not only to bring over all that is still vital in the traditional academy but also to reconstitute it in a way that leads to genuine renewal—a renewal powerful enough to absorb technological change and competitive pressures?

I think there are four strategies that can serve us especially well. Already they are in play across the country, in need only of more sustained attention and resources. The first revolves around the growing self-confidence and independence of non-research-intensive institutions. Only in the last decade or so have we begun to see a reembracing of the institutional diversity that emerged shortly after World War II. Less and less does higher education as a whole need to look to elite, flagship institutions for leadership. Increasingly we find comprehensive universities, faith-based institutions, community colleges, and historically black institutions deliberately reclaiming their original functions. As John Alberti (2001) of Northern Kentucky University has written, our discussions of the future of ... pedagogy in higher education are limited by models of college life rooted in enduring but increasingly misleading images that take the experiences and practices of elite research universities and liberal-arts colleges ... as the norm for higher education" (563). In point of fact, it is at "working-class," open-registration institutions that most Americans go to college. Research-intensive universities and selective liberal arts colleges will, of course, continue to play important educational roles-but those roles should no longer be viewed as normative.

Several years ago, in an essay entitled "Naming Pragmatic Liberal Education" (1995b), Bruce Kimball, an educational historian at the University of Rochester, identified seven concerns he found widely associated with contemporary liberal learning. They included (1) multiculturalism, (2) general education, (3) common good and citizenship, (4) K–16 continuities, (5) teaching as learning and inquiry, (6) values and service, and (7) assessment, and together Kimball saw them as constituting a new educational gestalt. After several dozen well-known academics had been invited to respond to his thesis, Kimball (1997) was, in turn, invited to respond to them. Almost as telling as his original thesis was his observation on their response:

The response to the consensus thesis . . . seems to vary with the perspective and context of the observer. Most of the original respondents who were doubtful of the consensus thesis work at institutions in the "top" 10% of the more than 3,000 post-secondary institutions in the country. Those tending to be persuaded by the consensus thesis come from the other 90% or from national associations or programs whose membership includes many from this sector. The correlation is not perfect, but is still significant. (60)

In other words, we should, perhaps, take to heart the fact that paradigm shifts more often progress from the periphery in than the center out. It may well be that those most interested in an engaged academy should concentrate their attention on building critical mass among that 90 percent of higher education institutions already somewhat open to change, leaving more elite, researchintensive institutions to follow when they will. Certainly we have no dearth of exciting models within that 90 percent majority. I think here of the pioneering work done by schools like Indiana University Purdue University-Indianapolis, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Portland State University among the public comprehensives; Marquette and DePaul among the privates; the campus-community partnering efforts facilitated by the Council of Independent Colleges, the American Association of Community Colleges, and the HBCU network; colleges like Calvin, Mars Hill, Miami-Dade, Kapiolani, and Lemoyne-Owen where multiple paths to institutional engagement have already been developed and tested. Here we find the gap between public mission and academic programming an object of neither rhetorical obfuscation nor wholesale denial but, instead, a source of what Peter Senge (1990, 150-155) has called "creative tension"-an honest juxtaposition of vision and reality that serves to spur evermore-successful efforts to bring the two into alignment.

Second, we need to make sure that the fragmentation that besets the academy as a whole does not also undermine our own reform efforts. It took ten years for the service-learning program at my institution even to begin collaborating with the diversity program, despite the fact that we shared every conceivable value. But there were no structures to facilitate our dialogue. We
were as unconnected as, in some schools, accounting and finance, psychology and sociology, biology and chemistry.

Indeed, I believe that, at some institutions, there already exists a critical mass of faculty committed to the scholarship of engagement in its broadest sense. However, their self-identification with a wide variety of different reform movements makes it difficult for them to communicate, let alone join forces. Service-learning, participatory action research and community-based research, professional service, diversity, women's studies programs, ethnic studies programs, environmental studies programs, the learning community movement, the first-year experience movement, problem-based learning and undergraduate research-those who support these may soon constitute a new working majority. Even now we are only beginning to understand, for example, how firstyear seminars, when linked to learning communities and community-based work, can result in educational experiences of unusual efficacy in reaching and retaining a diverse student population. To these we can add writing programs, internships, and other experiential education programs that take seriously the task of producing reflective practitioners, and study abroad programs that replace tourism with transformation. Indeed, if many of us were to take a careful inventory of what we have on our campus, if we were to invest more energy in on-campus grassroots organizing, we might be surprised by what we can already accomplish. The fact that women and persons of color-many with teaching goals and styles that value engagement-are not only now making their way into the academy but are also beginning to achieve positions of power suggests still another dimension of the change process that is slowly but inexorably overtaking the traditional academy.

Third, to actualize the potential of these developments, we must recognize that new programs, objectives, and priorities need new forms of support. Mary Walshok, in Knowledge Without Boundaries (1995), has called our attention to the critical importance of "enabling mechanisms" to facilitate new faculty work. The college or university that simply says, "Go to it, faculty," will not, in fact, succeed in creating an institution capable of generating and disseminating socially responsive knowledge. Such knowledge is the responsibility of the institution as a whole, and every office, every department has its role to play. That being said, we must recognize the importance of some kind of coordinating if not centralizing effort. We do not attempt to court corporations without the help of development offices. We establish alumni offices to help us keep in touch with our graduates. Why should effective ties with the community be any different? Ernest Lynton (1995) had it exactly right when he said that for outreach/engagement/service, choose whatever word one wants, to be effective, there must be "appropriate bridging mechanisms between the academic institution and its external constituencies. [For even] a relatively small college, and more certainly a comprehensive university, is guite opaque to anyone on the outside" (58). Indeed, in my numerous visits to campuses around the country, I have found no single instance of an effective, comprehensive community-based teaching and learning effort that does not draw upon the assistance of some specially organized and designated office.

Finally, and I think most importantly, we must begin making more room at the table of higher education-not simply for a wider variety of academics, for adjunct as well as full-time faculty, for community college and tribal college teachers as well as university researchers, but also for the outside community itself. Consider how the active participation of community members would change both the agenda and the tenor of the conversation at almost any academic forum, and one will immediately see how powerful the in-person presence of community partners could be in the change process. Campus Compact, the Council of Independent Colleges, and many other higher education organizations have on certain occasions required that campus teams participating in an engagement-related event include a community partner, and the results have been in some cases transformative. We know from the Civil Rights Movement and the Women's Movement that our best efforts to be fair are no substitute for those not present to speak for themselves. We need to hear directly the voices of our community counterparts. We need to abandon the idea that we can represent the academy and speak for the community at the same time. That is not dialogue but ventriloquism.

#### Conclusion: The Necessity of Contact

I think it would be hard to overestimate the importance of this fourth strategy. We in the academy have had throughout our history a tendency—and an ability—to co-opt almost anything not already a part of our agenda. Our intellectual facility and sense of self-importance often allow us to bypass our need to listen and to respect perspectives not our own. In an essay published in the religious studies volume of the AAHE series on service-learning and religious studies, Bounds, Patterson, and Pippin (2002) from Emory University point out how, even when we explicitly identify ourselves with "others," we usually spend our time "analyzing [them] through language and methodologies such as feminism, postmodernism, postcolonialism." In other words, through the very methodologies we use to address them, we separate ourselves from them. Postcolonialism itself becomes a tool of academic colonization.

No one has spoken to this problem more clearly or more forcefully than the former Father General of the Society of Jesus, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J. In a presentation at Santa Clara University in October 2000 Kolvenbach made the case for a far more socially engaged agenda at Jesuit schools. Recognizing the fiercely competitive nature of contemporary society, he noted: All American colleges and universities, ours included, are under tremendous pressure to opt entirely for success in [the] sense [of wellhoned technical and professional skills]. But what our students want and deserve—includes but transcends this [kind of] success based on marketable skills. (http://www.scu.edu/news/attachments/kolvenbach \_speech.html)

He then took a conceptual step as significant as it is rare. Noting that for 450 years Jesuit schools have sought to educate the "whole person," he suggested that this "holy grail" of American education is not an ahistorical concept:

In the emerging global reality, with its great possibilities and deep contradictions, the whole person is different from the whole person of the Counter-Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, or the 20th Century. Tomorrow's "whole person" cannot be whole without an educated awareness of society and culture with which to contribute socially, generously, in the real world. Tomorrow's whole person must have, in brief, a well-educated solidarity. (http://www.scu.edu/news/ attachments/kolvenbach\_speech.html)

"Solidarity" as an educational concept—it is hard to imagine a more powerful or effective way to short-circuit the academy's tendency toward selfreferentiality and intellectual "colonization." For the solidarity that Kolvenbach envisioned cannot be achieved by means of concepts: it requires contact—direct, personal contact:

Solidarity is learned through "contact" rather than through "concepts."... When the heart is touched by direct experience, the mind may be challenged to change. Personal involvement with innocent suffering, with the injustice others suffer, is the catalyst for solidarity which then gives rise to intellectual inquiry and moral reflection.... Students, in the course of their formation, must let the gritty reality of this world into their lives, so they can learn to feel it, think about it critically, respond to its suffering and engage it constructively. (http:// www.scu.edu/news/attachments/kolvenbach\_speech.html)

And like the faculty group at the University of Utah, he then explicitly warned that such engaged knowing cannot be achieved through "optional or peripheral" programs, but must be moved to "the core of every Jesuit university's program of studies." The work we need to do we cannot do except in active, personal contact with our community partners.

This essay began with a challenge posed by the events of September 11—a challenge that asked if today's faculty can bring to public events anything other than a private response. Although the events of that day were in many ways unique, the challenge they helped to articulate is not. It is posed not just by cataclysmic acts of terror but by all the everyday conditions of social injustice and economic need to which we as a nation have almost become inured. The assumptive world in which most of us were professionally formed will not demand that we recognize this challenge. We can only demand that of ourselves.

## 2 The Civic Promise of Service-Learning

John Saltmarsh

Since the early 1980s, there have been increased pressures on higher education to improve undergraduate education, particularly in ways that are responsive to the shifts in demographics that are bringing more nontraditional and underserved students to campus. The call for more student engagement in learning and more engaged pedagogical practices has coincided with new knowledge in the cognitive sciences and developmental psychology that emphasize problem-posing, learner-centered education. All of these trends parallel calls for accountability and assessment of student learning.

It is with these concerns in mind that this essay was written. Its intent was to draw attention to the learning outcomes of service-learning, in particular the civic learning outcomes that can be and should be the goal of engaged, community-based pedagogical practices. The problem, as referenced in the essay, was (and is) that much service-learning practice results in a technically improved teaching and learning method that is not applied to address civic learning outcomes. This was particularly apparent to me when I reviewed the nominations for the Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award

This chapter was originally published as John Saltmarsh, "The Civic Promise of Service Learning," *Liberal Education* 91, no. 2 (2005): 50–55. Reprinted with permission from *Liberal Education* 91, no. 2. Copyright 2005 by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

for Service-Learning that I administered each year as project director for Integrating Service with Academic Study at Campus Compact. While a number of nominations provided material demonstrating high-quality servicelearning, there were very few examples of practices that addressed not only learning outcomes related to the knowledge base of the discipline but also learning outcomes related to the public relevance of the discipline or the public skills of professional practice.

Since this essay appeared, a number of campuses have brought their civic engagement efforts together with measurement of civic learning outcomes, with some of the most promising work being done at Tufts University, North Carolina State University, and Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. At the national level, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) has taken the lead in advancing civic learning as part of the broader assessment of undergraduate learning. They have done this through national conferences (Civic Learning at the Intersections: U.S. Diversity, Global Education, and Democracy's Unfinished Work 2007), through targeted projects like the VALUE Project (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education), which includes developing rubrics for measuring civic learning outcomes, and through an upcoming publication on learning outcomes from civic engagement. With the increased interest in assessment of undergraduate education, the reclaiming of higher education's public purpose, and the civic dimensions of service-learning, defining and measuring civic learning will likely remain a key issue in the years ahead.

Many campuses across the country intentionally create opportunities for students to actively participate in the processes of democracy: community-based learning, service-learning, action research, public and community service, deliberative dialogues, community building, and public deliberation, among others. There has been less attention, however, to heeding John Dewey's admonition that democracy is a learned activity. To engage effectively in the processes of democracy, both during and after their college years, students will need to acquire, as part of their education, the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to participate as engaged, democratic citizens. Civic engagement can come about only with the development of a capacity for engagement. That development is what constitutes "civic learning."

#### Civic Engagement and Service-Learning

While at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the early 1980s, Frank Newman, an innovative leader in higher education, asserted that "the most critical demand is to restore to higher education its original purpose

of preparing graduates for a life of involved and committed citizenship.... The advancement of civic learning, therefore, must become higher education's most central goal" (1985, xiv). While Newman grounded the civic work of higher education in community service, he did not specify what civic learning entailed. What is it that we would want a civically educated student to know?

Through an agenda focused on promoting community service, a number of organizations and campuses pursued civic learning, vaguely construed, during the 1980s. By the end of the decade, the severe limitations to advancing civic learning separately from the core work of the academy had become clear. Thus, beginning in the early 1990s, service and academic study were integrated. Even with this shift, however, the emphasis was on a reflective, community-based pedagogy rather than on civic learning outcomes. While it was assumed to occur, civic learning was oftentimes omitted as a curricular goal. The emphasis was on adopting service-learning as a pedagogy that would allow faculty across the disciplines to teach the content knowledge of their courses more effectively. Little attention was paid to using service-learning to teach the civic dimensions of a discipline or to foster the specific civic learning outcomes that students were to achieve in addition to mastering course concepts. A review of service-learning syllabi reveals that some of the most exemplary curricular models of service-learning focus on the technical aspects of a discipline, almost to the exclusion of its civic dimensions. While there is evidence of faculty success in adapting service-learning to teach course content, there is little evidence of faculty success in focusing attention on civic learning.

By the mid-nineties, service-learning practitioners were faced with a new challenge, fueled in part by the accumulated data from numerous studies indicating that, even as students were increasingly involved in volunteer activity, they were increasingly disinterested in traditional political involvement. At the same time, there was increased awareness of what some defined as a "crisis of civic renewal" in America and deep questioning about higher education's role in addressing this crisis. Higher education's response to this shifting context, framed through efforts to consciously link civic renewal with education for democratic participation, coalesced into the concept of the "engaged campus." Service-learning, it has been observed, was "the leading edge of an academic 'glasnost' to create democratic, engaged, civic universities" (Benson, Harkavy, and Hartley 2005, 191). Civic engagement pursued through teaching and learning found kinship in the pedagogy of service-learning. As the larger institutional agenda became better defined and more comprehensive, and as it took on a distinct civic renewal flavor, "civic engagement" gained widespread acceptance as the encompassing conceptual framework.

Support for service-learning and other civic engagement activities in higher education is stronger now than at any other time in recent history. Civic engagement is featured in the strategic agenda of nearly every national higher education association, including the American Council on Education, Association of American Colleges and Universities, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association for Higher Education, Campus Compact, the Council of Independent Colleges, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and others, including an increasing number of disciplinary associations. The powerful attraction of civic engagement is in its broad appeal; there is room inside the civic engagement tent for the inclusion of issues of community development, student leadership, academic leadership, mission reclamation, pedagogical excellence, engaged scholarship, civics education, the renewal of liberal education, and more.

At the same time, this fragmentation of intention has resulted in a civic engagement agenda that does not have clear goals or outcomes. In a 2002 report, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities noted that while engagement has become "shorthand for describing a new era of twoway partnerships between America's colleges and universities and the publics they serve ... it also presents the risk that the term can say everything and nothing at the same time.... The lack of clear definition can leave some campuses and their leaders with the impression that they are 'doing engagement,' when in fact they are not" (8). A lack of clarity about what is meant by the term "civic engagement" is evident when, at almost any gathering convened for the purpose of furthering civic engagement in higher education, questions inevitably arise about how to define civic engagement and about how it relates to civic education, service-learning, democratic education, political engagement, civics, education for citizenship, or moral education. Moreover, the lack of clarity fuels a latent confusion about how to operationalize a civic engagement agenda on campus. In particular, with the ascendancy of civic engagement, there has been a diminished focus on the relationship between civic engagement and improved student civic learning. As a set of curricular outcomes in courses across the disciplines, civic learning remains largely unaddressed.

#### **Civic Learning**

In issuing a "call for a newly understood civic learning," Caryn McTighe Musil makes the case that civic learning must be academically based. On campus, she asserts, "responsibility for orchestrating such events is usually assigned to student affairs, or to students themselves, through freshmen orientation programs, student clubs, campus-based religious groups, or volunteer community centers on campus"; as a result, "civic engagement is not rooted in the very heart of the academy: its courses, its research, its faculty work." If educating for democratic citizenship is understood "as a fundamental goal of a twenty-first century liberal education," argues Musil, then it should be conveyed as fundamentally "what is learned through the curriculum" (2003, 4–5).

A civic learning framework is consistent with the concept of "civic professionalism," which points to the public purposes and social responsibilities of professional education and practice. Civic professionalism "recognizes that there is finally no separation between the skills of problem solving and those of deliberation and judgment, no viable pursuit of technical excellence without participation in those civic enterprises through which expertise discovers its human meaning" (Sullivan 1995, xix). It draws attention to the civic dimensions of education, emphasizing the need not only for the development of disciplinary mastery and competence but also for civic awareness and purpose. Civic learning illuminates the socially responsive aspects of disciplinary knowledge, those dimensions that expand the view of education to include learning and developing the knowledge, skills, and values of democratic citizenship.

Vital and dynamic, civic learning is rooted in respect for community-based knowledge, grounded in experiential and reflective modes of teaching and learning, aimed at active participation in American democracy, and aligned with institutional change efforts to improve student learning. It is important to recognize that civic learning will be defined differently depending upon disciplinary perspective, the identity and mission of the institution, the academic strengths on campus, and the unique social environment of the local communities. Civic learning outcomes need to be thoughtfully constructed and carefully assessed if there is a serious interest in knowing that students are learning the knowledge, skills, and values for active, engaged civic participation.

In this context, civic learning includes *knowledge*—historical, political, and civic knowledge that arises from both academic and community sources; *skills*—critical thinking, communication, public problem solving, civic judgment, civic imagination and creativity, collective action, coalition building, and organizational analysis; and *values*—justice, inclusion, and participation.

#### Civic Knowledge

The knowledge necessary for effective civic participation includes, but is not limited to, traditional notions of "civics"—including the study of structures and processes of government and the obligations of citizenship. It also includes, but is not limited to, the historical foundations of the country and the emergence of American democracy. This is knowledge that can be learned in the classroom through the study of texts, but it is richer and more vital when it is integrated into the life of a community. Emphasis on the community-based aspect of civic knowledge is consistent with the formulation provided by the U.S. Department of Education (Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education 2003, 7):

A good understanding of the democratic principles and institutions embodied in our history, government, and law provide the foundation for civic engagement and commitment, but the classroom alone is not enough. Research shows that students are more likely to have a sense of social responsibility, more likely to commit to addressing community or social problems in their adult lives as workers and citizens, and more likely to demonstrate political efficacy when they engage in structured, conscious reflection on experience in the larger community.

A key element of civic knowledge is historical knowledge that contextualizes community-based experiences such that past events provide a context and a foundation for present community-based problem solving. Every community has a rich and unique history that fundamentally shapes the present social environment. This history also shapes current politics in the community, drawing upon a definition of politics, broadly conceived, as "the way a society as a whole negotiates, argues about, and understands its past and creates its present and future" (Boyte 2004, 1). As such, an understanding of the community's history is essential to effectively participating in it as well as effectively shaping its future. Further, it is important to conceive of civic knowledge as knowledge that emerges from community settings. Civic knowledge, in this framework, emphasizes the role that the community, in all of its complexity, plays in shaping student learning. Additionally, every discipline and profession has a history that is unique to its particular intellectual community and social purpose. That history contextualizes the profession and allows for exploration of its public and social dimensions.

#### Civic Skills

Richard Battistoni's Civic Engagement across the Curriculum (2002) is perhaps the best resource available for framing a civic skills component for curricula in a variety of disciplines. Battistoni draws on multiple disciplinary perspectives to explore a range of civic skills that can be incorporated into courses. In some ways, the skills he addresses are traditional liberal learning outcomes, but they are translated into a public context. For example, critical thinking skills are a widely expected outcome in liberal education. In Battistoni's framework, those skills are shaped by the challenges that community-based experiences place on students' cognitive assumptions; "students' ability to analyze critically is enhanced by confronting ideas and theories with the actual realities in the world surrounding them" (32). Similarly, Battistoni reframes communication skills, a foundational liberal learning outcome, as skills that are "essential to effective civic participation and to the values of civility and public deliberation" (33). He employs this "translation" of traditional liberal learning outcomes into learning outcomes with a civic dimension to suggest a range of civic skills that include public problem solving, civic judgment, civic imagination and creativity, collective action, community or coalition building, and organizational analysis.

The skills base that Battistoni argues for is precisely what Mary Kirlin (2002) identifies as a deficiency in many civic education programs. Her research suggests that many service and service-learning programs have weak impacts in the area of civic engagement because they have not sufficiently addressed the development of fundamental civic skills.

#### **Civic Values**

Articulating civic values suggests that it is legitimate to frame a discussion of values around "democratic values." As presented here, key democratic values are participation, justice, and inclusion. The point is that faculty, based on their disciplinary contexts, and campuses, based on their unique social, historical, and community contexts, will frame the values of democracy somewhat differently. At the same time, a focus on democratic values suggests that there is, fundamentally, a set of values essential to a functioning democracy that can be widely agreed upon and shared.

#### The Civic Promise of Service-Learning

Attention to civic learning reflects an effort to move beyond effective educational strategies like service-learning to learning outcomes that have a civic dimension. An essential point made by Edgerton and Schulman in reflecting on the 2002 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results is relevant here: "Students can be engaged in a range of effective practices and still not be learning with understanding; we know that students can be learning with understanding and still not be acquiring the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are related to effective citizenship" (National Survey of Student Engagement, 3). A focus on civic learning will build upon effective teaching and learning practices by linking them more deliberately to civic learning outcomes. In this sense, service-learning can be viewed as an effective engaged pedagogy; the next step is to employ service-learning for the achievement of civic learning outcomes.

# SECTION II Antecedents

Introduction

Keith Morton

he two chapters that follow, first published in 1996 and 1997 in the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (and one of which I co-authored), begin to lay out an argument about the history of service-learning, focusing on its debts to Jane Addams and the settlement house movement of the Progressive Era; to the political, philosophical, and pedagogical ideas of pragmatism and its proponent, John Dewey; and to the radical, communally based "personalism" of Dorothy Day. A history of service-learning might begin, the chapters suggest, at the moment or with the processes through which the concepts of "community service" and "service-learning" became recognizable as the terms we now use. When a history of service-learning is framed in this way, it opens questions of how and when the organic behaviors of community and service became formalized and institutionalized, it points toward a discussion of subsequent changes in the ways that humans interpret and respond to the suffering of other individuals and of social groups, and it asks us to consider how we might appropriately respond.

# Why Create a History of the Field (and What Is the Field)?

In the decade since these chapters were first published, the scholarship on Dewey, Addams, and Day has undergone a resurgence. Much of the interest in Dewey can be traced to the influence of philosopher Richard Rorty (1980, 1982), and to Robert Westbrook's John Dewey and American Democracy, (1991) and Democratic Hope: Pragmatism and the Politics of Truth (2005). Perhaps the most direct link between Dewey's concept of the public intellectual and contemporary service-learning can be found in the work of Ira Harkavy and his colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania's Netter Center for Community Partnerships. Harkavy, John Puckett, and Lee Benson, in their recent (Benson et al. 2007) Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform acknowledge their indebtedness to Dewey, describe their experiments in harnessing the university to help solve some of Philadelphia's most pressing social problems, and write, "In this book we pay homage to Dewey by trying to transcend him ... reflectively building on both his general theories and his empirical experiments to solve what we call the Dewey Problem ... what specifically is to be done beyond theoretical advocacy to transform American society and other developed societies into participatory democracies capable of helping to transform the world into a 'Great Community'" (xiii, original emphasis).

Jean Elshtain's (2002) very careful Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy reminded scholars that Addams saw herself as an engaged social and political theorist, rather than a founder of social work, and had a significant influence on Nicholas Longo's (2007) Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life. Longo's book, a revised doctoral dissertation, explores the learning processes of the settlement house movement and an effort to establish a similar "neighborhood learning community" (which he helped lead) as a collaboration between students and faculty of the University of Minnesota and residents of St. Paul, Minnesota. Longo also explores the impact of Addams's ideas about epistemology, learning, social change, and democracy on Myles Horton and the Highlander Folk Institute, and of Highlander on the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s.

There has been renewed interest in Day, as well, evidenced in Paul Elie's (2003) *The Life You Save May Be Your Own*, Robert Ellsberg's (2008) *The Duty of Delight: The Diaries of Dorothy Day*, and Dan McKanan's (2008) *The Catholic Worker after Dorothy: Practicing the Works of Mercy in a New Generation*. Unlike the scholarship on Dewey and Addams, recent work on Day, spurred in part by the proceedings published by Marquette University Press (2000) following a celebration of Day's centennial, has been largely detached from questions of civic engagement and service-learning, focusing instead on individual experience and spiritually grounded questions such as the meaning of charity and pilgrimage, and on the continuing experiment of sustaining "houses of hospitality" in an indifferent world. Day's importance—her impact, for example, on the ideas and work of Robert Coles, whose *Call of Service* has been read widely in service-learning—might stand for service-learning's in-attention to the spiritually and religiously grounded histories of service in all faith traditions.

There is, of course, a paradox built into viewing service-learning through the eyes of Progressive- and Depression-era exemplars. In her thoughtful assessment of the teaching of Vida Dutton Scudder, a contemporary of Addams and a professor of literature at Wellesley who placed her students in the Denison Settlement House of Boston as a way of "illuminating" the ethical questions that bring literature to life, Julia Garbus writes:

I cannot emphasize enough that the settlers did the best they could, and that they helped neighbors in countless practical ways. Late Victorians with a vision, they ventured into dangerous inner cities before the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, or social work had crystallized. In fact, their work laid some of the foundations for those fields. Their intellectual influences were Kingsley, Carlyle, and Ruskin, not Bourdieu, Foucault, and Freire. That said, contemporary servicelearning practitioners would make different choices. (2002, 557)

Scudder, Addams, and their contemporaries leaned on Thomas Carlyle, John Ruskin, and Charles Kingsley, who collectively argued that a world of communal ties was giving way to modern fragmentation and individualism; that experience cannot be divided into objective and subjective, moral and practical; that we find meaning by serving our communities; and that change is brought about by committed, heroic individuals. Pierre Bourdieu, Michel Foucault, and Paulo Freire, on the other hand, attempt to look at history and society from the bottom, invite us to focus on the social production of meaning, on the problems of multiple narratives, on the ways in which power destabilizes human relationships, and on reimagining the individual's relationship to larger social systems.

This is perhaps a long way round of noting the increasingly rich ways in which the history of service-learning is developing, but it also suggests why we need a rich history of service learning if we are to individually or collectively develop a "point of view" that will allow us to approach our work more deliberately and with less likelihood of doing harm.

## What Should/Would a History of the Field Look Like?

There is clearly much more work to be done, and it is dauntingly complex. Much of the most recent wave of interest in service-learning is reflected in Timothy Stanton, Dwight Giles, and Nadinne Cruz's (1999) *Service Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice and Future.* But there remain, for example, questions about the impact of William James and his essay "The Moral Equivalent of War" on the national service corps. Influenced by James, Alec Dickson founded the Voluntary Service Overseas in 1958 and is credited with suggesting what became the Peace Corps to John F. Kennedy. Dickson was also a mentor of James Kielsmeier, founder of the National Youth Leadership Council, and of Richard Kraft, a faculty member at the University of Colorado and author of several influential volumes on service learning in the 1990s. Also significant are histories of organizational development and its emphasis on mission setting, conflict resolution, and group learning, suggested by the work of Kurt Lewin (1951), David Kolb (1984), and Donald Schön (1983).

Service-learning is also involved with community development, a field with relatively little formal history other than that suggested by Robert Halpern's (1995) *Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States.* Histories of the nonprofit sector such as Peter Dobkin Hall's (1992) *Inventing the Nonprofit Sector and Other Essays on Philanthropy, Voluntarism, and Nonprofit Organizations* begin to suggest the cultural oddity of the nonprofit sector as a product of the mistrust of both government and private enterprise, and describe many of the issues faced by this sector. Studies of public education, such as Deborah Meier's (2004) *Many Children Left Behind*, argue for learner-centered, experientially based education that combines content learning with the development of attributes such as compassion and citizenship. And there is a need to explore more formally the relationship among nonviolent social change, civil rights and service-learning, from Gandhi, through Horton and Martin Luther King, Jr.

Equally important and largely missing are histories of efforts that have taken place outside the dominant, mainstream culture of the United States histories that represent the multivocal, contested, and continuing efforts of very diverse practitioners to care for others and make positive change. As Charles S. Stevens (2003, 33), in his careful essay "Unrecognized Roots of Service-Learning in African American Social Thought and Action, 1890–1930," asks, "How do racial and social class differences among the socially committed affect service-learning programs? How do racial and social class differences among the socially committed affect service-learning program development and civic and academic outcomes?"

#### Practice

Addams, Dewey, and Day practiced (and their copious writings describe) a form of reflection that unites action, ethics, and aesthetics, allowing readers to find in their stories insights that help us to reflect on dilemmas we face now. They offer not only practical suggestions and possibilities but a process for learning from experience that is itself useful. Dewey approaches what we now call "reflection" most formally, but each of them tells stories of the ways in which they learned to "listen" and to respond to what they heard—enough stories that we can begin to discern a pattern that we can adapt and practice. I know that I am leaning on history as I read the words of people who were engaged in similar situations tens or hundreds of years earlier: what did they feel, think, conclude, leave unresolved? As these chapters invite us to do, I often find solace or inspiration in their words. How did they live with the ethical dilemma of "enough" that caregivers feel as they respond to the suffering of others, working out boundaries between their public roles and private lives? How did they find the patience to organize and educate in the face of broad cultural resistance? And I collect the stories of my campus and community partners, self-consciously weaving them into the narratives that bind us together, help me to make sense of what we are doing, and help me to join with others in a larger community of action and reflection.

## 3 Education for Critical Citizenship

John Dewey's Contribution to the Pedagogy of Community Service-Learning

John Saltmarsh

hen this essay was written, there had been modest attention paid to John Dewey's educational philosophy and its relationship to the emerging practice of service-learning in American higher education. Some of the leaders in the field recognized the importance of his work and opened the door for further exploration (see Giles and Eyler 1994).

At the same time there was something of a revival of Dewey in the early 1990s, resurrecting him from the conservative historiography of the postwar period that left him diminished as an innocuous educator, now bringing him forward as a political progressive and champion of democratic politics and culture—most notably in Robert Westbrook's 1991 biography John Dewey and American Democracy. It was in that spirit of reviving and making useful Dewey's progressive politics that this essay was conceived, as a way of explicating the importance of Dewey's contribution to the democratic dimensions of service-learning.

Throughout the 1990s and up to the present time, there was and is an ongoing tension within the service-learning and civic engagement movement

This chapter was originally published as John Saltmarsh, "Education for Critical Citizenship: John Dewey's Contribution to the Pedagogy of Service Learning," *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 3 (1996): 13–21. (An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Fifth Annual Conference of the Institute for the Study of Postsecondary Pedagogy, SUNY New Paltz, New York, November 1995.) to situate the democratic and political dimensions of engagement as central to the mission of higher education and to the operationization of that mission through academic practice. Dewey's philosophy is grounded in the inextricable intersection of democracy and education and challenges higher education to fulfill its democratic purpose. Dewey's influence persists as we see the continued importance of his thought in providing the foundations for the community engagement work at an exemplary engaged campus, the University of Pennsylvania (see Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett 2007).

Some years ago when I was in the Adirondacks, I climbed Mt. Marcy, the highest peak of those mountains. There, near the top, is a marshy space with a little brook trickling down, apparently insignificant. A few rods away, after a slight rise of land, there is a second little brook, likewise apparently insignificant. I was told that the first one I speak of is the headwaters of the Hudson River; that the waters a short way off, separated by a watershed only a few feet higher than this swampy land, finally empty into the St. Lawrence. These little streams, that are hardly to be called streams but rather rivulets, at their source are only a few yards apart, but traversing very different lands and seeing very different scenes they finally reach the Atlantic Ocean hundreds of miles from each other. This metaphor for purposes of comparison is trite, yet it seems to me that in its way it is representative of what happens historically. Great movements are not often great in their beginnings. Taken in themselves, their inception is as seemingly insignificant and trivial as the little trickles of water at the top of that mountain. It is only when after a long period of time we look back to see what has come out of these little beginnings, that they appear important; just as it is when we see the Hudson River after it has become a majestic stream that the small rivulet at the top of Mt. Marcy gains importance. (Dewey 1932a, 99)

I like this passage not only because of the inherent connectedness of an ecological metaphor but also because the purpose of this essay is to journey, as it were, upstream, to explore the source of a kind of education that addresses civic involvement. The aim of this brief discussion is to make explicit John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service learning (CSL) and in doing so explore a conception of CSL that focuses on education for critical citizenship. Dewey's writings inform service-learning through a philosophy of education, a theory of inquiry, a conception of community and democratic life, and a means for individual engagement in society toward the end of social transformation. While Dewey never specifically addresses "community service learning" as a term signifying a particular conceptual framework of education, his writings do analyze five specific areas of relevance to service-learning: (1) linking education to experience, (2) democratic community, (3) social service, (4) reflective inquiry, and (5) education for social transformation. Together, these contributions form the basis of a cultural and political critique and reconceptualized pedagogy aimed at the development of democratic values and critical citizenship.

His writings also reveal that CSL is a pedagogy grounded in the philosophical tradition of American pragmatism, the legacy of which has increasingly impacted postsecondary education over the last decade (Kimball, 1995a). Dewey's pragmatism-what he termed "instrumentalism"-was much like the watershed at the top of the mountain, a framework embedded in an ecology of relations and larger purposes. Philosophy, for Dewey, was "the theory of education as deliberately conducted practice" and education, as such, "is not a means to living, but is identical with the operation of living a life." This "theory of method of knowing," wrote Dewey, "may be termed pragmatic." Pragmatism's influence on education treats it as "a matter of instrumental values-topics studied because of some end beyond themselves" (Dewey 1916b, 342, 249, 353, 251). As Bruce Kimball has noted, two of the "developments in liberal education that suggest the influence of pragmatism" are the attention "to values and service" and the renewed "emphasis on community and citizenship" (Kimball 1995a, 91). CSL claims as its inheritance a concept of education that integrates thought and action, reason and emotion, mind and body, leisure and work, education and life, and connects individuals to their community and natural contexts.

CSL is a pedagogy of reflective inquiry linking students' involvement in community service with their intellectual and moral development. Since the term "service-learning" was coined in the late 1960s, there has been considerable effort to reach agreed-upon principles of good practice and a common definition (Giles and Eyler 1994). Yet there remains confusion over both definition and aim; one leading practitioner has suggested that recent practice has resulted in uncertainty over whether service-learning is a *form* or a *philosophy* of experiential education (Stanton 1990b). This essay, in looking at CSL through the lens of John Dewey's concepts of education and community, suggests that it is a particular pedagogy informed by a distinct philosophical tradition (Robertson 1992).

Over the last twenty-five years CSL has found justification in educational institutions both as an alternative pedagogy and as a movement of sorts aimed at transforming the culture of American higher education (Barber 1992; Barber and Battistoni 1993; Kendall et. al. 1990). Ernest Boyer has placed community service at the core of the creation of the "New American College," what he describes as "an institution that celebrates . . . its capacity to connect thought to action, theory to practice" (1994, A48). For Boyer, the university as a "connected institution" would have students learn and teachers teach in a way that is responsive to community concerns.

For Boyer and others, the influence of American pragmatism, particularly the thread connecting to John Dewey, is ever apparent, but rarely is it directly formulated or attributed. In the area of experiential learning, those in search of pedagogical foundations for service-learning have found an anchor in the writings of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire, particularly in his conception of praxis, dialogic education, a liberationist educational paradigm, and a redefined role of teaching. Little of this interest in Freire's work accounts for the roots of his educational philosophy in Dewey. Freire wrote his thesis to become professor of the history and philosophy of education based upon Dewey's *Democracy and Education*, published in Brazil in 1936 (Freire 1970; Gadotti 1994). Consider the notion of reflective teaching as just one example of Dewey's influence on Freire. Freire notes that "through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-students with students-teachers" (61).

Compare this with Dewey: "The alternative to furnishing ready-made subject matter and listening to the accuracy with which it is reproduced, is not quiescence, but participation, sharing, in an activity. In such shared activity the teacher is a learner, and the learner is, without knowing it, a teacher" (1916b, 167). Similarly, the theoretical basis of service-learning has found a solid basis in the work on experiential learning theory developed by David Kolb, yet there has been little attention paid to the roots of Kolb's writings in Dewey (Delve, Mintz, and Stewart 1990; Kolb 1984, 1985).

CSL is very much a part of a Deweyian tradition of what Philip Selznick calls "communitarian liberalism" combining "a spirit of liberation and social reconstruction with a strong commitment to responsible participation in effective communities." This incorporates a "normative theory of learning" whereby the individual seeks coherent, purposive, integrative, and self-affirming conduct. As such, pragmatism is defined as a "philosophy of commitment" (Selznick 1992, xii, 22, 29). This particular inheritance of pragmatism also has informed the educational concerns of Robert Coles in his advocacy of connecting community experience to purposive academic study (1989a). "Our colleges and universities," writes Coles, "could be of great help to students engaged in community service if they tried consistently and diligently to help students need more opportunity for moral and social reflection on the problems that they have seen at first hand... Students need the chance to directly connect books to experience, ideas and introspection to continuing activity" (1994, A64).

Finally, it is relevant to a discussion of Dewey's contribution to CSL to recognize the convergence of pragmatism and an epistemological orientation described as "connected knowing" that is associated with women's psychology and feminist theory that developed in the early 1980s (Belenky et al. 1986; Gilligan 1982; Kimball 1995a; Noddings 1984). Drawing on the studies of Gilligan (1982), Belenky and colleagues describe connected knowing as building "on the subjectivists' conviction that the most trustworthy knowledge comes from personal experience" (1986, 112–113). Connected knowing challenges the dominant educational paradigm in American higher education and not only is conceptually rooted in pragmatism but also is in agreement with

Dewey's definition of education: "It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience. The increment of meaning corresponds to the increased perception of the connections of the activities in which we are engaged" (Dewey 1916b, 82–83).

In this paradigm, according to philosopher Jane Roland Martin, education "integrates thought and action, reason and emotion, education and life" and "does not divorce persons from their social and natural contexts" (1984, 179-183). There is change in pedagogy and epistemology; the relations of teaching and learning shift from procedural knowing to the collective construction of knowledge; the teacher is de-centered, facilitating problem-posing education as a model for a dialogic search for knowledge; students become self-directed and reflective learners; and teacher and student engage in a relationship of reciprocity where both are equally committed to creating a context for learning. Connected knowing legitimizes learning that takes place outside the classroom, recognizes multiple learning styles, and values learning based in experience. Further, institutions of connected knowing are connected institutions, embedded in reciprocal relations that link the university to the communities of which they are an integral part. And connected knowing treats education not as something separate from "life," but as life itself, and education becomes a lifelong process carried forward by an individual provided with the proficiencies to be a self-directed learner. Education is a means to an end, a way of life delineated by civic engagement. As Dewey wrote, "Unless education has some frame of reference it is bound to be aimless, lacking a unified objective. The necessity for a frame of reference must be admitted. There exists in this country such a unified frame. It is called democracy" (1937, 415).

#### Education and Experience

Dewey's entire philosophical scheme, what he called instrumentalism, rests upon a refutation of the dominating "dualism" in modern thought. In philosophy, these "dualisms or antitheses" involved the "chief problems in philosophy such as mind (or spirit) and matter, body and mind, the mind and the world, the individual and his relationship to others, etc." (1916b, 343). Their "intellectual formulation" was found in what Dewey called the distinctions "of labor and leisure, practical and intellectual activity, man and nature, individuality and association, culture and vocation." Dualisms as they appeared in society were found in "more or less rigidly marked-off classes and groups." In all cases, Dewey countered with, in his words, "a philosophy which recognizes the origin, place and function of mind *in* an activity which controls the environment." In this original denial of dualism is the very definition of his philosophy. Dewey connected mind and action, and in doing so offered an instrumentalist philosophy that views "intelligence to be the purposive reorganization, through action, of the material of experience" (1916b, 332–333). With this basic connection, philosophy is neither a form of knowledge nor a means to acquire knowledge, but it is connected knowing, that is, education itself. As Dewey explained, "Philosophy may be defined as a general theory of education... Philosophy is the theory of education as deliberately conducted practice" (1916b, 338, 342).

For service-learning, Dewey's educational philosophy provides the basis for a pedagogy connecting practice and theory, what he called linking "action and doing on the one hand, and knowledge and understanding on the other" (1932, 107). Having done so, his approach to education inherently connects theory and practice, the school and the community, and fundamentally, knowledge and moral conduct (harking back to the central premise of Emerson's 1837 essay The American Scholar). It calls for both the centrality of experiential education, linking academic learning with learning through experience, and for the institutional reorientation of the school, college, or university in its relation to the community. The central idea of Dewey's pragmatism, of his educational philosophy, is that the individual engages in the world and brings meaning into existence (1938). "The level of action fixed by embodied intelligence," wrote Dewey, "is always the important thing" (1927a, 210). Learning is active; the learner is an explorer, a maker, a creator. "The inclination to learn from life itself," claimed Dewey, "and to make the conditions of life such that all will learn in the process of living, is the finest product of schooling" (1916b, 56).

#### Democratic Community

Dewey's belief that education is not a preparation for life but a process of living comes directly from this denial of fragmenting dualisms. It also has implications for the character and purpose of education: Education involves socially interconnected action for a particular social end. It is one thing to assert that schools should be not *in* but *of* a community, and another to find purpose in community life. As Dewey himself recognized, "The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind" (1916b, 103). The kind of society he envisioned was not only one in which individuals engage in pervasive associated activity but one in which "conjoint, combined, associated action" (1927a, 23) was the basis of a participatory democratic culture. For Dewey, "democracy is not an alternative to other principles of associated life. It is the idea of community life itself" (1927a, 148).

Associated activity would have to be inclusive and diverse. The "standard" for "desirable traits of forms of community life," wrote Dewey, was (A) "How numerous and varied are the interests shared?" and (B) "How full and free is the interplay with other forms of association?" (1927a, 89). Both, he claimed, "point to democracy" and "are precisely what constitute a democratically constituted society" (1916b, 88–92). Democracy, for Dewey, was "primarily a form of associated living, a conjoint communicated experience" (1916b, 93). In *Democracy and Education* he noted, "There is more than a verbal tie between the words common, community, and communication. Men live in a community in virtue of the things they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common" (1916b, 7). "All communication," he added, "is educative" (1916b, 8).

Experience in community life was education for democracy, yet that experience required certain characteristics. Concerned with the human quality of interaction and the tendency to trivialize the meaning of community by expanding it to encompass any kind of associated activity, Dewey recognized that "associated life is not a matter of physical juxtaposition, but of genuine intercourse-of community of experience in a non-metaphorical sense of community" (quoted in West 1989, 93). Community for Dewey emphasized "faceto-face" association. Repeatedly, Dewey implored that "in its deepest and richest sense a community must always remain a matter of face-to-face intercourse" (1927a, 211). More than anything, the quality of face-to-face interaction was essential to the experience of education. "Immediate contiguity, faceto-face relationships, have consequences which generate a community of interests, a sharing of values" (1927a, 39). Intense and intimate association was essential to education. As Dewey noted, "One cannot share in intercourse with others without learning-without getting a broader point of view and perceiving things of which one would otherwise be ignorant" (1916b, 130).

Connecting with others for a sense of a "community of interests" broadens the individuals' sense of self, connecting the "I" to the "we," fostering the collective norm that one should forgo self-interest to work for the common good. For Dewey, the individual's sense of self is fully developed only in association with others, such that he denied the dualism dividing self and society. "The individual and the social are not opposed terms," Dewey writes emphatically; "indeed, in the strict sense of terms, no question can be reduced to the individual on one side and the social on the other." The self is by no means denied, but individualism is redefined. "To gain an integrated individuality," wrote Dewey in *Individualism: Old and New*, "each of us needs to cultivate his own garden. But there is no fence about this garden: it is no sharply marked-off enclosure" (quoted in West 1989, 103). Only through association is separation of self and society overcome; as Dewey noted, "selfhood is not something which exists apart from association" (1932b, 298).

#### Service

While service-learning can be shaped by Dewey's principle of associated experience in the community as the basis for democratic education, the issue remains as to which associated activities to choose. While there are many forms of association, each individual can actively engage in only some. Which ones? How does the individual decide? Or as Dewey framed the question: "What attitude shall I adopt toward an issue which concerns many persons whom I do not know personally, but whose actions along with mine will determine the conditions under which we all live?" (1908, 319).

Dewey begins with the original premise of the dissolution of dualisms. Association should be undertaken to break down divisions and barriers between individuals. Next, associations aimed at overcoming social divisions should be distributive, mutual, and reciprocal relationships, or they will by definition perpetuate the barriers they set out to destroy. Finally, participation in a democratic culture recognizes that one contributes to social wellbeing to the degree that one has been afforded opportunities to reach one's full capabilities in life. Service, in other words, is defined by one's place of privilege in society and a relationship to those less privileged defined by a sense of justice.

Dewey's experience with what we might call a "service association" was profoundly affected by his relationship with Jane Addams and her work at Hull House in the 1890s (Feffer 1993, 107-116; Ryan 1995, 149-153; Westbrook 1991, 80-85). In writing about Hull House, a settlement house in Chicago, Dewey observed that "it is not merely a place where ideas and beliefs may be exchanged, nor merely in the arena of formal discussion . . . but in ways which ideas are incarnate in human form and clothed with the winning grace of personal life." The activities of Hull House were "modes of bringing people together, of doing away with barriers ... that keep people from real communion with each other." "Instead of fostering dependence and relieving wants," Dewey concluded that settlements "aim to promote independence, to set the man upon his own feet and enable him to achieve self-respect" (1908, 150). It was from his experiences with settlement houses that he came to the "growing recognition that the community life is defective and distorted excepting as it does thus care for all its constituent parts. This is no longer viewed as a matter of charity, but as a matter of justice" (1902b, 91, 93). A democratic community defined by civic engagement was the end to be achieved, and justice the means to that end. "Justice as an end in itself," he warned, "is a case of making an idol out of a means at the expense of the end which the mean serves" (1932b, 249).

Concerned with the possibility that associated conduct across class divisions could perpetuate or further entrench those divisions, Dewey explored further the qualities of justice and charity relationships. In his *Ethics* he wrote that the aim in associated activity is "general social advance, constructive social reform, not merely doing something kind for individuals who are rendered helpless from sickness or poverty. Its aim is the equity of justice, not the inequality of conferring benefits." He offered a justice orientation which "looks at the well-being of society as a whole," "realizes the interdependence of interests," is "fixed upon positive opportunities for growth," and is "centered on social rights and possibilities" (1908, 349).

This he contrasted with a "charity" perspective that "assumes a superior and inferior class," is "negative and palliative merely," and that treats "individuals as separate, to whom, in their separateness, good is to be done" (1908, 349). "Charity," wrote Dewey, "may even be used as a sop to one's conscience while at the same time it buys off the resentment which might otherwise grow up in those who suffer from social injustice" (1932b, 301). He concludes his thoughts on service in *Ethics* with the observation that "the best kind of help to others, whenever possible, is indirect, and consists in such modifications of the conditions of life, of the general level of subsistence, as enables them independently to help themselves" (1908, 350).

In Democracy and Education, Dewey returns to the issue of service association and emphasizes the importance of communicated activity in those areas of associated life where it is most restricted. This is critical to association for democratic education. His concern again is with "breaking down barriers of social stratification which make individuals impervious to the interests of others" (1916b, 129). His aim is a "cultivated imagination for what men have in common and a rebellion at whatever unnecessarily divides them" (1916b, 128). As an educational experience, he emphasizes the importance for communication, understanding, and learning to adopt a justice relationship and to reject one built upon charity. He warned that "what is sometimes called a benevolent interest in others may be an unwitting mask for an attempt to dictate to them what their good shall be, instead of an endeavor to free them so that they may seek and find the good of their own choice." Finally, a service relationship was defined by opportunity, choice, social responsibility, and social need. The individual with opportunity in society had the responsibility to choose to become socially engaged in such a way as to meet the most pressing social needs. "Power," wrote Dewey, "must be relative to doing something, and to the fact that things which most need to be done are things which involve one's relationships with others." "If democracy has a moral and ideal meaning," he concluded, "it is that a social return be demanded from all and that opportunity for development and distinctive capacities be afforded all" (1916b, 127-129).

#### **Reflective Inquiry**

The necessity of experience in education implies an approach to education that will foster learning from action, for as Dewey warned, "mere activity does not constitute experience" (1916b, 146). Experience as a means of learning is emblematic of pragmatism as a problem-solving mode of inquiry. The process by which knowledge is employed in a problem-posing process is though reflective inquiry. "When we reflect upon an experience instead of just having it," explains Dewey, "we inevitably distinguish between our own attitude and the objects toward which we sustain the attitude" (1916b, 173). Reflective learning breaks down the distinctions between thought and action, theory and practice, knowledge and authority, ideas and responsibilities. Reflection as a mode of inquiry is central to experiential learning and is the critical connection in service-learning between service activity and the learning associated with it.

Dewey concentrates considerable attention on reflective inquiry in *Democracy and Education* (1916) and in an earlier book, *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process* (1910). The "general features of a reflective experience" were, he explained,

(I) perplexity, confusion, doubt, due to the fact that one is implicated in an incomplete situation whose full character is not yet determined;

(II) a conjectural anticipation—a tentative interpretation of the given elements, attributing them to a tendency to effect certain consequences;

(III) a careful survey . . . of all attainable consideration which will define and clarify the problem in hand;

(IV) a consequent elaboration of the tentative hypothesis to make it more precise and more consistent, because squaring with the wider range of facts;

(V) taking one stand upon the projected hypothesis as a plan of action which is applied to the existing state of affairs: doing something to bring about the anticipated result, and thereby testing the hypothesis. (1910, 157)

In the reflective process, the "value of knowledge is subordinate to its use in thinking" toward the end of solving a problem faced in experience (1916b, 158). Without fostering reflective thinking, learning cannot move beyond conditioning, beyond the classroom, beyond formal education. Without reflection on activity, the connection between thought and action is dissipated, the ability to formulate further action is lost, and the whole philosophical scheme collapses.

In *How We Think*, Dewey describes reflective thinking as "the kind of thinking that consists in turning a subject over in the mind and giving it serious and consecutive consideration.... It enables us to know what we are about when we act. It converts action which is merely appetitive, blind, and impulsive into intelligent action" (1910 113, 125). Intelligent action brought together knowledge and experience and made the connection between reflective thinking and associated communication in the creation of meaning from experience. Reflection allowed for an experience "to be formulated in order to be communicated. To formulate requires getting outside of it, seeing it as

another would see it, considering what points of contact it has with the life of another so that it may be got into such form that he can appreciate its meaning" (1916b, 8).

The essence of reflective inquiry is its ability to make connections between all the various pieces of information that accompany a problematic situation and to make the connection between intent and result of conduct. First, information becomes "knowledge only as its material is comprehended," wrote Dewey, "and understanding, comprehension, means that the various parts of information acquired are grasped in their relation to one another-a result that is attained only when acquisition is accompanied by constant reflection upon the meaning of what is studied" (1910, 177). Second, Dewey defined reflection as "the discernment of the relation between what we try to do and what happens in consequence." Reflection is the "intentional endeavor to discover specific connections between something which we do and the consequences which result, so that the two become continuous" (1916b, 151). Finally, not only did the "consequences of conjoint action take on a new value when they are observed" through reflective thinking, but the observation "of the effects of connected action forces men to reflect upon the connection itself" (1916b, 24). In Dewey's words, "To put ourselves in the place of another, to see things from the standpoint of his aim and values, to humble our estimate of our own pretensions to the level they assume in the eyes of an impartial observer, is the surest way to appreciate what justice demands in concrete cases" (1932b, 251). Reflective inquiry is at the core of service-learning, creating meaning out of associational experience. It is also through reflection that one can perceive a framework in which education and service are means toward a larger end of a just democratic community.

#### Education for Social Transformation

What, according to Dewey, is the politics of service-learning? This is, perhaps, an unfair question given that Dewey did not write out of a perspective that conceptualized service-learning per se. Yet, we can with fairness raise the question of politics as it is embedded in both his conception of service and progressive education. In both cases, the unity of thought and action is a means to a particular end, that of a democratic culture built upon active participation by an engaged citizenry. The holistic nature of Dewey's philosophy means that it is impossible to discuss any one philosophical, educational, or political issue without bringing in all the others. The connections Dewey made, particularly connections between the private and the public, led him to offer a theory of education situated in the politics of modern society. The paradox of Dewey's pragmatic liberalism is that while he had an expansive view of democratic culture—"to be realized it must affect all the modes of human association, the family, the school, industry, religion" (1927a, 143) he had a limited conception of how the progressive ideals of democracy he cherished were going to be realized.

Dewey consistently calls for education linked to "social reconstruction." He looked to education as the primary means of social transformation; it was, he said, "*par excellence* the method of social reconstruction" (quoted in Feffer 1993, 113). "Schools have a role," he claimed, "in the production of social change" (1937, 409). Assertions like the following are not unusual for Dewey: "The social perspective of education does not involve a superficial adaptation of the existing system but a radical change in foundation and aim" (1913, 119) and "There is a standing danger that education will perpetuate the older traditions for a select few. . . . Education would then become an instrument of perpetuating unchanged the existing order of society instead of operating as a means of its transformation" (1916b, 325–326).

These kinds of statements are pervasive in his writings on education, and they lead to the question of what kind of social transformation Dewey had in mind. In *Democracy and Education* he explains that transformation of society "signifies a society in which every person shall be occupied in something which makes the lives of others better worth living, and which accordingly makes the ties which bind persons together more perceptible—which breaks down the barriers of distance between them" (1916b, 326). Significantly, not only is the purpose of education to bring about this kind of social transformation, but this is the role of service as well. Again, Hull House becomes his touchstone, and Dewey writes about its service function as "the unification of the city's life or the realization of city unity" (quoted in Feffer 1993, 113).

In other words, both education and service provided a mediating role mediating association between social groups, social interests, social divisions—a role that promoted a politics of mediation and gradualism. The observations about Dewey by West are of importance here, noting that "it is the *kind* of gradualism he promotes and the *form* of reformism he propagates; that is, his gradualism is primarily pedagogical in nature and his reformism is primarily dialogical in character." In assigning a mediating role to service and education, Dewey proposes a politics of social transformation that shuns confrontation and agitation. As West points out, for Dewey, "creative democracy is furthered by education and discussion." And "because his emphasis on culture leads him to promote principally pedagogical and dialogical means of social change," West concludes that "Dewey's culturalism was relatively impotent" (1989, 102, 106–107).

A careful reading of Dewey indicates that for all the emphasis he placed on the central role of education in social reconstruction, he also recognized, as early as 1902, that education had a proscribed role in altering the socialeconomic system. "I do not suppose education alone can solve it," he admitted; "it will take a great many other agencies as well to straighten out all the questions we are finding ourselves in" (1902a, 316). Yet it was not until the 1930s that Dewey pushed his social analysis to the point where there is an apparent shift in emphasis away from the transformative power of education to the need for concerted political activity to bring about the kind of social change he desired. He decried "the subordination of political action and ends" and conceded that it was "unrealistic . . . to suppose that the schools can be the *main* agencies in producing the intellectual and moral changes, the changes in attitudes and dispositions of thought and purpose, which are necessary for the creation of a new social order" (1937, 413–414).

West's analysis is critical for understanding Dewey's notion of radical democratic transformation. Dewey's philosophy was aimed at the enhancement of democratic education, and his conception of democracy was cultural, not political. Recall that democracy for Dewey was "a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated activity" embodied in "face-to-face" association with "stable loyal attachments" (quoted in Robertson 1992, 342). Dewey's culturalism was forced upon him by the erosion of local communities and his desire to revitalize a democratic political life. Yet he did not connect either school reform or community viability to political action. In a critique of Dewey, Charles Frankel has written that "a democratic polity is not a university, a scientific discipline, or a debating club. Its controlling purpose is collective action, not the accreditation of propositions as true" (quoted in Robertson 1992, 351). Dewey did not provide a means of collective action to address his own deeply felt fear, expressed in 1929, that the schools were merely turning our "citizenship fodder in a state controlled by pecuniary industry" (quoted in Robertson 1992, 345). In addition to what Wendell Berry refers to as the intangibles of community life in "culture-borne knowledge, attitudes, and skills; family and community coherence; family and community labor; and cultural and religious principles," a commitment to education for radical democracy would have to be aimed at engagement in collective political action (1987b, 187).

In the end, Dewey provides a means of political action defined by mediation and gradualism even though the kind of social change he envisions was unlikely to be achieved through discussion and association alone. This limitation of pragmatic communitarianism, one which Dewey recognized but did not resolve, is the belief, as Harry Boyte has written, that "community forms both the precondition and also the end of civic involvement" (1993, 173). Connecting service to action for social justice requires looking carefully at the relationship between association and civic engagement. It requires challenging the assumption that association itself constitutes civic engagement—an assumption that needs to be addressed by "social capital" theorists like Robert Putnam (1993, 1995), since it has implications for the dynamics of viable democratic communities—and in doing so addresses the connection between public activity and political activism. This would involve connecting community service to forms of engagement involving often messy realities of compromise, ambiguity, and the exercise of power. As Boyte explains, "The aim of politics is action on significant public problems—not bonding, or intimacy, or communal consensus" (1993, 177).

The challenge to service-learning as a pedagogy of critical citizenship is shaped by the dilemmas that Dewey faced. The challenge to Dewey was not only to provide a pedagogy of social reconstruction but to situate that pedagogy in the politics of modern America; it was to articulate a kind of political activity to which his conception of education and service could contribute. For service-learning to be an education for citizenship, it should be based upon a foundation unifying thought and action; it should engage students in a direct and intimate way so that they are of a community and not merely in it. Yet it should also not lose sight of its fundamental justice orientation, and it should build upon the premise of social justice in fostering critical reflection that begins to draw connections to a wider realm of activity beyond social association. Community service approached for social justice should be connected with reflective inquiry that provides a context for the role of mediation but also the role of advocacy and empowerment. Even as Dewey's philosophy did not clarify how the connection would be made between his educational theory and the kind of social transformation for social justice he advocated, he did recognize that "the problem of education in its relation to direction of social change is all one with the problem of finding out what democracy means in its total range of concrete applications; economic, domestic, international, religious, cultural, and political" (1937, 416). Those involved in practicing a pedagogy of service-learning as education for critical citizenship are challenged to foster the connection between the private and the public and then to the political. To complete the metaphor:

But as yet our education has not found itself; the stream has not reached port and the ocean. It has left behind traditional education; it can never return to its source. It has to meet the problems of today, and of the future, not of the past. The stream just now has gathered up a good deal of debris from the shores which it has flooded; it tends to divide and lose itself in a number of streams. It is still dammed at spots by barriers erected in past generations. But it has within itself the power of creating a free experimental intelligence that will do the necessary work of this complex and distracted world in which we and every other modern people have to live. (Dewey 1932a, 111)

### 4 Addams, Dewey, and Day

The Emergence of Community Service in American Culture

John Saltmarsh (with Keith Morton)

Some of the best learning comes from the presence of what Paulo Freire called "a presenting problem." In this case the presenting problem was understanding the origins and evolution of the concept of "community service" in twentieth-century American culture and politics. The opportunity to explore this problem came through a course co-taught by John Saltmarsh and Keith Morton while the former spent a year on sabbatical at Providence College, where the latter was at the time the associate director of the Feinstein Institute for Public and Community Service. The course we used to explore the problem at hand was a midlevel course within the Public and Community Service Studies curriculum called Community Service in American Culture.

As we developed the course we realized that while a significant amount of effort has been given to the management of service opportunities and to the pedagogy of service-learning, relatively little attention had been given to understanding the meaning of the concept of community service. In fact, no comprehensive history of community service in America existed (or exists now), and the absence of this history was reflected in

Keith Morton is Professor of Public and Community Service Studies and American Studies and Associate Director of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service at Providence College in Rhode Island. This chapter was originally published as John Saltmarsh, "Addams, Day, and Dewey: The Emergence of Community Service in American Culture," *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 4 (1997): 137–149. our collective difficulty in articulating what service-learning is; in sorting out the various, often competing, expectations of service that students, faculty, and community partners bring to service-learning; and in deepening the discussion about the meaning and potential of our work. The course allowed us to write what we understood to be the general contours of such a history.

If we were to teach the course today we would have a much richer literature to draw from because the history of community service and campus-community practice continues to be explored insightfully by a number of authors. Gary Daynes and Nicholas Longo focused on Jane Addams's influence in "Jane Addams and the Origins of Service-Learning Practice in the United States" (2004); Longo further explores Addams's contributions and deepens the history in Recognizing the Role of Community in Civic Education: Lessons from Hull House, Highlander Folk School, and the Neighborhood Learning Community (2005) and in his book Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life (2007); John Puckett and Michael Johanek have expanded our understanding of local practice with their history Leonard Covello and the Making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if Citizenship Mattered (2007).

Finally, writing this essay was a collective effort that extended beyond the two of us, and we acknowledged at the time and again acknowledge here the intellectual debts to our students in PSP 301, Community Service in American Culture, especially to our teaching assistants Dan Power and Sally Gerencser, and to our colleagues in the Service Learning Study Group.

#### Overview

While service, charity, and caring each have long histories that can be traced back thousands of years, "community service" is a modern phrase and did not enter the everyday language of Americans until sometime in the 1940s. We would argue the history of what we have come to call community service actually entails three different and continuing cultural responses to the individual and social dilemmas that emerged from the crisis of community at the turn of the last century.

Beginning with the settlement house movement in the 1880s, community service emerged as an experimental tool used by a wide range of reformers to explore ways in which the mainstream culture of the United States could accommodate its contradictory impulses toward capitalism and democracy. By the early 1930s, community service led in three quite different directions: (1) toward the nonprofit sector, (2) toward education and public policy as the essential tools and primary arenas for citizen action, and (3) toward the development of counter-cultural responses that explicitly rejected most of the assumptions and values underlying capitalism and democracy. While many individuals contributed to each of these avenues, they find symbolic as well as practical expression in the lives of three persons: Jane Addams (1860–1935), John Dewey (1859–1954), and Dorothy Day (1897–1980). Addams, in establishing Hull House, a middle-class Victorian home (office, school, and church) among the poorest tenements of 1890s Chicago, sought to analyze, humanize, and moderate the more destructive aspects of capitalism and offer the poor and immigrants a hand up on the ladder to success. In the process she contributed to the establishment of the profession of social work, helped to define the new field of sociology, introduced scientific method into philanthropy, and invented a model of what would become the modern nonprofit human service organization.

John Dewey, a philosophy professor and "public intellectual" active from the 1880s through the late 1940s, was a close friend of Addams and knew Hull House well from firsthand experience. He argued that capitalism was "eclipsing" the public (1927b), diminishing the work and lives of ordinary people, and transferring power into the hands of an educated and monied elite. Standing in opposition to other public intellectuals such as Lewis Mumford, founder of urban studies, and the journalist Walter Lippmann, he argued that it was the role of a strong federal government to address pressing human needs and disaggregate private power and that it was the work of ordinary citizens to define these needs and see that their governments met them. Dewey was critical and dubious of private, charitable responses to human suffering, arguing that these responses were throwbacks "to a feudal system" (1908, 334). Arguing that unchecked capitalism created the need for charity in the first place, he advocated for a two-pronged strategy in which the government would control those aspects of capitalism that threatened democracy and oversee the care of people who were its victims. Of primary concern was connecting education and community life as the basis for a popular democracy in which the public would enact social policy. His legacies to us are an abiding faith that education leads to social reform, an expectation that schools are the social center for local communities, an articulation of public and civic roles for ordinary people that would lead them to social and political activism, and an intellectual foundation for the welfare state.

Dorothy Day's life offers a study in paradox. A socialist who was philosophically an anarchist, a journalist, a freethinker, a single mother who had never expected to bear children following an abortion, a woman who suffered through a succession of punishing relationships with men—Day, in her midthirties, converted to Catholicism, met Peter Maurin, and with him founded the Catholic Worker movement. They began with a newspaper that continued the tradition of the defunct Socialist weekly *The Masses*, built a house of hospitality in the poorest section of New York City in order to practice what they preached, and started a series of rural farms that attempted to provide the urban poor with an agrarian, communal alternative to industrial capitalism. A devout Catholic, Day remained an outspoken critic of the institution of the Catholic Church throughout her life, even as she embraced a self-imposed monastic commitment to obedience, poverty, and celibacy. In the Catholic Worker houses, Day also offered an alternative to the emerging professionalization of service. Even as she continued her political activism, hospitality emerged as the defining value to be expressed in how one lived. Practicing hospitality as a celebration of her faith commitment, she refocused her activism from an emphasis on political and social change to a form of moral witness and placed increasing emphasis on the problem of personal integrityhow to live out values such as hers in a world that viewed them as signs of failure or weakness. Her legacy to us is not a strategy for humanizing or reforming the culture, or for realigning democracy and capitalism, but an experiment in creating and sustaining a place in which values antithetical to capitalism, and apart from democracy, could be nurtured. "We have all known the long loneliness," she wrote in the moving final lines of her autobiography, "and we have learned that the only solution is love and that love comes with community" (1952, 286).

Addams, Dewey, and Day not only were contemporaries but also shared in the political movements and social struggles of their time. To greater and lesser degrees, they shared political sympathies, activist commitments, social responses, and spiritual searching in determining life choices of how one behaves morally for a more just existence. They all came from privileged backgrounds infused with a sense of social responsibility that balanced obligations with rights. They all shared internalized and instinctive optimism for the capacity of humans to do good and to better the human condition.

While they learned a great deal from each other in their common work (in particular Jane Addams and John Dewey at Hull House in Chicago) and shared fundamental beliefs about the basis for restoring community (such as the antistatist, agriculturally based and craft-oriented restoration of stable local and intimate attachments and traditions held in common by Day and Addams), in the end they each carved out fundamentally different versions of "service" aimed at the restoration of community. Addams's settlement house approach fostered a movement toward the institutionalization of social service and the professionalization of social work and contributed to the origins of a nonprofit sector, that is, nongovernmental organizations that would address social needs with subsidies from the government but removed from democratic control. Dewey's faith in social policy and an educated citizenry led to support for a large, powerful state as the most potent vehicle for expressing a participatory democracy that would address the country's most devastating social problems. Finally, Dorothy Day made a pilgrimage into the wider world of social reform but recoiled from what she called a "telescopic philanthropy" (quoted in Coles 1987, 155) to come home to the faith of the Catholic Church through a radical hospitality to the poor.

Collectively, Addams, Dewey, and Day represent three major, competing expressions of community service in the United States. It is the joined history

of these three expressions that suggests what community service means in our culture today.

#### The Crisis of Community

The crisis of community defined the era in which Addams, Day, and Dewey came of age—an age that is very much "the first years of our own time" (1959, 1), as the historian Henry May has written—and understanding its contours and manifestations has direct implications for the present day. It was in this period that the "problem of community" was discovered and defined as a crisis of social, political, intellectual, and moral fragmentation, and it was this cultural turmoil that defined the lives of Addams, Day, and Dewey.

The general contours of the problem of community are to be found in what Addams, Day, and Dewey perceived as the fragmentation of a unified American culture by the combined forces of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration and by the increasing centralization of political and economic power in the hands of a private, industrial elite. The most immediate symptoms of this fragmentation, according to them and other contemporary cultural critics (George 1905; Veblen 1899), were a devolution of the ordinary person's role as a citizen and the emergence of a new role as an individual consumer of goods and services. The most direct consequence of cultural fragmentation was the threat to democracy. For Addams, Day, and Dewey, this cultural shift was marked by the intersection of capitalism and democracy: a culture of consumption and the economic hegemony of an industrial elite, on the one hand, joined with a technocracy of managers and physical and social scientists, on the other, to redefine individuals as consumers rather than citizens and to shrink the public realm altogether. The result was the disappearance of community. And the question was how to respond powerfully and authentically to this crisis.

Within this intersection of capitalism and democracy, community as a sense of place and a set of relationships was constantly shifting. As Thomas Bender (1978) has argued, community was in a continual state of reinvention and reconstitution during the social turmoil attendant to the turn of the century. More important for the analysis offered here is the question of how each of our subjects experienced the tensions surrounding community. Addams's was a world divided—divided along class lines, by immigration, and in the division of labor. The social tensions she experienced deeply touched her republican sensibilities regarding the social responsibility of elites, and her gender raised issues of legitimacy and viable social action. The settlement house offered a unique institutional form for addressing those sensibilities. For Dewey, it became primarily a philosophical rendering, an attempt to put a divided epistemological world back together and to restore a sense of unity in the perception of intellectual and experienced coherence. His solution focused on
progressive education as the basis for establishing the unity necessary for renovating community and restoring democratic culture. And Day's sense of drifting, her long loneliness, was a manifestation of a need for belonging, and was resolved through solidarity with the poor grounded in voluntary poverty, hospitality, and work for social justice—the very antithesis of the emerging culture of consumption.

The points of convergence for Addams, Day, and Dewey were that all experienced their crisis of community in ways both personal and political, all sensed fragmentation and longed for unity in restoration, none could locate existing institutional structures that would relieve their felt trauma or offer a place of synthesis, and all experienced their crisis in moral terms that required, in part, a deeply spiritual response. What they shared was not merely mutual acquaintance or intellectual exchange, but a profound sense of the crisis of community and the unavoidable questions raised about equality, justice, and citizenship in a democratic culture.

The central experience that most forcefully and directly clarified the crisis of community for each of them was the practice of charity. Addams, who anguished over what she referred to as "the charitable relation," claimed that "there is no point of contact in our modern experience which reveals more clearly the lack of that equality which democracy implies" (1899, 163). "The very need and existence of charity," she cautioned, "deny us the consolation and freedom which democracy will at last give" (1899, 163). Addams, Day, and Dewey were all faced with the task of redefining "the charitable relation" in an era when charity was shaped by the Charity Organization movement of the 1880s. This movement marked an era in philanthropy defined by middleclass, Protestant values. Charity as such stressed, according to social historian Roy Lubove, "the importance of cultivating provident and frugal habits among the poor" (1965, 3). Those values were personified by the "charity visitor," often female, a well-to-do model of middle-class evangelical Christian America who would make forays in poor urban neighborhoods to spread the gospel of middle-class habits and values.

Charity in this period "was essentially a process of character regimentation, not social reform, and involved the direct influence of successful, educated, and cultivated representatives of the middle class upon the dependent individual or family" (1965, 12). At the same time, the perfectionist quality of the dominant Protestant influence dictated that "since man was a free agent, he could control his destiny commensurate with his abilities and moral fiber" (1965, 13). Thus, any lapse from this ethic was obvious evidence of moral weakness and "the result of intemperance, improvidence, indolence, ignorance, or some other personal defect" (1965, 13). For Addams, the cultural authority defining charity led to the "unconscious division of the world into the philanthropist and those to be helped . . . the assumption of two classes" (1899, 163). It also meant that "the charitable agent really blamed the individual for his poverty" (1899, 163). As Roy Lubove notes, the charity visitor "saw in her client less an equal or potential equal than an object of character reformation" (1965, 16). The need for charity was seen as the result of "ignorance or deviations from middle-class values and patterns of life organization: temperance, industriousness, family cohesiveness, frugality, foresight, moral restraint" (1965, 16).

By the 1890s, the entire cultural framework supporting "the charitable relation" began to disintegrate under the weight of industrial capitalism and the realization that it had not resulted in community cohesiveness. In the name of a democratic culture worthy of strong community, human dignity, and social equality, Addams, Day, and Dewey all confronted the problem of charity by redefining the "charitable relation" as an issue of social justice.

For Addams in particular, the dynamics of charity provided a window through which to view democratic progress. Her life at Hull House placed her immediately within the problem of charity in a way neither Day nor Dewey would experience. As she wrote in an 1899 Atlantic Monthly essay entitled "The Subtle Problems of Charity," her "mind was sore and depressed over the difficulties of the charitable relationship" (1899, 178). Of all the struggles she encountered living at Hull House for a decade, none, she claimed "have made a more definite impression on my mind than the incredibly painful difficulties which involve both giver and recipient when one person asks charitable aid of another" (1899, 163). It was "the incessant clashing of ethical standards" (1899, 178) in a culture increasingly "divided-up into people who work with their hands and those who do not" (1899, 164) that drove her to conclude that it seemed "reasonable to say that nothing could be done until industrial conditions were made absolutely democratic" (1899, 178). Meanwhile, Addams suffered the burden of bridging the class divide by living among the poor as an emissary from the middle class. By living in the problem of charity she lived, too, with self-doubt and questioning: "The position of a settlement, which attempts at one and the same time to declare its belief in this eventual, industrial democracy, and to labor toward that end, to maintain a standard of living, and deal humanely and simply with those in actual want, often seems utterly untenable and preposterous" (1899, 178). In the end she was left with an unfounded optimistic faith in democracy and consolation that "the painful condition of administering charity is the inevitable discomfort of a transition into a more democratic relation" (1899, 178).

Hull House had not been in existence for half a decade when the severe depression of 1893–1894 in Chicago forced her to "take a hard look," according to biographer John Farrell, "at all the assumptions and motives of charitable work, especially the established method of relief, charitable visiting" (1967, 69). By December 1893, the economic depression deepened and thousands of unskilled workers, attracted to Chicago with the prospect of employment from the World's Fair, now found themselves unemployed and stranded. Faced with such distress, the tradition at Hull House against dispensing relief gave way to the first city-wide attempt to coordinate charitable

efforts. Under the supervision of a Hull House resident, the Bureau of Organized Charities was created in the winter of 1894. Confronted with the desperate condition of the unemployed, Addams asked that "we ought to come together and regard it as a common trouble, and we should consider not what we shall do with the unemployed, but what we and the unemployed do together, that we may all as brothers grow out into a wider and better citizenship than we have ever known" (quoted in Farrell 1967, 70).

In 1894 Addams became absorbed by the Pullman Strike, serving on a citizen's arbitration board that tried to mediate the dispute. In a speech she gave that year, which would not be published until 1912 as "A Modern Lear," Addams considered Pullman's philanthropy and observed that "he cultivated the great and noble impulses of the benefactor, until the power of attaining a simple human relationship with his employees, that of frank equality with them, was gone.... He and his employees had no mutual interest in a common cause" (1912, 112–113). As Farrell has noted, "The failure of this arbitration attempt led her to analyze and compare the motives of the labor movement with Mr. Pullman's philanthropies" (1967, 69) and connect questions of labor and charity with the larger issue of democratic community.

It was also during this period that political corruption in the Nineteenth Ward—the Hull House ward—provoked the residents of the settlement house to attempt to unseat the incumbent alderman. After three unsuccessful campaigns to do so, Addams became convinced, writes Farrell, "that patrician political reformers were, like charity visitors and philanthropic capitalists, brutally undemocratic" (1967, 69). He concludes that "by 1900, her experience with the depression, the Pullman Strike, the political battles in the Nineteenth Ward, had led her to evolve a new and significant ideal of progressive democracy . . . [an] insistence that charity had to be made democratic, that the social life of the city in all its aspects had to be made increasingly democratic" (1967, 69, 70).

The culmination of her thinking came in "The Subtle Problems of Charity." As a personal and institutional memoir, it is the ten-year biographical benchmark of her settlement experience, the precursor to the second-decade summary of *Twenty Years at Hull House* (1910).

The nuanced subtlety involving charity was representative of the Hull House experience writ large. Charity was, she wrote, "a comment on our democratic relations," "a perplexing question" (1899, 176) that unveiled the undemocratic class assumptions that underlay charitable relations: "The [charity] visitor does not realize what a cruel advantage the person who distributes charity has" (1899, 170). "The Subtle Problems of Charity" laid open "the complexity of the situation" of the "industrial view" (1899, 166) replete with a debilitating focus on money, individualism, and work being imposed upon the poor as a cultural standard. "In our charitable efforts," claimed Addams, "we think much more of what a man ought to be than of what he is or what he may become; and we ruthlessly force our consensus and standards upon him" (1899, 177).

Addams's ability to translate the cultural experience of the poor to those with wealth and at the same time make visible to the wealthy the depth of their class assumptions and prejudices was one of the things that drew John Dewey to her and to Hull House in the 1890s. Even before moving to the University of Chicago in 1894, Dewey lectured at Hull House and became one of its founding trustees. His thinking about class, democracy, community, and education was profoundly affected by his exposure to Hull House (Feffer 1993, 107-116; Ryan 1995, 149-153; Westbrook 1991, 80-85). He recalled that one of the many things he learned from Addams was "the enormous value of mental non-resistance, of tearing away the armor-plate of prejudice, of convention, isolation that keeps one from sharing to the full in the larger and even the more unfamiliar and alien ranges of the possibilities of human life and experience" (1930b, 421). As Dewey's daughter Jane M. Dewey (named for Jane Addams) prepared a biography of her father in 1939, she explained that his "faith in democracy ... took on both a sharper and deeper meaning because of Hull House and Jane Addams" (quoted in Farrell 1967, 69n42). The activities of Hull House were, Dewey claimed, "modes of bringing people together, of doing away with barriers ... that keep people from real communion with each other" (1908, 150). It was from his experience with settlements that he came to the "growing recognition that the community life is defective and disturbed excepting as it does thus care for all its constituent parts. This is no longer viewed as a matter of charity, but as a matter of justice" (1902b, 91, 93).

Addams's struggles over the problems of charity, community, and democracy most directly influenced Dewey's thinking about ethics. Dewey defined ethics not only as activity based but also as the foundation of community relations and democratic progress. Ethics, he claimed, was a statement of "the ways in which men are bound together in the complex relations of their interactions" (1893, 56). Echoing Addams, Dewey wrote in his 1908 version of "Ethics":

"Charity" (conceived as conferring benefits upon others, doing things for them) . . . assumes the continued and necessary existence of a dependent "lower" class to be the recipient of the kindness of their superiors; a class which serves as the passive material for the cultivation in others of the virtues of charity, the higher class acquiring merit" at the expense of the lower, while the lower has gratitude and respect for authority as its chief virtue. (1908, 348)

One threat to democracy was that charity would become a class-based justification for exploitation. "There is a danger," wrote Dewey in 1908, "that

the erection of benevolence . . . will serve to supply rich persons with a cloak for selfishness in other directions" so that "philanthropy is made an offset and compensation for brutal exploitation" (1908, 349). In 1932 he restated his position even more forcefully, perhaps out of frustration that the problem persisted a quarter century later. "Charity," he admonished, "may even be used as a sop to one's social conscience while at the same time it buys off the resentment which might otherwise grow up in those who suffer from social injustice. Magnificent philanthropy may be employed to cover up brutal economic exploitation" (1932, 301).

The second threat to democracy, as Dewey saw it—and again the influence of Addams is evident—was its tendency to reinforce social divisiveness. "The danger is not in benevolence or altruism" per se, explained Dewey, "but in that conception of them which makes them equivalent to regard for other as other, irrespective of the social situation to which all alike belong" (1908, 349).

The theory which erects charity in and of itself into a supreme excellence is a survival of a feudally stratified society, that is, of conditions wherein a superior class achieved merit by doing things gratuitously for an inferior class. The objection to this conception of charity is that it too readily becomes an excuse for maintaining laws and social arrangements which ought themselves to be changed in the interest of fair play and justice. (1932, 301)

The democratic redefining of charity was, for Dewey, as it was for Addams, a shift from "charity' which assumes a superior and inferior class" and which is "negative and palliate merely" to charity which is "constructive and expansive because it looks to the well-being of society as a whole" (1908, 350). The aim of charity should be "general social advance, constructive social reform" (1908, 350). At bottom, relations in an ethical democracy would be determined by "the equity of justice, not the inequality of conferring benefits" (1908, 350).

What connects Dorothy Day to Jane Addams and John Dewey is not influence through direct encounter but the problem of charity itself. Day was of a later generation than Addams and Dewey, born eight years after Hull House opened its doors. Even when she made her way to Chicago, attending the University of Illinois for two years (1914–1915), she never associated with Hull House activities, perhaps because her socialist political tendencies were too radical for the mild amelioration of reformers like Addams. For Day, the larger question was less one of political democracy and more the basic issue of human relationships; it was these relationships that defined community. As she wrote after her conversion to Catholicism, "We cannot love God unless we love each other, and to love we must know each other" (1952, 285). Her position was not encumbered by social theory and progressive politics but was simple and direct: "We have learned that the only solution is love and that love comes with community" (1952, 286). Charity, more than anything else, distorted one's ability to know others and thus endangered community.

In the period of her bohemian youth, she claimed that "our hearts burned with the desire for justice and were revolted at the idea of doled-out charity. The word charity had become something to gag over, something to shudder at" (1952, 87). She did not know then, and she would struggle to define her life by her attempt to know "the true meaning of the word" (1952, 87). That would come with the "personalism" and "voluntary poverty" at the heart of the Catholic Worker movement she founded with Peter Maurin in 1932. By then she had created for herself a Catholic identity founded on the communalism of the medieval church. But her version of Catholicism, her faith, was not consistent with the modern institution of the church, and the point of contradiction was the issue of charity. Wherever she distances herself from the Catholic Church in her autobiography, it is done in the context of charity.

She lived, she wrote, in a state of "permanent dissatisfaction with the Church" (1952, 150) because, in part, she "felt that charity was a word to choke over. Who wanted charity?" . . . And it was not just human pride but a strong sense of man's dignity and worth, and what was due to him in justice, that made me resent rather than feel proud of so mighty a sum total of Catholic Institutions" (1952, 150). The church, she claimed, "was so often a scandal to me, "the scandal of businesslike priests, of collective wealth, the lack of sense of responsibility for the poor, the worker, the Negro, the Mexican, the Filipino, and even the oppression of them by our industrial-capitalist order" (1952, 149–150). "There was plenty of charity," she observed, "but too little justice" (1952, 150).

### Paths Chosen: Addams and a Middle Way

Jane Addams understood that the converging phenomena of immigration, industrialization, and urbanization were rending and reweaving the fabric of American culture, calling into consciousness inherent and long-standing contradictions of a culture that identified itself as democratic and capitalist. Hull House, the settlement she founded in Chicago in 1889, was intended to be a place for studying and resolving these contradictions, for addressing what she and other observers articulated as a crisis of community. The settlement, she observed, "is an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city. . . . It is an attempt to relieve, at the same time, the over accumulation at one end of society and the destitution at the other" (1910, 98).

Addams experienced the contradictions between democracy and capitalism as crises of personal integrity and articulated them publicly as a crisis of community. What began as a personal crisis of integrity—how, for example, could she justify to herself her relative wealth when faced with people who suffered intense poverty—was followed by a stage of intellectual and moral definition that named what it was that had precipitated the crisis. This was in turn followed by some personal resolution and public action. Established in her decision to found Hull House, this cycle was repeated in her decisions to engage issues as seemingly divergent as U.S. entrance into World War I, women's suffrage, juvenile delinquency, labor, immigration, and political corruption. As varied as these issues may have been, Addams determined whether and how to engage them only after she experienced them as a personal crisis resolved through a process of intense reflection and personal resolution.

This cycle is most poignantly evident in Addams's description of the steps that led her to found Hull House. In her semiautobiographical *Twenty Years at Hull House*, Addams describes an inner and outer journey from college to the founding of Hull House that took her eight years to complete, eight years of indecision punctuated by periods of debilitating physical, mental, and spiritual struggle (1910, 61). At the end of this period, Addams decided to escape what she later termed the "snare of preparation" and to act. She decided to step into the leading problems of the age and experience them firsthand—not as a dilettante, ultimately, but as someone committed to living the problems, being present and constant to the suffering they caused.

Where fragmentation was the underlying and recurring cause of the crisis of community, Addams sought integrity in her own life, and especially, with support and help from colleagues and friends like John Dewey, she sought an integration of experience, intellect, and spirit.

What is striking is the degree to which Addams's was an aesthetic struggle—captured in a metaphor of life as art. Early in her journey, she witnessed an event that distilled this question and, she felt, forced her to seek an answer. Visiting a poor section of East London, she witnessed "two huge masses of ill-clad people clamoring" for food. A man's hand reaches up and catches a cabbage, and Addams watches him devour it. She describes him in language that makes it clear she understands that the man has been reduced to a feral, animal state. Her vision returns to the mob, and her "final impression was not of ragged, tawdry clothing, nor of pinched and sallow faces, but of myriads of hands, empty, pathetic, nerveless and workworn, showing white in the uncertain light of the street and clutching forward for food which was already unfit to eat" (1910, 62). How does one respond to an image so powerful that calls into question the integrity of every other element in one's life?

"I have never since been able to see a number of hands held upward," she confesses nearly thirty years after the experience, "... without a certain revival of this memory, a clutching at the heart reminiscent of the despair and resentment which seized me then" (1910, 62). It is this vision of the hands that animated her subsequent decisions, that becomes a metaphor for what it is that is making a moral claim on her, and that makes it a subjective necessity that she create something like the settlement as a way of making herself whole again. While the substance of Addams's engagement on a broad range of issues is relatively well documented by historians (Deegan 1988; Farrell 1967; Levine 1971; Quandt 1970), what is of interest to us here is this recurring pattern of her engagement and her effort to knit her life into one of personal integrity—what led her to recognize certain issues over others, how she determined to act, and how she attempted to sustain her moral and intellectual integrity even as the demands on her time increased and as she came under sharp criticism for her unpopular positions.

### John Dewey: The Politics of Education

Of the three figures studied here, Dewey is perhaps the most conventional in terms of professional choice and traditional middle-class stability and security. This may be a matter of gender more than class, but unlike Day and Addams, Dewey established himself in an existing institutional home, the modern college and university. This is not to say that he was always comfortable there; for example, even while at the University of Chicago, Dewey attempted to create an alternative school, the Laboratory School, to test out educational ideas that couldn't be made to fit traditional classroom practices and structures. What Dewey does share with the others is his profound sense of a crisis of community and an attempt both personal and political to address it.

From childhood on, Dewey experienced severe cultural fragmentation, both personal and public, but most immediately and viscerally personal. The crisis of community he encountered was not so much physical or structural but cultural. It ranged from the separation of mind from body to the division of labor. In his childhood he sensed a "demand for unification that was doubtless an intense emotional craving," a "sense of divisions and separations" precipitated most forcefully from "a heritage of New England culture" infused with Calvinist Protestantism. His experience with religion, with "divisions by way of isolation of self from the world, of soul from body, of nature from God, brought a painful oppression," he revealed, producing a wound that he described as an "inward laceration" (1930a, 7). His resolution to this crisis was to search for an alternative faith, which he found in democracy, and to search for intellectual coherence.

Dewey's entire philosophical scheme rests upon refutation of the dominating "dualisms" in modern thought. In philosophy, these "dualisms or antithesis" involve the "chief problems in philosophy—such as mind (or spirit) and matter, body and mind, the mind and the world, the individual and his relationship to others, etc." (1916, 343). Dualisms as they appeared in society were found in "more or less rigidly marked-off classes and groups" (1916, 332–333). Education, for Dewey, would be linked to social transformation toward a more unified society, the "great community," central to democracy (1927b). In *Democracy and Education*, his 1916 treatise on education, Dewey explained that education for democracy would lead to social transformation that "signifies a society in which every person shall be occupied in something that makes the lives of others better worth living, and which accordingly makes the ties which bind persons together more perceptible—which breaks down the barriers of distance between them" (1916b, 326).

Dewey's faith in democracy and a philosophical stance of reconstituting the fragmentation of American culture left him with a public philosophy combining thought and action for the creation of a revitalized democratic culture. At the heart of this democratic culture was the practice of community, the product of the process of creating and sustaining relationships. As Dewey himself recognized, "The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind" (1916, 103). The kind of society that he envisioned was not only one in which individuals engaged in pervasive associated activity but that this "conjoint, combined, associated action" (1927b, 23) was the basis of a participatory democratic culture. For Dewey, "democracy is not an alternative to other principles of associated life. It is the idea of community life itself" (1927b, 148). Democracy, he wrote, "must begin at home, and it's home is the neighborly community" (1927b, 213). Democracy, for Dewey, was "primarily a form of associated living, a conjoint communicated experience" (1916, 93). In Democracy and Education Dewey noted that "there is more than a verbal tie between the words common, community, and communication. Men live in a community in virtue of the things they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common" (1916, 7). "All communication," he added, "is educative" (1916, 8). And his aim in education was a "cultivated imagination for what men have in common and a rebellion at whatever unnecessarily divides them" (1916, 128).

The logic of Dewey's thinking about education led inextricably in the direction of the creation of social policy that would foster the kind of democratic training in community life that was at the heart of both his educational philosophy and democratic optimism. "Only through education," he claimed, "can equality of opportunity be anything more than a phrase" (1916), 138). An education cultivating a "cultural equality of opportunity" and fostering participatory democracy would "not involve a superficial adaptation of the existing system," he maintained, "but a radical change in foundation and aim: a revolution" (1913, 120).

### Dorothy Day and a Radical Hospitality

Day's is the most extreme and least accommodating response to the problem of community. A useful place to begin is her conversion to Catholicism. An initial look at Day's conversion to Catholicism suggests that it was counterintuitive. While much in her past seems to have prepared her for and precipitated a crisis of faith, her early history would seem to have prepared her for one form or another of liberal, socially progressive Protestantism. But these various forms of Protestantism, expressed through the Social Gospel movement and through emergent institutions such as the Salvation Army and the YMCA, for example, shared a belief (common among Progressive Era reformers) in the perfectibility of the world and of the people in it. A significant part of Day's decision to embrace Catholicism, rather than radical politics or Protestant expressions of the social gospel, seems to have been an acceptance that the world and the human beings in it—including herself were flawed and imperfect. This perspective helps to explain, as well, her politics of witness.

It is evident that the impetus for conversion was deeply personal and spiritual and had much to do with fundamental questions of moral philosophy and human nature. If the issues had been those of social religion and social justice alone, she would likely have chosen other options from among the many Protestant-based options. In this interpretive framework, a Protestant, liberal worldview accepts the belief in the perfectibility of man and nature, and this notion of perfectibility underlies movements for social reform. This is a dominant motif in Protestantism since the early nineteenth century and is prevalent in the urban Protestant churches associated with the social gospel from the 1880s through the 1920s. Day's personal history up to the point of her conversion in 1927 is one of instability in family and personal relationships and, associated with this, a deep suffering from an abortion.

Her difficult and often lonely journey reveals a world that, while beautiful, is neither perfect nor perfectible. This view locates for her a place in the world that accepts and accommodates sin and offers forgiveness. It is a world where moral disorder is countered by a vision of moral order in a disordered existence. It is deeply personal and social only to the extent of sharing solidarity with those whose imperfections dominate their perfectibility. It is a worldview explained and embraced by, as Day saw it, the teachings of the Catholic Church. In Catholicism, Day found not only a vision of the interconnectedness of all things but also a view that accepted, where the Protestant alternatives did not, the flawed and corrupt aspects of humanity, which Day-depressed, having had an abortion, suffering an unhappy love life and arguably an emotionally abusive childhood-needed. She would explain her adherence to Catholicism as the need for acceptance in her life and in the life of her daughter, and she would explain her allegiance to the church in terms of solidarity with the poor in the ideal of the medieval church, open to all, at the center of the community.

Day's entrance to Catholicism was guided, in large part, by Peter Maurin, whom Day later described as "a St. Francis of modern times" (1952, 273). Together they published the *Catholic Worker* as a forum for expressing their ideas, established a house of hospitality as word of their combination of spirit

and social commitment spread, and started Catholic Worker farms on Staten Island, in upstate New York, and in the Hudson River Valley. At the heart of their thinking—and it was their commitment to ideas that led them to act was an attempt to live out their religious and spiritual belief. As Christians, they were bound to live as Christ would have wanted them to live, seeing and honoring that of God in every person they encountered. At the heart of their actions was a decision to make justice an issue first of concrete human relationships, rather than of political, social, or economic abstractions. Where Addams used service as a way into understanding the larger, systemic issues that led to poverty, Day practiced service as a way to engage more deeply what she would call, in one essay, "the mystery of poverty" (1964, 330). The mystery, she wrote in 1964, "is that by sharing in it, making ourselves poor in giving to others, we increase our knowledge of and belief in love."

Day's journey to Catholicism and the Catholic Worker was a long, confusing struggle defined initially by capitalism. At the most intimate level, it had to do with the middle-class aspirations and failures of her parents; at the most sweeping level it had to do with her understanding of class structure, of labor and profit, and of economic exploitation as understood by the labor movement and socialists. It was defined, as well-to the degree that The Eleventh Virgin (1924), a successful autobiographical novel published before her conversion can be relied upon-by her increasing recognition that she was not concerned with ideology and politics but rather with a desire to be at the center of experience, to hear and gather and tell the stories of individual persons, to make human and personal the suffering and the strength of those who were touched by the violence of the new economic order. Pressed in later life to account for the logic behind her conversion, she observed, in a veiled but instructive sentence, that "it was the church of the poor." So, in addition to allowing her to accept herself as she was, with all her flaws, the Catholic Church, with its enormous membership from the immigrant and working classes, provided her a way to be closer to the economic exploitation that she understood was the defining problem of her age. This is not to suggest that her religious conversion was less than genuine, but rather that in her conversion she found an opportunity to make herself whole: move closer to those whose lives she wanted to share, find acceptance of herself as she was, and embrace a theology that gave meaning to and enriched her values and her life. In short, through her conversion, Day found a way to reintegrate her own life and begin answering the problem of community.

In the process of her conversion, Day seems to have redefined the meaning of her activism, putting it forward as a form of witness, of speaking truth to power. In this way, her activism was an extension of her decisions to practice voluntary poverty, live in community, and make hospitality the core value of her life's work. Her activism was not intended to change the world, though it might have some effect. Rather it was both an end and a means, a logical extension of caring, of witness, of an integrated life based on Christian principles. Voluntary poverty, hospitality to the poor, and social justice were moral imperatives and celebrations of what Day understood as the core of Christianity. Implicit and explicit criticism of capitalism emerged from this insistence on personal integrity of faith and life, from attempting to literally be the values that she claimed for herself.

From Dorothy Day we ultimately glean the insight that justice and service are not economic or political problems of distribution, of offering a hand up and into the consumer culture (as they largely were for Addams), or problems of education and citizenship (as they were for Dewey) but ways out of the traps set by that culture, traps that kept individuals from living a spiritually whole, fully integrated life. Service, as Day defined it through her life and her words—influencing thousands of young people including Daniel Berrigan and Robert Coles—was a way of discovering a life meaning that is essentially spiritual and a principle for constructing a life that was integrated. And her personal experience, from those periods in her life when she felt most alone to the times when she felt most engaged, provided evidence that community was both the essential ingredient and the greatest worldly gift of a life of service.

#### Conclusions

Our first conclusion is an observation about the politics of language. As the paradigm surrounding the language of charity was challenged by the turn of the century, a new language subsumed it. A dominant language of charity and philanthropy was replaced in the popular vernacular and public discourse sometime later in the twentieth century with a language of "service." Our reading of Addams, Dewey, and Day has led us to ask why and when this shift in language occurred and whether it marks a fundamental reframing of the issue or reflects a continuation of past practices and relations in a new economic order. One answer might begin with the emergence of the welfare state in a postindustrial society. A shift in language seems to begin in the late 1930s and early 1940s and finds clarity in the late postwar period. By this time the welfare state has become institutionalized and an economy of goods associated with industrial capitalism has given way to an economy of services in a postindustrial economy. With these shifts in the state and the economy, old divisions of class get reexpressed as divisions based on needs (Ignatieff 1984).

The major division in society becomes redefined; on the one hand, there are those who are dependent upon the state (or public) to satisfy their needs, and on the other hand, there are those who are free to satisfy their needs in the marketplace (and assume the associated ideological position that freedom is found in the market). These divisions are infused with a language of rights competing rights as well as needs conferred as rights (entitlements)—and most fundamentally as conflict between liberty and equality, freedom and solidarity. Amid these tensions, a language of "service" emerges. Its origins are most fundamentally grounded in a marketplace describing an economic structure that satisfies the needs and wants of the wealthy through the consumption of "services." This service economy is a defining feature of American economic life in the late twentieth century. Service in this sense is part of a language used by those whose privileged position in society allows them to express "freedom" and "independence" through their exercise of choices in a private marketplace.

It also means that those whose economic status prohibits them from participating in the "free" market become dependent upon the state and private recompensation. Under this dependency there is a reconstituted and limited notion of freedom, independence, and choice. It is a position scarred by stigma, a stigma justified by denial of systemic causes and the myth of righteousness of individual character as the basis for determining one's freedom or dependency.

Up to a point, particularly as the tensions in this division in society increase, a welfare society attempts to reduce conflict by attempting to satisfy the needs of the welfare dependent in ways that they do not go unmet while the privileged satisfy their needs in the private economy. There are all sorts of attempts to reduce the tensions of inequities—trying to guarantee that public goods are as attractive as private ones; attempting to limit the rights of the wealthy to opt out of public provision in such areas as education and health care. The emergence of "service" directed at the welfare dependant—community service, public service, nonmilitary national service—is one of these attempts to reduce this growing division in American society.

As such, it expresses at its core the values of the market and a language of class. It is meant specifically to address the needs of those who have been marginalized from a culture of consuming needs in the market. It is depoliticized language that works to perpetuate the divisions in society, not to alter them. It is a language increasingly adopted by the wealthy both in their support of state policies and in private market strategies to find ways to veil these social divisions as they become increasingly exacerbated. Service in its public sector, welfare dependency realm has the seemingly contradictory meaning of reducing social divisions in order to maintain widening inequalities of wealth and income. These are the subtle problems of service in the present.

Our second conclusion deals with how we live within these subtle problems of service. There is a legacy to the response of the crisis of community left, intentionally or otherwise, by Addams, Dewey, and Day. Their legacy is so powerful that it in many ways shapes our response to the crisis of community in the late twentieth century. This crisis accounts for economic, political, and social developments of the twentieth century: a society and politics dominated by national and international markets; increasing social fragmentation; the rise of experts as the gatekeepers on information, knowledge, and power; flourishing of the nonprofit sector that makes amends for the invidious carelessness of capitalism; education as a commodity in the marketplace at the service of the marketplace; government and politics dominated by private capital serving its own interests through legitimizing the welfare state.

In this social, political, and economic climate, Dewey's legacy has been a justification for the welfare state and an argument for citizen solutions to community problems, Jane Addams's response to the crisis of community has contributed to the professionalization of social work and the emergence of social service nonprofits, and Dorothy Day has left the legacy of the alternative of faith-based multiservice organizations that rely upon personal care, personal witness, and personal sacrifice in declaring an option for the poor.

Like her colleague and friend John Dewey, Addams recognized that her generation stood at a crossroads, where the intersecting logic and values of capitalism and democracy resulted in a sharply felt tension articulated as a crisis of community. Her decision to found Hull House—and her decisions to engage subsequent issues—rested on her determination to live at this intersection, to step into this tension and experience directly the contradictory logic and values of democracy and capitalism. If the economic system could not be changed, then individuals could be educated to survive it. And a life of integrity could be created by educating and supporting those who bore the brunt of economic exploitation.

It would be easy to dismiss Addams's approach as naive (if lifelong) optimism or idealism or to argue that she simply refused to face up to the harsh evidence of the crossroads to which she was a continual witness. But it seems a more accurate reading to suggest that she intentionally constructed for herself a way of living in this tension—of seeing both the power and limitations of this approach, of working within an overpowering system to take the rough edges off its more hurtful aspects.

Dewey shared with Addams a belief in the centrality of experiencing the world firsthand. More than Addams, he argued that industrial capitalism was responsible for the fragmentation of community, and this provided the basis for his willingness to use government as a tool for limiting capitalism and caring for those who suffered most from it. And it was only an informed, educated citizenry, Dewey argued, that would act in this way. And so, for Dewey, direct experience of cultural contradictions and their subsequent resolution became the process linking education, democracy, and community.

Day, like Addams, came to her understanding of her life's work only after a long period of intense, sometimes debilitating personal suffering. As for Addams, her work offered her a way to construct an integrated life. For both of them, the path toward an integrated life was begun by establishing an intentional community that immersed them in the lives of people who suffered most at the intersection of capitalism and democracy. And for both, the practical question of daily life was how to best serve these people.

Unlike Day, however, Addams maintained a belief in the perfectibility of individuals and the larger society, committed herself to trusting the democratic process, as unsavory as it might be in practice, and appropriated and made her

own humanely intentioned versions of the social sciences and business management. Where Day constructed a life of service as a form of witness, Addams constructed a life of service as a path to individual and cultural progress, arguing that capitalism and democracy, rightly understood and used, were tools of service, means for rebuilding community.

It is an understatement to observe that the crisis of community continues today. It is less obvious, perhaps, to recognize that community service, as it is variously expressed in history, represents an important pattern of response to this crisis. It is a mistake to believe that the legacy of service is politically neutral, or simple, or that it provides a common ground for the cultural fragments of the United States. Rather, we would argue, service is a phenomenon of the cultural history of the United States, defined by an educated middleclass seeking ways to live lives of integrity. Addams, Dewey, and Day all remained concerned with the well-being of individual persons, all remained concerned with policy and politics, and all maintained their activist commitments. Their understanding and articulation of what their work meant and their decisions when faced with the crisis of community differed. It seems to us, however, that the differences mattered less than the similarities early on, and that time has magnified these differences, to the point where the paths of Addams, Dewey, and Day now embrace and imply a range of ideological possibilities, reflecting the lived complexity of the common culture of the United States.

Rather than deconstructing the idea of community service and describing it as an interesting cultural artifact, we would rather like to suggest that it is evidence of the crisis of our day, a crisis of community defined by the intersection of capitalism and democracy, and to argue that, for all its contested, complex, and contradictory history, it does contain an antidote to the crisis of community: an insistence that we experience firsthand the suffering produced by our culture; an insistence that the fundamental problem is one of integrity or authenticity; and that the alternatives or solutions, whatever they might be, require our collective wisdom.

# SECTION III Service-Learning Pedagogy

Introduction

Donna Killian Duffy

n a recent article Mary Huber (2009) notes that "there is a great deal of useful work to be done to document the itineraries and transformations that pedagogical knowledge takes as it moves from thought to action . . . and back again" and to "figur[e] out what kinds of knowledge travel well in what conditions, and even what 'traveling well' might mean" (5). In this section we take a journey from "Does Service-Learning Have a Future" to "Pedagogy and Engagement" to "Academic and Civic Engagement." This introduction explores how these three entries in the service-learning travel diary reflect present realities and suggest what aspects of service-learning practice might "travel well" into the future.

In the context of the 1995 academic setting, Zlotkowski observes that "most academicians are all too ready to grant that the kinds of personal and civic development that service-learning facilitates are important—but not part of their professional responsibility" (17). Contrast this to results from the 2007–2008 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) survey noting that the "majority of college faculty (55.5 percent) now consider it 'very important' or 'essential' to 'instill in students a commitment to community service,' an increase of 19.1 percentage points since the survey was last conducted in 2004–2005" (HERI 2009). George Kuh (2008) lists service-learning as one of the ten high-impact educational practices effective in increasing student engagement and retention, issues of critical importance on most campuses today. In recent months on the national scene we witnessed passage of the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act expanding service opportunities for Americans of all ages and the launching of the serve.gov website "to help you do your part. America's foundation will be built one community at a time—and it starts with you." At the website you can register a project, get help, share a story, or stay connected via Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or Serve.govMobile. The landscape in 2009 offers multiple new ways to transport ideas, but the expanding choices can lead to other dilemmas for the service-learning practitioner. What are effective ways to incorporate the expanding wealth of online resources to enhance content knowledge and civic responsibility but not overwhelm our students or ourselves?

Zlotkowski's advice that "service activities must always be grounded in a deliberate, carefully articulated understanding of how such activities advance the specific learning goals of the course in which they are embedded" (1999, 12) is even more relevant today. In his book, Creating Significant Learning Experiences, L. Dee Fink (2003) emphasizes the importance of using an integrated approach in designing college courses and presents a taxonomy of significant learning. The taxonomy lists familiar categories of foundational knowledge, application, and integration but also includes categories related to the human dimension (learning about oneself and others), caring (developing new feelings, interests, and values) and learning how to learn (supporting inquiry and self-direction). These last three items can help faculty to reflect on the goals of their courses in terms of what students will need for the future. John Seely Brown (2008) states that learning in the twenty-first century "involves not only 'learning about' the subject matter but also 'learning to be' a full participant in the field" (p. xii) and suggests that networked learning communities as well as face-to-face communities can create this culture of sharing.

The service-learning matrix presented in "Pedagogy and Engagement" provides an excellent navigational tool for demonstrating how servicelearning can be the bridge "between institutional rhetoric and institutional action, between professed values and actual practice" (26) as we attempt to create cultures of sharing at our institutions. The horizontal axis of the matrix spans a focus on the common good to one on academic expertise, while the vertical axis links students on one end to sponsors at the other. As a professor preparing a course for this fall semester, I can review the significant learning experiences I hope to create for my class in light of these four end points on the matrix. What are realistic ways I can emphasize the common good and provide useful help to community partners while demonstrating evidence of student learning outcomes for the diverse students in my introductory courses? Similarly, institutions are now asked to document specific ways that their rhetoric and action align in addressing accreditation criteria for engagement and service (North Central and Western regions) and in applying for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification created in 2006. Concrete examples from the Indicators of Engagement project (Zlotkowski et al. 2004; Zlotkowski et al. 2005) show how institutions can build on their

unique assets to support sustained partnerships with communities and within the academic culture.

Authors of 2020 Forecast: Creating the Future of Learning encourage educators and "powerful innovators on the periphery" to create educational centers that are "life-affirming organizations," with learning as "an ongoing process whereby we all become engaged citizens of a global society" (Knowledge Works Foundation 2008, 3). Examples presented in "Academic and Civic Engagement" show how professors are beginning to fulfill this vision in a variety of courses and academic settings. The chapter is a snapshot of emerging work and captures the metacognitive processes involved in translating ideas into practice. Addressing the affective domain of learning and the lived experiences of students reflects the human dimension, caring, and learning how to learn categories of Fink's taxonomy and helps students in "learning how to be" participants in a discipline as well as engaged citizens. It is critical to note that faculty members continue to struggle with how to fit all of this into their classrooms. Although a majority of professors in 2009 may agree that it is important to instill a commitment to community service in students, they are a long way from finding the ideal way to do this. The examples in the chapter do not provide The Answer but do demonstrate that the struggle is worth the effort.

If educational institutions are to be "life-affirming organizations," it is also essential to include the affective domain and the lived experiences of faculty. Ongoing work in the scholarship of teaching and learning (Huber and Hutchings 2005; McKinney 2007) and communities of practice (Gleason 2008) is providing ways to do this as well as supporting inquiry into conditions of student learning. Keith Trigwell and Suzanne Shale (2004) suggest that it is the "quality of awareness that is evoked in collaborative meaning-making with students that defines the quality of a teacher's response to the teaching situation" (532) and define this as pedagogic resonance. As others have suggested (Bulcroft, Werder, and Gilliam 2002; Zlotkowski, Longo, and Williams 2006), we need to listen more closely to student voices if we are to develop the pedagogic resonances that lead to enhanced learning in our classrooms and beyond. Zlotkowski (2010) notes a reflection of Professor of Communication Rona Halualani that "perhaps our students' sense of themselves as 'part and parcel of a society that needs them' (69) could turn out to be the single most important factor driving their mastery of 'key skill sets'" (69).

Finding the commonalities in civic engagement and in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) can help to demonstrate the value of viewing higher education practice from a more integrated approach. The fragmentation of different "camps" and their unique demands does not help the average practitioner. We need to connect more dots across initiatives. Zlotkowski noted that "back in 1989 my discovery of a fledgling national movement took place only *after* I had personally experienced the upsurge in student interest and motivation that real-world connections can bring about." Ten years later in

this afterward to the volume *Citizenship across the Curriculum* he provides a number of insights related to the value of finding alignment with SoTL work. The chapter helps readers to see this broader context and to think about how they might connect some dots in their own work. As in the early days of service-learning, the path to integrating academic and civic engagement is not as developed and may be more of a rocky trail than a superhighway for those taking the journey.

In the fall of 2010 the topics of student voice, affective development, civil dialogue, and informed disagreement described in "Academic and Civic Engagement" seem much more central to our daily work than they were back in 1989. Recent town hall meetings on health care and classroom outbursts on any number of issues point to real problems in creating settings for effective communication among reasonable individuals. As faculty we need to engender respectful discussion of ambiguous issues in our classrooms, engage students in their own learning, and assess students' progress at attaining course learning objectives. Combining insights from the perspectives of civic engagement and SoTL can help us with these tasks. As Mary Huber and Jann Freed (2000) suggest, "An exemplary assessment task is one that involves college students in addressing enduring and emerging issues and problems that are ill-defined and of current relevance in their disciplines" (224). Service-learning provides a way to confront the ambiguity of ill-defined problems, civil dialogue can help classmates to share in insights, and a well-executed SoTL project can assist a professor in demonstrating the complexity of student learning emerging from these pedagogical approaches.

As we consider what types of knowledge will "travel well" on servicelearning itineraries in the future, we need to heed advice from 1995 that "just as every discipline brings to service-learning its own set of assumptions and expectations, so each faculty member enters the process with different skills and different needs" (p. 17). But, we now have a guidebook built on the collective wisdom of diverse professors over the past twenty years and can employ the SoTL approach to help us sketch maps for the journey ahead. With guidebook and map in hand we are better equipped to learn more from the new terrain we will travel. With students and community partners as traveling companions we can reach a destination that supports engaged communities focused on the common good.

### 5 Does Service-Learning Have a Future?

Edward Zlotkowski

In 1994 a new national organization called "The Invisible College" was formed to support faculty committed to building a national servicelearning movement. Quickly it became apparent that the group had many different agendas. However, its single most important fault line ran between those who saw the new organization as a kind of sanctuary where those working to change higher education might find encouragement and renewal and those who saw the organization primarily as an opportunity to generate practical resources. Although these two interests were hardly incompatible, tensions arose, and these may well have reflected a deeper philosophical difference.

As various essays in Jane Kendall's pioneering collection Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service (1990) make clear, defining service-learning had long been a contested undertaking. Certainly it could claim to be a form of experiential education, but it also seemed to propose a general philosophy of education. Furthermore, as both a methodology and a philosophy, it constantly had to balance two very different sets of values: academic rigor on the academic side and meaningful social change on the community side. Replicable programs and procedures versus governing vision, assessable knowledge creation/utilization versus concrete community assistance—depending on

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Does Service-Learning Have a Future?" *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2 (Fall 1995): 123–133.

how one adjusted each of these two tensions and both of them together, one could arrive at very different agendas for the still very young engagement movement.

This was the context within which I wrote "Does Service-Learning Have a Future?" for the second issue of the new Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning. As the essay makes very clear, it was my belief that what the movement needed most—in the context of the mid-1990s—was bottom-line academic legitimacy. After all, it was only a few years since Tim Stanton, acting director of Stanford University's Haas Center, had written for Campus Compact a white paper (1990) in which he proposed that the community service movement that had helped give birth to Campus Compact in 1986 would achieve neither significant impact nor a long future until it succeeded in attracting the interest of the nation's faculty. However, what had largely driven the movement up to that point was a set of social values and a commitment to develop new resources for underserved populations. In comparison to the needs of communities, the needs of the academy often seemed narrow, self-serving, and bloodless.

Thus the tension between those who saw the new organization potentially as an ideological refuge and those who saw it potentially as a strategic resource center. What was the value of achieving greater academic legitimacy if that legitimacy could only come by sanctioning activities that did not have the community's well being at their core? Might not the movement be in the long run better off by remaining academically marginalized but faithful to a vision of deep social change? Would it not be better to remain small but authentic rather than widely accepted but too willing to compromise? Although the Invisible College did not survive as a discrete organization, the engagement movement it helped promote has achieved considerable academic viability. Has too high a price been paid for that viability, or has the movement succeeded in laying the foundation for a new academic-social compact?

# Service-Learning and the Crisis of Higher Education

Earlier this year, at a conference of the Ohio Campus Compact, national Campus Compact executive director Nancy Rhodes, gesturing toward an array of Campus Compact publications spread out on the table in front of her, jokingly remarked that half of them seemed to begin with the prefix "Re-." In fact, this is hardly surprising. Two years ago the Clinton-Gore administration arrived in Washington brandishing a copy of David Osborne and Ted Gaebler's *Reinventing Government* (1992). Two years later, a new Republican congressional

majority found its own leader, Newt Gingrich, declaring: "Virtually every institution in America, except government, has reengineered themselves [*sic*] to become more efficient over the last decade" (Zuckman 1995).

But government is not the only major institution that has resisted what Gingrich calls "reengineering." American higher education also has, for the most part, continued with business as usual. Whether one looks at the agendas of professional conferences, the promotion and tenure criteria prevailing at individual institutions, or the pedagogies employed in the classroom, one could well believe little has changed for almost half a century. To be sure, the wine poured into the old bottles is of more recent vintage, reflecting especially the ascendant power of women and minorities. Nevertheless, the defining infrastructures of the higher education system have remained remarkably stable—or inert, depending upon one's point of view.

Recently, however, even higher education has begun to experience a serious challenge to its core assumptions and priorities. I refer here not only to the kinds of "Rethinking" (Kupiec 1993) and "Redesigning" (Jackson 1994) called for in the Campus Compact publications alluded to above but also to the work of important educational thinkers such as Ernest Lynton and Sandra Elman (1987, 1993), Boyer (1990), and Rice (1991). Indeed, in a much-discussed opinion piece published last year in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (1994), Boyer eloquently summarizes his vision of necessary and fundamental change in higher education by calling for nothing less than a "New American College":

What I'm describing might be called the "New American College," an institution that celebrates teaching and selectively supports research, while also taking special pride in its capacity to connect thought to action, theory to practice. This New American College would organize cross-disciplinary institutes around pressing social issues. Undergraduates at the college would participate in field projects, relating ideas to real life. Classrooms and laboratories would be extended to include clinics, youth centers, schools, and government offices. Faculty members would build partnerships with practitioners who would, in turn, come to campus as lecturers and student advisers.

The New American College, as a connected institution, would be committed to improving, in a very intentional way, the human condition. As clusters of such colleges formed, a new model of excellence in higher education would emerge, one that would enrich the campus, renew communities, and give new dignity and status to the scholarship of service. (A48)

The connections between this vision and service-learning are evident, but what is perhaps not so evident—at least at first glance—is the special developmental imperative Boyer's "new model of excellence" implies for service-learning. Indeed, I believe that unless service-learning educators heed that implied imperative, the future of the movement is very much in doubt.

Approximately a year before Boyer's piece, Benjamin Barber and Richard Battistoni published an article entitled "A Season of Service: Introducing Service Learning into the Liberal Arts Curriculum" (1993) in which they attempted to lay out some of the more important distinctions and choices facing service-learning educators. One of their most important distinctions revolves around the difference between what they call "philanthropic" and "civic" rationales for engaging in service-learning:

The first view is captured by the statement: "I am obliged to help others less fortunate than myself, and it will do my character good to do so!" The second, by the statement, "I cannot flourish unless the communities to which I belong flourish, and it is my enlightened self-interest to become a responsible member of those communities—whether they are my school, my neighborhood or my nation (or perhaps even my world)." (236)

As Barber and Battistoni point out, the fact that these two approaches "may be mutually reinforcing in certain ways" should not obscure another fact, namely, that they "nonetheless pose contradictory choices and yield different pedagogical strategies" (237).

At the time this article was written, Barber directed Rutgers' Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy while Battistoni directed the same institution's Civic Education and Community Service Program. Both authors are by training political scientists, and their article, appropriately published in *PS: Political Science and Politics*, the in-house journal of the American Political Science Association, clearly reflects a disciplinary perspective and commitment. In short, their work represents an excellent example of something the service-learning movement has so far seen too little of: a critical exploration of service-learning issues addressed first and foremost to colleagues working in the same discipline.

### Service-Learning in the Early 1990s

When one reviews the literature that has thus far developed around servicelearning, one may be surprised to discover how few contributions succeed in combining two of the key strengths of the Barber and Battistoni article, namely, (a) a language and a perspective especially suited to a particular discipline and (b) explicit recognition of the need for all service-learning courses—regardless of the ideological and tactical choices they embody—to evidence "critical depth and intellectual compass." This is not to deny that much hard work and serious thought has been successfully expended on a variety of servicelearning issues. Primary among these have been the elaboration and exploration of guiding principles, and the description of successful courses and programs. Furthermore, such focuses reflect well the developmental needs of the movement as it has unfolded over the past five years. Indeed, it is largely due to the successful promulgation of such principles and such models that service-learning has finally begun to win a voice in the national educational dialogue.

But developmental needs do not in and of themselves fully account for the complexion of the service-learning movement as it has evolved thus far. As a phenomenon tied to the social and political upheavals of the past 30 years, the movement has, quite often, revealed a fundamental—if not determinant—bias in favor of broad ideological, as opposed to specifically academic, priorities and perspectives. Indeed, articulation of the meanings and mandates latent in the word "service" has claimed a not inconsiderable share of the energies of the movement's proponents. From the 1989 "Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning" to the 1995 National Gathering panel entitled "Charity to Justice," scores of service-learning sessions, presentations, and articles have devoted themselves to clarifying the moral and/or civic ethos most appropriate to service-learning practice. Not infrequently, whatever else remains is then lumped together under the rubric of "nuts and bolts"—a telling phrase for educators committed to the value of experiential learning!<sup>1</sup>

In her introduction to what is surely the single most useful servicelearning resource published so far, *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service* (1990), editor Jane Kendall directly raises the question "Why This Resource Book Now?" Her answer is instructive for anyone trying to understand the disposition of the servicelearning movement. Briefly tracing the roots of contemporary interest in service-learning to "a similar wave of interest in community and public service in the late 1960s and the early 1970s" (7), Kendall goes on to identify three key lessons to be learned from that period—lessons that *must* be learned if the present "surge of interest [is] to last . . . rather than be just another exciting, but short-lived wave" (11). These lessons include the following:

- 1. The importance of integrating service-learning programs into the central mission and goals of the schools and agencies where they are based
- 2. The need to establish a balance of power between educational and community partners
- 3. The necessity of wedding reflection to experience

1. A contradiction between experiential/inductive theory and discursive/deductive practice is often evident in service-learning forums and discussions. James Ostrow (1994) has examined the way in which this contradiction manifests itself in approaches to evaluation.

Furthermore, if these lessons are to be operationalized successfully, Kendall maintains, faculty will have to play a pivotal role, for they are "the key to the long-term capacity of . . . institutions to commit to public service and to meaningful learning in the community" (12).

At first glance, one might conclude that such warnings have indeed been taken to heart and that, at least in this regard, the future of service-learning looks promising. Institutionalization of service-learning programs has been a primary concern of Campus Compact ever since its founding, and, over the past few years, that concern has focused ever more specifically on the integration of service into the curriculum. The Principles of Good Practice, referred to above, are invoked and distributed at almost every service-learning conference and institute, thus reminding participants of the need to effect a greater balance of power between academic and community partners. Far from being ignored, reflection now seems to command widespread interest and respect. Indeed, debate about the conceptual frame most appropriate for processing service experiences can become so serious, it can even lead to splits within programs.<sup>2</sup> However, such markers of "progress" may be misleading. Institutional efforts to develop "ownership and leadership ... within the ranks of respected faculty" (Kendall 1990, 12) have remained, for the most part, sporadic and uncoordinated. Lip service is paid to developing greater equality in academy-community partnerships, but little serious attention has been given to defining more precisely community responsibilities or to identifying the kinds of agencies actually capable of supporting effective service-learning collaborations.<sup>3</sup> Relatedly, reflection often amounts to little more than student "discovery" of a predetermined, ideologically "correct" interpretation of the service experience. Minimal interest is shown in making reflection a multidimensional educational exercise rooted in the traditions and objectives of a specific discipline. In other words, contemporary responses to Kendall's challenge can often best be characterized as "well intended."

And yet, there exists—within Kendall's own text—the key to a more satisfactory response. Toward the end of her discussion of the "lessons" the service-learning movement neglects at its peril, Kendall appends a subsection entitled "Other Contributing Trends." Here she identifies two further considerations—circumstances that make the present "a critical point in history and a time of great opportunity for efforts to combine service and learn-

<sup>2.</sup> At one institution I visited, for example, a group of faculty had balked at supporting the school's efforts to strengthen and expand its service-learning program on the grounds that the kind of reflection envisioned did not necessarily include radical social criticism.

<sup>3.</sup> There is, indeed, a widespread tendency in the service-learning community to "romanticize" the role of community agencies, to assume that it is the academic side that is to blame whenever efforts at community-academy collaboration fail. Such an attitude, however, is not only one-sided; it is also patronizing.

ing" (13). The first of these is the general effort to promote curriculum reform on the undergraduate level; the second, the increasing legitimacy of experiencebased education.

With regard to curriculum reform, Kendall approvingly quotes Tim Stanton, who wrote in 1987: "When effectively structured, facilitated, related to discipline-based theories and knowledge, and assessed . . . service-based learning is the means to link the initiative to develop [students'] social responsibility with . . . the efforts to improve undergraduate education" (14). Thus, in a sense, we come back to the point where we began, that is, with Boyer's call not for service-learning but for a "New American College": "an institution that celebrates teaching and selectively supports research, while also taking special pride in its capacity to connect thought to action, theory to practice."<sup>4</sup> In other words, we come back to the priority of *educational* vision, *educational* innovation, *educational* reform.

It is the contention of this essay that unless Kendall's "lessons," the lessons learned from service-learning's last "exciting, but short-lived wave" (Kendall 1990, 11), are deepened and extended in a *rigorously academic* way, unless Stanton's observations regarding "discipline-based theories and knowledge" are taken quite literally, the present upsurge of interest in community-based learning will last no longer than did its late-1960s, early-1970s predecessor. In fact, successful exploitation of the present window of opportunity may well depend upon a single elusive but nonetheless basic decision—whether the movement as a whole prioritizes ideological or academic issues. Personally, I firmly believe in the necessary primacy of the latter. In the following sections, I attempt to explain what this implies.

### Intellectual Resource Allocation

In his keynote address at the January 1995 Colloquium on National and Community Service, Tom Ehrlich made an important distinction: "Community service in the context of academic courses and seminars—often termed 'service-learning'—is valuable for two fundamental and interrelated reasons: (1) Service as a form of *practical experience enhances learning* in all areas of a university's curriculum; and (2) the experience of community service *re-inforces moral and civic values* inherent in serving others" (9, original emphases). Ehrlich's clear and explicit recognition of the two "interrelated" but nonetheless different rationales that support service-learning may not be conceptually new but helps clarify a very important point.<sup>5</sup> Until recently, the

<sup>4.</sup> Note that in this key definition the word "service" does not even appear.

<sup>5.</sup> The same basic distinction is made by Donald Harward (1994). Harward's observation that service also implies "epistemological" themes is especially suggestive.

service-learning movement has more often seen "moral and civic values" as the horse pulling the cart of "enhanced learning" rather than vice versa. As a result, the movement has achieved far less visibility—and attracted far fewer faculty proponents—than is beneficial for its future. As long as service-learning is described and recommended primarily, let alone exclusively, in terms of moral and/or civic lessons and benefits, the vast majority of academicians will do what academics almost always do when confronted with an educational issue they see as foreign to their own work—namely, agree that moral development and civic growth are indeed important, recognize its place in the undergraduate experience, *and deny that such concerns have anything to do with their own professional responsibilities.*<sup>6</sup>

Ehrlich himself implicitly recognizes this problem when, in his address, he focuses on the humanities: "Linking the humanities to service presents a special challenge because the humanities palette is the widest and most diffuse. The proposition that service enriches learning in all areas of the university finds its test case in literature. How can one 'experience' *Middlemarch* as well as read it?" (1995, 9-10).

Literature, or at least certain kinds of literature, may indeed be a "test case," but so are medieval history, astrophysics, differential calculus, bond markets, and hydraulic engineering. In fact, there may be no single discipline—including social work and applied ethics—that cannot and will not be seen by some of its practitioners as a "test case" of service-learning's academic relevance.

Nor should we be surprised that so many faculty members have adopted a posture of general approval but personal indifference. Even individuals committed to service-learning frequently concede the lack of *intellectual* depth and *academic* detail in many service-learning forums and documents. Conference sessions may promise serviceable models, but participants come away more with a sense of the presenter's dedication and enthusiasm than with any enhanced understanding of how traditional academic content has been enriched. Programs set out to collect sample service-learning syllabi only to learn that even some of the best practitioners "don't put much on paper"! When one adds to these difficulties the fact that the very language of service-learning can seem foreign to those not trained in the social sciences, it is not difficult to understand why personal *pre*disposition often seems more important than educational value in securing faculty participation!

The extent and depth of this problem may not at first be apparent. Take, for example, the very text of Ehrlich's address as adapted for publication in the *AAHE Bulletin* (1995). If I am a professor of English literature who has

<sup>6.</sup> Rick Battistoni tells of once having received a note from a chair congratulating him on his service-learning initiatives—but denying they had any relevance to the professor's own discipline, practical philosophy! Surely it is not coincidental that service-learning has found its greatest resonance in disciplines such as sociology and political science where even traditional academicians can quickly recognize familiar issues and "legitimate" concerns.

by chance stumbled upon this text, I may well find myself sympathetically engaged *and* intellectually intrigued by many of its general points. Then I come to the "test case in literature," and I am even more intrigued, recognizing a question that had slowly begun taking shape in my own mind: such a linking of learning and service might indeed have much to recommend it, but how indeed would *I*, as a professor of English literature, give such a pedagogy a try? But instead of a response to the *discipline-specific* question that has taken shape in my mind (i.e., incorporating service-learning into a course on *Middlemarch*, or George Eliot, or the Victorian novel), what I find . . . is the example of a course entitled "Altruism, Philanthropy, and Public Service"! Granted, the course makes extensive use of literary texts to promote discussion; it is nonetheless not a literature course, and for me, there is all the difference in the world between teaching literature and using literature to teach something else.<sup>7</sup>

Such an instance of potential "disappointment" is particularly distressing because it does not result from any deficiency inherent in service-learning as a pedagogy.<sup>8</sup> Rather, it suggests we have yet to develop a habit of thinking rigorously about the academic dimensions of our work. Given the fact that most service-learning advocates are moved by and responding to something larger than discipline-specific expectations, this is not surprising. Nonetheless, it has helped generate and reinforce some serious doubts about what the movement stands for and what it has to offer.<sup>9</sup>

Even Kendall's introduction (1990) is not free from problems of this kind. In identifying the work of the present "critical juncture," she offers the following list of questions to be addressed:

How do you involve the residents of a community in defining the service tasks? How do you balance and respect the differing goals of agencies, students, schools, and the individuals or groups whom these three have decided to "serve"? How do you gain the institutional support required for a strong, continuing program? How can schools and

9. Nowhere is this truer than with regard to terminology. Given the fact that one of the most serious misconceptions service-learning advocates have to deal with is the academic public's tendency to conflate service-learning with community service, it is remarkable how effortlessly most have adopted the hybrid "community service learning." And as if such confusion were not bad enough, many also continue to use the verb "volunteer"—a self-defeating move if there ever was one!

<sup>7.</sup> That literary texts do indeed lend themselves well to raising and exploring precisely the kinds of fundamental moral and social questions in which service-learning proponents are interested is clear. See, for example, Coles 1989b.

<sup>8.</sup> I have personally encountered such situations many times, even with colleagues already personally committed to service-learning. One colleague recently told me she has stopped attending service-learning conferences because she is tired of hearing the same things repeated every time.

colleges assess what students learn through community and public service? What types of public and institutional policies create a climate of sustained support for combining service and learning? (12)

She then goes on to stress the crucial importance of faculty "ownership and leadership," to which she previously referred. But where exactly in the above list of key questions are faculty represented? Where do we find their interests—*as faculty*—directly acknowledged and addressed? True, any experienced service-learning educator could immediately begin drawing those interests from items in the list. But that is precisely the point: very often it takes a prior commitment to the academic relevance of service-learning to see that relevance. The appeal is self-referential.

If such an analysis is at all correct, clearly some kind of "midcourse correction" is in order. Without abandoning the ideological concerns—moral and civic—fundamental to the very concept of service-learning, far more explicit attention must now be paid not just to the concept's general educational side, the kinds of learning that reflection can draw from experience, but to its specifically academic side, the concrete ways in which community involvement and community-based projects enhance the discipline-specific learning academicians see as central to their professional activities. In other words, the time has come for Stanton's vision of "service-based learning [as] the means to link the initiative to develop [students'] social responsibility . . . with the efforts to improve undergraduate education" (Kendall 1990, 14) to move from being merely "another contributing factor" to becoming the central task at hand.<sup>10</sup>

Fortunately, there are signs that this is, in fact, beginning to happen. In December of 1993, a potentially pivotal conference took place at Johnson and Johnson's Wingspread facility in Racine, Wisconsin: a planning meeting for the country's first faculty-based service-learning association. Since then, the "Invisible College," as this association has come to be called, has grown to over 60 members, a nationwide core of educators "who envision and model teaching linked to service and create sustained support for those who share this vision" (Mission Statement).<sup>11</sup>

Under the auspices of both this Invisible College and Campus Compact, the service-learning movement's first "national [faculty] gathering" took place

11. For more information about the Invisible College and its place in the development of the service-learning movement, see Morton and Troppe 1996.

<sup>10.</sup> In other words, there are three, not two, kinds of legitimacy we must attend to. In addition to moral/civic and community legitimacy, there is also academic legitimacy. And while it is clear these three do not exist in any neat, linear, or hierarchical relationship, it is also clear that without a strong base of academic legitimacy, neither moral/civic nor community legitimacy can be long sustained or developed to the point of real effectiveness. However, such a base can hardly be created if the academic (institution-focused) dimension is simply folded into the moral/civic, as if it were a secondary consideration.

this May at Providence College in Rhode Island. Relatedly, the two organizations agreed to sponsor, together with the American Association for Higher Education, a monograph series on service-learning and the major academic disciplines or interdisciplinary areas. Each volume is to be edited by faculty in the discipline or interdisciplinary area in question and is to contain essays and models of special relevance to those working specifically in that discipline or area. It is hoped that these monographs will promote a higher level of academic discourse throughout the service-learning movement.

However, even a major initiative like this series represents merely a fraction of what needs to be done if service-learning is to survive and prosper as a significant player in American higher education. As momentum builds within the individual disciplines, service-learning initiatives must achieve greater legitimacy within both disciplinary associations and individual departments.<sup>12</sup> Only in this way will its practitioners find access to institutional reward structures, and without such access, the movement can never hope to become more than a fringe phenomenon.

Thus, a twofold strategy suggests itself. First, a concerted effort must be launched to make service-learning a respected voice in those venues where discipline-related agendas are set and discipline-related issues are discussed. This imperative, in turn, implies both "political" and intellectual initiatives. It implies not only getting service-learning presentations and panels on national and regional conference agendas but also making sure those presentations and panels demonstrate real rigor and sophistication of thought.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, service-learning educators need to begin writing not just for publications targeting service-learning audiences but also for professional journals in their field. An excellent example of such work in the area of composition and communication is Bruce Herzberg's article "Community Service and Critical Teaching," which appeared in the October 1994 issue of *College Composition and Communication*.

But publications and presentations in and of themselves will not be enough to win disciplinary converts as well as disciplinary legitimacy unless considerably more attention is paid to the discipline-specific dimensions of servicelearning issues and activities. If, as was noted above, it is not uncommon to discover, even among experienced service-learning practitioners, a surprising

13. The significance of this second consideration has taken on new urgency now that several national associations—for example, the American Sociological Association, the Speech Communication Association, and the Academy of Management—have demonstrated a willingness to include service-learning in their conference agendas. In such forums, panel discussions and presentations that are long on personal testimonials but short on intellectual and/or pedagogical substance will probably wind up doing more harm than good.

<sup>12.</sup> It would be hard to overestimate the importance of this point. Many educational thinkers have stressed the pivotal role played by discipline-based groupings. For example, Donald Kennedy, former president of Stanford, describes departments as "the units in which the institution's strategy for academic development is formulated in practice" (1995, 12).

lack of documentation with regard to service-learning assignments, it is even less common to discover anything resembling developed disciplinespecific thinking. Reflection, for example, tends to be generic, not discipline specific.

But why? Are the elements that make for an academically successful service-learning experience as generic as much of the literature and discussion would lead one to believe? Almost everyone in service-learning has heard of David Kolb's experiential learning cycle (1984); many regularly invoke it. But Kolb's cycle is not without important disciplinary implications, and these one finds referred to far less often. However, unless we do begin to take them seriously, and develop our strategies with them in mind, we are depriving ourselves of a resource that could be very useful in making service-learning legitimate outside of those disciplines that have already demonstrated a "natural fit."

A second set of strategic initiatives needs to focus on the various efforts already underway to redefine traditional concepts of faculty responsibility, productivity, and excellence. For while service-learning can indeed be accommodated and legitimized within prevailing academic norms, for example, as contributing to effective and innovative teaching, or providing opportunities for pedagogical as well as field-based research, there can be no doubt that these norms have become extremely and unnecessarily narrow. Thus, all efforts to rethink and expand them are of critical, if indirect, importance to the service-learning movement.

Again, "political" as well as intellectual enterprise is called for. Toward the beginning of this essay, I referred to the work of educational thinkers such as Boyer, Rice, and Lynton. In each case, one finds not just a body of important ideas but also the nucleus of an "interest group." Boyer's efforts to redefine scholarship, Rice's concern with faculty roles and responsibilities, Lynton's advocacy of faculty professional outreach—all represent initiatives with broad academic resonance, and those who support these initiatives share many of the same concerns and values as do those in the service-learning movement. Thus, by reaching out to these natural allies, service-learning educators can form strategic alliances and more quickly achieve "critical mass," both in their professional associations and at their home institutions.

Indeed, the number of potential allies is quite significant. For in addition to those dealing with structural and functional issues in higher education, there are also those concerned with curricular reform and pedagogical effectiveness. All whose educational agendas include active or collaborative learning, critical thinking, portfolio assessment, diversity and multiculturalism, to name just a few major interests, can and should be brought into active dialogue with the service-learning movement. As Battistoni has pointed out in a recent issue of *Liberal Education*, service-learning and diversity work do indeed go hand in hand. But how many of those whose primary focus is diversity rather than service-learning are aware of this congruence? One could, in fact, argue that even service-learning's central task—designing and implementing educationally effective and socially engaged courses largely depends upon its success in exploiting the potential of such alliances.<sup>14</sup> Kendall herself implicitly makes this point when she identifies, as a major "trend" working in favor of contemporary service-learning, higher education's increasing recognition of the value of experiential learning in general. "The *methods* of experiential education are the same as those needed for the effective combination of service and learning. These methods were better refined and articulated in the 1980s, thus offering a deeper body of knowledge... There is more expertise about how to facilitate and assess the learning that is derived from experience" (Kendall 1990, 14, original emphasis).

In other words, the work of researchers like David Kolb (1984) and Donald Schön (1983, 1987), though not specifically concerned with service-learning, helps nonetheless illuminate and refine service-learning by illuminating and refining the experiential learning theory it depends upon. Or, to take still another example, the task of documenting and assessing faculty involvement in service-learning could—and should—draw directly on Lynton and Elman's research on "Evaluating and Rewarding New Professional Activities" (1987).<sup>15</sup>

# Conclusion: Service-Learning and Academic Culture

At the risk of oversimplification, one could reduce the thesis of this essay to the proposition that service-learning educators must decide whether they are first and foremost a movement of academically based community advocates or first and foremost a movement of socially and pedagogically concerned academicians. What should take priority in our discussions and writings: a

15. Another article that makes an important contribution to linking service-learning with a potential ally is "Bridging Two Worlds" (Hirsch and Lynton 1995). Hirsch and Lynton explore the relationship between service-learning and what they call "professional [faculty] service." For a thorough discussion of the latter, see Lynton 1995.

<sup>14.</sup> Still another important reason why service-learning advocates need to begin striking strategic alliances is suggested in the May–June 1995 issue of *Change*. As AAHE's Ted Marchese (1995) points out in his introduction to the issue's three featured articles, "The problem [in higher education] is the system [itself] and what seems called for is systemic change . . . [but] the term 'systemic change' fails to tell us *what* the content of that change should be" (4). Unless service-learning advocates become a part of the larger dialogue trying to specify the content of "that change," we could well find ourselves on the outside of whatever does develop. For example, in the first of the three featured articles that follow, Donald Kennedy speaks of his belief that higher education is, in fact, in the midst of a revolution comparable to the one that introduced graduate education over 100 years ago. And yet, despite Kennedy's impeccable credentials as a supporter of campus-based service, community outreach never once appears in his discussion of needed change.

probing of the suitability of concepts such as "charity," "citizenship," and "justice" or a probing of the rationales that will allow engineers and chemists as well as sociologists and political scientists to see service-learning as directly relevant to their work? Do we expand the service-learning circle by insisting that community members be actively invited into all forums or by insisting that academicians from all areas of higher education be included?

Naturally, the immediate impulse is to say both! Indeed, I would maintain that until we can fully develop both our academic and our community relationships, and learn to include both groups as effectively as possible, our work will not realize its full potential and must perforce remain incomplete. But such a desire for completeness should not be allowed to obscure the fact that resources are, in fact, limited; priorities must be set and strategies established if the movement is to continue to thrive. For example, if we wish to extend the circle of academicians willing to participate, we must skillfully manage the dialogue of invitation: if participation in service-learning is seen as requiring too much additional responsibility and too much sacrifice of traditional control, the number of those willing to experiment with this pedagogy will grow very slowly indeed. Community organizations may or may not welcome an opportunity to collaborate on a syllabus, but such collaboration should not be made a criterion of faculty participation. Relatedly, potential faculty practitioners need to be assured that personal circumstances and institutional or departmental expectations are legitimate engagement considerations.

In short, we must make every effort to rid ourselves of a "hoops" mentality—a sometimes palpable if also only implied demand that unless certain conditions of attitude or action are met, what is happening is not "real" servicelearning.<sup>16</sup> To be sure, everything anyone chooses to call "service-learning" should not be automatically sanctioned and supported. Guidelines and principles of good practice have not lost their relevance, and service-learning advocates have a serious obligation to see that programs and projects do not wind up "doing more harm than good." Nonetheless, we must also be willing to take risks, to stretch and learn from experience. For just as every discipline brings to service-learning its own set of assumptions and expectations, so each faculty member enters the process with different skills and different needs. Attending to these takes time, but such attention is essential to building a strong, self-sustaining movement.

Nor should such a stance be misconstrued as a "selling out" of the servicelearning vision, as a pursuit of academic acceptance at any price. If at present

<sup>16.</sup> Several years ago when I was participating in a Campus Compact Summer Institute as part of a Bentley team, I became aware that the team across the hall was having a very difficult time developing an action plan to take back to its home institution. Their "block" was not resolved until they discovered that not all service-learning courses needed to follow the fully developed model they had been introduced to. It was all right to start with something that could be gradually developed over time.

service-learning runs any danger of co-optation, that danger rests, not in too great a willingness to accept ideologically questionable attitudes and practices, but in the transformation of service-learning into still another academic specialty. As was noted earlier, most academicians are all too ready to grant that the kinds of personal and civic development that service-learning facilitates are important—but not part of their professional responsibility. Hence, any strategy that inadvertently confirms such thinking—through the barriers it raises to widespread faculty participation—may do more to reinforce than to transform the status quo.

For what is ultimately at stake is indeed nothing less than a transformation of contemporary academic culture: the transformation of a set of elitist. self-referential academic assumptions into what the American Association for Higher Education's 1995 national conference characterized as "the engaged campus." Such a campus implies far more than community-based learning in the name of justice or citizenship education. It implies more even than a rethinking of faculty roles and rewards, or acceptance of a broader definition of scholarship and a more diversified, representative curriculum. In the end, it implies nothing less than a reintegration of higher education into the overall educational continuum-and a refocusing of that continuum on the needs of today's students as members of today's society.<sup>17</sup> Over the past few years, I have certainly encountered more than a few well-designed, well-recognized service-learning programs that implicitly practice the very "missionary" mentality they ideologically denounce. "Community" means "minority community," and it is always "out there." To be "engaged" does not imply developing a long-term strategy to engage and transform the academic community itself. As outposts for alienated community organizers and campus-based activists, service-learning programs run the risk of forfeiting much of the very potential to promote social change that makes an engaged academy worth struggling for.<sup>18</sup>

In his book *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (1990), Peter Senge identifies as fundamental to every organization's success the ability to establish and sustain what he calls "creative tension"—the propulsive power inherent in adhering simultaneously to a guiding vision *and* to an accurate assessment of current conditions (150). The

18. This, of course, does *not* mean that there is no legitimate place on our campuses or in our faculties for such organizers and activists, only that their role must always remain, by their own choice, limited.

<sup>17.</sup> For a similar understanding, framed by a different set of concerns, see Bromell 1995. I should add that *within* higher education itself, there is a pressing need to reestablish the educational continuum. For example, the service-learning movement as a whole has far more to learn from community colleges than many four-year institutions have yet realized. Programs like Brevard's in Florida and Mesa's in Arizona are rich in interesting models and innovative ideas.

same, I believe, can be said of the service-learning movement. Unless we learn soon to respond in a much more differentiated and adequate way to the realities of our institutional and professional contexts, our commitment to social ideals will not generate long-term progress. And without such progress, it is a question if the movement can—or even should—survive.

### 6 Pedagogy and Engagement

Edward Zlotkowski

By the second half of the 1990s, the scholarship of engagement, and service-learning in particular, had begun to generate many new publications. With the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning successfully established as the field's first independent peer-reviewed journal (as distinguished from publications linked to the work of a specific educational association), publishers like Anker and Jossey-Bass also began to take an interest in service-learning scholarship. Barbara Jacoby and Associates' influential Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices appeared in 1996, and two years later my own edited volume Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education (1998a) complemented the Jacoby et al. volume by providing a series of institutional case studies.

One institution not included in my book is Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), an institution that had begun emerging as a major player in the field of engaged scholarship just as I started gathering and editing my case studies. Quickly it became apparent that IUPUI would have made a handsome addition to the group of schools I had selected, but I was relieved to learn that one of the driving forces behind that institution's growing commitment to engaged work, Robert Bringle,

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Pedagogy and Engagement," in *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*, ed. Robert Bringle, Richard Games, and Edward Malloy, 96–120 (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999).
was planning to co-edit a volume of his own, and that not only he but IUPUI's dean of the faculties and executive vice chancellor, William Plater, would be contributing to the volume. That volume, Colleges and Universities as Citizens, appeared in 1999.

I was also fortunate enough to be asked to contribute to the book, and I very much wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to explore the considerable conceptual and methodological complexity of service-learning as a pedagogy. By this point I had had enough experience working with colleges and universities to know that a belief in the educational value of community-based assignments and the translation of that belief into a set of effective practices are two very different things. What I so often encountered was sufficient dissatisfaction with what Parker Palmer (1987) has called "objectivism," with its "ethic of competitive individualism, in the midst of a world fragmented and made exploitable by that very mode of knowing" (22), to drive faculty to value-engaged teaching and learning but insufficient attention to what would make such engagement an intellectually rich experience.

At the core of "Pedagogy and Engagement" is what I call a "servicelearning matrix": a structuring of the service-learning undertaking along a pair of complementary axes: a horizontal axis spanning academic mastery and the larger context within which the social value of that mastery reveals itself and a vertical axis spanning activities organized around student learning and the priorities of those with whom the students engage. The four quadrants created by this schematic allow faculty to identify four complementary areas of concern, all of which must be carefully attended to if service-learning is to deliver for its key stakeholders: faculty, students, higher education institutions, and community partners. Over the last fifteen years I have found the conceptual model presented here so useful I have continued to regard it as the single most important conceptual tool in my service-learning work with other faculty. For this reason I have chosen to include in this volume a revised version of the original, a version that takes advantage of some of the resources that have become available since the original essay was published.

In a 1994 essay entitled "Service on Campus," Arthur Levine pointed out that "student volunteer movements tend to be a passing phenomenon in higher education, rising and falling on campuses roughly every 30 years" (4). Are we now riding the crest of such a wave? Several factors suggest we are. Campus Compact, a national association of college and university presidents committed to fostering community service on their campuses, now numbers over 1,000 members. New student initiatives such as "Alternative Spring Break" and "Into the Streets" draw thousands of undergraduate participants each year. The number of books, articles, and special issues focused on service-related topics has exploded. What does all this mean for "universities as citizens"?

The very cyclicality of this phenomenon may suggest "Not much!" However, unlike earlier waves of interest in service, the present wave has been characterized not only by a rise in student interest but also by a less visible but no less remarkable rise in faculty interest. Indeed, no less an observer than the late Ernest Boyer suggested something qualitatively different was taking place this time around. "The social imperative for service has become so urgent that the university cannot afford to ignore it. I must say that I am worried that right now the university is viewed as a private benefit, not a public good. Unless we recast the university as a publicly engaged institution I think our future is at stake" (1996, 138).

Hence, without denying the influence of cyclical patterns, we may do well to consider whether the current interest in service must not be understood as qualitatively different from its predecessors. For if, as Boyer suggests, service must now be viewed as an "urgent" "social imperative," it is critically important that those responsible for contemporary American higher education clearly understand both the forms service now takes and its potential to promote civic and academic renewal.

This, in turn, implies an understanding of service-learning, since it is service-learning more than anything else that distinguishes the current service movement from earlier surges of campus volunteerism. Indeed, on many campuses curriculum-based service rather than traditional co-curricular volunteerism represents the real "growth area" (Fisher 1998, 218). The rest of this essay focuses exclusively on this growth area, first by reviewing a useful definition and then by utilizing a complementary matrix to explore service-learning's constituent elements in greater detail. These elements can be thought of as comprising four related fields: (1) service-learning as a discipline-specific activity, (2) multilayered reflection, (3) academic support structures, and (4) academy-community partnerships. We conclude with a glance at some of the larger educational and institutional needs service-learning helps to address.

## Understanding Service-Learning

One of the more frequently cited definitions of service-learning currently in circulation first appeared in a 1996 article by Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher:

We view service learning as a credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. Unlike extracurricular voluntary service, service learning is a course-based service experience that produces the best outcomes when meaningful service activities are related to course material through reflection activities such as directed writings, small group discussions, and class presentations. Unlike practica and internships, the experiential activity in a service learning course is not necessarily skill-based within the context of professional education. (222)

The value of this formulation lies not only in its specification of key servicelearning features but also in its differentiation between service-learning and both volunteerism and traditional practica and internships. A clear awareness of these distinctions is essential if one is to understand service-learning's potential to shape the academic-civic dialogue.

The first feature Bringle and Hatcher identify is that service-learning is a *credit-bearing* experience, that is, a part of the academic curriculum. Not all would agree this is essential. In *Service-Learning in Higher Education* (1996), Barbara Jacoby and Associates adopt an approach that includes both curricular and co-curricular practices. However, even those who embrace this broader approach would agree that faculty support and participation make achieving the "learning" dimension of service-learning much more likely. Recognition of the importance of such support first became widespread in the early 1990s, thanks largely to a report (1990a) prepared for Campus Compact by Tim Stanton, then associate director of the Haas Center at Stanford University. In his report Stanton noted that, until then, "little attention [had] been given to the faculty role in supporting student service efforts and in setting an example of civic participation and leadership through their own efforts" (1). This neglect would have to be corrected if campus-based service were to reach its full potential.

As a result of Stanton's report, Campus Compact, with Ford Foundation backing, launched a multiyear initiative aimed at "Integrating Service with Academic Study." This initiative has helped shift the primary focus of servicelearning from student to faculty affairs. Currently, almost all service-learning programs that seek to have a significant institutional as well as community impact also seek to promote faculty involvement and to establish a reliable curricular base.

A second service-learning feature found in the Bringle-Hatcher definition lies encoded in its phrase "identified community needs." "Encoded" is appropriate because both "identified needs" and "community" require some explanation. One of the most significant ways in which service-learning differs from many other community-related campus-based initiatives involves its insistence that the needs to be met *must* be defined by the community, not the campus. In other words, service-learning deliberately seeks to reverse the long-established academic practice of *using* the community for the academy's own ends. This, of course, does not mean the academy is expected simply to do the community's bidding. The watchword here is reciprocity: there must be an agreed-upon balance of benefits and responsibilities on both sides (see the following section on partnerships).

Such a call for reciprocity has far more serious consequences than may at first be apparent. For one, it significantly qualifies the academy's traditional claim to preeminence by virtue of its expertise. In a service-learning context, the concept of "expertise" encompasses more than theoretical understanding and technical skill; it also includes the in-depth knowledge that comes from having lived with a problem or set of circumstances over an extended period of time. Thus, the community lays claim to its own kind of expertise—an expertise the academy is bound to acknowledge and respect.

Second, reciprocity implies that all processes and roles are functionally interchangeable. It is no more accurate to identify the academy as "serving" and the community as "being served" than vice versa. If the community benefits and learns from the academy, it is no less true that the academy benefits and learns from the community. If the academy gives the community access to new technical and human resources, the community gives the academy access to new educational opportunities. It is commonplace among servicelearning practitioners—student and faculty alike—to realize, once a project has been completed and evaluated, that those on campus have gotten back far more than they have given.

If, then, service-learning implies that the needs around which projects are organized are to be identified by community partners who are regarded as the academy's equals, the next question must be, what does service-learning understand by the word "community"? Here again, as in the case of "creditbearing," what prevails is more a tendency than a consensus. While "community" might well refer to the off-campus community in general or even the on-campus community, the "community service" roots of service-learning, still evident in the formulation "community service learning," point toward a less inclusive understanding. For the most part, the community referred to primarily consists of (1) off-campus populations underserved by our market economy and (2) organizations whose primary purpose is the common good. To be sure, at institutions where many students come from underserved populations, service activities often include on-campus as well as off-campus activities. However, few programs provide assistance to for-profit enterprises, except in cases where those enterprises themselves can be regarded as serving more than proprietary interests.

How one understands community is closely related to a third key feature of the Bringle-Hatcher definition; namely, service-learning is an experience that includes reflection "on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility." So important is this feature that practitioners often single out reflection as *the* key to making service yield real learning. To be sure, conscientious experiential educators of all kinds, not just those involved in service-learning, have long recognized the importance of reflection as a complement to experience. What is distinctive about reflection in a service-learning context is its multilayered quality: what students reflect on results not just in greater technical mastery ("course content") but also in an expanded appreciation of the contextual or social significance of the relevant discipline or area of studies and, most broadly of all, in "an enhanced sense of civic responsibility." Thus, students in a chemistry course may be asked to connect testing for lead in housing projects with what they have learned both in their course lectures and in the chemistry laboratory while also processing their personal reactions to conditions in the projects and their evolving sense of children's right to a safe environment.

Such a multilayered understanding of reflection is critical to any attempt to differentiate service-learning not just from curriculum-based preprofessional field experiences such as internships and practica but also from volunteerism of the kind traditionally associated with student organizations. To the degree that a given service activity is deliberately tied to structured learning objectives, to that degree it can be seen as approaching the functional core of service-learning—whether or not it is formally sponsored by a course. However, the very significance of this demand that structured, in-depth reflection complement the service experience is what argues most convincingly for service-learning as a course-based undertaking. Absent such a credit-bearing framework, it is difficult to harvest the learning "service-learning" implies. And without that harvesting, its potential to link private advantage and public good, to facilitate civic as well as more technical kinds of understanding, cannot be realized.

## A Service-Learning Matrix

I have proposed elsewhere (Zlotkowski 1998b) that one especially useful way to capture the complexity and richness of service-learning is to conceive of it as a matrix (Figure 6.1). What such a conceptualization suggests is that service-learning can best be seen as a field where two complementary axes intersect: a horizontal axis spanning academic expertise and a concern for the common good, and a vertical axis that links the traditional domain of the student—that is, classroom activities—with that of those who guide and mentor him or her in service activities in the larger community. Through this utilization of multiple learning sites, this axis also links situations where student needs dominate (i.e., the academic course) with situations where student needs are subordinate to other concerns (i.e., the delivery of social services and other kinds of practical assistance). In this way, service-learning can be seen to link the kind of work characteristic of the classroom—hypothetical, deductive, reflective—with the kind of work most typical outside it—concrete,



Figure 6.1 Service Learning Conceptual Matrix

inductive, results driven. Or, to appropriate Donald Schön's memorable image, it connects "the high ground [where] manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the use of research-based theory and technique" with "the swampy lowlands [where] problems are messy and confusing and incapable of technical solution" (1995, 28). Although the point where the two axes intersect will necessarily differ from one service-learning situation to the next, with either academic or civic learning, classroom or field experience more or less emphasized, all four poles are always to some significant degree represented.

In encompassing this constellation of interests and activities, servicelearning both complicates and liberates educational practice. No longer can the teaching mission of colleges and universities—as ratified by and articulated in the curriculum—be adequately described in terms of preprofessional and self-contained academic practice. The kind of learning faculty facilitate *must* now include a broader public dimension. The circle of stakeholders directly involved in the academic enterprise *must* be expanded to include members of the off-campus community.

Such imperatives are enough to explain why service-learning possesses such enormous potential to move higher education in the direction of civic involvement. It also explains why colleges and universities often find it easier to frame their civic responsibilities in other ways, for example, in terms of extension services, selectively shared resources, special programs, and even purchasing and employment practices. So long as the classroom door can literally and figuratively remain shut, institutions can "accommodate" a considerable measure of citizenship with little or no challenge to their traditional structures and self-understanding. Service-learning makes business as usual more difficult. Boyer himself did not shrink from the consequences of such a challenge. It is fashionable nowadays to cite with approval his vision of a "New American College" (1994). However, if Dale Coye (1997), a longtime Boyer associate, is correct in asserting that "the New American College was the natural outcome of Boyer's work, the point for him at which all roads met" (21), it behooves us to invoke that vision with special care and attention. For although Boyer (1994) does not explicitly refer to service-learning in his sketch of such an institution, the kinds of activities and arrangements he recommends leave little doubt as to service-learning's central relevance:

This New American College would organize cross-disciplinary institutes around pressing social issues. Undergraduates at the college would participate in field projects, relating ideas to real life. Classrooms and laboratories would be extended to include health clinics, youth centers, schools, and government offices. Faculty members would build partnerships with practitioners who would, in turn, come to campus as lecturers and student advisers.

The New American College, as a connected institution, would be committed to improving, in a very intentional way, the human condition. As clusters of such colleges formed, a new model of excellence in higher education would emerge, one that would enrich the campus, renew communities, and give new dignity and status to the scholarship of service. (A48)

Through its institutes and field projects, the New American College can be said to connect different kinds of discipline-specific knowledge *and* to connect that knowledge to an overt commitment to the common good. By extending the concepts of the classroom and the laboratory to include "health clinics, youth centers, schools, and government offices," it not only links traditional on-campus learning to experiences in the world beyond the campus but also reconceptualizes what is appropriate to the curriculum and the ways in which that curriculum should be delivered.

## The Four Quadrants of Service-Learning Practice

One way to begin unpacking some of the more systemic implications both of Boyer's model and of service-learning in general is to explore the four fields of the matrix just introduced. Each quadrant can be said to define a different area of faculty and/or institutional activity: (A) design and implementation of course-specific pedagogical strategies, (B) facilitation of course-appropriate reflection strategies, (C) reform of academic culture to recognize communityrelated professional activities, and (D) creation of community partnerships based on long-term interdependency. Much of the remainder of this essay explores each of these areas in turn.

### A: Pedagogical Strategies

No changes in instructional practice are likely to have greater significance than a shift in basic faculty function from information delivery to learning environment design (Guskin 1994). As Lee Schulman, director of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, once remarked (Miller 1997), working on a "pedagogy of substance" means "assisting teachers to focus on the *design* aspects of teaching" (6, original emphasis). With regard to service-learning, such a focus is essential if the service-related learning process is to have any chance of success. Faculty who practice service-learning *must* begin doing now what Shulman, Alan Guskin, and others see as fundamental to the future of instruction in general.

To many only vaguely familiar with service-learning (including some who claim to practice it), adoption of a service-learning pedagogy implies little more than telling students to work at a community site and write a paper on their experiences. The service activity is generic; the learning—whatever learning there is—is also generic. The entire exercise is justified by the idea that students should be exposed to social problems and encouraged "to give something back."

Indeed, even when such an exercise results in substantive service, it still may not recommend itself as *service-learning*. As Benjamin Barber (1997) notes with regard to mandating service:

If service-learning is about *voluntary* service, it does not belong in the curriculum, should not be mandatory, and, indeed, when it is mandatory may violate the Constitution. If service-learning is about *learning*, however, then it needs to be directly folded into curricula, it can be made mandatory just as English or biology can be made mandatory (for pedagogical, not social welfare reasons), and it no more violates the Constitution than does a requirement for freshman math or swimming. (228, original emphasis)

If, then, academic justification of service-learning lies primarily in its educational value, faculty are under considerable obligation to understand how they can most effectively tap that value—and institutions are under equal obligation to provide the kinds of support faculty need in order to be able to do so. Two kinds of support are here at issue, though only the first of these is discussed in the present section. (See *D: Community Partners* for the other.)

As might be expected, service-learning has received an uneven welcome across the disciplinary spectrum. This is explained, most often, as a matter of natural disciplinary "fit," but willingness to acknowledge fit is itself reflective of differences in disciplinary cultures. Up through the 1990s, service-learning in higher education was championed primarily by faculty from certain liberal arts disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology, communication, composition, and political science). As I have noted elsewhere (Rama and Zlotkowski 1996), the interest these faculty evinced actually helped reinforce the impression that service-learning is primarily suited to meeting *their* needs. And yet, if we look at a document like Lyman W. Porter and Lawrence E. McKibbin's *Management Education and Development: Drift or Thrust into the 21st Century?* (1988) (commissioned by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business), it becomes immediately clear that service-learning could equally well serve many of the most important *self-identified* goals of the business disciplines (Zlotkowski 1996b). A similar argument can be made for the natural sciences.

Thus, to meet adequately the demands of quadrant A, institutions that claim to take community engagement seriously need to mount a comprehensive effort to help those working in disciplinary areas across the academic spectrum to both understand and appropriate service-learning *on their own terms* (Zlotkowski 1995, 1996b). It was, in fact, to help faculty do precisely this, to help them "customize" service-learning that the American Association for Higher Education published a twenty-one-volume series on service-learning in the disciplines and interdisciplinary areas (AAHE 1997–2006).

What, then, does such discipline-specific design entail? As an extensive database of course models attests (see, for example, Campus Compact's online syllabi: http://www.compact.org/syllabi/), it involves at least three kinds of carefully considered choices: (1) the *rationale* behind and *purpose* of the service activity to be introduced; (2) the *kind* of service most appropriate to the goals of the course, the level of student expertise available, and the needs of the community partner; and (3) the course *format* most appropriate for the kind of learning and the kind of service aimed at. Each of these topics challenges the service-learning instructor (in consultation with his or her community partner) to bring to course design a degree of deliberateness many more traditional instructional strategies regularly do without.

#### **Rationale and Purpose**

The educational logic that leads faculty members to employ service-learning may differ widely from course to course, despite the fact that some rationales are more or less universally applicable. Thus, for example, the frequently invoked value of linking practice to theory can take a variety of forms. In a public relations course, it may mean a more or less straightforward application of concepts and practices discussed in class to the needs of local nonprofits and/ or neighborhood-based organizations. In a sociology course, straightforward application may yield to implicit critique whereby students are expected to experience not the utility but the inadequacies of a textbook formulation. In an environmental chemistry course, application may yield not to critique but to field research whereby students are expected to develop new knowledge needed to understand and address a community problem.

Still another kind of educational logic diverges from the theory-practice model altogether. Through service-learning, students may be challenged to develop more fully their moral imaginations. Courses in literature, ethics, and religious studies often fall into this category. When, several years ago, I was asked to teach a course on Shakespeare's tragedies, my students spent part of the semester working at a shelter for homeless men. This assignment occurred in conjunction with our discussion of *King Lear*, and its primary educational purpose was to help the students more successfully appropriate the play's exploration of human vulnerability and spiritual renewal.

Such an exploration would undoubtedly be irrelevant in the context of a pre-calculus course, but a student's ability to *demonstrate* his or her grasp of basic mathematical concepts and procedures would not. As Lee Schulman (1997) once acknowledged: "Indeed, I wouldn't claim that I'd 'learned' something until I had successfully explained or discussed it with someone else, and seen what they did with what it is I think I know" (4). Thinking like this underlies the many service projects that ask students to "step down" something they are studying on the college level to the needs of students on lower educational levels. Verbal, cultural, scientific, and financial literacy initiatives all fall into this category.

Still other educational rationales could be adduced, but by now the underlying point should be clear: service activities must always be grounded in a deliberate, *carefully articulated* understanding of how such activities advance the specific learning goals of the course in which they are embedded. Students can hardly be expected to do quality community-based work if they are not convinced such work has academic integrity. Nor can they do such work if their instructor has not carefully considered the nature of the service they can appropriately be expected to provide.

#### Kind of Service

Academics are not the only ones who frequently confuse service-learning with traditional volunteer work masquerading as an academic assignment. Those who manage community agencies and public institutions often make the same mistake. When they do, the care faculty have taken to clarify the educational rationale behind their service requirements can easily come to naught: instead of creating the donor database a computer science instructor envisioned, students are busy stacking boxes or standing at a copy machine. Such mis-assignments represent more than a frustration of educational design; they also represent a loss of opportunity for the community partner, replacing technical expertise with unskilled busy-ness.

Indeed, for many faculty members, perhaps the single greatest obstacle to sponsoring community-related work is a habit of seeing such work solely in terms of some generic busy-ness. This is especially true at research-oriented universities and highly selective liberal arts colleges. There is, however, no reason why the special strengths and interests of faculty at institutions like these cannot be utilized to create valuable community projects. Courses in research methodology, capstone seminars requiring the production of original work, and courses sufficiently advanced to permit policy analysis and recommendations are at least as suitable for service-learning initiatives as courses that lend themselves to more direct kinds of assistance. Undergraduate research and participatory action research represent two other established areas of academic activity whose methods and aims lend themselves effortlessly to service-learning.

To be sure, not all service assignments need be of a technical nature even in capstone courses. An introductory philosophy course exploring the concept of justice may require and be able to provide no more than generic assistance to an agency working with the homeless. The same may be true of a senior seminar on contemporary moral issues. In these cases, all that will distinguish service-learning from traditional volunteerism is the educational framework within which the service experience is set, that is, the kinds of questions and exercises the instructor provides to help students link their experience to readings and class discussions. In short, whether the service in question is generic or technical, is geared to assist individuals or clarify policy, takes place primarily off or on campus—none of these choices has any *intrinsic* bearing on the educational or social value of the service activity involved. The only constants among these many possibilities are that the activity at issue be designed to meet real needs as well as real educational objectives and that the students be capable of performing the tasks required.

#### **Course Format**

If the nature of available student expertise helps determine what kinds of service tasks are at least possible, so also does the instructor's decision as to how those tasks will be weighed in relation to other class assignments. Will the service component be required of all students or will they be able to choose among several kinds of work? Will it involve a significant or relatively minor time commitment? Will it define or complement core course objectives? Again, there is no single correct answer to any of these questions (Enos and Troppe 1996). While some service-learning practitioners warn against the dangers of including service assignments only as structural "add-on's," others stress the importance of being sensitive to students' personal circumstances and the danger of sending unwilling or even resentful students into the community. Service as a "fourth-credit option" represents an excellent case in point. Some practitioners view this arrangement (which allows students to earn four rather than three credits if they complete a set of field-based activities as well as all of a course's regular requirements) as a useful way of making service-learning available to more students, while others see it as reducing service to an afterthought, a signal to students that the work that really matters still lies in the

traditional classroom. The one point on which both sides should be able to agree is that the service assignment must never be taken casually, in either its educational or its social dimension. Instructors unwilling to give a student's service work serious attention, whether or not that work is required, probably shouldn't offer service opportunities in the first place. It is too easy inadvertently to "do harm" when one isn't paying sufficient attention. Learning to pay sufficient attention brings us directly to the subject of reflection.

## B: Reflection Strategies and the "Reflective Practitioner"

Until now, much of what has been said could apply not only to servicelearning but also to other, more traditional forms of experiential education (Schön 1983, 1987). Granted, service-learning occurs primarily not as a special unit as do many "practica" and "internships" but as a component of standard, classroom-based courses; granted, it places special emphasis on the importance of reciprocity, of carefully balancing the needs and goals of both academic and nonacademic partners (Furco 2003); nonetheless, even these features could be regarded as differences in degree rather than in kind. Quadrant B, however, fundamentally differentiates service-learning from other forms of experiential education. For as Bringle and Hatcher note, "Unlike practica and internships, the experiential activity in a service-learning course is not necessarily skill-based within the context of professional education" (1996, 222). In other words, service-learning assignments may or may not improve the technical skill set related to a particular discipline or interdisciplinary area. However, under all circumstances they should help students "gain ... a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (222). In this regard, service-learning shifts attention away from our widespread preoccupation with education as private gain and seeks to balance that concern with a focus on the common good.

Such a balance clearly pivots on the concept of reflection. As Janet Eyler, Dwight Giles, and Angela Schmiede point out in their *Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service-Learning* (1996), no less an advocate of experiential education than John Dewey insisted that "*reflective thinking* was the key to making experience educative" (15, original emphasis). Regardless of the care and skill with which a faculty member designs the service activities in a course, he or she cannot fully achieve his or her objectives unless similar care and skill are expended on designing exercises that will allow students to turn those activities into conscious learning.

But because service-learning goals are not limited to developing courseand discipline-specific expertise, reflection in a service-learning context must facilitate a wider range of educational outcomes than reflection in other contexts. Besides providing the mechanism that links theory to practice in the technical sphere (i.e., Bringle and Hatcher's "course content"), it must also help students locate that technical sphere in a field of broader concerns. It is to this latter task that Barber (1997) refers when he notes that "[helping] create contributing, responsible citizens . . . is a task schools and colleges can be expected to undertake, for it reflects nothing more than a recognition of and recommitment to the traditional ideal of education as preparation of young people for civic life in a free society" (228).

And yet, as traditional as such a task may be, it faces many challenges. For while some faculty may object to experience-based assignments as insufficiently "academic," even more will regard the task of creating citizens as simply irrelevant to what they teach. Indeed, many will see the development of citizenship and democracy skills as matters that belong in the province of student, not faculty affairs.

For this reason reflection, like service activities, must be approached with considerable sensitivity to course-specific considerations. Although, as Schön (1995) and others have suggested, reflection may be the natural process by means of which experience yields real discipline-specific understanding, it is not at all clear how such an understanding can be convincingly developed in a way that also allows other, less discipline-specific but not discipline-irrelevant kinds of understanding to emerge. In other words, while the concept of citizenship may be as appropriate in an accounting class as in a political science class, the way in which it is introduced, developed, and made integral to a course's concerns will vary greatly from one course to the next. Indeed, even the terminology different disciplinary cultures employ to articulate their sense of civic obligation and "public work" (Boyte and Farr 1997) must show considerable variation. As Richard Battistoni (2002), in his *Civic Engagement across the Curriculum*, has pointed out:

If we want to engage all across campus in education for civic engagement . . . we need to go beyond the social sciences for conceptual frameworks that will inform the theory and practice of service-learning. While political and other social scientists have a rich tradition and language around concepts like democracy, citizenship, community, political participation, civil society, and public work, they obviously do not own these concepts. (19)

He then goes on to identify some of the terms that emerged in his conversations with different disciplinary associations and to discuss briefly "seven conceptual frameworks for civic engagement that come from theory and practice found in disciplines outside the social sciences" (20). These terms include civic professionalism, social responsibility, social justice, connected knowing or "ethic of care," public leadership, public intellectual, and engaged/public scholarship (20–29).

Furthermore, such conceptual frameworks and the behavior that embodies them are not necessarily as foreign to practitioners as one might think. I still remember clearly an occasion when I approached the steering committee of the Massachusetts Support Center, Accounting Assistance Project, to discuss the possibility of project members becoming involved in my college's servicelearning program. Although I had prepared myself to "make the case" for such participation, I found myself instead on the receiving end of a mini-lecture on the importance of modeling "professional responsibility" for future accountants. Indeed, an active concern for the civic dimension of a discipline or profession is sometimes far more evident in professionals outside than inside the academy. It has been my experience that faculty who come to the academy after years of outside experience more quickly come to appreciate the importance of discipline-specific community-based work than the majority of their "purely academic" colleagues. In this area, as in many others, change seems to come to the academy from without. The transforming power of new Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) accreditation standards in engineering education is a case in point. The profession clearly wanted a kind of graduate that schools of engineering were not producing.

Another case in point is the Accounting Education Change Commission's monograph *Intentional Learning: A Process for Learning to Learn in the Accounting Curriculum* (1995), a publication that nowhere explicitly mentions service-learning. Here one finds, in a "Composite Profile of Capabilities Needed by Accounting Graduates," such nontechnical, citizenship-related items as "awareness of personal and social values"; "ability to interact with culturally and intellectually diverse people"; and "knowledge of the activities of business, government, and nonprofit organizations, and of the environments in which they operate" (94). To require, as service-learning does, that higher education reestablish a vital connection between issues of disciplinary expertise and issues of broad, public concern need not mean decontextualized "relevance."

There is, finally, a third kind of reflection—in addition to technical or course content-related and civic—that needs to be considered central to the way in which service-learning works. While the first helps students better master the concepts and skills a course is organized around and the second helps them better appreciate the societal context and civic responsibilities that elevate them from being mere technicians to being professionals in the full sense of the word (see, among others, Sullivan 1995), this third kind of reflection seeks to ensure that service-learning students continue to grow in the direction of the "examined life"—the ideal of self-awareness that lies at the core of all liberal learning. In other words, if civic reflection leads students out from their technical expertise into a larger world of "global" considerations, "personal" reflection drives them deeper into themselves to better understand the unexamined assumptions and "mental models" (Senge 1990) that filter their experiences.

Unfortunately, much of what passes for reflection in service-learning can best be described as an anemic version of such personal reflection. Assignments that ask students simply to respond to a service experience, to identify "highs and lows," to describe "what they learned" most generally fall into this category—a category where affective reaction substitutes for disciplined self-analysis. What exactly it is that students are supposed to learn from such reflection, let alone how an instructor is supposed to grade something so intellectually formless, is not at all clear. Still, the fact that so few service-learning instructors have themselves had formative service-learning experiences or have learned to prepare and "unpack" work that happens outside the classroom may help account for the depressingly frequent occurrence of such personal reflection assignments. It will require considerable institutional leadership if faculty are to learn to harvest effectively the full range of learning outcomes service-learning is capable of generating.

### C: Academic Culture

It is at this point that most discussions of service-learning end. If we were to return to the Bringle-Hatcher definition in its entirety, we would find that we have by now addressed all of its concerns. Why, then, should the servicelearning matrix posit four rather than two quadrants? The answer lies in the fact that service-learning is not simply a course-based undertaking with implications for (a) the way in which faculty teach and (b) the kinds of faculty development opportunities they need to succeed in their teaching. It is also, perforce, a larger departmental and institutional undertaking, and its implications for these two units are every bit as challenging as are its implications for individual faculty members.

For the most part, the kinds of departmental and institutional issues service-learning raises can also be found in other academic contexts. In his influential paper "Making a Place for the New American Scholar" (1996), Gene Rice has identified what he refers to as the "assumptive world of the academic professional," that is, the "complex of basic assumptions" that have come to dominate and structure the work of faculty. These include a privileging of research above all other forms of scholarly activity, a privileging of pure research above applied work, a privileging of specialization above connections and context, and a privileging of the internal values and priorities of the academy above the needs and concerns of nonmembers (8 ff.). It is these assumptions that have shaped the professional socialization of "the large number of older senior faculty who now head departments and influence tenure and promotion decisions." However, even as this assumptive world continues to shape the academy in its image, "institutional developments [have] pulled in another." Primary among these developments is the pressure to pay more serious attention to undergraduate education and the needs of the larger community.

As we moved into the 1990s . . . [the] priorities that had been central to the assumptive world of the academic professional began to be not necessarily challenged and rejected but added to. The junior faculty

interviewed for the "Heeding New Voices" inquiry report that, in one sense, it is a new day on campus. . . . Extensive peer review of one's publications continues to be what is valued most; but in addition to thorough student evaluation, one's teaching also has to be peer reviewed in multiple ways. While new faculty are, on the local level, being encouraged to engage in the very gratifying work of curricular development and reaching out to the broader community through newly initiated service-learning programs, they are being told that their more cosmopolitan responsibilities to professional associations and their guild colleagues are to be their first priority.

Some of the best new faculty are being attracted to a new set of priorities focused on the essential missions of our institutions. On the other hand, the old priorities—the assumptive world of the academic professional—remain intact. (10)

It is interesting that Rice should here explicitly refer to service-learning, for few initiatives that characterize the emerging paradigm so vividly concretize its implications for the departments and institutions where future faculty will work. In this regard, service-learning can be viewed as a kind of litmus test: departments and institutions that have fully recognized its significance and have provided for its operations have not only made a strong commitment to undergraduate education and civic outreach, they have also indicated a willingness to begin exploring the necessity of structural adjustments. Such adjustments will necessitate dealing with at least some of the following cutting-edge concerns.

#### **Reintegration of Faculty Roles**

One of the questions that most frequently surfaces at institutions where a significant number of faculty have embraced service-learning is how one can best capture this work in annual reports and faculty profiles. A historian who has developed an upper-level seminar around community-based research is certainly not involved in faculty service in the traditional sense. Hence, despite the "service" profile of the project, it should perhaps more properly be placed in the category of "pedagogical innovations"—unless, of course, it reflects the faculty member's own scholarly interests, adds to her work, and winds up being published in some form. In that case, it can also be entered under "research" or "scholarship" or "professional activity"—or whatever other suitable category happens to be available.

There are, in other words, few academic undertakings that so effectively point up both the incoherence and the inefficiency of the traditional tripartite division of faculty responsibilities. In an era of shifting expectations, such incoherence can have especially serious consequences. As James Votruba, former vice provost for Outreach at Michigan State University and current president of the University of Northern Kentucky, noted in 1996: Traditionally, we have treated the academic trilogy of teaching, research, and service as if they were separate and conceptually distinct forms of professional activity. In times of limited resources, it is assumed that any attempt to strengthen one part of the trilogy must be done at the expense of the others. If outreach is to become a primary and fully integrated dimension of the overall academic mission, this "zero sum" mentality must be overcome. (30)

If colleges and universities are to reemerge as active citizens, they simply cannot *afford* to sustain this kind of fragmentation. By encouraging faculty to develop projects that make their work simultaneously productive in all three of the traditional categories, service-learning helps both individuals and institutions do more with the resources available to them.

#### **Reconsidering Assessment and Recognition**

In discussing the implications of quadrant A (course-specific service activities), we noted that service-learning challenges faculty to be much more deliberate in their course design and pedagogical strategies. One of the most important areas in which this heightened deliberateness must manifest itself is in matters of assessment—in developing measures of student performance adequate to the complex, real-world dimensions of community-based work. The same can be said for departments and institutions with regard to faculty work. Over and beyond the task of conceptualizing and capturing the multidimensionality of such work, there remains the task of judging its merits and rewarding it appropriately.

Here, of course, we go back directly to the issues raised by Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990). If the scholarships of integration, application, and teaching are to be regarded as genuinely complementary to the scholarship of discovery (i.e., traditional research), we have to find ways to assess and reward them with comparable confidence. As a pedagogy of process, closely allied to both the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application, service-learning is concerned with "not only transmitting knowledge, but *transforming* and *extending* it as well" (Boyer 1990, 24, original emphasis). In embracing activities where "theory and practice vitally interact," it allows "new intellectual understandings [to] arise out of the very act of application" (23).

Thus, service-learning has a vested interest in undertakings such as the Clearinghouse for the Scholarship of Engagement (http://www.scholarship of engagement.org) and the New England Resource Center for Higher Education's Ernest A. Lynton Award for the Scholarship of Engagement (http:// www.nerche.org/fellows0001/assets/funded\_projects.html). Departments and institutions that explicitly regard teaching as public work and/or that recognize the distinctive nature of outreach activities "based on [a] faculty member's professional expertise" (*NERCHE Report* n.d.) can in the long run more effectively support service-learning than can those that profess progressive values but remain exclusively tied to traditional academic procedures and expectations.

#### Validating New Curricular Collaborations

Throughout this essay, special attention has been paid to the important role played by course- and discipline-specific thinking in developing effective service-learning initiatives. To some, such an emphasis on traditional, for the most part discipline-based courses may seem anachronistic, especially in the context of a progressive pedagogy such as service-learning. Are we not constantly reminded, every time we step outside the academy, that our traditional discipline-based distinctions are indeed "academic"—in the narrow sense of the word? Does not the future belong to interdisciplinary studies and problemorganized learning?

Such a charge should not be taken lightly. If academic specialization is largely responsible for the many "disconnects" that characterize our current system (Smith 1990; Wilshire 1990), should not service-learning unambiguously align itself with programs that reject such specialization? In my opinion, such a move would be counterproductive. Whatever the liabilities of our current discipline-based academic culture, that culture remains, in fact, the basis of most faculty members' professional identities. As such, it underlies both their sense of competence and the meaning of their work. For service-learning to challenge these fundamentals—in addition to the many other givens it *must* challenge—would doom it to academic marginality for the foreseeable future.

However, service-learning does *indirectly* challenge the trend toward ever-greater specialization *within* the disciplines. By anchoring itself in realworld projects, it naturally serves to pull participating faculty members in the direction of functional and conceptual integration. Indeed, over and beyond such integration, it promotes new opportunities for dialogue among disciplinary participants. Enhanced collegiality and communication are almost always a "side benefit" of developed service-learning programs.

Such collegiality and communication are not, of course, without practical consequences. Rarely have I facilitated a service-learning workshop for faculty at the same institution without at least two participants from different disciplinary backgrounds "finding" each other for the first time, that is, discovering that they share issue-, problem-, or site-based interests. Such discoveries sometimes lead, right on the spot, to concrete plans for curricular collaboration—from the use of students in one course to serve as consultants to students in another to the creation of learning communities organized around a single service initiative.

#### D: Community Partners

The final quadrant of the service-learning matrix addresses issues directly related to academy-community partnerships. From a service-learning perspective, the word "partnership" demands special attention. On the one hand, a partnership may indicate little more than those work sites and/or tasks that serve to define a given service project. Such a concept of partnership differs little from the list of "volunteer opportunities" maintained by many student-led organizations. To be sure, even opportunities of this kind must be more deliberately defined and pursued in a service-learning context (e.g., the service activity must be matched with academic needs, and the community sponsor must be carefully consulted as to priorities and goals). Nonetheless, these are adjustments that do not fundamentally challenge the notion of a casual, task-specific relationship.

On the other hand, "partnership" may also point to relationships that call for significant investments of time and effort on both sides, relationships designed to continue far beyond the achievement of specific tasks. Keith Morton (1995), former director of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service at Providence College, has described his institute's "four or five ... core partner[ships]" as involving "commitments [that] have taken the form of doing strategic planning together, intentionally developing interdependent agendas; supporting the work of the partner by actively developing other campus-based resources; and ... down the road [possibly] ... swapping or sharing (formally or informally) staff" (30). It is partnerships like these that lie at the core of this fourth quadrant, for it is only here that the full potential of service-learning as a strategy of academic citizenship can manifest itself. Service-learning *placements*—like extension programs, faculty professional expertise, utilization of campus resources for community and civic purposesclearly serve an important function, and go a long way toward strengthening academy-community ties. However, it is only through full service-learning partnerships that the academy and the community come together as equals for the purpose of better fulfilling their core missions. Only through the kinds of long-term interdependencies Morton describes can the community be invited to become centrally involved in higher education's obligation to generate and communicate knowledge-even as these same interdependencies invite higher education to become centrally involved in the community's obligation to meet essential human needs.

Interdependency of this sort is necessarily transformative. It transforms academic engagement from a responsible action to a civic obligation. It transforms institutional citizenship from the concern of a designated office to the business of the campus as a whole. It is unsettling, subversive, shifting the very foundations of academic work from self-definition to joint purpose. It affects the way students learn, what they learn, and how they are assessed; it affects the way faculty teach, how they frame their research, and why they are recognized; it affects the agendas administrators set and the way in which they allocate resources.

One allocation is of special importance, for on it the work not only of this fourth quadrant but also that of the other three largely depends. Just as faculty cannot be expected to undertake the challenge of service-learning course design and implementation without adequate recognition and academic support, so the availability of such recognition and support may itself accomplish little unless faculty also have access to structures that facilitate the establishment and maintenance of community partnerships. A wide variety of such structures currently exist, but some functions and features cut across most arrangements (Troppe 1996; Zlotkowski 1998a). Thus, for example, most support structures assist faculty in identifying suitable partners and projects, facilitate student transportation to and from community sites, and monitor student participation as well as stakeholder satisfaction. Institutions like Brevard Community College have developed an elaborate, efficient, and inclusive protocol to help faculty, students, and community partners navigate all aspects of that institution's service-learning effort.

As for the personnel needed to provide such support, successful programs almost always require the leadership of a professional staff person, someone familiar with the local community and with an institution's faculty. Such a person must be able to work with off-campus groups in a knowledgeable, respectful way and yet also feel at home in the culture of higher education. "Bilingualism" of this sort is essential if the mutuality that must characterize service-learning partnerships is to be cultivated and maintained.

Clearly, however, the presence of a single professional staff person, no matter how competent and energetic, is insufficient to meet all the logistical needs attendant upon a comprehensive service-learning program. How, then, one develops an adequate staff to meet those needs becomes a critical question facing institutions committed to engaged teaching and learning. Fortunately, this problem can also serve as a blessing in disguise.

Colleges and universities seeking to promote service-learning sometimes encounter opposition from an unlikely quarter: students already involved in co-curricular community service. This opposition often stems from a fear that, if service-learning is successfully established, student efforts will be preempted by faculty-led activities. Such a concern should be taken seriously since student leadership and efficacy are too valuable a resource to be put at risk. Still, in this case, neither students nor student affairs personnel need be alarmed. In the first place, the kinds of needs—academic and social—servicelearning seeks to meet are often quite different from the needs addressed by traditional volunteer programs. Just as service-learning complements rather than replaces traditional internships, so it should also be seen as complementing rather than replacing other kinds of service and outreach. Secondly, students also have an important, though often unrecognized, role to play in the successful functioning of academic service-learning.

That there can be a powerful relationship between service and leadership development has been demonstrated in a variety of contexts. Robert Greenleaf's concept of "servant leadership" (1977) and Helen and Alexander Astin's *A Social Change Model of Leadership Development* (1996) represent only two especially relevant contributions to our understanding of this relationship. What the work of people like Greenleaf and the Astins makes available to the service-learning community is a solid theoretical or practical foundation for developing positions, functions, and arrangements that facilitate the service-learning work of faculty even as they provide students with opportunities to develop special service-related skills of their own. Thus, for example, at the University of Utah's Bennion Center, "many student leaders of . . . cocurricular projects serve as teaching assistants for new service-learning courses. These undergraduate students essentially share with their faculty colleagues what they have learned through directing their own cocurricular projects" (Fisher 1998, 225).

At Providence College's Feinstein Institute, "Students have played a pivotal role in planning the new program and managing its activities. This has also been a conscious strategy, necessitated by both [a] commitment to democratic community and the fact that, as an academic program, the tendency for faculty to control the curriculum has had to be balanced by a strong student presence and voice" (Battistoni 1998, 183). The Community Scholars program at Bentley College, the Student Ambassadors program at Miami-Dade Community College, the Public and Community Service Scholars program at Augsburg College—despite many specific differences, all represent efforts to utilize and develop student leadership potential by making students structurally significant players.

Indeed, so important are the opportunities service-learning creates to help students acquire the skills, experience, and confidence that will allow them to emerge as committed citizens and social entrepreneurs that Campus Compact has made such opportunities the focus of a book. Students as Colleagues: Widening the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership (Zlotkowski, Longo, and Williams 2006) brings together dozens of examples of how colleges and universities across the country have turned student leadership into a central feature of their partnering strategy. Recruited and recognized in a variety of ways, students have assumed responsibility for program design and management, peer recruitment and supervision, communication and collaboration with community partners, issue area expertise, and even the creation of new intellectual resources to facilitate campus-community problem solving. So potentially important is the student contribution to the partnering process, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that failure to recognize and strategically develop this resource may intrinsically compromise the quality and the scope of any institution's service-learning efforts.

## **Collateral Benefits**

In exploring the four quadrants of service-learning practice, we have either explicitly or implicitly touched upon many of the ways in which this pedagogical approach enhances both faculty effectiveness and student learning. If, moreover, Robert Barr and John Tagg (1995) are correct and we are in the midst of a major conceptual shift from education as a system for delivering instruction to education as a system for producing learning (13), service-learning's significance only increases. This is a function not only of the way in which it works but also of what it seeks to accomplish.

In a comprehensive article on "Restructuring the Role of Faculty" (1994), Alan Guskin, former chancellor of the five-campus Antioch University System, makes an observation that has become increasingly more important, namely, "that the primary learning environment for undergraduate students, the fairly passive lecture-discussion format where faculty talk and most students listen, is contrary to almost every principle of optimal settings for student learning." These principles, which Guskin draws from the work of Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson, include student collaboration, active learning, time on task, and respect for multiple learning styles.

Every one of these principles finds a natural home in service-learning (as do also, if somewhat less distinctively, three other principles: student-faculty contact, prompt feedback, and high expectations). In contrast to the traditional lecture-discussion format, service-learning encourages—in many instances, mandates—student-student collaboration on significant real-world tasks, tasks that require an assortment of strengths and skills, including problem identification, process adjustments, and project ownership. By linking theory and practice, reflection and experimentation (Kolb 1984), it opens up the learning process to accommodate a much wider variety of student learning styles than has traditionally been the case. In an academic context where more and more students are turning to higher education as the key to future economic success, the significance of such expanded access can hardly be underestimated.

Like many instructors, I do not have the luxury of taking student intellectual engagement for granted. In fact, most of my students approach their education from a decidedly utilitarian standpoint. While I am, in fact, deeply sympathetic to their practical concerns, I am too committed to the value of liberal learning not to be troubled by what many of them sacrifice in their quest for "marketable skills." By opening up the learning process through community-based projects, I can avoid both narrow vocationalism and academic disengagement. In addressing real community needs, students can follow their instinct to learn through concrete experience, to remain firmly in contact with "the real world," while at the same time grappling with situations that challenge their preconceptions and self-understanding.

Such bridge-building lies at the heart of the service-learning experience and provides the best metaphor for its value to universities as citizens. I noted earlier how service-learning works to create new patterns of coherence in many areas of academic life: in the way it helps faculty naturally link their research, teaching, and service interests; in the way in which it fosters intra- and interdepartment collaboration; in its linking of faculty needs and student leadership opportunities. Research conducted by UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute points to another kind of service-related bridge-building. According to Alexander Astin, Linda Sax, and Juan Avalos (1996), service involvement (curricular and co-curricular) not only "encourages students to become more socially responsible, more committed to serving their communities, more empowered, and more committed to education," it also "encourages socialization across racial lines and increases commitment to promoting racial understanding in the years after college" (16).

Given America's ever-accelerating demographic diversity, these results point in two equally significant directions. In the first place, the undergraduate service experience may be one of our best hopes yet that racial and ethnic tensions will eventually be resolved. But no less important is the social potential captured in the finding that service encourages students to become "more empowered, and more committed to education." Research findings have begun to suggest that involvement in service-learning has a strong positive influence on student retention (http://www.compact.org/resources/downloads/ Retention\_Literature\_Review.pdf). Since service-learning opens up to students multiple paths to participation, achievement, and success, such an influence is not at all unlikely.

But perhaps the single most important bridge service-learning helps build and maintain is that between institutional rhetoric and institutional action, between professed values and actual practice. Whether an institution is a research university, an urban land-grant, a liberal arts college, or a community college, the chances are excellent that its mission is enshrined in some form of service or public purpose. Because service-learning can, and in some cases does, affect virtually every aspect of a school's operations, few other initiatives have the same potential to bring professed values and actual practice so thoroughly into alignment. Hence, institutions as diverse as St. John's University (New York), the University of Pennsylvania, Bates College, Middlesex Community College (Massachusetts), and Portland State University have deliberately turned to it as a primary means of more authentically living out their own self-identified missions and traditions—whether these are expressed in terms of religious commitment, public charter, research capability, or civic and personal values.

## Conclusion

This essay began with a brief discussion of the present wave of interest in service on America's campuses. Such interest, I conceded, may be cyclical, but we have good reason to believe that this time around it differs in several important respects from its earlier manifestations. Service as a voluntary, co-curricular undertaking has been complemented by course-based service-learning, and through the latter, institutions of higher learning have become involved in academy-community partnerships in a new, potentially revolutionary way. As much of this essay has attempted to show, service-learning's implications reach into almost every facet of the academic enterprise. For this reason, it can be said to be more challenging and, perhaps, more institutionally significant than other kinds of engagement that leave an institution's core educational functions unaffected. As I have already pointed out, Boyer's New American College, with its "cross-disciplinary institutes [organized] around pressing social issues"; its "classrooms and laboratories . . . extended to include health clinics, youth centers, schools, and government offices"; its "practitioners who . . . come to campus as lecturers and student advisers," envisions nothing less than a total institutional commitment.

## 7 Academic and Civic Engagement

Edward Zlotkowski

cademic and Civic Engagement" is my most recent essay in this collection (with the exception of the joint "Looking Back, Looking Ahead: A Dialogue") and the only essay written in response to a collection of essays by other scholars. It is also one of my few essays that does not focus on service-learning but rather on civic engagement in general. I was persuaded to include this essay—despite its original function as an afterword to a collection of essays with which many readers will not yet be familiar, Citizenship across the Curriculum (Smith, Nowacek, and Bernstein 2010a)—because it helps clarify two important ideas not directly addressed in my other essays included here.

The first of these ideas concerns the relationship between the scholarship of teaching and learning, especially as championed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the scholarship of engagement in its teaching form: service-learning. It is my contention that much of what we have come to understand as good teaching in a general sense overlaps in many ways with good service-learning practice. Hence, service-learning should not be viewed as something exotic, a practice out-

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Academic and Civic Engagement," in *Citizenship across the Curriculum*, ed. Michael B. Smith, Rebecca S. Nowacek, and Jeffrey L. Bernstein, 199–210 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010). Reprinted with permission. (The version of this essay included here has been modified to make the text more intelligible outside the context of its original publication.) side the mainstream of what we expect of excellent teaching regardless of the specific form it takes.

For many years I have been struck by the way in which those working in areas of academic concern quite independent of civic engagement—areas such as the quality of students' academic efforts (represented most visibly by the work of George Kuh and the National Survey of Student Engagement) and student retention (represented most visibly by the work of Vincent Tinto)—regularly cite community-based academic work as one important strategy to achieve traditional academic goals like student success. In this essay I make the case that many of the goals and strategies identified by the scholarship of teaching and learning naturally find expression when education for citizenship (a broader concept than service-learning) is also regarded as a core course objective.

The second idea explored here relates directly to the relationship between service-learning and education for citizenship in general. After over twenty years of championing the former, it is clear to me that those concerned about civic engagement as a core educational goal need to explore more deliberately an entire range of strategies to achieve it—strategies that include but are not limited to service-learning. This, indeed, was one of the reasons that, in the early years of the twenty-first century, Campus Compact began using "civic engagement" rather than "service-learning" to identify its primary area of interest. However, despite this important conceptual shift, pedagogical strategies that do not include community partnerships have not received the kind of attention they deserve—certainly not the kind of attention that has been paid to service-learning. Citizenship across the Curriculum strikes me as precisely the kind of publication that can help us begin developing the wider range of academic resources the civic engagement movement will need if it is to succeed in winning a truly broad constituency.

There are at least two perspectives from which one can view the collection of essays that make up *Citizenship across the Curriculum*, edited by Michael Smith, Rebecca Nowacek, and Jeffrey Bernstein (2010a).<sup>1</sup> As the volume's title suggests, the contributions all deal with some form of "citizenship" and the ways in which citizenship can be incorporated into the academic curriculum as a legitimate teaching-learning objective. But they are all at least as intensively focused on the teaching-learning process itself. It is no easy task to put together a collection of essays all of which have something important to say. To put together a collection that simultaneously contributes to two important academic conversations is even more of a challenge. *Citizenship across the Curriculum* meets that challenge.

<sup>1.</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all of the references in this essay are to this collection. Full citations are provided in the References.

## The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

As the introduction to the volume makes clear, an intensive concern with the scholarship of teaching and learning was the culture out of which the book grew. A concern with some kind of citizenship may well have been encoded somewhere in that culture, but it was heightened *academic* engagement that paid the bills. This is evident everywhere throughout the essays both in the quantity of time, space, and energy devoted to pedagogical issues—quite irrespective of any civic dimension or civic implications—and in the sophistication with which these pedagogical issues are addressed. In other words, even if one were not at all personally concerned with "citizenship" and preparation for citizenship as items that should be on the academic agenda, one could still learn so much from these essays that one might recommend them simply because of what they have to say about good teaching and deep learning.

What, then, does this collection tell us about good teaching and deep learning? First and foremost, it tells us it is impossible to underestimate the importance of active learning. In every instance, from the real-world problemsolving modeled by those working in scientific-mathematical fields to the agency-intensive focus of the humanists and social scientists, all the courses described place a premium on students as knowledge producers (Nowacek). Such an emphasis demands that students acquire not only effective intellectual tools and analytical skills but also habits of critical inquiry and the kind of a self-knowledge that anchors their skills in a dynamic sense of self. Perhaps no essay makes this clearer than Carmen Werder's "Fostering Self-Authorship for Citizenship: Telling Metaphors in Dialogue" (original emphasis). Here the work at hand is first and foremost to help students recognize just how poorly they are served when they choose for themselves as learners the metaphor of "Self-as-Sponge" (60, original emphasis). Unless they can begin to move beyond such an inherently limited self-image, even their acquiring sophisticated analytical skills may not save them from shallowness.

But truly active learning, whether it be of a more technical or existential kind, cannot draw exclusively on cognitive development. Equally important is the affective domain, a domain as likely to be ignored in contemporary courses on literature as in courses on water purification. As Michael Smith remarks of the competencies he seeks to develop: "Most of [them] fall into categories of affective learning that fall far from the content-oriented learning goals" of the disciplines that inform his own teaching, namely, history and environmental studies (168). Cultivating such competencies can take many forms. In Howard Tinberg's seminar on the Shoah, it assumes the personally intimate form registered in the title of his essay: "We Are All Citizens of Auschwitz: Intimate Engagement and the Teaching of the Shoah." In David Geelan's course for teachers of science—described in "Science, Technology and Understanding: Teaching the Teachers of Citizens of the Future"—it reveals itself in

an "approach to teaching and learning science [that] naturally places science education within the context of students' 'lived experience'" (150). In other words, what matters most is one's ability to tap and develop a genuine sense of personal connection.

All of the contributors to this volume pay careful attention to the connection between the "content" of their course(s) and their students' "lived experience," whether this entails choosing illustrative materials with which the students are already familiar (Fisher and Geelan); working with the students' personal (Tinberg and Werder), ethnic (Halualani), or geographical (Smith) identities; or some other kind of connection. Especially interesting in this regard is Rebecca Nowacek's essay, "Understanding Citizenship as Vocation in a Multidisciplinary Senior Capstone," for while several contributors work with the professional and disciplinary identity students bring to the course(s) in question, Nowacek makes this professional and disciplinary identity the very center of her capstone seminar. In this way she is able to help her students "identify the worldviews and ways of knowing they [have] cultivated during their university studies" (94). Here the word "vocation" is meant to have full resonance. As Mike Burke notes in response to her essay: "I must admit to an initial sense of discomfort when I first saw Rebecca's chapter. . . . The use of a term ["vocation"] so laden with religious history and meaning seemed problematic to me" (107). But it is very much in the spirit of these essays that Nowacek does not back away from the weight of this term. For her, as for each of her colleagues in his or her own way, the connection between academic study and something larger than academic study, between course work and an individual's sense of himself or herself as someone capable of addressing what she calls "the world's 'great hunger'" (95) lies at the very heart of the teaching-learning experience.

Finally, Nowacek's phrase "the world's 'great hunger'" serves to introduce one other critical dimension of the teaching-learning complex we have been delineating—a dimension Matthew Fisher identifies when he notes that an important similarity between his work as a teacher of chemistry and Mike Burke's work as a teacher of mathematics is the priority they make of "contextualizing data and ideas'" (119). As important as it is to link the course to the learner, to anchor it in a student's potential for agency and ability to contribute, so it is of equal importance that a student's potential be focused on issues worthy of deep learning. If we imagine the course, and the discipline(s) it embodies, as a bridge that allows holistically engaged students to go somewhere, to move beyond the familiar, to develop new skills and expand their sense of self, the place they use that bridge to get to must be worthy of their effort. Hence, we can understand the care all the contributors take to connect their course not just to their students and their students' evolving identities but also to the great questions and issues that challenge our country and our planet.

It would be easy to underestimate the importance of this move. There is probably no faculty member anywhere who does not believe that what he or she teaches is important not only for the students in his or her class but also for society in general. Moreover, there are probably few faculty members who do not see their teaching as relevant to some contemporary issue. Matthew Fisher speaks to this point when he notes, "Undergraduate science education assumes that majors who have a basic understanding of the scientific concepts will automatically make the connections between those concepts and global challenges." (113). Unfortunately, experience shows that this is not the case, and so one word from Fisher's essay that especially stands out is "explicit," as in "explicit recognition of the important connection between science and social issues" (112). But even in essays without this verbal emphasis, it is clear Fisher's co-contributors are very much on the same page when it comes to contextualizing their teaching within a set of urgent contemporary issues. I return to this topic when I discuss the volume's approach to citizenship, but for now I simply want to underscore the importance of embedding learning in such issues. As Mike Burke remarks at one point, "I have never before taught courses in which the level of student interest was so high.... I was never asked the question, 'Why do we have to learn this?'" (137). How many faculty who simply assume students see a connection between course content and "the world's 'great hunger'" can make this claim?

In the end, what all these observations suggest is the primacy of design, and design, in turn, implies intentionality, scaffolding or structure, assessment, and experimentation. Many of the essays include a detailed design history in which we see the author struggle to "get right" the various elements and activities that constitute his or her course(s). Active experimentation assisted by diagnostic assessment creates a pattern of constant improvement. We are here at a far remove from teaching and learning as simply a teacher's delivery of technical expertise combined with students' commitment to "apply themselves"—the "conventional" success Michael Smith finds personally insufficient. Jeffrey Bernstein knows, for example, he can deliver "course content" as well as the next person but questions whether "educating [his] students as future political scientists" is all he should aspire to. Is there not, in his words, some "better legacy," "something more lasting"(17)?

It is ironic, but also not surprising, that in rejecting conventional disciplinary strategies and a narrow academic understanding of success, each of the volume's contributors succeeds not only in helping his or her students achieve "something more lasting" but also in more effectively mastering if not disciplinary "content" in the traditional sense then something even more important: essential disciplinary skills. Demonstrating a course's ability to deliver the latter is a key function of the outcome assessments most essays include. Matthew Fisher, David Geelan, and Mike Burke have no interest in sacrificing scientific or mathematical competence to some fuzzy notion of "relevance." The courses they describe and document allow students to develop and strengthen essential technical competencies while at the same time developing a sense of agency in addressing real-world problems. Indeed, as Geelan explicitly notes in response to Fisher's essay, "There's a very strong argument to be made that engaging with the science content in the context of an authentic social or public-health issue leads to a deeper or richer engagement with and understanding of the science." (126). In some of the less technical courses discussed in the essays, the potential for tension between discipline-based expertise and contemporary relevance may be less apparent, but here too it is clear that contributors see relevance as way of strengthening, not undermining or diluting, discipline-based competencies. Indeed, Rona Halualani, a professor of communication, suggests in response to Carmen Werder's essay: "Perhaps we have it backwards" (69). Perhaps our students' sense of themselves as "part and parcel of a society that needs them" could turn out to be the single most important factor driving their mastery of "key skill sets" (69). It is time we turned directly to questions of citizenship.

## Citizenship

As much of the research Jeffrey Bernstein cites in his essay shows, youth participation in the political process—as well as youth appreciation of the importance of staying informed about current events-traced a steady and fairly steep decline from the late 1960s through the middle of the 1990s. More recently, a marked increase in youth participation in the 2006 and 2008 elections suggests this trend may have bottomed out and has led some researchers to express guarded optimism. This includes Robert Putnam, whose Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community (2000) raised enough concern about declining "social capital" to put the book on the New York Times bestseller list. In March 2008, Putnam wrote in a Boston Globe op-ed piece: "Last month the UCLA researchers reported that 'For today's freshmen, discussing politics is more prevalent now than at any point in the past 41 years.' This and other evidence led us and other observers to speak hopefully of a 9/11 generation, perhaps even a 'new Greatest Generation" (http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial\_opinion/oped/articles/2008/03/02/the rebirth of american civic life/).

Whether or not we really are experiencing some kind of renaissance in political engagement, other studies clearly establish that with regard to *nonpolitical* forms of civic engagement, today's young people are not, in fact, any less engaged than their elders. (See, for example, Cliff Zukin et al.'s *A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen* [2006] for a comprehensive review of the data that support this finding.) Furthermore, young people themselves have vigorously rejected the blanket implication that they are *civically* disengaged. As a group of thirty-three student leaders who met at Wingspread in 2001 note in *The New Student Politics* (2002): "For the most part, we are frustrated with conventional politics, viewing it as inaccessible. We discovered at Wingspread, however, a common

sense that while we are disillusioned with conventional politics (and therefore most forms of political activity), we are deeply involved in civic issues through non-traditional forms of engagement. We are neither apathetic nor disengaged" (1).

One of the present volume's editors, Rebecca Nowacek, implicitly corroborates this claim when she notes that most of the students at her university, Marquette, "actively embrace the Jesuit goal of becoming 'men and women for others,' volunteering their time to social justice work in impressive numbers. And yet . . . many of them remain wary of the obligations of democratic citizenship" (92).

Thus, the question of how best to promote citizenship demands that we disabuse ourselves of both unexamined assumptions regarding young people's civic indifference and a reductive understanding of citizenship as simply—or even primarily—participation in electoral politics. Richard Battistoni, the author of *Civic Engagement across the Curriculum: A Resource Book for Service-Learning Faculty in All Disciplines* (2002), has developed an exercise that asks each participant to look at a list of fifteen possible responses to the question "How do you define citizenship?" and then to rank them in the order that "most closely models" his or her "own idea of good citizenship" (71). The items include voting, working for a candidate in a local election, tutoring a migrant worker, walking a frail person across a busy street, leaving one's car at home and biking or walking to work or school, talking with a friend about a social issue of importance, and joining the armed forces. Such an exercise helps us appreciate the many legitimate ways in which one can understand civic participation.

This is especially important in the present context because one can easily imagine each of this volume's contributors making a different first choice or adding still another item not on the list. Thus, the exercise suggests the wisdom of an expansive approach to citizenship, one in which the term can mean or imply, among other things, developing traditional political skills or "tools" (Bernstein 27), building "a soulful relationship with others" (Tinberg 86), the ability "to participate in an *informed* way in the on-going social conversation around the issues and problems" (Geelan 149), being "actively involved and immersed in one's surrounding community and civic society" (Halualani 37), a vocation, "something we are called to do" (Nowacek 95), and "the manner (skills, disposition) in which an individual responds to membership in a community and the mutual relationships that come with such membership" (Fisher 116).

It is important to note that such variety is not to be equated with conceptual incoherence. Many of the definitions stated or implied in the volume's essays overlap, and even when they do not, they are more likely to be complementary than contradictory. Thus, while contributors like Jeffrey Bernstein and Mike Burke stress skill sets as key to citizen participation in American democracy, David Geelan, the only non-American in the group, suggests "we are citizens of our families, our local communities and the world, much more than citizens of nations or states" (149, emphasis added). Taken together, the volume's stated and implied definitions model an understanding of citizenship that necessarily works on many different levels. This interrelated diversity represents one of the collection's primary strengths. While helping students acquire the skills that will make them more likely to contribute to what the Wingspread participants (The New Student Politics 2002) call "conventional politics" (1), we must not ignore the very real openings other, "nontraditional forms of engagement" (1) provide. Rather than merely insisting on the importance of conventional politics, we must be prepared to help students foster a commitment to civic awareness and public action in all relevant spheres. And we must do so, not only because such a strategy allows us to tap into acknowledged interests and inclinations but because we have good reason to believe forms of civic engagement do not operate in sealed environments. While researchers disagree as to the extent to which nonpolitical forms of engagement naturally lead to more political forms (Zukin et al. 2006, 193-194), it seems safe to conclude that "widening the many narrow pathways" to public engagement that already exist "can help more young people find their way to active citizenship and public lives" (153).

Hence, the wisdom of the editors' explicitly evoking the ideals, insights, and strategies of the writing across the curriculum (WAC) movement as a model for their own work. Like the development of writing skills, the development of citizenship skills *must* be a cross-curricular undertaking, and that, in turn, necessitates respect for a wide diversity of disciplinary interests and priorities: citizenship in a chemistry course will not, cannot look like citizenship in a communication studies course. The challenge is not to seek uniformity but to nurture distinctive possibilities. Citizenship across the curriculum cannot succeed if it is merely "sequestered" in a single discipline like political science, but it can also not succeed if it is not *naturalized* in every discipline in a convincing way. As the editors write, it must work in a way that furthers legitimate disciplinary goals "while also helping students become more aware of citizenship" (10).

I believe all the essays in this volume succeed beautifully in "naturalizing" citizenship—however the term be defined—in allowing it to emerge holistically from legitimate discipline-specific activities and concerns. I also believe that, just as WAC encourages "writing to learn" as well as "writing in the disciplines," all the essays convincingly demonstrate not only that preparation for citizenship can take a wide variety of discipline-appropriate forms but that incorporating a discipline-appropriate commitment to citizenship can itself contribute mightily to the social value and the educational resonance of the disciplines. This is a point I have already alluded to in the preceding section of this essay.

## Another Civic/Civil Dimension

There is, moreover, one special way in which this volume makes a distinctive and important contribution to education for citizenship. I refer here to its exploration of the importance of civil dialogue and informed disagreement. Both Jeffrey Bernstein and Rebecca Nowacek contextualize their courses and their educational goals with reference to "the crippling effects of living in a society dominated by the shrill talk radio of Limbaugh and Franken" (92). Mike Burke is at pains to stress the need to ground "our national discourse" in "analyses built on a solid foundation of data" (142). Carmen Werder requires her communication students to participate in a public dialogue practicum. Again and again the contributors return to the importance of helping students learn "to engage in extended dialogue across difference" (Nowacek 100), to move beyond the "dominance of consecutive monologues" (Nowacek 100). Surely Michael Smith is correct when he notes in response to Nowacek's essay:

We *all* "need practice and coaching in the art of principled and civil disagreement." Without this capacity differences fester and the cost of conflict can potentially become much greater. In a world in which we are all increasingly pulled toward people and media whose worldviews primarily resonate with our own, civil disagreement becomes one of the more important mechanisms for civic engagement. (106, original emphasis)

Furthermore, in the very way in which the volume is structured, the contributors try to model what it means to go beyond the "dominance of consecutive monologues." While they take pains to be respectful and supportive of each other's work, they also work hard to learn from each other, to appropriate concepts, concerns, and distinctions that can enrich their own thinking. As many of us can recall from our graduate student days, the academy need not take a back seat to any legislative body when it comes to aggressiveness, hypersensitivity, and barely disguised disdain. By placing such a premium on civility with substance, the book does more than simply explore another dimension of citizenship; it recognizes civility as a *foundational value*. As the expression goes, this by itself would be worth the price of admission.

## Opportunities

When it comes to teaching and learning strategies, none of the contributors to *Citizenship across the Curriculum* is in need of any advice. Still, a number of potentially useful observations suggest themselves.

Several years ago I was fortunate to be able to spend a year working with John Gardner on active and civic learning in the first-year classroom, a project I have described elsewhere. (See the section "Service-Learning in the Curriculum: The First Year" in this volume). No word or term came up more frequently in my meetings with students than "hands-on." By this students meant not just issues and assignments with real world significance but work that took them out into the real world. On just about every campus, this was the way a majority of students characterized their preferred learning style. I see a similar inclination running through many of the course narratives in this collection. Michael Smith's work, of course, deliberately focuses on the power of such hands-on learning, but it also appears explicitly when Carmen Werner notes in response to Matthew Fisher's essay: "Students often try to remind us of this need for genuine opportunities for practice" (127) and implicitly when Rebecca Nowacek describes how "seeing that cavernous pipe [that dumps raw sewage into the Milwaukee River] while paddling down the river brought home to me and (I know from conversations) to others the reality of the Deep Tunnel problem" (104).

Nowacek's experience in the context of a course at a Jesuit university brings to mind a point made in 2000 by Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., former superior general of the order. Emphasizing the need to "raise our Jesuit educational standard to 'educate the whole person of solidarity for the real world,'" he referred to a recent statement by the pope in which the latter observed that such solidarity "is learned through 'contact' rather than through 'concepts'" (http://www.scu.edu/ignatiancenter/bannan/eventsandconferences/justice conference/nationalconference/kolvenbach.cfm). Whether or not one agrees with this judgment, I think there can be no doubt that "contact" can serve as a powerful complement to "concepts." It seems to me Werner has it exactly right when she proposes that "across higher education, we continue to emphasize the cognitive domain exclusively" (127) or Burke when he suggests that "the habits of textbook learning and, more recently, digitally mediated learning often induce a kind of stupor in our students, and the kind of hands-on experience that Michael [Smith] requires of his students works well to counteract this" (180). The fact that Tinberg has designed the research assignment in his course on the Shoah around each student's interviewing "a Shoah survivor, child of a survivor, or a contemporary eyewitness" (82-83) and that Halualani sees her intercultural communication course as leading to "concrete action," big or small, ranging in "different degrees and levels" (49), indicates to me such a recognition of the power of the sensuous and the concrete. I am by no means suggesting that every course should include a field-based component, only that a failure to make greater use of field-based experiences must rank among instructors' most important "missed opportunities."

A second important opportunity, perhaps of equal importance, comes into focus in Bernstein's description of the mechanism that makes possible his experiential version of American government. I refer here to his use of undergraduate honors students to facilitate the course simulations. They are, in his own words, "the linchpins in making this arrangement work" (21), but they do more than "just" make possible the course's experiential dimension. They also alert us to the untapped potential of seeing at least some of our students as genuine colleagues. Indeed, so impressive have been the leadership roles students have assumed in service-learning programs around the country, several years ago my colleagues Nicholas Longo, then the director of Campus Compact's Raise Your Voice initiative, and James William, then a junior at Princeton, set out to capture some of what was happening. The result was a publication represented elsewhere in this volume. (See "Introduction to *Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership.*") If our goal is to graduate more students who possess a strong sense of civic agency, we could hardly go wrong in making more students our partners both in designing and in implementing opportunities for citizenship across the curriculum.

# SECTION IV Service-Learning in the Curriculum: The First Year

Introduction

John N. Gardner

his collection of essays is the latest, the most precise and direct confirmation I have received from my friend Edward Zlotkowski and his co-author, John Saltmarsh, whom I also know, that the need for my forty-year crusade to reform the first year has not been rendered obsolete. This publication should serve as a wake-up call to the now legions of educators who are invested in the so-called "firstyear experience" movement that we still have a long, long way to go. Largely unintentionally, we have been pursuing the holy grail of increased student success in the first year and ultimately improved graduation rates by nibbling around the margins of the real first-year experience: that real experience being what happens to first-year students in introductory postsecondary courses, most typically mathematics, English, history, political science, psychology, biology, chemistry, and maybe a few others. This work is an admonition that our work to improve the first year still has left substantially untouched the last frontier: what happens in these courses.

The author's critique of introductory courses reminds me of a backhanded compliment one of my sons offered unsolicited to his major professor (in political science) on the day of his graduation from Elon University in 1998. Jonathan Gardner said to his professor, whom he addressed by his first name: "You know, Chalmers, if you had given me a first year like the senior year you gave me, my whole college career could have been different!" What had happened to this student in his senior year? He was
a student fortunate enough to be enrolled at a university that required him to do a senior thesis and to defend that thesis in front of other graduating students in the major seated along with their faculty in the discipline, the latter all dressed in regalia during these defenses. Prior to the writing and defense of this senior thesis, this particular student had traveled to Costa Rica, for again, he was fortunate enough to attend a university that had a structure for engagement-a winter term-and an institutional culture that gave great encouragement to students and faculty to travel with each other in January somewhere away from campus, preferably international, to take a course. In the context of taking a winter term political science course studying the democratic institutions of Costa Rica, the only Central American nation never to be invaded by the U.S. armed forces during the era of "gunboat diplomacy," my son was led serendipitously to discover the topic of this senior thesis: a study of the Nobel Prize winner and former elected leader of Costa Rica Oscar Arias Sanchez. So what was the student telling the professor at graduation? He was saying that had he had in his first year the opportunity to make meaningful educational choices about at least one topic for in-depth study, conducted in conjunction with work off campus with a professor and other students, coupled with another structure for a high level of personal accountability to demonstrate his learning and its impacts-well, he would have been more motivated and directed and enthused about his entire undergraduate experience!

The kind of experience I describe above is precisely what does happen for some first-year students who become meaningfully engaged in well-conceived and well-executed service-learning experiences incorporated into first-year courses, most typically first-year composition and first-year seminars. Those students who are especially fortunate find themselves introduced to college in this manner in learning communities where these two courses and their service-learning components are linked and integrated. Just like my son's senior capstone, in such courses, the notion of "classroom" has been redefined and broadened; the students and faculty interact in new and unfamiliar spaces for learning; they interact outside class; and the students are asked to reflect and make meaning out of their experience. Alas, this kind of experience remains for a privileged minority and does not more broadly characterize a mainstay of the first-year curricular structure.

Scott Evenbeck, a friend at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis, preaches to me regularly about the importance of us higher educators having a "critical friend." This is precisely the service that Zlotkowski renders in these three chapters. He has played this role before for me and he has done it again! He appropriately nailed me about a decade ago for omitting from my published (with Lee Upcraft) "definition of freshman student success" (Gardner and Upcraft 1989) any mention of the development of competencies in service-learning and serving the public good. Well, Lee and I and co-author Betsy Barefoot have corrected that omission in our restatement of that definition in our more recent 2005 work, *Challenging and Supporting*  *the First-Year Student*. In this work we argue that for us there are eight components that constitute the achievement of "student success" in the first year of college:

- · Developing intellectual and academic competence
- · Establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships
- · Exploring identity development
- · Deciding on a career
- · Maintaining health and wellness
- · Considering faith and the spiritual dimensions of life
- · Developing multicultural awareness
- · Developing Civic Responsibility

To briefly make the case for the last, we suggested the following:

First-year students are frequently caught up in their own narrow collegiate worlds, with little awareness of or commitment to their responsibilities as citizens in a democratic society. For example, far too few college students vote in national, state, or local elections. Fortunately, over the past fifteen years, many colleges and universities have a renewed interest in promoting civic responsibility [I add as a parenthetical example the American Democracy project organized by the American Association of State College and Universities' Vice President George Mehaffy], not only through providing opportunities for community-based volunteer work and charitable fundraising events, but through curriculum and course-based service learning. *Thus, first-year students must begin to become responsible citizens outside the collegiate environment* 

In these three chapters in this collection Zlotkowski argues cogently that there continues an unfortunate separation between the work of those who teach first-year seminars and those who practice the pedagogy of service learning, with the possibly tragic outcome that the only thing the two cadres of educators may have in common is a joint failure "to transcend the academy's culture of fragmentation."

He also correctly points out that a symbol and symptom of the first-year experience movement's failure to fully embrace the need for the pedagogy of service-learning is the lack of any relevant categorical topic in the index of the movement's flagship scholarly organ: the *Journal of the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition*, of which, ironically, my wife, Betsy Barefoot, and I are co-founders. Notwithstanding, once again, he has nailed me. He is correct.

Zlotkowski charges us in these essays to realize that a high proportion of our entering college students have already experienced community-based service-learning in high school courses. Unfortunately, many higher educators labor under the self-congratulatory illusion that postsecondary education is more innovative and provides curricular experiences not possible for students to have had in high school—experiences such as service-learning. We are challenged here to face a reality that is the exact opposite: a high proportion of high school students have already experienced service-learning before coming to college, and hence their expectations for our practice of this pedagogy are unrealistically inflated. There are similar findings that reported levels of first-year college boredom are actually higher at the end of the first year than at the end of the senior year of high school (as found in results from the University of California at Los Angeles's Higher Education Research Institute's survey "Your First College Year"). The reality is that first-year students report that their least preferred but most widely encountered teaching style in college is the lecture. These low levels of engagement and high levels of boredom are one more reason why we need to act on these essays' clarion call.

Zlotkowski acknowledges the influence his participation in 2003-2004 in the national pilot for the voluntary self-study and strategic action planning process known as Foundations of Excellence in the First College Year has had on him. This influence is evident in the chapter "Service Learning and the Introductory Course: Lessons from across the Disciplines." This chapter is derived, in part, from his visits to the twenty-four public and private campuses that constituted the "Founding Institutions," visits during which he worked with faculty to consider the extent to which their introductory courses provided the kind of "foundation" for what could ultimately be construed as an "excellent" first year and undergraduate education. He was a member of a research and design team that developed nine aspirational principles for excellence in the first college year, known as "Foundational Dimensions of Excellence for the First College Year (see www.fyfoundations.org), one of which is relevant to the three chapters that follow. We developed these principles to address the need for a *philosophy* for an excellent first year; an appropriate organizational structure; learning goals for first-year students and faculty; an enhanced role for *faculty* in the design and execution of the first year; special attention to the importance of student transitions; the need to better understand who all students actually are; the need for more intellectual diversity in the first year; and the need for "improvement" strategies to apply to the first year (note: italics denote the names given to these "Foundational Dimensions"). There was also one other dimension that these chapters connect to so perfectly. This is a dimension of first-year excellence that we called "roles and purposes," and I quote:

Foundations Institutions promote student understanding of the roles and purposes of higher education, both for the individual and society. These roles and purposes include knowledge acquisition for personal growth, learning to prepare for future employment, learning to become engaged citizens, and learning to serve the public good. Institutions encourage first-year students to examine systematically their motivation and goals with regard to higher education in general and to their own college/university. Students are exposed to the value of general education as well as the value of more focused, in-depth study of a field or fields of knowledge (i.e. the major).

The following three chapters provide for me a compelling argument for and practical illustrations of how service-learning can and should be utilized to do exactly what this dimension demands: introducing new students to the roles and purposes of higher education. Just think, if we could do that more effectively, we would improve student motivation and commitment. In turn, that would increase their class attendance, overall levels of engagement, and most importantly their development of the all-important sense of purpose. These chapters provide a vision for why this is needed and how to achieve this.

It has been Zlotkowski's and my argument that "a" way, not "the" way, to improve first-year student success is to provide an overall excellent first year that results from an institution-wide self-study which in turn produces a grand design, an intentional plan, based on an explicit philosophy for excellence in the first year. One component of producing such a strategic plan would be to study the extent to which the institution intentionally introduces students to the roles and purposes of higher education and to those of the institution being attended, and in this case, to do so through the lens of service-learning. We strongly believe that colleges and universities need a more intentional rationale and specific plan for excellence in the first year, of which service-learning can and should be an educationally purposeful and powerful component. We would also strongly reject the notion that educational excellence in the first year is the exclusive domain of highly selective, elite, wealthy campuses and students. In contrast, we believe that educational excellence can be achieved by any institutional type and that such excellence is always relevant to institutional mission and entering student characteristics. We see that service-learning is an indispensable means to this more egalitarian end.

As I think about the uses to which this collection can be put, it is my hope that colleges and universities will organize reading and discussion groups around this work, convene for discussion and sharp debate, and make these ideas a stimulus for redesign of introductory courses. At the very least, I am hopeful that this work will encourage department heads to place more frequently on the agendas for departmental faculty meetings the question of the status of their department's introductory courses.

Finally, in introducing these three chapters, I look toward the need for future work which is suggested by the arguments presented here. More specifically, Zlotkowski in his own framing statement for the chapter "Service Learning and the Introductory Course: Lessons from across the Disciplines" concludes "what is really needed is an entire series of volumes on best practices in introductory courses across the disciplines or at least the broad disciplinary areas (like the humanities)" (emphasis added). Zlotkowski, as the editor of the American Association for Higher Education series "Service Learning in the Disciplines," is not just tossing this out as an abstract possibility. This is clearly, in my judgment, what is needed as the next step. Thus, it is my hope that readers of this entire work, and particularly of these three chapters, will be moved to volunteer to help produce such a series. First-year introductory courses, many of which lack an engaging pedagogy like service-learning, and in which unacceptably high proportions of students receive D, W, F, and I grades, report high levels of boredom and frustration but are nevertheless the "foundation" of the entire undergraduate experience. In forty-five years we have changed dramatically who is coming to college, but not what "college" means in terms of engaging pedagogies. Coincidentally with the publication of this work, the academy celebrates the tenth anniversary of the National Survey of Student Engagement. It is my hope that we can eventually look forward to an appropriate anniversary for the creation of this "next step" in our work: a series of best practices in the disciplines for the teaching of introductory college courses. I don't believe we can hope to improve student engagement, student retention, and graduation rates until we do. This collection gives us directions for moving to that next level. Now enjoy the next three chapters and allow them to move you.

# 8 Service-Learning and the First-Year Student

Edward Zlotkowski

y interest in first-year students began in the late 1990s when I became personally acquainted with John Gardner, at that time the executive director of the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina. John was good friends with several key figures at the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and regularly attended AAHE conferences. As volumes in the AAHE series on servicelearning in the academic disciplines began to appear, he suggested that I also consider editing a volume on service-learning and the first-year experience. Thus, in 2002, the National Resource Center published Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility.

From a certain standpoint one could argue this book was several years ahead of its time. Indeed, the same could also be said for the essay that follows. Although "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience" appeared not in the 2002 publication but three years later in Lee Upcraft, John Gardner, and Betsy Barefoot's (2005) Challenging and Supporting First-Year Students, it was not until quite recently that the evidence challenging the

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the First-Year Student," in *Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student: A Handbook for Improving the First Year of College*, ed. M. Lee Upcraft, John N. Gardner, and Betsy O. Barefoot, 356–370 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

assumption that young people have no interest in community or civic engagement began to appear in quantity. To be sure, there has long been credible research showing that young people's participation in formal politics (and "young people" remain the primary focus of all the work here referred to, despite the acknowledged age diversity of the first-year student population) did decrease markedly during the last two decades of the twentieth century. However, beginning by at least the mid-1990s, their interest in community service had grown to the point where, by the mid-2000s, the then college-age population was among the most locally engaged cohort in recent history. Furthermore, sometime around 2006 a sea change also began to take place vis-à-vis even formal political involvement. In both the 2006 and 2008 election cycles the role of young people was substantive, perhaps decisive. (For a brief summary of these trends, see my afterword to Civic Engagement across the Curriculum [2009].)

Thus the central argument that "Service-Learning and the First-Year Student" makes (the same argument made in the introduction to Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience), namely, that substantive civic and community engagement should be central to the first-year experience and that servicelearning programs need to be much more mindful of the first-year experience, has, in a sense, been historically validated. Many students want their education to be more, not less, relevant to the issues faced by our local communities, our democracy, and our planet as a whole. Indeed, not only are community and civic engagement not irrelevant to student interest, they may be one of the most effective ways to help students make a commitment to their education. (For the growing literature on the relationship between service-learning and college persistence, see http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/resources/ downloads/Retention\_Literature\_Review.pdf.)

Unfortunately, there exists on many campuses a significant culture gap between those working in service-learning and those responsible for first-year programming. While the former have pushed hard to achieve academic legitimacy through a link to faculty affairs, the latter continue to belong primarily to student affairs. Hence, as another essay in this section describes, what often passes for first-year service-learning is in fact nothing more than the traditional community service students have already experienced in high school. And while such service may be valuable, it cannot by its nature deliver the kinds of intellectual growth and academic engagement true service-learning can.

I have never had an English class that taught more than just grammatical issues. [This class has] not only helped me improve on my English skills but... also taught me a lot about our community. [It] has undoubtedly made me a more complete and well-rounded person. (Peter, Composition 101 (S-L), Bentley University) It is one of the ironies of current attempts to reform higher education that the very fragmentation that reformers lament and seek to correct also informs their own work. The relationship between the first-year experience movement and service-learning is a case in point. In the same year that Upcraft and Gardner published their groundbreaking *The Freshman Year Experience* (1989), galleys were being readied for Jane Kendall's no less groundbreaking *Combining Service and Learning* (1990). "Service-learning" is not listed in the index to the former; "freshman" is listed once in the indexes to the latter. More significantly, *The Freshman Year Experience* reflects almost no awareness of either the potential or the importance of community-based learning while *Combining Service and Learning* shows no greater awareness of the special needs of first-year students.

Indeed, even as both movements began to mature, achieve momentum, and find national resonance during the last decade, they did so largely in isolation from each other. Despite a small number of programs that recognized the logic of linking the two, it has been only in the last few years that even a significant minority of educators has begun to share this recognition. Most designers and directors of first-year programs can now identify service-learning but still tend to see it as something "incidental" to their concerns, while designers and directors of service-learning programs still largely fail to appreciate the critical importance of addressing the special needs of first-year students.

What makes this disjuncture especially disconcerting is the rather obvious way in which both the first-year and the service-learning movements model so many features of the same educational gestalt. In his essay "Toward Pragmatic Liberal Education" (1995b), Bruce Kimball, an historian of education at the University of Rochester, identifies seven concerns that he sees as "becoming prominent" in liberal education today: (1) multiculturalism, (2) values and service, (3) community and citizenship, (4) general education, (5) commonality and cooperation between college and other levels of the education system, (6) teaching interpreted as learning and inquiry, and (7) assessment. Whether or not one subscribes to Kimball's overall thesis, it would be hard to deny the centrality of most of these concerns to those seeking to develop effective first-year programs as well as to those seeking to establish effective service-learning programs.

One could, in fact, argue not only that the concerns of these two groups overlap but that, the better we understand the needs of first-year students and the conditions that make service-learning an effective learning strategy, the more the two concerns would seem to demand cooperation. Consider, for example, the following passage from A. Jerome Jewler's "Elements of an Effective Seminar: The University 101 Program" (1989):

It occurred to the founder of University 101 that, if faculty could view students more positively, if they could experiment with interactive

teaching methods that fostered the development of a community of learners, and if they could meet with other faculty and staff on common ground in this endeavor, the benefits to students, faculty, and the institution would be overwhelming. For freshmen and faculty alike, University 101 subscribes to the belief that development is not a onedimensional affair but must reach far beyond the intellect and into emotional, spiritual, occupational, physical, and social areas. (201)

The importance of developing through "interactive teaching" a facultystudent collaborative effort, teaching as something shared by an academic community, the necessity of transcending a narrowly intellectual approach to student development—all these positions are also fundamental to servicelearning, both in theory and in quality practice. Indeed, when just prior to this passage Jewler identifies as two of the "philosophical underpinnings" of University 101 its belief that one of higher education's "most important missions is the development of people who will be the movers and shakers of the next generation" and "the belief that learning should be exciting . . . fun . . . and provide learning for the instructor as well as the students" (200), he is identifying precisely that social efficacy and academic dynamism that servicelearning seeks to bring about by coupling the concepts of community service and academic learning.

Unfortunately, because first-year programs and service-learning both challenge traditional academic assumptions about student development, faculty-student relations, and what should be accepted as legitimate learning goals, they also share a long list of challenges. Principal among these are (1) a supposed lack of academic rigor, (2) the necessity of developing new peda-gogical techniques, (3) suspicion regarding the value of partnerships between academic and student affairs, (4) acceptance of the social dimension of learning, (5) interdisciplinarity or cross-disciplinarity, (6) the wisdom of allowing nonfaculty to teach, and, consequently, (7) the tendency of senior faculty to see their involvement in both as "beneath them."

In this essay, I focus on important areas of congruence between servicelearning and the first college year in the hope that greater understanding may lead to greater cooperation. I begin by exploring some of the benefits servicelearning can bring to first-year courses and programs. Next, I explore the complement of those benefits, namely, the reasons why first year programming deserves the special attention of those designing service-learning programs. Finally, after a brief review of several programs that have sought to reap the mutual benefits identified here, the chapter concludes with some "lessons learned" as well as some general recommendations for working more effectively together. However, before we begin, a brief clarification is in order.

Although the term "service-learning" has largely come to mean communitybased work in a curricular, that is, academic, context, it is still sometimes used to identify any form of community service where there exists reciprocity between the campus and the community and where the service activity is informed by reflection "designed to promote student learning and development" (Jacoby 1996). This is not the place to take up the debate as to whether this broader understanding represents an advantage or a disadvantage to the adoption of service-learning as an effective educational strategy. What is most important for our purposes is that one never lose sight of the central role of a designed learning component in distinguishing service-learning from traditional community service or service for its own sake. As we will see later in this essay, even when service-learning is clearly located within the curriculum, the danger of its collapsing back into some kind of generic philanthropy is considerable. For those designing community experiences for first-year students, failure to identify the service component consistently and clearly as a designed learning component will significantly weaken many of the educational benefits the service-learning can facilitate.

#### Service-Learning as Resource

Given the many challenges first-year programs face at most colleges and universities, one can well understand why those responsible for those programs might hesitate to take on the additional challenges service-learning entails. However, the very importance of the first year as a developmental opportunity argues against making those challenges decisive. For example, toward the end of Jewler's essay (1989) on the first-year seminar, we find the suggestion that what distinguishes University 101 from more traditional areas of academic study "is its need to stay abreast of current trends in freshman behavior and to be able to respond to those trends from one year to the next, one decade to the next, one generation to the next" (215). How, then, does service-learning help educators respond to first-year students' changing "behavior"?

In another essay in the same book in which Jewler's essay appears, Arthur Levine (1989) attempts to answer the question: "Who are Today's Freshmen?" Referring to traditional-aged students of the 1980s, he describes "a generation lacking in great visions for our collective futures and mired in a parochial and small vision of their own futures" (21). This being the case, what they require by way of an educational agenda is (1) the skills and knowledge needed to live in our world, (2) hope, (3) a sense of responsibility, and (4) a feeling of efficacy (21–23).

A little less than a decade later, Levine and Jeanette Cureton updated this portrait of traditional-aged students in *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Students* (1998a). In an article based on their book, "What We Know About Today's College Students" (1998b), they paint a picture that is, in most respects, quite similar to the earlier one—with one very significant exception: "Unlike their predecessors of the 1980s, current students have concluded that they do not have the luxury of turning away from [large-scale] problems.... Today's undergraduates don't expect government to come to the rescue; instead, they have chosen to become personally involved, but at the local level—in their community, in their neighborhood, and on their block" (5).

By the first decade of the twenty-first century, the shift Levine and Cureton here identify had blossomed into what some have called the "millennial" generation, a cohort of young people anything but "lacking in great visions for our collective futures."

Indeed, in an op-ed piece published in the *Boston Globe* on March 2, 2008 (http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2008/03/02/the\_rebirth\_ of\_american\_civic\_life/), Robert Putnam, whose book *Bowling Alone* (2001) warned that America has experienced a serious erosion of its civic life, dramatically shifted from concern to hope partially in response to the upsurge in youth participation in the 2008 presidential primaries: "Primaries and caucuses coast to coast in the last two months have evinced the sharpest increase in civic engagement among American youth in at least half a century, portending a remarkable revitalization of American democracy." And one key explanation for this upsurge, Putnam suggested, was the impact of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, on "the cohort of Americans caught by 9/11 in their formative years." Findings by researchers at UCLA and elsewhere now make it possible "to speak hopefully of a 9/11 generation, perhaps even a 'new Greatest Generation,'" comparable to the generation that responded to the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

At the same time, and perhaps not coincidentally, American higher education has been experiencing its own civic renewal. Even as the young people studied by Levine and Cureton (1998b) didn't have "the luxury of turning away from [large-scale] problems," Ernest Boyer, former president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and United States Commissioner of Education under President Carter, was warning the academy it too no longer had that luxury. In one of the last presentations he made before he died, Boyer predicted that "service is going to reemerge with greater vitality than we have seen in the last 100 years, simply because the university must be engaged if it hopes to survive. The social imperative for service has become so urgent that the university cannot ignore it. I must say that I am worried that right now the university is viewed as a private benefit, not as a public good" (1996b, 138).

If, then, a defining characteristic of first-year programming is "its need to stay abreast of current trends in freshman behavior and to be able to respond to those trends" (Jewler 1989), the potential significance of service-learning for today's first-year students should be obvious. Indeed, when one looks at Upcraft and Gardner's 1989 edition of *The Freshman Year Experience* from today's perspective, one cannot help but be struck by how relentlessly private the book is. Overtly civic considerations are almost completely submerged in developmental concerns that seem to owe little to structured public engage-

ment. Nothing in Upcraft and Gardner's articulation of six indicators of "freshman success" necessarily points to any kind of formative experience, values clarification, or skill set that would require contact, let alone collaboration, with anyone outside the college community. Academic and intellectual competence, interpersonal relationships, a developed identity, career and life-style decisions, personal health and fitness, and an integrated philosophy of life—all of these are understood in a way that makes the first year a decidedly on-campus experience and the campus itself an implicitly self-contained social unit. (To their credit, Upcraft, Gardner, and Barefoot have addressed this lack of a public dimension by adding "developing civic responsibility" to the definition of first-year student success they offer in the 2005 revision of their book.)

In short, our understanding of what an effective contemporary education demands and what constitutes a truly inclusive approach to student development has changed considerably over the last fifteen years. As the faculty advisory committee of the Lowell Bennion Center at the University of Utah has noted (1998), "Higher education is at a crossroads," and to many has lost its "relevance . . . to contemporary society" (J-1). If it wishes to regain that relevance, it will have to rededicate itself to "the task of educating . . . students to be good citizens" by recognizing that, in addition to "foundational" and "professional" knowledge, it must also help create and disseminate "socially responsive" knowledge: "The many social challenges that now demand our attention force us as academicians to no longer assume that we can perform our teaching role without playing close attention to the impact of that role on the communities that surround us.... Simply providing opportunities for volunteer service will not enable universities to meet the social demands of the coming decades" (J-5, emphasis added). "Opportunities for volunteer service" are, however, all that most first-year programs offer their students. Thus the choice is clear: if Jewler is correct in asserting the responsibility of firstyear programs to stay culturally current, those programs simply cannot maintain their integrity without developing some kind of substantive engaged dimension.

One can go even further. Given what we now know about the role of unstructured, "real-world" experiences in the design of effective pedagogical strategies and the development of lifelong learners, it is hard to see how firstyear programs can prepare new students—especially older, more experienced students—to maximize their learning potential unless those programs abandon the often unexamined assumption that significant academic learning takes place only on campus—in classrooms, libraries, playing fields, and residence halls.

In a 1996 interview, John Abbott, director of the Education 2000 Trust, discussed what the research now shows about the competencies that will be needed in the twenty-first century. After reaffirming the continuing importance of such basics as "skills of numeracy, literacy, and communication," Abbott

noted there is now "a whole series of new competencies" (3)—competencies that cannot simply be added to a classroom curriculum.

Not to prejudge [efforts to create relevant new courses], but I doubt such abilities can be taught solely in the classroom, or be developed solely by teachers. Higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills grow out of direct experience, not simply teaching; they require more than a classroom activity. They develop through active involvement and real-life experiences in workplaces and in the community. (3–4)

Nor is Abbott alone in pointing to the critical, formative role of experience as an educational resource. According to Peter Ewell, senior associate at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (1997, 5), "decades of experimental work in educational psychology and instructional design" suggest several "'big ticket items' [that] are good places to start in remaking instruction." The very first of these is "Approaches that emphasize application and experience.... Approaches such as internship and servicelearning [that try] to break down artificial barriers between 'academic' and 'real-world' practice (as well as between the curriculum and the cocurriculum)." Along the same lines, the Report of the AAHE, ACPA, and NASPA Joint Task Force on Student Learning (1998) underscores the fact that "what we know about learning" includes the principle "Learning is enhanced by taking place in the context of a compelling situation." To create these, "faculty and staff collaborators ... establish internships, externships, service learning, study abroad and workplace-based learning experiences" (3–4).

What makes these research findings even more compelling is the way in which they dovetail with other research findings on the learning-style preferences of new students. According to a study conducted by Charles Schroeder (1993), there exists a serious discrepancy between the preferred learning styles of the majority of new students and the majority of their instructors. Whereas "60 percent of entering students" (and "approximately 75% of the general population") feel most comfortable with learning styles "characterized by a preference for direct, concrete experience; moderate to high degrees of structure; linear, sequential learning; and, often, a need to know why before doing something" (22), approximately 75 percent of faculty "prefer the global to the particular, are stimulated by the realm of concepts, ideas, and abstractions, and assume that students, like themselves, need a high degree of autonomy in their work" (25).

Why new student learning-style preferences show the biases they do is not something Schroeder seeks to explain. Nevertheless, another study may provide some clues, at least with regard to traditional-aged students. In "Essential Demographics of Today's College Students" (1998), Edmund Hansen indicates that just 34 percent of freshmen "report having spent six or more hours per week studying during their senior year in high school," that 36 percent of them "report having been frequently 'bored in class' during their last year of high school," and that "the average adolescent . . . views approximately 35 hours of television programming per week" (4–5).

What studies like these suggest is that the interactive teaching styles featured by many first-year programs not only are on the right track but should be even further developed to help new students overcome the legacy of passive learning expectations so many of them associate with formal education. In order to help them become motivated students and lifelong learners, they need to be given a chance to discover how they themselves can better address and solve problems that matter, how they themselves can bridge what Donald Schön (1995) has called the "high ground [where] manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the use of research-based theory and technique" and "the swampy lowlands [where] problems are messy and confusing and incapable of technical solution" (28). There may, in fact, be no more important lessons first-year students can learn.

## The First Year as Opportunity

Shifting the emphasis in the last sentence from "important lessons" to "firstyear students" is all that is needed to redirect our discussion from a focus on the benefits of service-learning for first-year programs to the benefits of addressing the needs of first-year students for service-learning programs. Earlier in this essay, we noted that in Kendall's groundbreaking Combining Service and Learning (1990) "freshman" is referenced only once in the index to the three-volume set. That reference is to Georgetown's Freshman Orientation to Community Involvement (FOCI) program, one of eighteen "service-learning" programs profiled as models. In point of fact, the editors missed a second program they could and should have referenced in their index: Bronx Community College's SHARE program for first- and second-year students (300). It is interesting, but ultimately not surprising, that even in that section of Kendall's book dealing with model programs only two of those programs explicitly identify first-year students as a focus of their concern or that the two schools that proved to be the exceptions to the rule should turn out to be Georgetown and Bronx Community College. After all, Georgetown is a Jesuit university for which social justice concerns are fundamental, while Bronx Community College, as a largely minority-serving institution, can draw upon the same powerful traditions of service as do historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) (Jones 1998; Zlotkowski 2006).

But even if—almost two decades after Kendall's book—civic and community engagement have become far more prominent in the programming of many institutions and many kinds of institutions, the situation vis-à-vis service-learning designed explicitly for first-year students has improved only marginally. For while it is true that a fair number of introductory courses in some disciplines (e.g., composition, psychology, sociology) have incorporated service-learning assignments into their design (see Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the Introductory Course," in this volume), and many schools *claim* to have incorporated "service-learning" into their first-year orientation program or first-year seminar (see Zlotkowski, "Getting Serious about Service," in this volume), the truth of the matter is introductory disciplinary courses do not necessarily target first-year students (except for first-year composition and math), and what most schools really incorporate into their firstyear programs is simply traditional community service relabeled. Rarely does one find any first-year service-learning that builds deliberately on what we know both about the special interests and needs of first-year students and about quality service-learning design.

The imperative for service-learning proponents to focus more carefully on the interests and needs of first-year students is anchored in a wide range of considerations. As Eyler, Root, and Giles (1998, 98) suggest, the fact that "transfer of learning ... rests on multiple opportunities to apply what has been learned" may well imply that "those planning service-learning programs ... think about creating a series of community options over the four years of [a] college program." A few schools have already begun to do this, identifying developmentally appropriate activities for students at different stages of their college careers. For example, the College of Business at Montana State University-Bozeman (Lamb et al. 2000, 170-171) frames its program with a first-year and a senior-year seminar. The service-learning goals of the school's "Freshman Seminar" focus on such foundational issues as "positive team building and introductory exposure to the not-for-profit sector." Its corresponding service activities are also of a nonexpert nature: "[Students] build and repair trails, stock shelves at the local food bank, chaperone junior high dances, visit shut-ins, and participate in a variety of programs in the local schools." Admittedly, much of this activity resembles traditional community service. However, in this case, the resemblance stems not from a failure to differentiate but from the logic of a larger plan. By the time the business majors are seniors, they will be expected to perform on a very different level: "While freshmen engage in a short-term, awareness-building experience, seniors engage in long-term, strategic application" (172).

However, the first college year is of critical importance not just as the platform from which to launch a series of ever-more-challenging communitybased assignments but also as a key factor in determining whether the background of community service many students now bring with them to college will have any lasting value. For this to happen, what had been primarily a service *activity*, a matter of the hands and hopefully the heart, needs to be transformed into an exercise in developing habits of "reflective practice" (Schön 1995)—a matter of the intellect as well. The stakes here are considerable.

According to Brian Kleiner and Chris Chapman (Duckenfield 2002), the level of community service and volunteer activities of American high school students grew from 27 percent to over 80 percent between 1994 and 1999. Over this same period of time the percentage of high schools sponsoring service-learning grew from nine to approximately forty-six. As one researcher notes (Duckenfield 2002), "This incredible increase is due to several major efforts over the past decade that have worked in synergy to make service-learning a major educational reform initiative in our public schools" (39).

But with success have come many new challenges. On the one hand, we now have a significant body of traditional-aged students who, thanks in part to meaningful service experiences at the high school level, are already better prepared for community-based learning than many college faculty and staff imagine (Furco 2002). Will such students be given the kinds of opportunity for intellectual and civic initiative they have come to expect? How can their skills be tapped to help other students become more motivated, engaged learners and community members?

On the other hand, we have an even larger number of first-year students whose only service experience in high school was a formal community service requirement. For such students, whose experience of community work is not associated with meaningful learning and recognized leadership, the first college year may turn out to be the death knell of all future civic engagement (Jones and Hill 2003). Despite a recent increase in the number of first-year students who indicate they expect to be involved in some kind of service activity in college (14.2 percent in 1990 versus 23.8 percent in 2000), the first year remains the time when students with prior service involvement (up to 81 percent in 2000) most frequently turn away from service as a part of their future (Vogelgesang et al. 2002).

Still a different set of challenges faces those working with adult students. Here one often finds a rich history of service experiences and community involvement unconnected to any school program or requirement. How does one help such students both inventory and harvest the learning in community relationships they have already established? And how does one factor in this experiential base as part of a larger learning plan? (O'Connell 2002).

Thus, the challenge for service-learning proponents could not be more clear: they *must* work with those responsible for first-year programming not only to see that community engagement activities are part of the first-year experience but also to ensure that those experiences are intellectually, personally, and socially significant. This, in turn, implies a whole new level of collaboration between those whose primary concern is the first year of college and those whose primary concern is civic and community engagement. Both camps have much to learn from each other. Both have much to offer each other. At this point it might be useful to look at a few institutional strategies.

## Institutional Practice

In 1995, the University of Rhode Island (URI), responding to a presidential challenge to develop "a new culture for learning" (Richmond 2002), launched a one-credit first-year seminar, "URI 101, Transitions and Transformations." The material it was to cover was standard first-year seminar fare: "academic integrity, values formation, diversity, drugs and alcohol, library skills, career planning, and time management." Also not surprising was the decision to include in the course a community service component. What is interesting here is the evolution of URI's understanding of what such a decision should entail.

As has already been noted, the community service component of a firstyear seminar typically differs little from the kind of service required for high school graduation. This is even more likely to be the case when the seminar in question carries a single credit, does not meet for a full semester, and needs to accommodate a significant number of first-year students (see Zlotkowski, "Getting Serious about Service," in this volume). This being the case, one might have predicted what course designers would-and, in fact, did-discover when they subjected the course's first iteration to a comprehensive assessment process. In a series of focus group debriefings (Richmond 2002), students told them "the [service] requirement had very little meaning.... There was no connection to their course work, or to their career goals.... [The] service projects ... seemed to them trivial or insignificant." Community partners confirmed this response when they commented on the students' "attitude and work ethic" (68). In other words, the URI 101 designers immediately came up against the fact that many, if not most, traditional first-year students come to higher education with an understanding of community involvement as a formally required set of otherwise meaningless service tasks (Jones and Hill 2003).

Feedback from course faculty pointed in precisely the same direction: "[They] were unanimous in their assessment that community service had to become a more meaningful part of the curriculum rather than just an 'add-on,' and that they needed [support] to put the service projects into a learning context." In other words, course faculty needed help in transforming UR 101's community service requirement into an effective *service-learning* experience. And, of course, this transformation had to take place in a way that took into account the seminar's severe time constraints.

URI's solution to this problem can be captured in two words: greater specificity. First the course organizers revisited their expectations for the service

component and came away with a much clearer sense of priorities. Through their community involvement, students would

- Gain a better understanding of themselves and their involvement in the community
- Become more aware of issues in the community and develop a sense of responsibility for addressing those issues
- Be exposed to diverse communities and dialogue about preconceived notions regarding diversity
- Develop class cohesiveness
- Discuss their own sense of civic responsibility and plan for future involvement

To accomplish these goals, community placements were reorganized around ten thematic areas: Children and Families, Education, the Elderly, the Environment, Domestic Violence, Health Care, Homelessness, Housing, Hunger, and Literacy. Then, on the basis of this reorganization,

over 100 projects were designed.... In each case, students were provided with the materials needed to create a context in which they could understand their service experience. For example, students working at the local food bank would not only learn about the agency's services but more importantly about issues of hunger in Rhode Island, the United States, and throughout the world. (69)

In this way, the URI 101 designers were able to make "experiential learning with a focus on service-learning the foundation on which [they] stood" (69). Furthermore, the successful reorganization of the seminar naturally led to other exciting initiatives such as the development of first-year learning communities:

These consist of the URI 101 seminar plus a skills course with 25 or fewer students (either writing, communications, or math) and one or two more general education courses. . . . By sharing common courses, students find that they work more in groups, work more on academic issues outside of class (additional time on task) and feel better "known" by their teachers and peers. Now when a community service project is chosen in URI 101, the implications of this project can be reviewed and discussed in the "content" coursers these same students share in common. (74)

At least three features of URI's first-year service-learning strategy are worth special attention: first, the community service component was comprehensively assessed and significant changes were made on the basis of that assessment; second, the service projects were reorganized into thematic areas that allowed both students and academic departments to base their involvement on personal interest and/or relevance; and third, all the community-based activity was intellectually contextualized. Regardless of the organizational particulars of any first-year service-learning program, these three features comprehensive assessment and related adjustments, thematic relevance, and intellectual contextualization—deserve to play a shaping role. The same can be said for several features of the first-year service-learning approach developed by Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI).

In 1997 IUPUI's chief academic officer appointed a Service Learning Advisory Committee to work with University College, the campus unit that provides "academic support to entering students prior to their formal admission to a degree-granting school" (Hatcher, Bringle, and Muthiah 2002, 80). Its task was "to advise faculty and instructional teams on integrating servicelearning into the curriculum of first-year courses and to promote co-curricular service opportunities for entering students," and from the very beginning, this effort was characterized by a keen awareness that "designing communitybased service experiences for freshmen is different than involving upperclassmen who are typically more skilled, more experienced in managing academic responsibilities, and more confident in career direction" (83). Hence, the committee drew up and distributed a list of recommendations for all instructors teaching the required one-credit first-year seminar (called at IUPUI a "learning community" [LC] although it does not involve multiple linked classes). These included an emphasis on group projects, utilization of one-time projects, utilization of the "student mentors" who are a part of each LC, and other suggestions regarding project design and implementation.

The chief academic officer's charge, however, did not *mandate* that service-learning be incorporated into all first-year LCs. In fact, servicelearning is only one of several strategies that can be used to introduce new IUPUI students to the importance of community engagement. Another vehicle is Middle School Campus Visits. In this program, the campus's central servicelearning office works with instructional teams to support the design and implementation of campus visits hosted by LC students. Each participating LC designs its campus tours according to the learning objectives of its unit. "For example, a communications class designed a letter exchange program between college students and middle school pen pals and then hosted their pen pals for a campus visit" (83). Through the Middle School Campus Visit program, first-year students not only reach out to children in surrounding communities, helping them begin to see a college education as part of their future, but also bond more deeply with the campus they themselves introduce and represent.

A third strategy IUPUI employs in introducing first-year students to the importance of community engagement involves incorporating service-learning into what are called "Gateway Courses." Because these discipline-based introductory courses often have large enrollments, the service-learning center staff offers those who teach them several kinds of assistance: consultations on course design and implementation, assistance in obtaining curriculum development funds, and Service Learning Assistant Scholarships that make it possible for course instructors to hire qualified student assistants to help them implement service-learning in their classes.

IUPUI's multistrategy approach to community-focused work both reflects and draws upon the institution's considerable experience in making servicelearning and civic engagement a defining feature of the school as a whole. Because it has been willing to make a major investment in service-learning, developing one of the country's top service-learning centers, IUPUI is able to support several quality options at the same time. However, as much as this model may differ from URI's in its particulars, it shares with the latter a commitment to rigorous program assessment, student and staff options, and the embedding of all community-focused work in a carefully designed learning environment.

Clearly there is no single right or effective way to link service-learning and the first-year experience. Were one to survey the full variety of programs and approaches utilized by campuses across the country, one could not fail to be impressed by both the creativity of individual institutions and the powerful effect a well-designed service-learning experience can have on first-year students. Drawing upon what we have learned about effective first-year programming through approaches not intrinsically linked to service-learning, such campuses have utilized LCs (as we have seen in both cases discussed above), lessons and techniques borrowed from interdisciplinary course design (e.g., Portland State University), collaborative and problem-based learning (e.g., Samford University), and a variety of linkages among courses, the community, and residence halls (e.g., California State University-Humboldt, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst) as well as education and work histories (Metropolitan State University). However, regardless of the particular design adopted, in each instance the key to success remains a thorough understanding of both the special needs of first-year students and the significant difference between traditional community service and academic service-learning.

### Recommendations

Although many "lessons" have already been identified in the preceding sections of this essay, it may nonetheless still be useful to bring together here a few of the more important considerations one should keep in mind when attempting to combine quality service-learning with quality first-year programming.

As was just suggested, undoubtedly the single most important "lesson" is that without a thorough understanding of first-year student needs and the ways in which service-learning differs from traditional community service one starts at a perhaps fatal disadvantage. Unless one understands the former, one runs the risk of overtaxing students at a time of great personal vulnerability, distressing rather than empowering their sense of self. Unless one understands the latter, one may well find oneself dealing with students, faculty, and even community partners frustrated by what seems to be an ill-conceived, academically worthless exercise in do-goodism.

Most other lessons flow from this first one. Faculty development and faculty support are critical until instructors have acquired some reliable base of experience and expertise. This is especially true with regard to reflection perhaps the single most important means of turning raw experience into usable learning. Furthermore, to satisfy both faculty and student demands for academic—and preprofessional—relevance, one should consider thematically organized placements, explicit disciplinary connections, and/or some kind of meaningful choice among partners and issues to be addressed.

Once a well-designed program has been implemented, comprehensive assessment as the basis for subsequent design modifications becomes imperative. Red flags to look out for would include insufficiently specific, insufficiently measurable service goals; poor integration of the service experience with other required activities and concerns; generally inadequate and/or intellectually weak student service preparation; lack of sufficiently early and/or substantive instructor contact with the community partner; failure to match the service task with student abilities, interests, and backgrounds; and failure to ensure that student on-site service will bring them into meaningful contact with agency personnel or community members.

Finally, one should never forget that most instructors need logistical support to do service-learning well. Those teaching first-year seminars are typically undercompensated to begin with, so asking them also to facilitate a community-based program of the kind discussed here may well bring them to the breaking point. Even if instructors do not complain openly, they may only "save" themselves at the expense of a quality student experience. Fortunately, an at least partial solution to this problem can be found in the upper-class mentors and assistants frequently attached to first-year seminars. Service-learning leaders at Portland State University have given us a compelling description of just how much such an arrangement can achieve—for all stake-holders (Williams et al. 2006).

#### Conclusion

This essay began with the observation that, despite many shared interests and concerns, the contemporary first-year experience movement and the contemporary service-learning movement have developed largely in parallel silos. Perhaps the numerous challenges this chapter identifies may serve not merely to explicate but even to justify that lack of interaction. If so, that would be unfortunate. Those working to improve the first year of college and those developing service-learning know equally well our dominant academic assumptions and practices are not delivering what either our students or our society needs. At bottom, the set of developmental beliefs and educational concerns the two groups share points to a need for change that trumps whatever special effort may be required for the two to work effectively together. It would be little less than tragic if in the end it turned out that the final characteristic the two groups shared was their inability to transcend the academy's culture of fragmentation.

# 9 Service-Learning and the Introductory Course

Lessons from across the Disciplines

Edward Zlotkowski

Generational series on service-learning in the academic disciplines since the series contained a fair number of the kind of introductory disciplinary courses taken by most first-year students to fulfill their general education requirements.

For the present volume, I have revised the original to include relevant research I either conducted or became familiar with during the 2003– 2004 academic year when I worked with John Gardner on a new project called Foundations of Excellence in the First College Year: "a comprehensive, guided self-study and improvement process that enhances an institution's ability to realize its goals for student learning, success, and persistence" (www.firstyear.org). My role in this project was to visit as many of

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the Introductory Course: Lessons from across the Disciplines," in *Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility*, ed. Edward Zlotkowski, 27–36 (Columbia: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, 2002). Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

the twenty-four participating institutions as requested a visit and work with them on issues of both academic and civic engagement as those issues related to first-year programming. Since civic engagement was only one of many project concerns and since my interests and experience centered more on standard academic courses than on special first-year seminars, I brought to the project a set of priorities not duplicated by other staff members.

In preparation for each visit I asked the school in question to send me approximately a dozen syllabi from courses across the curriculum taken primarily by first-year students. I also asked each school to arrange for me to meet, preferably privately, with a group of first-year students to discuss their experiences. After the participating schools had completed their internal self-assessments toward the end of the summer of 2004, I also was given access to those documents. Over the next academic year (2004–2005), I juxtaposed much of what I had learned from project participants with relevant published research on civic and academic engagement as it related to first-year students. The project report I eventually completed not only provided material I used to revise—and, I hope, strengthen—"Service-Learning and the Introductory Course" but also provided much of the material I used to draft the following essay, "Getting Serious about Service."

As I quickly discovered in the course of both writing and revising this piece, almost all the essays written for publications and journals focused on the first-year experience deal exclusively with the first-year seminar. Articles dealing with standard discipline-based introductory courses tend to appear only in discipline-specific journals. Thus, while those working with first-year students can easily access and draw upon a wealth of useful research on the first-year seminar, it is much harder for them to get a more comprehensive picture of first-year students' course-based experiences. This, in turn, may help explain why first-year seminars on many campuses have steadily improved in effectiveness while other courses taken exclusively or primarily by firstyear students have not. Certainly there exists a considerable gap between student satisfaction with first-year seminars (provided they are well designed and don't attempt to accomplish too many things for too little credit) and student satisfaction with many courses that make up the general education curriculum. Needless to say, the fact that those responsible for first-year programming rarely have any say in what academic departments offer only exacerbates this situation.

I mentioned in the framing statement that introduces "Service-Learning and the First-Year Student" that it was John Gardner's suggestion that led me to put together Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility. However, what is really needed is an entire series of volumes on best practices in introductory courses across the disciplines or at least across broad disciplinary areas (like the humanities). Such a series would help all those responsible for the first year of college to get on the same page, and in doing so would help ensure that what we do with one segment of the first-year experience is not undone by another.

Of the over 100 courses profiled in the American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) series on service-learning in the disciplines, approximately one-tenth are introductory courses frequently—in some cases, exclusively taken by first-year students. Unlike the first-year seminar, these courses represent standard departmental offerings with a traditional disciplinary focus. However, very much like the first-year seminar, they should, ideally, take into account the special needs of first-year students. Indeed, the failure of traditional introductory courses to do so is in many disciplines a matter of growing concern. For example, Richard Fox and Shirley Ronkowski (1997) recently looked at the preferred learning styles of political science students. They concluded that

in lower level introductory courses, a greater emphasis should be placed on activities that provide concrete and active experiences for students, since lower division students indicated a greater preference for these styles than upper-class students. If one of the aims of lower division classes is to interest as many students as possible, particularly women and traditionally underrepresented students, in choosing political science as a major . . . then this strategy could be beneficial toward meeting this goal. (736)

Sociologists, biologists, and historians (AAC 1991) have articulated a similar concern with the traditional introductory course in their disciplines.

### Introductions and Farewells

Such a concern is well founded. Like political science, many disciplines are experiencing a disturbing decline in the number of students that elect to continue studying them. For example, a joint task force convened by the Mathematical Association of America (MAA) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC, now the Association of American Colleges and Universities [AAC&U]) noted (AAC 1991): "Data from many sources show that women and members of certain minority groups often discontinue their study of mathematics before they are prepared for jobs or further school. Black and Hispanic students drop out of mathematics at very high rates throughout high school and college, and only a tiny fraction complete an undergraduate mathematics major" (87). Not surprisingly, the failure of students to pursue degrees in the traditional arts and sciences serves to circumscribe the value of

those disciplines. The same MAA-AAC report just cited (AAC 1991) also points out: "Today mathematics is the second largest discipline in higher education. Indeed, more than 10 percent of college and university faculty members and student enrollments are in departments of mathematics. More than half of this enrollment, however, is in high school-level courses, and most of the rest is devoted to elementary service courses" (77). It is not difficult to imagine the deleterious effect a shortage of arts and sciences majors could have on a range of social sectors from education itself to nonprofit and public administration.

Clearly, the solution to declining student interest in many of the arts and sciences is not simply a function of what happens in the introductory course, nor is the solution to the design of effective introductory courses simply a matter of incorporating into them some special strategy such as a servicelearning component. Nonetheless, it is worth pausing to look at what we know not only about today's students but also about effective teaching and learning, and their relationship to work outside the traditional classroom.

In a piece entitled "Essential Demographics of Today's College Students" (1998), Edmund Hansen reviews a number of statistics that should be of interest to any course designer likely to encounter first-year students. He notes, for example, that "just 34% of freshmen report having spent six or more hours per week studying during their senior year in high school," that 36 percent of them "report having been frequently 'bored in class' during their last year of high school," and that "the average adolescent . . . views approximately 35 hours of television programming per week" (4–5). Meanwhile, almost three out of every five students identified "the chief benefit of a college education" as "increasing earning power" (4), while those who recognized "developing a meaningful philosophy of life" as an important objective numbered just a little over two out of five (4).

In other words, many of the students filling the seats in introductory courses have already developed habits and attitudes that create a barrier to sustained attention and meaningful intellectual engagement. Confronted by courses that aggravate rather than challenge their sense of the irrelevance of nonvocational knowledge, the students vote with their feet, making their first college-level political science, sociology, history, biology course also their last. According to a task force chaired by the American Sociological Association's Carla Howery (AAC 1991), "90 percent of students in introductory sociology never take another sociology course" (195).

Exacerbating this situation still further is the fact that, as the joint MAA-AAC task force put it (AAC 1991), "Too often [instructors] assume with little reflection that what was good for their own education is good enough for their students, not realizing that most of their students... have very different styles of learning" (84). Indeed, Charles Schroeder, in a study of student versus faculty learning styles, came to precisely the same conclusion:

As faculty, we have generally espoused the common belief that students learn and develop through exposure—that the *content* is allimportant. We have been accustomed to a traditional learning process where one who knows (the teacher) presents ideas to one who does not (the student). Many of us prospered under the traditional lecture system, where the focus is on coverage of material through teaching by telling. This approach may work for us but it may not work for the majority of today's students. (22)

As I have noted elsewhere in this volume, Schroeder's research also indicates that while "over 75 percent of faculty prefer [an] intuitive learning pattern" (that is, "the realm of concepts, ideas, and abstractions" [25]), "approximately 60 percent of entering students prefer [a] sensing mode" (that is, "the concrete, the practical, and the immediate" [22]).

Statement after statement by discipline-related groups bears out Schroeder's identification of "content" as the unexamined but nonetheless "allimportant" focus of introductory courses. According to a task force of the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AAC 1991), many of the more than 300 biology majors who participated in a survey "felt compelled to comment on their experiences in the beginning biology course. They appeared to feel some sorrow for the non science majors enrolled in this first biology course as well as for the students planning to major in biology. Statements such as 'year-long rat race,' 'course in memorization,' and 'waste of time' were used by majors to describe their experiences in the beginning biology courses" (13).

A group of historians (AAC 1991) has come to a similar conclusion. Decrying what they see as prevalent practice, they suggest, "Building on the precollegiate experiences of the entering college students, the foundation course should eschew the 'one-damn-fact-after-another' approach to history" (47). After all, the "purposes of foundation courses are to excite as well as to inform, to engage the minds and imagination of those who may be indifferent to history or even antagonistic to it" (52). It is indeed sobering to see the degree to which the observations of disciplinary groups clearly confirm the observations and critiques of higher education researchers.

One final problem with the traditional introductory course deserves to be mentioned. In his book *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States* (1993), Thomas Bender warns that current threats to academic integrity stem not from contamination by modes of discourse outside the academy: "The risk now is precisely the opposite. Academe is threatened by the twin dangers of fossilization and scholasticism (of three types: tedium, high tech, and radical chic). The agenda for the next decade, at least as I see it, ought to be the opening up of the disciplines, the ventilating of professional communities that have come to share too much and that have become too self-referential" (143). Many of the disciplinary groups cited above share this concern. The biology group laments that "little attention is given to making the connections among science, technology, and society in most introductory courses" (AAC 1991, 13). The mathematicians complain that most mathematics courses "pay no more than superficial attention to the historical, cultural, or contemporary context in which mathematics is practiced" (AAC 1991, 89). The historians suggest that more attention needs to be given to questions like "How do historians deal with questions of citizenship—their own and their students'—in the courses they teach?" (AAC 1991, 58).

In other words, other functions of the introductory course should include locating the discipline and its concerns in a broader historical and intellectual context, making clear its potential role in addressing problems of the contemporary world, and exploring its relationship to other areas of study. Failure to address such concerns may result in graduates who are technically competent professionals but also civically incompetent members of society. As a report sanctioned by the American Psychological Association (APA) suggests, the study of psychology is not a self-contained undertaking. Rather, it "is a preparation for lifelong learning, thinking, and action; it emphasizes specialized and general knowledge and skills. The skills required to be a successful student do not always match those required to be a good citizen" (AAC 191, 155).

It is precisely this recognition of the necessity of attending to more than technical competence that William Sullivan (1995) addresses in his book *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*: "Resolving the problems of education, health care, and the effectiveness of American business . . . involves more than the selection of competencies necessary for achievement. It requires that academic professionals and their students develop new capacities beyond technical skills through communication with a far broader range of groups and issues in the society" (164).

Nowhere does such an exploration of a discipline's broader, public dimension deserve more attention than in courses that introduce that discipline to new students. Social significance and personal interest are related if not identical concepts, and inattention to both cannot help but reduce the effectiveness of the introductory course as an experience with positive educational consequences.

#### Toward Greater Engagement

Strategies to promote engagement—the engagement of students in their academic work and the engagement of disciplinary expertise in a wide range of public concerns—can take many forms. The bearing course concepts have on contemporary events, guest speakers, and interactive class activities can all help achieve one or both of these forms of engagement. However, given the magnitude of the overall problem, it may be that classroom-based activities are not in and of themselves sufficient to offset habits of disengagement developed during the high school years. As the MAA-ACC group (ACC 1991) says in another context, "Research shows that formal learning by itself rarely influences real-world behavior; many students continue to use their flawed intuitions instead of the concepts learned in the artificial classroom environment... Students whose minds and eyes become engaged in the challenge of true discovery are frequently transformed by the experience" (83–84).

Designers and instructors of introductory courses would do well to pay special attention to the phrase "transformed by the experience."

As the Fox-Ronkowski study (cited above) illustrates, the failure of some introductory courses to capture the lasting interest of first-year students can be especially acute when the students in question are female or minority. In discussing the effect of service-learning on Biology in Engineering, a second-semester core course at Louisiana State University, Marybeth Lima (2000) notes, "Emphasizing the social component of engineering could enhance the attractiveness of the engineering discipline, particularly for women and minorities. Indeed, the retention rate for women and minorities in the three years that [service-learning] projects have been implemented in this course has been substantially higher than the national average" (114–115).

The reason for this, according to Lima, is that experiencing "a tangible purpose and framework" in core courses motivates students by helping them to "understand why they are learning the required material" (112).

An instructor in a related area makes a similar point. "Through [his] work with SL [service-learning] projects in an introductory course for nonmajors," John Kinnell (2000), a biologist at Southern Methodist University, has found

that such projects are particularly meaningful for students whose primary field of study lies outside the sciences. Specifically, service projects help engage these students in biological issues that they often have little interest in understanding or to which they have had little exposure. SL projects add a human dimension to issues that often seem irrelevant to the life of the average college student. In addition, such projects help students gain an appreciation for the methods, complexity, and goals of scientific research. In many instances, having a positive experience outside the classroom can invigorate a student who does not have an aptitude for science and can stimulate his or her interest in the course content. (9)

Kinnell's second point is particularly worth noting: not only has integrating a service-learning option into his course stimulated greater overall student interest but that interest has, in turn, led to an increase in "the general quality of the [participating students'] reports" (13). More than 75 percent of these students "thought that their projects made the research more interesting and hence led them to dig a little deeper into the literature" (13). Such an observation runs counter to the not infrequently held faculty assumption that service necessarily comes at the expense of scholarship. Indeed, as Alexander Astin and Linda Sax (1998) report, the argument that service in general consumes time and energy that might otherwise go to academic work "has effectively been laid to rest by the results of our longitudinal analyses, which reveal significant positive effects [of student service involvement] on all ten [measured] academic outcomes" (255).

But it is not just faculty in science and technology who report that the inclusion of a service component improves the introductory course in multiple ways. In the history volume of the AAHE series, co-editor Bill Donovan (2000) reports on his first-year history survey. In showing slides of the Great Depression, Donovan found that many of his students simply could not relate to what the slides depicted and made comments based on clearly flawed assumptions. This experience framed for him a critically important task: "In Alfred Lord Whitehead's words, how could I as a teacher bring to my students' notice, 'some fundamental assumptions which . . . appear so obvious that people do not know what they are assuming because no other way of putting things have [*sic*] ever occurred to them'" (152).

Initially, Donovan attempted to demonstrate the fallacy of student assumptions through class discussion. Still, he found himself wondering just "how many students had been actually convinced that their initial arguments contained problematic assumptions" (152). It was only a matter of time before he decided critical thinking could be more effectively facilitated through off-campus experiences.

This was also the conclusion of Jonathan Arries, a professor of Spanish at the College of William and Mary. Unlike Donovan, Arries (1999) stumbled upon the efficacy of service experiences in the first-year course quite by accident. Spanish 151: Cultural Perspectives of U.S. Hispanics was designed to accommodate that "small number of freshmen who have studied Spanish for four or five years and have traveled or lived in a Spanish-speaking country" (33). For this relatively advanced, already motivated first-year group, Arries designed a "course syllabus that, if not exactly driven by critical pedagogy, would at least permit students to write in a variety of ways about literature and films by Latino artists" (39). When he casually mentioned to his students the possibility of "basing their research paper on a service experience" (38) like the one he himself had had the previous summer at a migrant workers' clinic, two of his students wound up going with him back to the clinic. What unfolded next was completely unanticipated.

Even more surprising than [the students'] successful "reading of a myth" [i.e., some promotional/informational brochures produced by the hospital] without the benefit of my stock presentation on semiological systems was the fact that our roles had changed from "expert"

professor and "non-expert" students to co-workers.... Our collaborative engagement in a problem-solving effort to help real people had carried us across a ... pedagogical boundary which would have been much more difficult to cross in our regular classroom. (39-40)

In short, the experience wound up being transformative for both teacher and students, redefining the former's very understanding of "context":

I now see it as a personally lived event that gives a learner sudden insight or a discovery that therefore becomes a memorable schema or "subtext" she or he can use to make sense out of experiences in different settings, like an internal guidebook or map. Second, I learned that "context" created by service can empower students, enabling them to demystify complex aspects of language and society. I learned that the "borders" imposed by institutional forms can and therefore must be crossed. The pleasure I myself experienced while crossing the borders of pedagogy, culture and language *with* my students made the hard work we did on the Eastern Shore (and subsequently in the classroom) like no other experience I have had as a teacher or a student. (41)

Having himself entered into the learning process in a new way—solving problems *with* his students rather than providing them with "stock" explanations— Arries personally experienced the truth of Schroeder's (1993) caution regarding the limited effectiveness of "teaching by telling."

Thus, it would seem to make little difference whether one is teaching in the sciences or the humanities, at a research university or a liberal arts college, whether one's students are relatively unmotivated to begin with or members of a well-prepared first-year group—appropriate, academically framed service experiences can help students develop unexpected levels of personal and intellectual engagement. Such engagement can, of course, lay the foundation for further involvement, but even when further involvement is not an important issue, service-learning in the introductory course can play still other valuable educational roles.

Take, for example, the heightened civic dimension that both Lima (2000) and Kinnell (2000) identify as additional benefits of their first-year courses. As Kinnell (2000) notes:

The uncertainty and range of students' responses [to their service projects] enable their instructors to emphasize the value of providing educational opportunities for all members of our society and the need to increase our nation's level of scientific literacy. An additional benefit of these projects is that they can increase the students' sense of civic responsibility and often serve as a catalyst for additional community service. (9)

Lima (2000) makes a similar point in discussing how her project "was chosen to give students the opportunity to see beyond themselves and their education into the community at large" (113). In facilitating such an expanded awareness, she hopes to help them see that "engineering must truly address social issues and fully interface with society [if it is] to be a vital, positive influence" (116).

But civic awareness, as critically important as it is, represents only one of the many dimensions of learning community-based work can promote. In an article entitled "Organizing for Learning: A New Imperative," higher education researcher Peter Ewell (1997) lays out succinctly some of the basic insights that have resulted from a "decade of pathbreaking research" regarding differences "between knowledge based on recall and deeper forms of understanding" (4). Two of Ewell's insights are especially relevant to the present discussion. First, he notes that "Direct experience *decisively* shapes individual understanding" (emphasis added), and explains this insight by explaining, "Cognitive science . . . tells us that the brain's activity is in direct proportion to its engagement with *actively stimulating* environments" (emphasis added) (4). Logically linked to this insight is the following one: "Learning occurs best in the context of a compelling 'presenting problem'" (4). Ewell's gloss of this insight is worth quoting in its entirety:

Maximum learning tends to occur when people are confronted with specific, identifiable problems they want to solve and that are within their capacity to do so. The first condition emphasizes the strong role of "thinking dispositions" that determine when students will actually invest energy in learning. The second compels attention in creating learning situations that carefully manage the level of challenge provided: too much, and the brain simply "turns itself off." (4)

When one considers the frequency with which first-year students are confronted with course material—indeed, entire academic disciplines—which possess for them absolutely no compelling rationale, one can begin to appreciate the importance of Ewell's word "compelling." As Bette Erickson, Calvin Peters, and Diane Strommer (2006) note in their *Teaching First-Year College Students*:

First-year students enroll in many of their courses to meet curricular requirements, and they bring about as much enthusiasm to the task as we might expect from people doing something that someone else has decided will be good for them. Yet there is no getting around the relationship between motivation and learning . . .

The reasons first-year students give for coming to college ... may not give us much to go on. Few of us can claim a direct link between our course and a better job or higher salary—and we are not convinced we should even if we could. It is also true, however, that students are just as interested in what is happening in their lives right now as they are in the good life they envision down the road. If we can find even one or two connections between our subject matter and the questions, issues, or dilemmas students encounter, their motivation will be strengthened. (69-70)

Thus, the question becomes: How does one help first-year students make personal connections with the material being studied? If we draw upon the first of Ewell's (1997) two insights, namely, "Direct experience decisively shapes individual understanding," it seems obvious that one strategy at least worth trying out is putting them in situations where they come face to face with some aspect of the larger issue at hand.

What lends this suggestion special urgency is the very real possibility that some high percentage of today's students come from cultural environments in which concrete contextualization is a significant feature of the learning process. Indeed, Roberto Ibarra (2001–2002) has proposed that much current diversity work fails to address issues critical to the success of an ever-larger segment of America's student population, especially students of color, because it fails to take into account the fact that cognitive learning styles are culturally conditioned. Higher education, he maintains, "is stalled at a cultural crossroads because we still misperceive diversity systems as separate from the primary academic systems and structures of higher education, namely, the departments and programs within the faculty domain" (63). In other words, attempts to be educationally more inclusive will not succeed until academic departments participate in those attempts, and the single most important way in which they can do so is to recognize the ways in which culturally determined factors can affect cognitive understanding and academic success.

What this means in practice is that minority students-students from what Ibarra and others refer to as "high context cultures"—are far less likely to flourish if the cultural conditions in which they learn best are simply not present in the academic environment they encounter on campus. Those conditions include "the multiple streams of information that surround an event, situation, or interaction (e.g., words, tones, gestures, body language, status or relationship of speakers)" that allow such students "to determine meaning from the context in which it occurs" (Ibarra 2001, 53). In other words, highcontext learners look for the sensory and social particulars in which concepts and facts are embedded. For such students it is precisely these particulars that help trigger and guide the learning process. Historically, however, academic environments in the United States have catered primarily to the cultural conditions favored by low-context learners-that is, environments that "filter out conditions surrounding an event, situation, or interaction to focus as much as possible on words and objective facts" (53). In such a learning environment, even the inclusion of multicultural readings, examples, and references may not be enough to facilitate success for a majority of high-context learners.

This is not to suggest that all minority students are high-context learners, nor is it to imply that high-context learners are somehow less gifted than low-context learners. The insights Ewell (1997) summarizes describe generic characteristics of "deeper forms of understanding" (4). "Direct experience decisively shapes individual understanding" (4) regardless of the learning conditions an individual learner favors. Nevertheless, when one adds to this finding the circumstance that contextual particulars are especially important for a growing student demographic, the case for moving beyond business as usual is even more compelling.

"Compelling," however, was only the first of the two conditions Ewell associates with "maximum learning." The second is captured in the rather unusual phrase "presenting problem," which refers to a problem within one's "capacity" to solve (4). In other words, relevance is not enough. For a learning situation to be most effective it must also provide scope for action. Making a personal connection is an important first step, but full ownership follows only from an opportunity to contribute to addressing the issue at hand. When a student in Edmund Tsang's (2000) service-learning version of Introduction to Mechanical Engineering] students for the real world" (128), he or she could have been referring merely to the course's concerns and illustrations, but when a fellow student wrote, "I learned how to get on [my] feet" (128), efficacy as well as relevance has clearly entered the equation.

Because most first-year students have little experience and even less expertise, many—though by no means all—first-year service-learning projects are of relatively limited scope, that is, a single multihour event that is prepared for over a multiweek period or weekly tasks that call for few developed skills. Nevertheless, even limited community-based assignments can be linked to legitimate course objectives. While some instructors may include, or even stress, such non-content-specific objectives as team building, interpersonal communication, sensitivity to diversity, and practical problem solving, others may utilize off-campus worksites to raise questions and challenge assumptions.

For the most part, service projects that require little technical competency do not pose problems for community partners, at least not if they are thoroughly discussed and planned ahead of time. Nevertheless, even a community partner aware of the difference between community service and service-learning may need help in making sure more generic and/or short-term projects do not inadvertently slide into simple community service. For this reason, first-year service projects may require more detailed guidelines and monitoring than would otherwise be the case. Failure to articulate, prepare, and process the learning-related dimensions of the experience clearly and deliberately may even lead students to conclude that the learning agenda that underlies and justifies the service activity is of minimal importance.

## Plato and Positivism

However, in the end, it may not be special logistical or design considerations that pose the greatest challenge to effective utilization of service-learning in the introductory course. As several of the statements cited in the first part of this essay indicate, the educational model that informs many introductory courses can be accurately characterized as a kind of "grand tour," whereby the first course is seen as a way of mapping out the broad features of the discipline that electives will later explore in depth. Even when the course is intended for nonmajors, this same coverage-driven approach prevails, perhaps in a somewhat "dumbed down" form, on the assumption that if students are to take only one course in the discipline, it should introduce them to a wide variety of its concerns. A "'one-damn-fact-after-another' approach" (ACC 1991, 47) is often the inevitable result.

In an article published in 1998, Benjamin Miller and Barbara Gentile reported on a nationwide survey of the introductory psychology course, examining both its objectives and its outcomes. There was, to begin with, no lack of awareness or good intentions on the part of the instructors they surveyed. Not only did these instructors acknowledge the importance of student engagement, facilitating such engagement was the goal they most often recognized as important (70 percent of all participants). Unfortunately, they also had to admit engagement was the goal they least frequently achieved, with only 20 percent of them indicating they had "very definitely" done so (91, 93). In sharp contrast, the second most frequently identified goal, providing a survey of the field, was the goal they most successfully achieved. As Miller and Gentile summarize, "Although instructors rated the goal of engage [*sic*] as most important, what instructors believed their courses did best was to provide a 'comprehensive survey of the field' and an introduction to the 'different approaches psychologists take'" (91).

In other words, what the introductory course did best was expose students to information. It did not so much facilitate a learning *experience*, an opportunity for students to think or work like psychologists, as it did provide a conceptual map, an overview of disciplinary topics. Unfortunately, for many students, such topics did not speak to their interests in taking the course. This we know because Miller and Gentile also surveyed students. Hence, a second significant disjuncture came to light—one between what students were seeking and what they actually encountered.

Students' descriptions of the introductory course at the end of the semester were different from their expectations at the beginning. The most widely held expectations [i.e., "understanding people and relationships, gaining knowledge useful in personal or professional life, and learning to think critically" (94)] . . . were less likely to be checked on the posttest than on the pretest. Few expected the course to be easy, but more found that it was; more than a third expected an intellectual challenge, but fewer found it. (95)

Not only were the students disappointed in their initial expectations that the course would improve their understanding of people and relationships; they were also disappointed in its relative lack of intellectual challenge. Instead of intellectual challenge (e.g., "learning to think critically" [94]), what they found was more of a "comprehensive survey of the field" (91), a kind of disciplinary narrative: "The biggest change between pretest and posttest was in the proportion of students who expected a comprehensive survey. Forty-eight had this expectation at the beginning of the course, but 69% described the course this way at the end" (95).

Thus, despite discrepancies between goals/expectations and outcomes on the part of both instructors and students, the two groups ultimately agreed that a "comprehensive survey of the field" was the introductory course's single most reliable outcome. And they reached this agreement even though *both* groups would have preferred a course that allowed for greater student engagement. What Paulo Freire (1971) has called "the fundamentally *narrative* character" (original emphasis) of contemporary education ultimately prevailed: "This [character] involves a narrating Subject [*sic*] (the teacher) and patient, listening objects (the students). The contents, whether values or empirical dimensions of reality, tend in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified" (57).

Those contents also tend to become boring, for the "outstanding characteristic of this narrative [approach to] education . . . is the *sonority* of words, not their transforming power" (57, emphasis added). Thus, what comes to define most of the first-year classroom experience is not creative faculty-student interaction but exposure to demonstrable faculty expertise.

Although there are many factors that contribute to the continued health and well-being of this narrative approach to education, surely one of the most important intellectual factors is the continuing influence of positivism or the belief that facts exist independently of values and assumptions. As such they provide the securest foundation for our knowledge, and whatever diverts time and attention from them must be rejected as intellectually fuzzy and academically suspect. That the tyranny of facts is actually driving an increasing number of students to put purely "objective" data manipulation and "quantifiable" skills at the center of their educational agenda is somehow beside the point.

For even further back, partially obscured by this positivistic legacy, lies still another set of largely undigested assumptions, namely, that the realm of
doing is really but a pale shadow of the realm of pure knowing. As Ira Harkavy and Lee Benson (1998) have argued, this Platonic perspective, "uncompromisingly aristocratic and antidemocratic . . . has had perhaps its greatest (and most pernicious) impact on Western education": "For Plato, learning occurred through contemplative thought, not through action and reflection. Dividing the world into ideal and material universes, Plato viewed knowledge as deriving from the ideal spiritual universe of permanent and fixed ideas. He conceptualized the material world of objects and actions as merely 'a shadowy, fleeting world' of imperfect imitations" (12).

The contradictions between this position and the positivist focus on facts need not detain us here. Suffice it to say, the ways in which these two legacies complement each other have helped to make the introductory course an educationally dangerous undertaking. Not only must students navigate a sea of what are to them largely meaningless facts, they must also eschew the assistance of useful applications and nonacademic experiences that would, perforce, "impede" their progress toward the life of the mind and/or the touchstone of pure or basic research. Woe to that 60 percent of first-year students (Schroeder 1993) who find utility, concrete particulars, and personal relevance an effective way to enter the educational arena!

Several years ago at an AAHE national conference (1996), then chancellor of the University of Massachusetts David Scott made an observation to the effect that putting internships at the end of a student's academic career really made little sense. Internships should come at the beginning, so that a student's remaining semesters could be used to unpack his or her experiences. The same logic applies to the introductory discipline-based course. If we want our first-year students to become truly liberally educated—regardless of their eventual major—we need to give them more reasons to take seriously all the academic disciplines to which they are exposed. The incorporation of service-learning into the introductory course is one promising way to achieve that end.

# 10 Getting Serious about Service

Civic Engagement and the First-Year Experience

Edward Zlotkowski

I nlike most of the other essays I have contributed to this volume, "Getting Serious about Service" is being published here for the first time. The essay is based largely on research already referred to in the framing statement for "Service-Learning and the Introductory Course," namely, the work I did with John Gardner on his project Foundations of Excellence in the First College Year in 2003–2004. One result of that work was a white paper on academic and civic engagement that I sent to him approximately a year after the project's completion. This essay is a reworking of the second part of the paper, the part on civic engagement.

Although, given its subtitle, one might well assume that this essay covers much the same ground covered in "Service-Learning and the First-Year Student," also included in this collection, the two essays actually point in somewhat different directions. What impelled me to write the present essay was my concern not with the general logic of linking servicelearning with the first-year experience but with what many first-year programs seem to understand by meaningful civic engagement. Most Foundations of Excellence schools had already made civic engagement a part of their first-year programming well before they joined the Gardner project. Most, though by no means all, also utilized what they called "service-learning" as one important way to facilitate that engagement. Furthermore, their self-assessments indicated that they were generally pleased with their efforts in this direction.

For me, these positive self-assessments were puzzling. I had visited most of the participating campuses, and in most cases I was not overly impressed by what passed for civic engagement in the first year. Certainly the focus groups I held with students left me more skeptical than encouraged vis-à-vis the civic dimension of their experiences. Why would institutions that cast a critical eve on their efforts to promote substantive academic engagement among their first-year students express themselves satisfied with what often looked like a far less serious effort to promote civic engagement? Nor was the relevant scholarly literature encouraging about the situation in general. Many more students seemed to enter the first year of college with a solid record of community service than left it with any deeper sense of civic commitment. All of this suggested a discrepancy between institutional assumptions and actual results. It is this discrepancy that the following essay explores. Could it be that many administrators and faculty members do not even recognize what substantive civic engagement looks like? If this is the case, laving a foundation of civic engagement in the first year may be even more difficult than many of us have assumed.

Recently (2008), a group of educators, John Gardner among them, published a resource book on civic engagement in the first year: First-Year Civic Engagement: Sound Foundations for College, Citizenship and Democracy (ed. LaBare). This is a welcome publication, but I fear we have a long way to go before we can claim to be at all adequate to the task of making the first college year an effective bridge to something beyond traditional community service and literally academic conversations about citizenship. Certainly we will not progress very far until colleges and universities begin to set for civic engagement the same kind of high, measurable standards they set for academic engagement.

#### Background

During the second half of the 1990s, much of my professional work revolved around a series of monographs exploring the relationship between servicelearning and individual academic disciplines or disciplinary areas. Once this series had been launched, John Gardner, then director of the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, suggested I also edit a volume on service-learning and the first-year experience. This suggestion resulted in *Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility* (2002).

After Gardner stepped down as director of the National Resource Center, he went on to launch a second national center focused on the first-year experience: the Policy Center on the First Year of College. The following essay draws upon many sources, but none is more important than a personal opportunity I had to work with Gardner during the 2004–2005 academic year.

At the time I started working with Gardner, the Policy Center's selfidentified "signature project" was an initiative called Foundations of Excellence in the First College Year: "a comprehensive, guided self-study and improvement process that enhances an institution's ability to realize its goals for student learning, success, and persistence" (www.firstyear.org). Funded by the Atlantic Philanthropies and the Lumina Foundation for Education, this initiative sought to bring a new deliberateness to the design of first-year programming and was officially launched in February of 2003

with an open invitation to over 900 four-year campus chief academic officers at member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC). These campuses were invited to participate with the Policy Center in the development of standards for the first year, which we termed "Foundational Dimensions®" or "Dimensions" for short. Over 200 member institutions of both organizations agreed to participate in the project and to establish campus-wide "Foundations Task Forces" to consider an initial short list of six Dimensions developed by Policy Center staff. (Policy Center on the First Year of College n.d.[b])

At the core of this effort lay a "highly intensive year-long assessment project, involving both qualitative and quantitative measures, to measure [a] campus's achievement of each Dimension" (Policy Center on the First Year of College n.d.[b]). A complementary, but secondary, aspect of this work focused less on achieving a comprehensive understanding of each school's first-year efforts and more on what was referred to as the project's "aspirational" dimension: strategies to improve academic and civic engagement among first-year students.

It was this aspirational dimension that accounted for my own participation. Since my job was to help improve practice, it made sense for me to visit interested campuses. Eventually, I was able to visit twenty-two of the participating twenty-four campuses, offer workshops, and hold focus group meetings with students as well as faculty members. Much of what follows is based on the notes I made during those visits, supplemented by information the campuses provided to the project in general and relevant educational research.

Although I worked with interested campuses on both traditional academic engagement and civic or community engagement, what follows deals only with the civic side of my work, especially as it relates to service-learning. Since, moreover, my job was not so much to assess current practices as to suggest future initiatives, I have decided not to identify the specific institutional source of any of the oral or written statements to which I refer. (The names of all institutional participants can be found on the Foundations website.) Like my campus visits, this essay can best be viewed as a tool to help campuses strengthen their civic engagement efforts, in this case by understanding more clearly what substantive civic engagement entails.

## How Are We Doing?

Just about every campus I worked with expressed some kind of interest in and commitment to civic and community engagement. (Indeed, a few of these campuses have nationally recognized service-learning programs.) More often than not, administrators and instructors were aware of the steady decline in student political and civic engagement that marked the final third of the twentieth century. Like their colleagues across the country, they found disturbing the implications of studies suggesting, for example, that becoming well off financially had far eclipsed intellectual development and civic leadership as a reason for attending college. Although they may not have been personally familiar with the American Political Science Association's Task Force on Civic Education in the 21st Century, they implicitly shared its concern that "current levels of political knowledge, political engagement, and political enthusiasm are so low as to threaten the vitality and stability of democratic politics in the United States" (APSA September 1998, 636).

Perhaps it was in part this very concern that led many campus teams, faced with the task of rating their own curricular and co-curricular efforts to promote civic engagement, to see those efforts in a much more favorable light than one might have assumed given the acknowledged extent of the problem. Asked to respond to the question "To what degree does your campus provide structured opportunities for students to practice the habits of civic engagement?" and then to summarize how they arrived at their judgment, many schools not only gave themselves high marks but gave themselves higher marks than even their own explanations would seem to justify.

Certainly, as some institutional responses explicitly noted, a lack of definitional clarity made this question difficult to approach in the first place. Indeed, this difficulty was compounded by the fact that *both* words in the term "civic engagement" lend themselves to multiple interpretations. What, for example, is the relationship between "civic" and "political"? Even the APSA statement (1998) just cited could be said to contribute to this confusion. While the word "political" dominates the statement's formulation of "The Problem," the task force that drafted it chose to call itself the "APSA Task Force on *Civic* Education in the 21st Century" (emphasis added), and its members set themselves the task of identifying the "most important single *civic* lesson" (emphasis added) citizens of a democracy must learn.

The second word in the term, "engagement," also slides into neighboring concepts. How does "engagement" relate to "responsibility" or even "aware-

ness"? Although it is not difficult to distinguish these words formally, they are, in fact, often used and understood more or less interchangeably—civic engagement, civic responsibility, and civic awareness—and the degree to which they are cannot help but affect the degree to which one sees "opportunities" for civic engagement being adequately addressed.

There is, however, still another factor that may have contributed to the surprisingly positive self-assessments in this area. As many recent critics of higher education have noted, the public purposes-as opposed to the private benefits-of higher education have been receding into ever-greater insignificance. This recession has been less the result of a deliberate turning away from public purposes than of a failure to redefine and recommit to those purposes in an effective, contemporary way. This is William Sullivan's (2000) point when he speaks of a "default program" of instrumental individualism that "leaves the larger questions of social, political, and moral purpose out of explicit consideration" (21, emphasis added). The basic problem is not a repudiation of civic engagement; it is the failure to develop a civic engagement strategy appropriate for today's circumstances. This may well explain why some of the participating campuses identified preprofessional internships and career development workshops as instances of civic engagement. As a clear strategy for civic engagement fades more and more into the background, another, less precise, less legitimate understanding of the concept begins to take its place, and private benefits are themselves seen as a form of commitment to the common good. As R. Claire Snyder (2008) says of her own university in "Should Higher Education Have a Civic Mission? Historical Reflections": "If asked whether [it] serves civic purposes, the administration would no doubt say that it does: it prepares students to contribute to the world as informed and productive 'citizens' (read: individuals), no matter what field of employment they pursue. But this vision does not entail any particular responsibility for participation in the practice of self-government" (54).

Snyder's glossing of "citizens" as merely the equivalent of "individuals" succinctly makes the point. (In this regard it is interesting to note how frequently national surveys of student interest and experience treat preprofessional and civic/service activities as a single item.)

Nor is it only preprofessional experiences that get thrown into the pot of civic engagement. Many faculty routinely assume that the standard components of a liberal education—for example, exposure to certain cultural topics and the development of certain skills—constitute in and of themselves "habits of civic engagement." Carol Schneider (2000), president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, has identified an important dimension of this assumption when she points to the disconnect that exists between "the actual content of Western Civilization courses [i.e., the cultural side of the general education curriculum] and ... students' self-identification as American citizens responsible for the policies and practices of a particular set of communities" (104). In other words, although campuses like to point to

courses in their general education curriculum as evidence that first-year students have "structured opportunities" to acquire habits of civic engagement, in point of fact the instructors in these courses most often leave it "to the students' own determination" to make meaningful connections between course content and contemporary "policies and practices" requiring public action. Rarely is the curriculum used to help students clarify their responsibilities as citizens of a democracy and members of specific communities.

In short, much of what colleges and universities identify as justifying their claim to high levels of civic engagement turns out to be little more than a grab bag of courses, programs, and activities that leave students no more inclined or empowered to participate effectively in civil society than did their high school experiences. As the 2002 "Oklahoma Students' Civic Engagement Resolution" (okhighered.org 2002) laments:

We [the students of Oklahoma] value education and the knowledge required to become informed citizens. However, the higher education institutions [in Oklahoma] do not provide adequate education and knowledge about our civic responsibilities. We often do not know how to address civic issues. Higher education institutions' primary focus is to produce professionals, when instead they should be producing citizens.

Exposure to cultural topics and the development of skills like effective speaking and critical thinking are as essential to a fulfilling life beyond the academy as they are to college success, but in and of themselves they are unlikely to advance the civic engagement of students who "often do not know how to address civic issues." As Schneider points out in the same essay cited above (2000), "Cultivating analytical abilities in citizens is certainly important to the health of a political democracy as it is to the modern economy [but] it is not ... sufficient to the vitality of a healthy and self-correcting civic society" (108).

### **Community-Based Programs**

There are, of course, many first-year programs and activities that do focus on the *public* as distinct from the *private* realm and do seek to promote more than a general cultural awareness and/or stronger analytical abilities. The question is: how effective are they as vehicles of civic engagement? According to the introduction to one widely respected text, Thomas Ehrlich's *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education* (2000), the "civic," while

partially overlapping with dimensions of personal responsibility and social conscience," pays special attention to "coming to understand how a community operates, the problems it faces, and the richness of its diversity, as well as fostering a willingness to commit time and energy to enhance community life and to work collectively to resolve community concerns. (xxx)

The bottom line here would seem to be "to work collectively to resolve community concerns," and such an emphasis accords well with the capstone recommendation of the APSA Task Force on Civic Engagement (APSA 1998), namely, that faculty should above all "teach the motivation and competence to engage actively in public problem solving" (636).

But if one were to take such a fostering of both "the motivation and the competence to engage actively in public problem solving" as one's measure of success, how many first-year programs could honestly rate themselves "adequate," let alone "excellent"? Is it not indicative of a general failure to "update" (Sullivan 2000), to design and assess, institutional strategies to advance civic engagement in the first year of college, that the topical index of the *Journal of the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition* (http://sc.edu/fye/ journal/journalindex.htm), the field's premier peer-reviewed publication, includes no category centered on civic engagement or related concepts?

What, then, is one to make of those countless examples of first-year public service activities—day-long community "plunges," service in the context of an orientation program or a first-year seminar, student club– and residence hall–organized volunteer work—in short, all those explicitly community-based, "structured activities" colleges and universities like to cite as primary evidence of their commitment to fostering "habits of civic engagement"? Surely programming of this nature should legitimately "count," whether or not it has received much scholarly attention?

At this point it may be good to remind ourselves of the question around which this discussion has revolved, namely, "To what degree does your campus provide structured opportunities for students to practice the habits of civic engagement?" Until this point we have focused primarily on what we should understand by "civic engagement," but perhaps we also need to explore the phrase "structured opportunities." Perhaps the willingness of colleges and universities to rate highly their civic engagement efforts results at least in part from their understanding of this phrase. Does, for example, the weight of the central question fall upon inputs-"structured opportunities"-or outcomes-"habits of civic engagement"? Certainly "opportunities," especially "structured opportunities," are easier to quantify than "habits" of engagement, just as one can far more easily count up "hours of service provided" than evaluate whether those service hours are related to any growth in social responsibility. This distinction would seem to be one of the main points the Reverend Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., former superior-general of the Society of Jesus, was driving at when, in a key address on Jesuit education (2000), he referred to the many opportunities for service one finds at Jesuit universities: "Our universities . . . boast a splendid variety of in-service programs, outreach programs, insertion programs, off-campus contacts and hands-on courses. These should not be too optional or peripheral, but at the very core of every Jesuit university's program of studies" (Kolvenbach 2000).

In other words, one can offer opportunities—a "splendid variety of programs"—without ever dealing with the degree to which those opportunities remain essentially "optional or peripheral" to what students perceive as really important. Assuming the Foundations of Excellence question was concerned at least as much with impact as with opportunities, even many of the seemingly legitimate service activities schools boast of hardly justify a high self-assessment.

As I have noted elsewhere in this volume (Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience"), the first-year service activities offered by most American colleges and universities do not differ significantly from the community service activities young people now encounter in high school. When the students who drafted the "Oklahoma Students' Civic Engagement Resolution" (okhighered.org 2002) noted that more members of their generation "participate in community service than any other cohort," it was in large part to these "standard" community service activities that they were referring. Indeed, as Susan Jones and Kathleen Hill (2003) point out at the beginning of their important study of student service motivation, "Understanding Patterns of Commitment," "Findings from the 2000 survey of first-year college students report that just over 81% of students had performed volunteer work in the last year" (516). However, the same survey also indicated that only 22.7 percent of these students felt "it was important to participate in a community action program" and only 30.9 percent "valued becoming a community leader" (516). Given this discrepancy between service activities and community values, we should perhaps not be surprised that "only 23.8 of first-year students ... indicated that the chances were very good that they would participate in volunteer or community service work" in the future (516).

Thus, it seems safe to conclude that, however many service activities today's traditional-aged first-year students have been exposed to, those activities have not led the vast majority of them to develop "habits of civic engagement." As a related, subsequent study by Helen Marks and Susan Jones (2004) suggests:

For the majority of students . . . involvement in community service may be episodic and contextually driven—not so much a deeply motivated value-oriented choice as an occasional activity that personal circumstances may dictate, encourage, support, or deter. The responses of the first-year students to other [Marks and Jones's] survey items appear to support this claim. For example, while volunteering in high school is on the rise among the respondents, trends over the past decade indicate a simultaneous decline in both interest and participation in other forms of voluntary activity, including community action programs, social activism, political participation, and general civic engagement and altruism . . .

Most strikingly, just 59% of first year students reported a personal commitment to "helping others in difficulty," the lowest response level in over a decade. Paradoxically, while more students are volunteering than ever before, they are not espousing the civic values that community service is intended to encourage. (307–308)

What many educators—on both the secondary and the postsecondary levels—would like to imagine is a valuable step toward developing an ethos of civic responsibility turns out to be, for many students, merely an enjoyable group activity with a rush of self-approval or even a cynical exercise in improving one's personal advantage in certain competitive contexts. (While there may well be good reason to hope that the generation entering college post-9/11 will demonstrate a deeper commitment to the common good than have their recent predecessors [see Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience," in this volume], there is little evidence to see traditional community service activities as the cause of that commitment.)

Cynicism regarding the value of service requirements and organized service activities was certainly widespread among the first-year students I interviewed in the course of my Foundations of Excellence work. Over 90 percent of these students had been involved at least briefly in some kind of service during high school. Many had been required to serve in order to graduate. All were acutely aware of the value community service activities had added to their college applications. But now, having encountered college service activities as options-or "opportunities," to use the word in the Foundations of Excellence survey-many had decided not to participate. Indeed, even where they had found such activities *required*, many had found a way around that requirement. One group, for example, described with some pride how easy they had found it to fabricate the "reflection essay" used to document and assess their school's requirement. To be sure, many others had genuinely enjoyed their service experience either because they "liked to give back" or because they got to spend time with friends, but very few spoke of their service experiences as important or educational in any substantive way. A slight majority indicated they probably would not volunteer again anytime soon. My overall impression was that most simply did not see service activities as a "big deal," one way or the other.

#### Back to the Drawing Board

Frank student assessments not only cast considerable doubt on the value of much of what passes for civic engagement in first-year programs but also lead us to ask what kinds of programs might actually achieve that end. There are, I believe, several considerations that should guide their design. One of Jones and Hill's (2003) key findings was that "almost without exception, students noted that *required* service quickly took on a negative connotation for themselves as well as their friends. They were clear: as soon as they met the requirement, they were moving on to other activities" (524, emphasis added). However, as those responsible for first-year service activities well know, if a service activity is made optional, it will probably miss many of the very students most in need of personal and civic development. Thus, the question becomes, how does one shift the emphasis of required service from the actual requirement to some other feature capable of effecting substantive outcomes?

Students themselves have been suggesting at least one answer to this question for many years. As one of Jones and Hill's interviewees remarked of her required high school service, "If I knew what I was doing, what the reason was, and I knew the person or organization it was helping, . . . maybe that would make me feel better about doing [community service]" (524). In other words, one of the things that makes service activities more than still another hoop to jump through is contextual understanding—the same thing students want in their discipline-based introductory courses (see Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the Introductory Course," in this volume). Jones and Hill (2003) note that the most successful examples they found of first-year service, service that resulted in genuine civic engagement, were programs that

included small groups of students who received training to prepare them for their experiences and on-site reflection with the faculty and staff who traveled with the students. These were the most structured community service opportunities we heard about from students and also, not coincidentally, the experiences about which the students spoke with the greatest enthusiasm and insight in relation to their interest in and commitment to community service. (529)

Unfortunately, such careful planning, especially with regard to contextual preparation and rigorous reflection, is rarely the norm, in part because it tends to require substantive faculty involvement. If, however, service work is to be embedded in an educational context that transforms acts of charity into opportunities for systemic understanding, it is difficult to see how one can do without active faculty participation. In other words, the model for civic engagement programming must be *service-learning* in the full sense of the term, not community service or community service simply relabeled "service-learning." While nothing intrinsically precludes substantive civic engagement from taking place without faculty participation, by far the easiest way to facilitate such engagement is through a classroom or curricular connection.

Other essays in this volume (Zlotkowski, "Pedagogy and Engagement"; Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience"; and Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the Introductory Course") carefully explore the reasons why service-learning is uniquely constituted both to hold students' attention and to promote deep learning. It is, however, important to hear what students themselves say about its special potential as a vehicle of civic engagement. For example, in *The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Civic Engagement* (Long 2002), a publication documenting the conclusions of thirty-three students from twenty-seven campuses gathered to discuss student civic engagement, academic service-learning clearly emerges as the strategy they believe most likely to help them "realize that collectively we are a powerful force for social change" (7). This they explain as follows: "Community service without a curricular connection often does not allow students to realize interconnections between the service work and larger systemic issues. Service-learning provides the 'why'—the reason for doing service, and shows us how we can attempt to bring about greater social change" (7).

Although many of the campuses I visited in the course of my Foundations of Excellence work boasted at least a few examples of service linked to the first-year academic curriculum, this arrangement was far less in evidence than one might have assumed, especially given the commitment several of the campuses had made to service-learning in general. Furthermore, whatever curriculum-based service activities there were tended to be linked to some kind of first-year seminar where an already unmanageable agenda made it unlikely those activities would ever move far beyond the traditional community service students had already experienced in high school.

As I have argued elsewhere (see Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience" in this volume), a sense of "been there, done that" can be educationally very counterproductive. One of the most frequent complaints I heard in my student focus groups was that a certain course was merely a high school repeat: it did not open up new perspectives, did not develop new skills, did not meet the expectation that college means moving on to a new level. Most first-year service requirements produce precisely the same response: they do not open up new perspectives or develop new skills; they do not meet the expectation that college means moving on to a new level. Far from showing how intellectual analysis, historical awareness, and societal context are essential in addressing public issues, they simply offer more of the same, a requirement to "do good." No wonder only 22.7 percent of first year students see more community service in their future!

However, linking intellect to action is, by itself, insufficient to make first-year service experiences a gateway to "habits of civic engagement." At least equally important is a deepening of the affective dimension. Kolvenbach, in his statement on Jesuit education, points to this necessity when he suggests, "Students, in the course of their formation, must let the gritty reality of this world into their lives, so they can learn to feel it, think about it critically, respond to its suffering and engage it constructively" (www.scu.edu/ ignatiancenter/bannan/eventsandconferences/justiceconference/nationalcon ference/kolvenbach.cfm).

Engagement of this kind—what Kolvenbach calls "solidarity"—"is learned through 'contact' rather than through 'concepts'" (Kolvenbach 2000), for it requires more than the ability to analyze. It also requires the ability to empathize.

This is also the conclusion of Russ Edgerton, former president of the American Association for Higher Education and former director of the Education Program at the Pew Charitable Trusts. In a 1997 white paper for the trusts, Edgerton calls for the development of a "new civics' of the 21st century." "Learning about things," he explains, "is not enough":

Graduates also need to learn how to do things. Having looked at the new civics, we can further conclude that learning how to do things is also not enough....

To be a citizen one must not only be informed. One must also care, and be willing to act on one's values and ideas. Crucial to all the new civic literacies is the development of an emotional identification with the larger community and the belief that, in the face of overwhelming complexity, one individual can make a difference. (37)

"Emotional identification," "solidarity," Blythe Clinchy's (2000) "connected knowing"—whatever term one uses, the basic idea is the same: while a willingness and an ability to analyze public issues are essential to substantive civic engagement, they are not by themselves sufficient. Students must also learn to form powerful affective bonds with others, especially those whose public voice is often overlooked.

Taking seriously the power of emotional identification has important design implications. In the vast majority of first-year service programs, in one "community plunge" or "make a difference" day after another, the operative word is almost always "placements": literally, places were students can perform service. What "the community" comes to mean in most of these instances is first and foremost the place where students have raked leaves, picked up trash, painted rooms, stacked cans, delivered food, or played with children while the actual members of that community either did other things or, in some cases, simply sat and watched. The community's one "essential role" in this scenario is to express gratitude for the students' help. Community gratitude neatly complements student self-satisfaction.

Whatever such programs may accomplish in providing genuinely needed assistance or in facilitating interstudent bonding, they rarely result in anything even faintly resembling an "emotional identification with the larger community" (Edgerton 1997, 37). If they did, their influence would not fade so quickly from students' lives. This is why Jones and Hill (2003) found multiday immersion programs so effective and why the students they interviewed spoke of these programs "with the greatest enthusiasm and insight" (529). The intensity of community contact that multiday immersion experiences almost always involve makes them different in kind from what typically passes for civic engagement.

To be sure, most of these of substantive partnerships and programs do not specifically target first-year students. Indeed, as has already been suggested, even on campuses that have developed exemplary service-learning programs, first-year service activities often remain relatively weak or unassimilated into any broad-based plan to help students "practice the habits of civic engagement." One of the reasons for this may be a fear that first-year students already have enough to take care of without their also worrying about civic engagement. As Jones and Hill (2003) report, "Nearly every [first-year] student not currently involved in community service in college mentioned time and setting priorities as a deterrent to their continued participation in service. In addition, every participant, with the exception of two, was balancing significant employment obligations, with more than half working over 11 hours a week" (526).

Thus, the temptation is very strong to "postpone" substantive civic and community engagement to a later point in students' careers. Some four-year schools actually do postpone off-campus community-based experiences in a very deliberate, constructive way, using the first-year to lay a *conceptual* foundation for later *hands-on* service activities designed to build on that foundation.

Schools that have adopted this comprehensive approach can hardly be charged with paying insufficient attention to the civic dimension of their students' first-year experience. However, at the majority of schools, the absence or relative thinness of first-year community-based programming has no redeeming four-year logic. On these campuses, creating a first-year program substantive enough to be worth the effort will require a fundamental change in attitude. Instead of introducing students to a short-term service experience as part of their collegiate initiation, an experience on approximately the same level as a tour of the library, community-based work will have to be seenand experienced-as the development of a critically important set of competencies students will need to draw upon again and again over the course of their academic careers and professional lives. In other words, it will have to be seen and experienced as the equivalent of other foundational literacies like writing and mathematics. No one argues that the full schedules first-year students keep justify postponing the development of basic writing and math skills until sophomore year. By sophomore year one wants students to be already in a position to draw upon their basic skills in a wide variety of academic fields. Indeed, we lament long and loud about students who advance through their academic careers with only minimal verbal and quantitative

literacy skills. We should be equally concerned about students who advance through their academic careers with a correspondingly low level of civic literacy. If we insist on not feeling any concern, we should at least have the honesty to delete from our mission statements all reference to graduates *prepared* to lead and to serve their fellow human beings.

# SECTION V Service-Learning in the Curriculum: The Disciplines

Introduction

KerryAnn O'Meara

his section explores the critical issue of discipline and the civic engagement movement. If it is true, as much research on the academic profession suggests, that "the academic department is the foundational unit of U.S. universities . . . and faculty careers are shaped there" (Hearn and Anderson 2002, 503), then those interested in advancing civic engagement in higher education must find ways to dialogue with disciplines, whether on campus in departments or in disciplinary associations. In the four chapters in this section Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh do just that.

In "Mapping the New Terrain," Zlotkowski takes us on the journey he experienced to produce the twenty-one-volume series on servicelearning in the academic disciplines. This series provided invaluable resources to faculty on campuses who needed syllabi and models of programs and projects specific to their disciplines. Once this project was complete, there was simply no rational argument that could be made that "I cannot do service-learning, I am in Business . . . or . . . Engineering . . . or Composition, etc." Rather, the series pulled scholars from across the humanities, social sciences, and natural and physical sciences into discussion with their colleagues about the best models for service learning in their fields. Aside from these models, the series also made significant contributions to the articulation of pedagogical goals and student learning objectives in different disciplines, reinforcing the idea of service-learning as good teaching. In "Disciplines and the Public Good," Zlotkowski moves from sharing his journey with the series to providing the philosophical and historical rationale behind realigning the disciplines with civic work. He argues that most disciplines were deeply embedded in public purposes at their beginning but have drifted toward technical professionalism and away from civic professionalism over the last century. The essay chronicles the efforts of many disciplinary associations and clusters of disciplines in organizations like *Imagining America*, and *Community Campus Partnerships for Health*, to recommit to these original public purposes and the many resources they have produced to do so.

In the third chapter, "Opportunity for All," Zlotkowski moves from the macro conversation of connecting the disciplines to the public good to a micro example of connecting service-learning to the discipline of business. He observes that no discipline was less enthusiastic about embracing servicelearning and civic engagement than business. Whether for reasons of foreign nomenclature or perceived conflict between profit motives and social change motives, business faculty were not interested initially. Zlotkowski carefully makes the case for how service-learning can serve business education by providing students exposure to diversity, opportunities for critical skill-building, and experience with real-world, unstructured problems. Having made the case for service-learning's benefit to business education, one is left wondering what business education has to offer those who wish to advance civic engagement and social change, an answer partially provided by the observation that many community-based organizations (and we might add some administrators in higher education) lack the expertise and entrepreneurial, marketoriented perspective business programs specialize in. Reading this essay now is especially interesting given the Wall Street meltdown, decline of the American automobile industry, and general American distaste for the corporate world. Perhaps more than ever, service-learning offers business education a means to discuss ethics, problem-solving, and risk in ways that may redeem business education through a sort of social entrepreneurship.

In discussing the potential benefits of service learning in exposing students to diversity, one is reminded of the important intersections of discipline and institutional type. Many business students in community colleges and public four-year institutions will have grown up in diverse communities and themselves be students of color and first generation—and in this way, the role of service-learning may be less exposure to diversity and more enhancement of civic agency and business skills likely to make one more successful in achieving career and civic goals.

This essay is followed by John Saltmarsh's essay "Emerson's Prophecy," which, like the essay before it, provides a portrait of the distinct challenges within a single discipline struggling to find itself civically. In this case, Saltmarsh considers the training of historians. He observes, "The professional academic's oath of allegiance is to an abstract notion of truth, without com-

mitments, claiming scientific detachment and neutrality." Saltmarsh observes this training, which he himself experienced, is a "formula for disengagement" and ignores Emerson's strong proposition that historians be grounded in the world. He then goes on to offer a suggestion of another way, a more connected way of teaching and knowing that he experienced working with students in an American History course where service-learning became text as well as a process in learning.

Read at this moment in time, these four chapters remind us of old and new tensions for the disciplines and civic engagement. For example, there are

- Tensions in how to connect often interdisciplinary, paradigm-shifting civic engagement with mainstream research in a discipline
- Tensions between a faculty service orientation and civic impulse, and technocratic and more disciplinary impulse to be engaged with community, and the consequences for the kinds of projects and relationships that are formed
- Tensions in how to integrate civic engagement and service-learning within other faculty roles
- Tensions between single faculty courses versus departmental approaches to partnership and curricular coherence

Read at this moment in time, these four chapters are also interesting in relationship to the current condition of the academic profession. The academic profession has less job security and a greater proportion of faculty who are non-tenure-track and part-time than ever before. As we look ahead, fewer faculty are likely to have research and deep connections with their disciplines embedded in their job descriptions. The faculty role has been unbundled to focus either on instruction or on research or on extension/outreach. Yet as Tony Becher and Paul Trowler (2001) observe, these shifts do not necessarily mean the decline of the "academic tribes." Rather, as with the Chinese symbol for "crisis" which presents the idea of threat and opportunity as two sides of the same coin, power is often contested and reforms won in environments such as these. The transition the academic profession is undergoing now in appointments and its implications for the disciplines may become a radical space of opportunity for new conversations about the social relevance of disciplines and the kinds of scholarship and teaching that should be valued—a potential opening for advocates of service-learning.

In conclusion, there is no doubt that we need to continue to think of the disciplines as "leverage points" in discussions of the academy and the public. Much discussion and rhetoric in civic engagement unfortunately has portrayed them as the rock that itself needs to be lifted, rather than as actual leverage. Yet, as these authors remind us, they are not going anywhere. Perhaps more importantly, they have important things to offer, such as strong invisible colleges and networks for dissemination of new service-learning models. The

disciplines have scholars passionately committed to the study of subjects that transform the way we look at most of the social problems service-learning encounters. As we look nationally at exemplary engaged faculty, some of the very best examples are those who rigorously apply the knowledge, methods, and standards of their disciplines to complex problems, and as they do, invite indigenous knowledge into conversation with their disciplines, with students and colleagues at their sides. Finally, using a more liberal conception of disciplines as academic tribes and territories, we find they are, in fact, us. Most leaders in the civic engagement movement were trained in specific disciplines and fields in universities and maintain ties within them, even as they have created new, more interdisciplinary tribes around the study and practice of servicelearning and civic engagement. Therefore, rather than distancing ourselves from the "hard to move disciplines," we should find ways to create alliances, common allies, and interests as we move toward a more engaged university and public. These four essays map out that territory and start us down that road.

# 11 Mapping New Terrain

The American Association for Higher Education's Series on Service-Learning in the Academic Disciplines

Edward Zlotkowski

The original version of this essay was written to mark the conclusion of the American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) series of books on service-learning and the academic disciplines. Although the entire series had not yet appeared in print, I had wrapped up my work as general editor of the eighteen volumes that made up the original set and wanted to put the project in a broader educational and academic context. There were at least three general points I wanted to stress.

First, one of the least often discussed features of service-learning is the widespread academic assumption that "real" learning happens primarily in the classroom. Richard Light (2001), in his Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds, speaks to this assumption when he notes that he himself "assumed most important and memorable academic learning goes on inside the classroom, while outside activities provide a useful but modest supplement. The evidence shows that the opposite is true: learning outside of classes . . . is vital" (8).

In other words, it is not simply the suspicion that "service" activities do not deserve academic credit that has stood in the way of service-learning's

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Mapping New Terrain: Service-Learning across the Disciplines," *Change* (January/February 2001): 25–33. Reprinted with permission of the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation. Published by Heldref Publications, 1319 Eighteenth St., NW, Washington, DC 20036-1802. Copyright © 2001.

acceptance among faculty, especially in more traditional academic disciplines, it is a suspicion of experiential learning in general. Hence, Richard Freeland (2009), writing almost a decade after "Mapping New Terrain" was written, has called recent attempts to connect "ideas with action" "a profoundly important, indeed revolutionary, challenge to the version of liberal education that has dominated American higher education."

Second, as is becoming increasingly clear to an ever-larger group of scholar-teachers, good service-learning is at bottom simply good teaching. Robert Barr and John Tagg's (1995) influential article "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education" as well as educational researchers like Peter Ewell (1997) have made it abundantly clear that what makes service-learning a powerful pedagogy is at bottom identical to what makes other innovative pedagogies effective—be they problem-based learning, learning communities, cross-disciplinary projects, or even technologyassisted learning. Clear objectives, attention to design and learning styles, structured reflection, and regular feedback and assessment help fold servicelearning into a much larger pattern of educational reform. This, in turn, helps remove from all these strategies the stigma of being simply the latest educational fad.

Finally, "Mapping New Terrain" suggests that even a project like the AAHE series with its 400-plus contributors was never meant to be more than a way of advancing the conversation about what can and should be the appropriate contemporary relationship between higher education and civic responsibility in a democratic society. Since the essay was published and the series concluded, we have seen a significant increase in the number of colleges and universities around the world for which this relationship has become a matter of considerable concern. At almost the same time "Mapping New Terrain" was being written, the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education was meeting in its twentieth session to explore "Educational policies for democratic citizenship and social cohesion: challenges and strategies for Europe" (http://www.coe.int/t/e/cultural\_co-operation/education/ standing\_conferences/f.20thsessioncracow2000.asp). Since then, the Council of Europe has moved to add to the Bologna agreement that governs higher education in the European Union a resolution on the importance of linking universities to the development of civic capacities.

#### The Need for a New Educational Map

In the March 1996 issue of the *AAHE Bulletin*, former American Association for Higher Education vice president Ted Marchese interviewed John Abbott, director of Britain's Education 2000 Trust and the leader of "an international

effort to link experts in disciplines such as neurology and evolutionary psychology and leading educational innovators in a search for new learning strategies that 'go with the grain of the brain' " (Abbott 1996, 3). In a section of the interview entitled "Learning for the 21st Century," Abbott notes that "people world-wide need a whole series of new competencies." When Marchese replies, "We see all kinds of movements today to add these to the curriculum," Abbott introduces a critical distinction:

Well, not to prejudge, but I doubt such abilities can be taught solely in the classroom, or be developed solely by teachers. Higher order thinking and problem-solving skills *grow out of direct experience*, not simply teaching; they require *more than a classroom activity*. They develop through active involvement and *real-life experiences in work-places and the community*. (3–4, emphasis added)

At almost exactly the same time that Marchese's interview with Abbott was going to press, AAHE was launching what would turn out to be the largest publishing venture in its history: a twenty-one-volume series on servicelearning in the academic disciplines. Although no one at the time linked the interview with the prospective series, in retrospect the latter can almost be viewed as a response to Abbott's insistence that "higher order thinking and problem-solving skills grow out of direct experience . . . they require more than a classroom activity."

It is a curious phenomenon how vigorously many in higher education defend both their programs and their students from "more than . . . class-room activity." Not infrequently, "experiences in workplaces and the community" are viewed as suspect, as narrowly vocational undertakings hardly appropriate for the complex, liberal learning at the core of postsecondary education. But as the late Donald Schön (1995) pointed out:

In the varied topography of professional practice, there is a hard, high ground overlooking a swamp. On the high ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the use of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowlands, problems are messy and confusing and incapable of technical solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems of the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or to society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human concern. (28)

In other words, widespread assumptions to the contrary, it is in the "swampy lowlands" of "real-world" experiences that real complexity resides. The academy's problems, in contrast, are the "manageable" ones. Is it any wonder, then, that research suggests that "higher order thinking and problem-solving skills grow out of direct experience . . . [and] require more than a classroom activity?"

In the very first volume of the AAHE series, *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition* (1997), Nora Bacon tells the story of a pair of her students who chose to write a piece for a nearby recycling center. After the pair had gotten her feedback on a draft of their work, they also brought it to the center's director for critique. As it turned out, his recommendations pointed in a very different direction.

The student writers wisely ignored my suggestions and accepted the director's, recognizing that his criteria were grounded in intimate knowledge of the audience and purpose of the text. In their next conference with me, they presented their revision and explained the rationale for their choices. It was an awkward meeting. All of us felt that my authority had been undermined, and though we finally worked our way into some interesting conversation about the assumptions behind the two evaluations, I had to struggle against the impulse to defend my response. I was embarrassed by what I did not know. (50)

One cannot help wondering how many academics bar the door to "realworld" experiences because of an underlying fear their students will return to the classroom with questions and answers that are "messy and confusing" and that challenge their authority, if not their actual expertise.

The over 400 contributors to the series's twenty-one volumes have all, at least to some degree, indicated their willingness to risk the "embarrassment" Bacon describes. In doing so, they have helped meet the challenge identified by William Plater, former dean of the faculties and executive vice chancellor at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis when he wrote (1995, 27): "The metaphor of the classroom is a powerful one. This most basic and fundamental unit of academic life—the sanctity of the classroom and the authority of the teacher within it—is about to be turned inside out." By discussing and documenting what happens when the classroom door is deliberately opened—in some cases, taken off its hinges—the series's contributors have begun to create for us an at least rudimentary map of a new (or renewed) vision of American higher education.

Furthermore, those contributors represent an inclusive cross-section of the American professoriate, and a detailed analysis of the institutions they represent reveals just how diverse a group they are. Based on the Carnegie classification system, over 100 contributors come from research I universities and approximately 75 from other PhD-granting institutions. Approximately 100 are from master's I and II schools; approximately 60, from liberal arts colleges; the rest, from two-year colleges and schools in other categories. Public and private institutions are almost equally represented: 54 percent to 46 percent.

#### Variations on a Theme

It is a truism among service-learning practitioners and researchers that there has never been anything resembling comprehensive agreement on how the term should be defined. Already at the time of her groundbreaking collection of essays *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service* (1990), Jane Kendall claimed to have found in the relevant literature 147 terms specifying actions or programs one might also identify as related to service-learning. Reviewing this confusion in an essay published in that collection, Timothy Stanton suggested that perhaps the best way to proceed was to recognize that "rather than a discrete type of program, service learning appears to be an *approach* to experiential learning, an *expression of values*—service to others, community development and empowerment, reciprocal learning—which determines the purpose, nature, and process of *social and educational exchange* between learners (students) and the people they serve" (1990b, 67, original emphasis).

For some academics, accustomed as they are to rigorous definitions and the pursuit of reliable distinctions, this lack of specificity was disturbing. However, from at least one perspective, traditional academic rigor was beside the point: service-learning was not so much a phenomenon to be analyzed as it was a movement to be built. What was most important was to identify useful examples of academic initiatives that expressed the "values" Stanton identified. Since the AAHE series intended to demonstrate that "there is probably no disciplinary areas where service-learning cannot be fruitfully employed to strengthen students' abilities to become active learners as well as responsible citizens" (Zlotkowski 1997), it would necessarily have to bring together programs from disciplines with very different traditions and nomenclature. One rigorous definition would not fit all.

On the other hand, for the series to have any illustrative as well as practical value, some congruity had to be expected—and was expected in three key areas. The series would include academic programs, courses, and activities (1) that focused on engagement with underserved groups, or organizations and projects focused on issues of the common good; (2) that included structured reflection activities on service-related as well as discipline-specific concerns; and (3) that respected the needs, interests, and concerns of the community partner. Thus, although the approximately two hundred programs and courses described vary considerably in the degree of explicit attention they pay to each of these constituent features, there nonetheless does exist a general philosophical consistency throughout at least the first twenty volumes. (The twenty-first volume was overseen by a different general editor than were the first twenty volumes.) At a minimum, agreement on the importance of working within a conceptual frame that reflected these three features helped ensure a distinction between service-learning and both traditional community service and traditional preprofessional fieldwork.

However, in other respects, the existence of variations in understanding and practice only made the series more interesting. Two variations in particular deserve notice: (1) the way in which a given course or program construes the relationship between traditional academic and community-generated knowledge and (2) the sophistication of its reflective practice.

With regard to the first variation, we find instructors for whom work in the community serves essentially as a demonstration site for knowledge generated primarily or even exclusively in the classroom. In this case, the value of service-learning lies in the opportunity it affords students to test and confirm their academic mastery. In contrast to this approach, we find other instructors for whom the community experience actually generates new knowledge. Service activities do not so much clarify, emphasize, and certify what already has been learned in the classroom as they do complement, question, and qualify such knowledge. The incident described by Bacon may be seen as an example of this approach.

Clearly this second alternative represents the more pedagogically risky and epistemologically radical approach. By implicitly redefining what counts as "expertise," it acknowledges the limits of academic knowledge as well as the limits of the individual instructor's competence. In this way, it opens the door to a far more complex and substantive reciprocity between the academy and the community. However, even the first, more conservative alternative embodies many of the principles of effective learning and teaching that educational researchers have begun to stress. For example, summarizing "what we know ... about higher learning itself," Peter Ewell (1997, 4-5) includes among seven key findings: "Direct experience decisively shapes individual understanding" and "Learning occurs best in the context of a compelling 'presenting problem'" (original emphasis). Among his "parallel insights" about "the kinds of setting and techniques that foster such learning effectively," we find "Approaches that emphasize application and experience" and "Approaches that emphasize linking established concepts to new situations" (original emphasis).

The second variation that deserves notice concerns the degree to which an individual instructor *deliberately* extends his or her academic agenda to include what the University of Utah calls "socially responsive knowledge" (1998). Of course, to some degree, every project profiled in the series can be said to do this simply by virtue of its engaging students in activities that address an unmet community need. Furthermore, every project also includes reflective activities that seek to turn simple exposure into a deliberate learning opportunity. However, the degree to which instructors are willing to place "socially responsive" knowledge on a par with "foundational" and "professional" knowledge (University of Utah 1998) differs enormously. In some cases, the practice and goals of reflection remain so closely tied to issues of technical mastery that the civic dimension of the project is all but overshadowed. Processing the service experience results in intentional learning that is only marginally different from what would occur in the case of private sector work. Elsewhere, however, we find a well-developed approach to using the service experience to identify and develop skills of democratic participation.

In a 1998 report, the American Political Science Association's Task Force on Civic Education in the 21st Century concluded, "We . . . take as axiomatic that current levels of political knowledge, political engagement, and political enthusiasm are so low as to threaten the vitality and stability of democratic politics in the United States" (636).

Insofar as one accepts this finding *and* accepts that the academy has at least some responsibility for addressing it, service-learning curricula that deal more substantively with "socially responsive" knowledge are clearly to be preferred over those that implicitly relegate such knowledge to a marginal position. For as Russ Edgerton noted in his 1997 "Higher Education White Paper" for the Pew Charitable Trusts, higher education's record is weakest in what Edgerton called the "new civics"—"literacies in science and technology, literacies in global awareness and foreign languages, literacies in dealing with diversity, and giving meaning to the words 'us' and 'them'" (37). Nevertheless, as was pointed out with regard to the relationship between community experiences and new knowledge generation, even the less developed approaches to reflection included in the series represent a notable advance over normative higher education practice.

#### Course Design

In a section in *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* entitled "The Leader's New Work" (1990, 341), Peter Senge asks us to imagine what our role would be if the "organization" we are responsible for—whatever it might be—were "an ocean liner, and [we were] 'the leader.'" He then reports that the most common answers he receives are "captain," "navigator," "helmsman," "engineer," and "social director." Each of these, he admits, has some validity, "but there is another [answer] which, in many ways, eclipses them all in importance": "the *designer* of the ship." To be sure, Senge's frame of reference here is not higher education. Nonetheless, his stress on the importance of design as fundamental to the "Leader's New Work" speaks perfectly to the pedagogical needs of the academy at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Charles Schroeder (1993, 22) implicitly makes the case for a heightened awareness of pedagogical design when he notes:

As faculty, we have generally espoused the common belief that students learn and develop through exposure—the *content* is all-important. We have been accustomed to a traditional learning process where one who knows (the teacher) presents ideas to one who does not (the student). Many of us prospered under the traditional lecture system, where the focus was on coverage of material through teaching by telling. This approach may work for us but it may not work for the majority of today's students. (original emphasis)

In an article on "Restructuring the Role of Faculty" (1994, 20), Alan Guskin, former chancellor of the five-campus Antioch University System, goes a step further, maintaining that "the primary learning environment for undergraduate students, the fairly passive lecture-discussion format where faculty talk and most students listen, is contrary to almost every principle of optimal settings for student learning."

This, of course, is not to deny the very real value of traditional pedagogical strategies in some contexts, for some purposes, for some students. Clearly there is no single strategy that will work all of the time "for the majority of today's students." But if traditional lecture, discussion, lab work, and individual research projects continue to serve a useful purpose in some circumstances, others call for more recently developed strategies such as collaborative learning, problem-based learning, learning communities, and community-based learning. What this, in turn, implies is that any instructor seeking to maximize learning for the majority of his or her students must deliberately *design* curricula to do so. (For a related discussion, see Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience" in this volume.) If there is any one pedagogical certainty, it is that focusing on content delivery to the exclusion of all other considerations holds little prospect of meeting the needs of twenty-first-century higher education.

Taking the concept of pedagogical design to a new level of significance may well be the single most important contribution the series can make to today's dialogue on educational reform. Since service-learning, as a subset of experiential education, can be directly related to the work of David Kolb (1984), it can be said to provide faculty with a natural variety of ways to engage students in the learning process. Whether students access that process most effectively through abstraction, experimentation, immersion, or reflection—key stations on Kolb's circle of experiential learning—it allows faculty to honor all student learning styles. In this way, it does not so much demand that instructors abandon the use of lecture and discussion as it does insist that they supplement and complement them with other, more inductive activities.

Countless course models in every one of the twenty-one volumes demonstrate just how mistaken the notion is that service-learning denies the importance of traditional teaching skills and renders traditional teaching goals irrelevant. Indeed, if anything, these models demonstrate how service-learning raises the bar for effective teaching in general. Formal demonstrations of mastery, as evidenced by tests and papers, are paired with more proficiencybased outcomes—the ability to teach concepts and skills to others and to create products of demonstrable social value. Engagement as measured by attendance and class participation is balanced by engagement as evidenced by initiative and unstructured problem-solving.

One goal of this expanded spectrum of learning opportunities is to increase student motivation, and enhanced motivation is, in fact, one of the themes that recurs most frequently across the series' volumes and individual course models. As Jeffrey Simmons (2000) explains in an essay in the biology volume:

Service-learning enhances motivation in several ways: 1) it makes topics relevant to students by involving them in an issue, 2) it helps them gain a sense of ownership of a project or issue, 3) it satisfies the urge many students have to do something tangible and positive ..., 4) it gives them an opportunity to gain the satisfaction of performing community service, and 5) it demonstrates that knowledge is useful. (26)

Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters (1997) echo this observation in their introduction to the composition volume as does James Ostrow (1999) in his introduction to sociology. Essays in communication studies (Bergstrom and Bullis 1999) and political science (Palazzolo 1997) underscore the specific ways in which linking a research methods course to community-based problem-solving can transform a dreaded requirement into a breakthrough understanding of the importance—and the potential power—of research methodologies. (For a related discussion, see Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the Introductory Course" in this volume.)

# Service-Learning and Other Progressive Pedagogies

A not-infrequently heard academic complaint voices frustration with the seemingly endless list of new concerns and teaching strategies faculty are now expected to incorporate into their courses. To a considerable extent, these complaints are valid. Aware of the challenges posed by cultural and demographic shifts, administrators and other academic leaders do indeed demand that faculty keep abreast of promising responses to these challenges. The real problem is that these responses are often introduced in a sequential, piece-meal manner. As Ewell (1997, 3) points out, "This means that often-significant investments of time and resources, however well-motivated, don't fit together very well." One of service-learning's most promising features is that, far from

representing merely another discrete innovation, it can function as a way of organizing a variety of progressive pedagogies into a new educational gestalt.

For example, "Applying Service-Learning to the Problem of Prejudice: A Psychology and Theater Course" (1998) by Stevenson Carlebach and Jefferson Singer demonstrates how service-learning naturally leads to cross-disciplinary collaborations, while at the same time linking active learning strategies with learning about diversity. Indeed, the fact that such a large percentage of community-based projects involve activities with underserved children makes service-learning an especially effective vehicle for diversity work across the curriculum. In the process of developing and demonstrating discipline-related skills, students are simultaneously exposed to a range of cultures and demographic groups that they learn to understand and to respect. To be sure, diversity work in and through service-learning requires careful preparation and focused attention. Nevertheless, it does not require that a free-standing "diversity unit" be added to faculty and student agendas.

Luther Brown's essay in the biology volume (2000) not only shows how this can be done in the context of a biology-based program; it also shows how effectively service-learning can be used to structure and unify an entire curriculum. In his essay Brown describes George Mason's Bahamas Environmental Research Center located on Andros Island, a "field station" designed to model "post-colonial" behavior by working reciprocally with the local community. Because the work of the field station is deliberately organized around projects co-sponsored by that community, its biology-based operations do not funnel students into areas of narrow specialization but lead them instead to link their biological interests with course work in geology, geography, cultural studies, art, English, and human ecology.

In "Community and Compatibility in the York River Watershed" (2000), Christine Brown and Samuel McReynolds describe another kind of servicebased coherence, namely, a joint biology-sociology project undertaken in collaboration with the residents of York, Maine. In this case, interns from the Departments of Life Sciences (DLS) and Social and Behavioral Sciences (DSBS) served "as liaisons between [the University of New England (UNE)] and various community groups in the Town of York. They also coordinated activities with students and faculty in four courses regularly offered at UNE: Community Organization and Research Methods in DSBS, and Invertebrate Zoology and Microbial Ecology in DLS. All four are upper-level courses for majors" (85). Thus, the project functioned both as an extended learning community and as a sophisticated demonstration of the possibilities of collaborative learning: "The interns presented the project and background information to the students in the conventional courses ... helped instructors train their students in the techniques required to participate in the project ... [and at] the end of the semester . . . collated and analyzed the results which were then presented to the classes involved as well as to the university community as a whole" (85). As a result, "greater scientific literacy" developed "among social

science participants and an understanding of sociological research techniques among life science students" (90).

Two other especially interesting models of service-learning as a vehicle of curricular coherence appear in the engineering and management volumes. In the former, Edward Coyle and Leah Jamieson (2000) describe Purdue's Engineering Projects in Community Service (EPICS) program, a "track of courses [spanning] freshman through senior year, with freshmen and sophomores registering for one credit per semester and juniors and seniors registering for one or two credits each semester" (60). Thus, the EPICS program not only fosters "horizontal" integration, with teams drawing on a variety of engineering and nonengineering disciplines; it also fosters "vertical" integration as students from different stages in their academic careers learn to learn from each other.

In the management volume (2000), Christine Lamb, James Lee, Robert Swinth, and Karen Vinton present an initiative that they describe as a "systematic integration of a developmental service-learning agenda into the business curriculum" (167). In this arrangement, service-learning informs both "(1) the first course taken by first-year business students, the Freshman Seminar; and (2) the last course taken by undergraduate business students, the Senior Seminar, which also constitutes the capstone course" (169). In the former, service-learning

is introduced in the context of the stakeholder model that emphasizes the interconnectedness of businesses and legal, regulatory, sociological and competitive environments. Students are asked to personalize the stakeholder model by identifying their primary and secondary stakeholders. Discussion focuses on students' roles as stakeholders in the college, university and community. They examine businesses that have been recognized as doing well by doing good, and discuss the role of business in promoting healthy communities. (170)

In this way, the students' first-year service experience is designed to serve as preparation for a course of study that eventually leads to a

business capstone course in which students are required to apply concepts, skills and values mastered in the business core courses (management, marketing, finance and accounting) to strategic analyses of a variety of firms, including not-for-profit. The structure of the course is similar to that of the Freshman Seminar; however, as a capstone course it requires that students engage in activities at a strategic and integrative level.

... Each team initiates a semester-long project with a local not-forprofit organization. Occasionally, students select agencies with which they have worked in their freshmen assignment. Using discipline-specific skills, students conduct a strategic analysis of their client organization and make strategic recommendations. At the end of the semester, they present their findings and recommendations to the whole class. Each team's final report and recommendations are forwarded to its partner agency....

Thus, while freshmen engage in a short-term, awareness-building experience, seniors engage in a long-term, strategic application. (172)

That service-learning should foster such multifaceted and yet integrative learning experiences is not at all surprising. After all, as service-learning practitioners and many others have repeatedly pointed out, only in the academy do problems occur in discrete disciplinary compartments. In the world off-campus, it is only natural that different courses and disciplines should have to work together. It is, indeed, a testimony to service-learning's ability to facilitate such experiences that it is ever more frequently serving as the context for capstone courses across the curriculum. As Harold Ward (1999), editor of the environmental studies volume, notes with regard to the natural compatibility of service learning (SL) and environmental studies (ES):

An ES/SL experience can bring ... segregated material together. At the same time, it can help students identify gaps in their backgrounds, and thus assist them in course selection. Often, after an ES/SL experience, students are more willing to undertake the challenge of courses they avoided before because of intimidating reputations (e.g. chemistry, economics). In many programs, the ES/SL experience, usually in a senior seminar or a thesis, is a device to integrate the entire major as a "capstone" experience. (5)

Across the twenty-one volumes, Ward's observation is echoed in many disciplinary contexts (e.g., accounting: Ravenscroft, 1998; nursing: Workman, Davis, and Anderson, 1998; women's studies: Gilbert, 2000). It seems safe to predict that the number of programs using service-learning in this way will continue to grow.

### Conclusion

Although it has by now become less common for faculty and administrators to confuse academic service-learning with traditional community service, it is still very common—even among service-learning practitioners—to view service-learning as a pedagogical strategy to be accepted and implemented on an individual course basis. To be sure, it can be implemented in this way, and its broad academic applicability is perhaps the primary "lesson" of the AAHE series. However, as I have attempted to suggest throughout this essay, to conceptualize service-learning only in terms of individual course design is to overlook its potential as a vehicle of general curricular reform, as a way of addressing a variety of pressing educational and institutional needs. As Ewell notes in "Organizing for Learning: A New Imperative" (1997, 3):

Our limited success in actually improving collegiate learning . . . is the result of two important attributes of most of the approaches that we've up to now tried:

- They have been implemented without a deep understanding of what "collegiate learning" really means and the specific circumstances and strategies that are likely to promote it....
- They have for the most part been attempted piecemeal both within and across institutions. (original emphasis)

Because well-designed service-learning activities naturally and effectively lead to a deeper understanding of the learning process even while they provide an opportunity to create larger units of curricular coherence, they can be seen as addressing directly the very handicaps Ewell identifies.

Furthermore, as Ira Harkavy warns in the history volume (2000, 28): "In its 'classic' form, service-learning can function as a pedagogical equivalent of 'exploitative' community-based research." In other words, our failure to move in the direction of a more comprehensive, multifaceted approach to service-learning may leave our attempts at community partnering too fragmented to achieve meaningful *social* results. In that case, failure to achieve greater integration would not only be academically shortsighted, it would also be morally indefensible.

For these reasons, developing a more multifaceted, comprehensive approach to service-learning may well be *the* cutting edge of contemporary service-learning theory and practice. One is here reminded of Boyer's now famous description of the "New American College" (1994, A48):

This New American College would organize cross-disciplinary institutes around pressing social issues. Undergraduates at the college would participate in field projects, relating ideas to real life. Classrooms and laboratories would be extended to include health clinics, youth centers, schools, and government offices. Faculty members would build partners with practitioners who would, in turn, come to campus as lecturers and student advisers.

Although Boyer nowhere explicitly uses the term "service-learning," there exist few more eloquent formulations of its academic and social potential. That potential, however, is clearly tied both to the "deep understanding" of learning Ewell (1997) proposes and to the comprehensive implementation strategy he advocates. Perhaps someday we will view AAHE's twenty-one-volume series in the same way we view early nineteenth-century maps of North America—a pioneering effort to identify the basic contours of a new continent, but an effort as important for the agenda it set as for the achievements it documented.

# 12 The Disciplines and the Public Good

Edward Zlotkowski

**G** The Disciplines and the Public Good" is the third—or, if one includes "Mapping New Terrain," the fourth—essay in which I explore the relationship between the academic disciplines and civic/community engagement. Indeed, because of my work as editor of the American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) series on service-learning and the academic disciplines, I was asked as early as 1999 to contribute essays on this topic both to a special research-focused issue of the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (2000) and to Tom Ehrlich's (2000) edited collection Civic Responsibility and Higher Education.

Because these pieces were written in 1999–2000, they had to, of necessity, focus more on the why than the how of the disciplines' relationship to public work. By 2005, however, when "The Disciplines and the Public Good" appeared as a chapter in Adrianna Kezar, Tony Chambers, and John Burkhardt and Associates' Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Views from a National Movement, it really was possible to talk about a "national movement," and the work being done in and through the disciplines was certainly one of its centers. My initial interest

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "The Disciplines and the Public Good," in *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement*, ed. Adrianna J. Kezar, Tony C. Chambers, John Burkhardt, and Associates, 166–186 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley, 2005).

in undertaking the AAHE series was based on the recognition that, whether or not one saw the current disciplinary organization of the academy as a good thing or as a liability, one needed to deal with it and, if possible, exploit whatever opportunities it presented.

This was not always a popular position, and not a few individuals, some well known, suggested that working within a disciplinary culture that had overseen and legitimized the withdrawal of higher education from active civic engagement and public problem-solving represented a betrayal of both the scholarship of engagement and underserved communities. My position, however, was that we had no alternative. The "national movement" was at the stage of trying to build critical mass, and critical mass—the number of faculty involved—would never be achieved if engaged work were seen as foreign to the very structures and concerns by which faculty were defined.

However, regardless of whether one approved or disapproved of this strategy, there can be no doubt that it yielded results. Between 2000 and 2005 several developments took place that brought the national civic engagement movement to a new level. First, as a direct result of its interest in capitalizing upon the AAHE series, Campus Compact developed an initiative sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts to create resources on the level of the academic department. National, regional, and institutional institutes helped bring the possibilities of community-based academic work to the very units within which most faculty worked. Second and at the other end of scale, the first decade of the new century saw the full emergence of a wide variety of organizations and initiatives designed to provide targeted multidisciplinary areas with a set of resources far more extensive than those the AAHE series alone could provide.

Both these developments are discussed in the present essay. With the spread of engaged departments and the models now available in the natural sciences, the arts and humanities, engineering, and the health-related disciplines, to name but a few, service-learning and the scholarship of engagement in general had achieved a currency that it would have been hard to imagine only ten years earlier.

Were one to ask most faculty about forces threatening the future of the academic enterprise, one would, in all likelihood, hear a lot about inadequate funding, public misconceptions, vocationalism, or insufficiently prepared incoming students. But the significance of these external threats may be in some ways misleading. While they are real, they do not account for a less discussed but more pervasive problem at the very heart of the contemporary academy. As Thomas Bender (1993) writes in the concluding essay of his book *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States*: The integrity of academic intellect is not endangered by competing discourses of social inquiry [i.e., nonacademic modes of analysis and assessment]. The risk now is precisely the opposite. Academe is threatened by the twin dangers of fossilization and scholasticism.... The agenda for the next decade, at least as I see it, ought to be the opening up of the disciplines, the ventilating of professional communities that have come to share too much and that have become too selfreferential. (143)

In other words, if one is concerned about the health of the academy, one would be well advised to focus less on threats from without and more on the danger of solipsism within. And such solipsism—"fossilization," "scholasticism," "self-referential[ity]"—perforce implies a critical examination of the role of the disciplines.

The importance of recognizing the disciplines as strategic leverage points in any discussion of the academy and the public good would be hard to overestimate. Their influence, through their organization into academic departments, is immediately apparent to anyone who looks at the structure of the modern college or university. On an institutional level, it is the department rather than the administration that determines *how*, if not actually *what*, policy decisions are implemented; on a cultural level, the agenda of a faculty member's discipline often takes precedence over her or his commitment to institutional priorities. In other words, as important as presidential leadership and institutional mission are with regard to issues of civic engagement, they cannot in most instances achieve even modest goals without paying careful attention to the culture of discipline-based departments. (See, for example, Elison 2002.)

### In the Beginning

In the early years of the modern American university, linking the work of the disciplines to issues related to the public good would have been self-evident. In an essay entitled "Service-Learning, Academically Based Community Service, and the Historic Mission of the American Urban Research University," Ira Harkavy (2000), director of the University of Pennsylvania's Natter Center for Community Partnerships and a historian by training, points out that a "tradition of problem-driven, problem-solving strategic academically based community service" (30) is immediately evident in the histories of schools like Johns Hopkins University, the University of Chicago, Columbia University, and the University of Pennsylvania around the turn of the twentieth century. Thus, as Bender (1993) notes, "When the graduate school at Columbia, the Faculty of Political Science, was established in 1881, it was intended, as the name suggests, to reform our political life, our civic life, our politics" (130).
But it was not only the faculties at the new universities that saw issues of the public good as central to their work. As many of those faculties began to be organized into professional associations, those associations themselves especially in the new social sciences—clearly saw the public and its problems as germane to who they were and what they aspired to do. In an afterword to *Cultivating the Sociological Imagination: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Sociology* (1999), Carla Howery, then deputy executive officer of the American Sociological Association, observes:

The very roots of American sociology dovetail with service-learning. In 1906, Lester Frank Ward helped found the Society to bring scientific attention to social problems, and became the first president of the American Sociological Association (then American Sociological Society). Our field has always espoused the interplay of theory, research, application, and reformulation, as an ongoing and iterative process. (151)

Howery's linking of her discipline's, and its professional association's, "very roots" with the concept of public service would hold true for many other disciplinary organizations.

Which is not to deny those roots are in need of serious stimulation. For as Howery goes on to remark, "Service-learning is the right topic to help sociologists to rediscover their disciplinary roots" (155). Whether the "right topic" is service-learning, public problem solving, participatory action research, applied research, professional service, or the public intellectual, clearly most contemporary disciplines—working through both their national and their regional associations as well as through individual academic departments—have for many years prioritized interests, values, and standards identified exclusively by their members over more public concerns. They have, in the terminology of William Sullivan (1995), sacrificed "civic professionalism" to "technical professionalism," creating in the process an ethos in which "public service can only appear as an admirable but accidental feature" (11) of the main work at hand.

### Recommitments

There is, however, some reason to believe that questions of the public good may once again be returning to a position of importance—even within the traditional academic disciplines. Ernest Boyer, who did so much to open up the idea of what counts as scholarly work within the academy (1990), also provided the key concept needed to renew and legitimize ties between the disciplines and society in general. That concept is "the scholarship of engagement" (Boyer 1996):

At one level, the scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems.... Campuses would be viewed by both students and professors not as isolated islands but as staging grounds for action.

But at a deeper level, I have this growing conviction that what's also needed is not just more programs, but a larger purpose, a larger sense of mission... Increasingly, I'm convinced that ultimately, the scholarship of engagement also means creating a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other, helping to enlarge what anthropologist Clifford Geertz describes as the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life for all of us. (19–20)

Scattered across the academic landscape, one can now identify many specific developments that reflect this idea of a scholarship of engagement—both in the form of specific programs and as a cultural ethos.

To be sure, not all these developments explicitly identify themselves as efforts to promote the public good. Take, for example, a statement by the Association of American Geographers (AAG) included in the first volume of Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam's The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty (1995). At the end of a section on "outreach," the association suggests, "The ability and propensity of geographers to grapple with real problems is a disciplinary strength.... Geography departments should ensure that their departmental and institutional reward systems weigh such contributions accordingly" (40). Such a position would seem to be primarily concerned with faculty well-being. However, in the statement's next section on "citizenship," the association makes an important distinction between "professional citizenship" and the "fulfillment of *civic* responsibilities" (41, original emphasis). Although the latter has "no place in faculty reward evaluations," the former-including outreach activities "grounded in disciplinary knowledge"-clearly does, leaving room for faculty to claim public problem solving as an activity legitimately deserving academic recognition.

In the same volume, we also find the "Report of the American Chemical Society Taskforce on the Definition of Scholarship in Chemistry." The report's introductory section explicitly recognizes that "forces at work in higher education . . . are calling for institutions of higher education to be more responsive to their roles of teaching students and providing various kinds of community service" (Diamond and Adam 1995, 48) and that these forces establish the context within which the following report must be read. Drawing directly on the work of Boyer, the report asserts that "although research is [always] scholarship, not all scholarship is research" (52). Indeed, the very health of the discipline demands that much more attention now be paid to "a new area that we refer to as the scholarship of outreach" (53). Recognizing the degree to which this new

area diverges from what has come to be the accepted norm for scholarship within chemistry departments, the report concedes that interest in outreach is both "of vital importance" and "relatively new and undeveloped" (53).

While the Diamond-Adam volume focuses on changing approaches to what constitutes acceptable scholarship, a volume compiled five years earlier by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (then the Association of American Colleges) consists of disciplinary statements dealing with the undergraduate major. But *Reports from the Fields* (1990), despite its different focus, yields many analogous statements on the importance of public engagement. For example, one of the recommendations made in a report sanctioned by the American Psychological Association reads as follows:

We recommend an additional component for all undergraduate majors in psychology. An interpersonal skills and group-process laboratory is included in all of our proposed models in order to develop students' abilities to work in groups. Whenever possible, we recommend that this laboratory (or the senior year applied project) be combined with a community-service component.... Supervised community service can instill a sense of responsibility that is critical for informed citizenship while addressing a broad range of human needs. (163–164)

Here, on the undergraduate level, the line between "professional" and "civic" is much less sharply drawn. Study of the discipline goes hand in hand with "informed citizenship."

In the case of a statement made by a task force of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, study of that discipline goes hand in hand with "an understanding of how science can make major contributions to a free society" (11). Indeed, since "most of the critical problems society faces have a biological component" (19), the task force goes so far as to suggest, "If biologists are unable or uninterested in acquainting themselves and the millions of undergraduate students with the natural world that controls the destiny of all life on Earth, the value of biology departments to education in the liberal arts stands in question" (16). Environmental education and environmental awareness are disciplinary imperatives.

### **Concrete Resources**

But if it is increasingly easy to find signs of public awareness in the more programmatic statements of many disciplinary groups, there remains a great distance between the statements of those groups and the actual practice of their members. For many faculty, indeed, for most faculty at four-year institutions, disciplinary and institutional recognition remains securely tied to traditional research. At the same time, the challenge these academics see themselves facing in their teaching is not how to integrate into their courses a broader societal perspective but how to achieve sufficient "coverage." If individual faculty members are to come to embrace the public good as an important dimension of their work, they will need more than general pronouncements to help them do so.

At least two major initiatives of the last decade have attempted to provide just such concrete assistance. Early in 1995, a new faculty-based organization under the aegis of Campus Compact called for the development of a series of volumes on service-learning in individual academic areas. Responsibility for funding and organizing the series quickly passed to the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), largely due to the leadership of then vicepresident Lou Albert. By 2000, the project as originally conceived had reached completion. AAHE's eighteen-volume series on service-learning in the academic disciplines was the largest publication project the association had ever undertaken.

Drawing upon the talents of 400 contributors from every sector of higher education, the series explored both theoretical/contextual and practical issues involved in linking academically rigorous course work with projects involving the public good. English instructors explored a variety of literacy-related initiatives in community-based organizations. Biologists described not only course-based environmental research but the creation of supplemental science resources for public schools. Accountants discussed the many ways in which participation in the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program (VITA) could provide both a teaching resource and a public service. The medical education volume took the idea of service-learning to the professional school level. Volumes in peace studies and women's studies demonstrated the relative ease with which new interdisciplinary areas could frame syllabi organized around public issues.

Since completion of the original set, new volumes in religious studies; lodging, food service, and tourism; and architecture/urban planning have been added to the series.

However, far more important than the volumes themselves are the many ways in which these publications have either contributed to or, in some cases, actually precipitated related undertakings in and through the disciplines. Thus, the political science volume, *Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Political Science* (1997), added timely momentum to the American Political Science Association's (APSA) renewed interest in civic education—an interest perhaps most strikingly concretized in the association's appointment of a special Task Force on Civic Education for the Next Century (1996).

Meanwhile, the teacher education volume, Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Teacher Education (1997), quickly led to a follow-up volume, Service-Learning in Teacher Education: Enhancing the Growth of New Teachers, Their Students, and Communities (2001), while the Spanish volume, Construyendo Puentes (Building Bridges): Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Spanish (1999) just as quickly led to Juntos: Community Partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese (2003). A new professional journal in composition and rhetoric (Reflection: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy); an independently published volume in economics (Putting the Invisible Hand to Work: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Economics (2002); a service-learning faculty fellows program in management studies; and countless sessions at national and regional disciplinary conferences can also be linked to the AAHE project.

A second important resource also owed its conception to Campus Compact. Thanks to a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Compact in 1999 launched an initiative to explore systematically what it called the "pyramid of service-learning." As the Compact conceived of this pyramid, colleges and universities can be seen as embodying one of three stages of civic engagement. At the beginning stage, engagement efforts are loosely organized and have little bearing on the institution's academic mission. At the advanced stage, an institution can be identified as an "engaged campus," that is, a campus that has embraced service-learning, community-based research, and civic engagement as essential to who it is. In between, there exists a broad intermediate stage at which many of the key structures that make possible an engaged campus are put into place. One such structure is the "engaged department."

For several summers beginning in 2000, the Compact ran a variety of Engaged Department Institutes—at the national level via a competitive application process, at the state level for the California State University System, and for individual institutions (e.g., Portland State University, Miami–Dade College). However, regardless of focus and venue, the purpose, structure, and format of the institute remained the same. Over a two- or three-day period, depending on the time available, departmental teams each consisting of a chair, several faculty members, and a community partner of the department's choosing came together to create a profile of and action plan for civic engagement. Over the course of the institute each team tackled four key issues:

- 1. Unit responsibility for engagement-related initiatives
- 2. Departmental agreement on the concepts and the terminology that would allow faculty most effectively to explore the dimensions of engaged work
- 3. Departmental agreement on how best to document, evaluate, and recognize the significance of engaged work
- 4. Strategies for deepening the department's community partnerships

Unlike the AAHE series on service-learning in the disciplines, the Engaged Department Institutes did not focused exclusively on service-learning although, very often, service-learning turned out to be the engagement tool of choice. Instead, teams explored in various combinations service-learning, internships, capstone projects, applied research, participatory action research, professional service, and other kinds of campus-community collaborations especially wellsuited to a given department's interests and skills and its off-campus community's particular needs and priorities.

The approximately 100 departmental action plans that the institutes facilitated represent perhaps one of the best examples to date of how general disciplinary statements like those cited above can be operationalized on the department level. Like the AAHE series on service-learning in the disciplines (now available from Stylus Publications), the *Engaged Department Toolkit* (http://www.compact.org/publications/)—a strategic development tool any department can use on its own—constitutes an essential resource for every higher education institution seeking to promote the scholarship of engagement. For as Deborah DeZure (1996), assistant provost for Faculty and Organizational Development at Michigan State University, has noted, even strictly academic initiatives—for example, traditional faculty development programs—need to take the self-referentiality of disciplinary cultures deliberately into account. Centralized efforts

while useful in many ways . . . are often underused by faculty, rejected by many as too remote from their disciplinary teaching concerns. For many faculty, *teaching* means *teaching history* or *teaching music* or *teaching biology*. For them, instructional development should become more disciplinary, engaging these faculty by exploring issues of teaching in the context of their departmental expectations and their disciplinary values and modes of discourse. (9, original emphasis)

In short, colleges and universities seeking to renew their social contract with the larger community need to create "resource units" deliberately targeted to specific departments and disciplines or interdisciplinary areas. These resource units should include

- Models of successful courses, programs, and projects from other, comparable institutions
- Texts that explore an academic area's historic and contemporary commitment to civic engagement
- Contact information for engaged colleagues at the local, regional, and national levels
- Information on discipline-specific opportunities to present on and to publish engaged work

- · Information about funding opportunities for engaged work
- · Opportunities to bring relevant presenters to campus

No doubt, assembling such resource units for every academic department represents a serious investment of time and energy. However, the alternative may well be a more or less permanent stasis whereby only the "usual suspects" actively participate in engagement efforts, while the vast majority of the faculty continue with business as usual.

Recent publications like Kevin Kecskes's *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good* (2006) offer hope that the importance of cultivating civic engagement through department-based initiatives will continue to win everwider recognition.

Not surprisingly, Kecskes is director of Community-University Partnerships at Portland State University, one of the first schools in the country to embrace the scholarship of engagement. Thanks in part to the visionary leadership of then president Judith Ramaley, the university recognized from the start the compelling logic of adopting an institution-wide engagement strategy rather than relying on individual faculty "volunteers." Ramaley (2000) has since distilled some of what she learned about winning faculty support for "activities that promote civic responsibility and sustain campus-community engagement" (12) into an article entitled "Embracing Civic Responsibility." She notes that, in her experience, "10 to 15 percent of the faculty or staff on [any given] campus already have a broad repertoire of interests ... consistent with the full realization of engagement." A second group, roughly double in size, has "a genuine interest in new ways of doing things but want clear signals [of support] ... if they venture into new territory, in this case, literally, into the community." Group three, approximately the same size as group two, sees the new agenda as a fad or institutional whim, "certain [to] disappear when the new president/provost/dean moves on to greener pastures." Finally, there is "a small number (maybe 10 percent) of the faculty or staff ... certain that the new agenda or the new modes are not legitimate faculty work" (12).

According to Ramaley, each of the last three groups has its own distinctive barrier to participation. What is most relevant to the present discussion is the barrier holding back group two: "The boundary between the committed [group one] and the cautious [group two] is defined by a *disciplinary barrier* and discipline-based definitions of research and scholarship" (12, original emphasis). If Ramaley is correct in her analysis, the single most important step any institution can take to move beyond merely the "usual suspects" to a healthy base of 30 percent to 45 percent participating faculty is to lower the disciplinary barrier. In the pages that follow we look briefly at several broad disciplinary areas where especially effective resources are now available to help institutions in this task.

## **Outstanding Disciplinary Resources**

### The Engaged Discipline

Perhaps no national disciplinary association has more effectively or enthusiastically embraced the scholarship of engagement than the National Communication Association (NCA). Beginning with its co-publication of the communication studies volume in the AAHE series, NCA staff and elected officers have demonstrated how vision, commitment, and organizational know-how can enable a discipline to appropriate and contribute to the national conversation on "creating a new [academic-civic] compact for the next millennium . . . a compact [that] could energize and reorganize the talent and power we possess for the common good and for maintaining the support of our constituencies" (Applegate and Morreale 1999, ix).

NCA's strategy for helping its members appreciate the importance of such a compact has had at least three broad dimensions. First, at the level of national and regional programming, the association's leaders have skillfully created forums that allow communication studies scholars to define engagement in a way that derives from and conforms to their own disciplinary culture. Luckily for NCA, communication studies and engagement do indeed exist in a "reflexive relationship" (Applegate and Morreale 1999, xi) that sees theory and praxis, the study of communication and efforts to improve it, as complementary aspects of a single whole. Still, one should not underestimate the skill it takes to put this "reflexive relationship" squarely in front of influential individuals and to transform a disciplinary commonplace into a principal of action. Meetings with "divisional leaders . . . elected association leadership, and journal editors" (Applegate and Morreale 2001, 9) require of engagement advocates more than logistical planning. They also require a willingness to invest political capital.

A second key aspect of NCA's strategy has involved the creation of specific resources to help its members succeed in their engaged teaching and research. Particularly noteworthy in this respect is the "Disciplinary Toolkit" (Conville and Weintraub n.d.) the association commissioned and disseminated to support service-learning in communication studies. Complementing the AAHE communication studies volume, the toolkit includes units on such practical items as managing risk, understanding terms, getting started, reflection, assessment, and frequently asked questions. It also includes a bibliography, a list of helpful websites, and summaries of model courses from across the communication studies spectrum, together with relevant contact information. The product of a special subcommittee, the toolkit is only one of several special initiatives launched to help ensure that engaged work in communication studies really exemplifies quality scholarship, in Boyer's expanded understanding of the term.

The third dimension of the association's engagement strategy also can be considered a resource, but a resource of a very different nature. In 2000, NCA entered into a formal partnership with the Teaching Tolerance project of the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC). The partnership, which was called Creating Common Ground, called for communication studies scholars to utilize Teaching Tolerance curricular materials in designing service-learning partnerships with K-12 classrooms and nonprofit organizations across the country. Thus, it brought together two highly complementary sets of interests and strengths. On the NCA side, it offered a ready-made platform for the practice and study of diversity-related communication issues. Participating individuals and departments gained access to a potentially rich professional opportunity through their national disciplinary organization. On the SPLC side, it provided an opportunity to increase the impact of the Teaching Tolerance project by enlisting a whole new group of instructor-facilitators. Schools and organizations that might otherwise lack the personnel or the expertise to sponsor a Teaching Tolerance program could now team up with communication studies faculty and students from a nearby college or university. In short, the NCA-SPLC partnership pioneered a whole new kind of disciplinary outreach, one that combines the advantages of centralized organizing and training with unit flexibility and sensitivity to local needs and considerations.

#### Sector Focus

An analogous but different kind of disciplinary resource can be found in Community Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), located at the University of Washington. Founded in 1996, CCPH "promotes health through partnerships between communities and higher educational institutions." The fact that "community" precedes "campus" in the organization's name is no accident. Partnerships, specifically partnerships in which the community has a powerful voice, are the "tools" CCPH uses in its efforts to improve "higher education, civic engagement and the overall health of communities" (http://www.ccph.info/ ).

At the same time, CCPH has been both vigorous and creative in attending to the needs of its academic constituencies. Fully committed to the value of service-learning, community-based research, and professional outreach, it has helped to provide a wide range of discipline-specific as well as interdisciplinary resources for those working in health-related disciplines. It was, for example, CCPH that co-sponsored both the nursing and the medical education volumes in the AAHE series. It has also reached out to over thirty disciplinerelated associations in the health area, seeking to collaborate with professionals not just in nursing and medicine but in dentistry and dental hygiene, pharmacy, public health, allied health, physical and occupational therapy, and other, related fields. Through its national and regional conferences, its publications, and its links to health-related programs and agencies, it has promoted the scholarship of engagement more extensively than almost any other organization of its kind. Parallel to CCPH, Imagining America (IA) is a "national consortium of colleges, universities, and cultural institutions dedicated to supporting the civic work of university artists, humanists, and designers" (http://www .imaginingamerica.org). Located at Syracuse University, IA provides members with a variety of resources to facilitate engaged arts and humanities programming. These include networking opportunities (e.g., conferences), publications, site visits, and public advocacy. The University of Washington's public humanities institute for graduate students, the University of California–Irvine's Humanities Out There program, the Arts of Citizenship Program at the University of Michigan, and other, similar initiatives at universities and colleges from coast to coast document IA's success in building a coalition of schools committed to innovative civic programming. As founding IA director Julie Elison has noted (Fall 2003), the kinds of projects IA features and facilitates

change higher education by testing the ability of a campus to sustain major partnerships and pushing it to adapt to the realities of innovative practice. Such examples offer rallying points for artists and humanists who are eager to learn from one another across nations and continents and also are resolutely committed to local alliances. Integrating these two aims—local engagement, global engagement—is the trick. (2)

Since, for the most part, the humanities (as opposed to the arts) have not been leaders in exploring how higher education can more effectively and directly serve the public good, IA's efforts help to address a special need in the larger engagement movement.

Another academic sector less than well represented, at least until recently, in the contemporary engagement movement is the natural sciences. Despite the kinds of statements cited earlier by organizations like the American Chemical Society and the American Institute of Biological Sciences, faculty in disciplines like chemistry, biology, and physics have not, for the most part, seen the call to reexamine the academic-social contract as relevant to the way in which they view their work and their responsibilities. Not only do many feel locked into course sequences and research agendas that appear to leave little room for "nonessentials"; they also have to deal with an engagement movement whose language and social issues frequently fail to resonate with their own disciplinary traditions.

Hence, the importance of Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER) launched by the Association of American Colleges and Universities with funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF). According to David Burns (2002), principal investigator for the program, "SENCER is a national dissemination program seeking to improve learning and stimulate civic engagement by teaching science through a growing collection of complex, capacious, largely unsolved, civic issues, issues that interest large numbers of students" (20). Unlike Community Campus Partnerships for Health and Imagining America, SENCER focuses less on academycommunity partnerships and more on the kind of problem- or inquiry-based learning that science and math reformers have favored for years. In this case, however, the problems to be addressed necessarily include a public or civic dimension that helps students, to return to a distinction made above, move in the direction of "civic" as well as "technical" professionalism (Sullivan 1995).

SENCER also lacks the kind of fiscal and organizational self-sufficiency CCPH and IA have achieved. Nevertheless, its NSF funding lends it considerable disciplinary legitimacy, and its Web-based resources argue for potentially widespread impact. By 2008, thirty SENCER course models were available for downloading, from courses focused on biomedical issues related to HIV/ AIDS, tuberculosis, and human genetics to courses focused on environmental issues (e.g., energy use, global warming, and toxic brownfields) to courses drawing directly on the mathematical sciences (such as the application of statistical probability to civic issues) (http://www.sencer.net/Resources/pdfs/ Models\_Print\_Web\_2004/Abstracts.pdf). Each in its own way, CCPH, IA, and SENCER demonstrate the kind of sensitivity to disciplinary cultures and practices that is essential if the larger engagement movement is to succeed.

#### Institutional Program Model

Still another kind of special disciplinary resource can be found in the Engineering Projects in Community Service (EPICS) program created by faculty in the College of Engineering at Purdue University. Although the creation of a single institution, EPICS has become a national resource both through its own replication program and through the lead role it has played in a series of national and regional workshops on service-learning in engineering. Through both these outreach efforts, the concept of community-based projects in engineering has been brought to institutions from MIT to the University of Texas, El Paso, from Georgia Tech to the University of Washington.

Organized around interdisciplinary (both within engineering and between engineering and other disciplines), technology-based projects, EPICS fields student teams that work to address specific public needs until those needs have been adequately met. In other words, EPICS projects are not limited to a single semester or term. Instead, they are passed from one student cohort to the next until they reach genuine closure. Completed projects include

- Creation of a Web-based program of standardized housing plans that allows future Habitat for Humanity homeowners to choose their own building design
- Construction of a "life-size camera" for Happy Hollow Elementary School

- Creation of various "Imagination Stations" for the local children's museum (the stations help children understand such things as principles of magnetism, electromagnetism, speed, and mechanical gearing)
- Design and construction of a variety of devices to help disabled children at the Wabash Center Children's Clinic, for example, devices to improve body posture and develop motor skills (for a summary of all completed projects, see http://128.46.121.174/delivered\_projects/)

Apart from the intrinsic educational and community value of projects like these, what has made the EPICS program so successful is the way in which it has capitalized on a reform movement within the engineering education community. In 1998, ABET, the accrediting body for schools of engineering and technology, issued *Engineering Criteria 2000*, a document calling for a far more inclusive, broad-based set of competencies for those graduating from engineering programs than has traditionally been the case. Among the competencies ABET now calls for are such things as "an ability to function on multidisciplinary teams; an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility; an ability to communicate effectively; the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context; and a knowledge of contemporary issues" (Tsang 2000, 2).

It is to criteria like these that EPICS can respond far more effectively than most standard engineering curricula. Communication skills, teamwork, professional ethics, and community awareness are as essential to the success of EPICS projects as is technical engineering know-how (http://128.46.121.174/ about/overview.htm).

Hence, it might be more accurate to identify Purdue's EPICS program *and* ABET's *Engineering Criteria 2000* as together constituting a special disciplinary resource. For although they can function independently, in tandem they provide engineering educators with both a discipline-specific motive and a discipline-specific means to reformulate the relationship between their field and the public good. It is, indeed, hard to see how one could make a stronger case for civic engagement in and through a discipline's own culture.

But, of course, not all engineering programs are rushing to emulate EPICS—or to meet ABET's new criteria in a way that focuses on the common good. Indeed, many engineering educators still see such nontechnical demands as irrelevant to or even subversive of the discipline's core work. What hope is there, then, for other disciplines where no accrediting body calls for reform and no extra-academic interest group—such as engineering firms—exists to demand a less parochial course of study? Are the disciplines, and the disciplinary associations that represent them, capable of rising to the challenge of rethinking and rewriting the academic-civic compact, or must we instead limit ourselves to strategies designed to bypass them?

#### Conclusion

The gap between the traditional academic disciplines and an engaged campus has been well described. Elizabeth Minnich (1996) contrasts the "professionalized" disciplines at the heart of the campus with a "new academy" consisting largely of interdisciplinary or area studies—establishing itself at the campus's edge, where the nonacademic community begins. Julie Elison (2002) makes an analogous distinction when she speaks of the "two professional cultures for liberal arts faculty in American research universities: the dominant departmental culture and the culture of engagement" (1). Despite variations in the specific players assigned to each of the two sides, the fundamental point of tension always remains more or less the same: relatively self-contained disciplinary pursuits versus reciprocal academy-community partnerships.

As the present essay illustrates, the disciplinary camp is hardly monolithic. Not only do professional societies like the National Communication Association, the American Studies Association, and the Conference on College Composition and Communication housed within the National Council of Teachers of English actively support the engaged scholarship of their members, but many faculty in traditional disciplines—especially those not teaching at research-intensive institutions—have embraced the idea of engagement and made it a part of their own disciplinary culture. While the culture of research universities is certainly very visible and very influential, it does not dictate much of what happens at community colleges, minority-serving institutions, faith-based liberal arts colleges, and even some regional universities. Indeed, many of the faculty teaching at these schools have long since let their national disciplinary memberships lapse precisely because the agenda of their national societies reflects too narrowly the culture of research universities and comports so poorly with their own interests and priorities.

Still, there can be little doubt that the dichotomy Minnich, Elison, and others refer to represents a significant barrier to renewing American higher education's compact with civil society. What then is one to do? However much one might wish it were otherwise, the traditional academic department continues to be central to the vast majority of our colleges and universities. At the very least, we must concur with an observation the historian Howard Zinn (1996) once made of sociopolitical reform in general: "Nothing will happen anytime soon. People have to enlarge their time perspective . . . People give up. But you can't do that."

But we can do more than grit our teeth and persevere. If this essay has any practical lesson for leaders both inside and outside higher education, it could probably be summarized in a single, simple observation: since the disciplines, and the intellectual power they embody, are not going to go away anytime soon, our efforts to build an engaged academy will have to include them. This means we will need to make much more of a serious investment in working with them than we have until now. Many of the initiatives described in this essay represent both useful starting points and invaluable resources. However, many of them also struggle for the kind of funding that would significantly increase the effectiveness of their work. This is something national funders, public and private, should take to heart.

But perhaps even more importantly, the colleges and universities that could benefit so much from the increased efficacy of these initiatives need to be much savvier, much more deliberate in how they press for reform. They need to develop and implement the kinds of change strategies and political skills we tend to associate with industrial and community organizing. They need to make the kinds of resources identified in this essay part of a carefully formulated plan to move beyond centralized engagement efforts. For many institutions, such a plan would probably yield significant results much sooner than one might expect.

# 13 Opportunity for All

Linking Service-Learning and Business Education

Edward Zlotkowski

o area of higher education has responded less enthusiastically to the opportunities and challenges of community and civic engagement than the business disciplines. To people not in those disciplines, this often seems puzzling. After all, don't community-based organizations offer business students countless opportunities to utilize marketing skills, create practical documents and electronic resources, rationalize personnel and financial procedures, and get more substantive hands-on experience than any other kinds of organization are likely to afford them?

Indeed, wasn't it Peter Drucker (1993), one of business education's most revered sages, who wrote that "the community that is needed in postcapitalist society [Drucker's term for where global but especially Western countries are headed]—and needed especially by the knowledge worker has to be based on commitment and compassion rather than being imposed by proximity and isolation" (174, original emphasis). At an Academy of Management (AoM) conference I attended in the late 1990s, Drucker was one of the featured speakers, and one of the points he made was that the organization of the future would undoubtedly resemble the flat, flexible profile of community-based organizations more than the formal hierarchies of

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Opportunity for All: Linking Service-Learning and Business Education," *Journal of Business Ethics* 15, no. 1 (January 1996): 5–19. Reprinted with kind permission of Springer Science and Business Media.

most contemporary for-profit companies. Drucker, of course, received a standing ovation—but there is little evidence his comments made many in his audience of management educators more receptive to the educational potential of working closely with community-based groups.

Why is this? To some extent it is a function of the cultural gap that divides the business disciplines from the rest of higher education. C. P. Snow (1959) may have popularized the gap that exists between the arts and the sciences, but on many campuses that between business and everything else is even more formidable. In fact, the very term "community-based" is a case in point. For many, if not most, business faculty, "community" refers to the "business community," not to organizations and groups working to promote the public good. In other words, even the nomenclature of civic engagement can seem like a foreign transplant.

"Opportunity for All" argues that this need not be the case and explores several substantive ways in which service-learning experiences can be especially useful to business faculty and students. Since its publication in a special servicelearning-focused issue of the Journal of Business Ethics in 1996, many business faculty have demonstrated this through their courses and research, and despite the field's general lack of enthusiasm for this kind of work, there is no dearth of examples of quality course models. Indeed, in 2005, the Academy of Management's online journal, Academy of Management Learning and Education, published its own special issue on service-learning. Included in the issue is a dialogue I had with Andrew Van de Ven, a former president of the AoM, in which we discuss some of the ways in which service-learning and reform efforts in management education would seem to complement each other. Since then, Van de Ven (2007) has published an award-winning blueprint for such reform, his Engaged Research: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research, in which he again acknowledges such complementarity. Since more American college students major in business than in any other field, and community-based organizations often lack precisely the kind of expertise business programs specialize in, this acknowledgment—coming from such a highly respected figure—may perhaps help service-learning in the business disciplines develop some of the traction it has heretofore lacked.

## Educational Reform for the Twenty-first Century

We believe that because of the increasingly complex environment in which business operates, business schools must give more consideration to whether they have an appropriate balance between an internal and an external focus....We were somewhat surprised that this did not seem to be as salient an issue as we thought it should be. Part of the reason may be that it is more of a subtle and diffuse issue than some other curriculum issues, but that does not mean that it is any less important. In our opinion, failure to address it in a more head-on fashion now will likely generate more pressure to do so in the not too distant future. (Porter and McKibbin 1988, 85)

Thus Lyman Porter and Lawrence McKibbin (1988) register their sense of the growing need for business schools to deal more effectively and directly with the "external legal/social/political environment" of business. Nor is this the only place where the two authors address this issue. In their concluding set of recommendations, they point out that "senior executives in the business world" registered concern that "business school students tend to be rather more narrowly educated than they ought to be": "From this perspective, business schools seem to be turning out focused analysts, albeit highly sophisticated ones, adept at measuring and calculating the probabilities of certain outcomes, but, at the same time, graduates who often are unwittingly insensitive to the impacts of these outcomes on factors other than the 'bottom line.' This is a view with which we ourselves strongly concur" (316).

To counter this trend, Porter and McKibbin suggest that

[business]/management school faculties, in their responsibilities for the undergraduate education, ought also to concern themselves with the education of the whole student. They should proactively engage their colleagues across the campus to help ensure that business students come away from 4 years of acculturation in the university with exposure to a wider range of issues and ideas than is true of the typical business school graduate today. (316)

The same recommendation is made for students in MBA programs insofar as these students have not already had "this kind of exposure to breadth in their baccalaureate degree programs" (317).

The Porter-McKibbin report is not, of course, the only statement of its kind calling for greater breadth in contemporary business education.<sup>1</sup> What makes it especially noteworthy is its comprehensiveness and provenance, having been both sponsored and published by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Still, the report's dispassionate call for

<sup>1.</sup> See, for example, the articles by Williams and Lynton cited later in this essay. As James W. Schmotter (1992), associate dean of the Johnson Graduate School of Management at Cornell, has noted, "Hardly a month passes without a new article in the business press lamenting the narrow, overly quantitative focus of graduate business curricula, the irrelevant research done by business schools' faculty members, and the inability of graduates to grapple successfully with the nation's economic problems" (A44).

greater educational engagement with our "increasingly complex environment" can, from many perspectives, be seen as but one more indication of a general paradigm shift in the direction of institutional—especially academic social awareness and accountability.<sup>2</sup>

At the end of the 1992 annual conference of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), Carol Cartwright, then chair-elect of the AAHE board, skillfully summarized much of what that conference had learned about "restoring the public trust" in higher education. She pointed out that non-academics invited to participate in the conference had confirmed what many academics already suspected, namely, that public trust of and public support for higher education have seriously eroded, that higher education desperately needs to face a growing "reality gap"—a gap between the needs of external society and the academy's own "internal priorities."

But eroding public trust is only one of several problems fed by this "reality gap." As the contemporary writer Wendell Berry (1987a) has pointed out, the fact that "Community is a concept, like humanity or peace, that virtually no one has taken the trouble to quarrel with," has not precluded another fact, namely, that "neither our economy, nor our government, nor our educational system runs on the assumption that community has a value—a value, that is, that counts in any practical or powerful way" (179). Indeed, Berry's concern with our endangered appreciation of community-that socioeconomic unit whose members depend directly upon each other for support and who together comprise a single, self-sustaining whole-finds ample support in the work of many contemporary sociologists. For example, in Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life, Robert Bellah and his colleagues (1985) remark upon the proliferation of a very different kind of social unit-the "lifestyle enclave": "Whereas a community attempts to be an inclusive whole, celebrating the interdependence of public and private life and of the different callings of all, lifestyle is fundamentally segmental and celebrates the narcissism of similarity" (73). In short, one cannot unreasonably conclude that the kind of insularity that has come to characterize not just educational institutions but even individual departments and disciplines may well be preparing students less to overcome than to perpetuate the social and professional fragmentation from which we suffer.

It was at least partially in response to this growing loss of community and higher education's role in abetting it that the "service-learning" movement developed. Encouraged both by organizations specific to higher education, such as Campus Compact,<sup>3</sup> and by governmental programs, such as the Corporation for National and Community Service, the service-learning move-

<sup>2.</sup> For a thoughtful and provocative discussion of the full dimensions of this shift, see Capra 1992.

<sup>3.</sup> For more on Campus Compact's mission and activities, see Morton and Troppe 1996.

ment has gained considerable momentum over the last two decades. Understood most simply as "a specialized form of internship where students work in settings established primarily to meet some social and community need" (Wutzdorff 1993, 33), service-learning projects can be included in any creditbearing course in the standard curriculum. However, what distinguishes service-learning from internships in the usual sense is not only its relationship to the curriculum and its prioritization of "meeting some social and community need" but also its utilization of pedagogical strategies that promote reflection on the social dimensions of the need being met as well as the learning process itself.<sup>4</sup> Thus, in describing service-learning programs, Jane Kendall, editor of Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service (1990), has offered the following, more specific definition: "Service-learning programs emphasize the accomplishment of tasks which meet human needs in combination with conscious educational growth.... They combine needed tasks in the community with intentional learning goals and with conscious reflection and critical analysis" (20). What such programs aim at is the development of skilled, socially aware, lifelong learners.<sup>5</sup>

Despite the obvious appeal of such a goal, the connection between the service-learning movement and business education has not been as strong as one might expect. As the examples cited in this essay suggest, there have been several promising developments.<sup>6</sup> And yet, given the compelling external or social *need for* and internal and educational *logic of* this connection, much more could be done. Indeed, the opportunities the service-learning movement offers business education are not dissimilar—or unrelated—to the opportunities offered business education by the end of the Cold War. As Jesse Jackson pointed out in his address at the AACSB's 1993 annual meeting, "To rebuild Russia, [the federal government is] going to put money at the grassroots level and fund programs which train students, business people, scientists and officials in ways of the free market. Something ghetto, barrio, reservation America has never had" (4).

In other words, the logic that recognizes a successful free market system in Eastern Europe as something "in our national security and economic interest" must recognize similar truths here at home—especially in the context of

4. The parallels here to the work of Donald Schön (1983, 1987) are immediately apparent. Indeed, it is surprising that Schön's work has not been cited more frequently by service-learning proponents.

5. For other useful attempts to define service-learning, see Sigmon 1990 and Stanton 1990b. Also of special interest is Barber and Battistoni 1993, where different approaches to service-learning are compared.

6. For examples of programs that link business education and community needs, see the summary entitled "Business Schools Pursue the Business of Rebuilding Urban Economies" (1993). It should, however, be noted that the programs identified in this summary do not necessarily represent "service-learning" in the full sense described above. For still other examples of business education–community linkage, see the "Models" section of this essay. an American workforce in which women and racial "minorities" are rapidly becoming primary players. Furthermore, if the opening up of Eastern Europe can be said to give "American business schools a unique opportunity to redeem themselves" from charges of "narrowness" and "irrelevance" (Schmotter 1992, A44), so the emergence of the service-learning movement, with its emphasis on action wedded to reflection, offers business programs, perhaps even more than liberal arts colleges, an unparalleled opportunity to develop and implement a broader vision right here in the United States.

## An Experience-Oriented Pedagogy

One point on which almost all contemporary critics of business education agree is that, for a variety of reasons, it is imperative that business students learn to deal more effectively with change and ambiguity. As Doyle Williams (1993), past president of the American Accounting Association, has remarked, whereas the traditional approach to accounting education stressed "calculating one right answer," the new focus must recognize the importance of "solving unstructured problems," of "dealing with 'messy' or incomplete data" (78); whereas, in the past, procedural rules and passive absorption of knowledge defined the pedagogical culture, that culture must now be characterized by the "learning process [itself]—learning to learn" (81). And if, indeed, this new approach must prioritize teaching students not what but *how* to learn, it should also "be designed to help them . . . become productive and thoughtful citizens through gaining a broad understanding of social, political and economic forces" (80).

In identifying some of the specific ways in which business professors can achieve these goals, Williams and other critics frequently mention the importance of "case presentations," "role plays," "project teams," and other pedagogical strategies that simulate the practice of the real world (80). Without a doubt, such in-class activities represent important resources. However, by their very nature, such strategies can only approximate the "culture" and complexity of nonacademic situations. It is, perhaps, for this very reason that Ernest Lynton (1993), one of the most perceptive and thoughtful researchers in the field of educational reform, supplemented his endorsement of in-class exercises with an equally strong endorsement of direct practical experience:

The education of future practitioners must help them to recognize the many different factors which affect a given situation, to discover what the real problems "out there" are, to identify available options and trade-offs involved in each, to recognize the limits of what can be accomplished, and finally to make choices and compromises. Such skills, all components of effective critical thinking, cannot be acquired in an abstract fashion. Content and process cannot be separated.... Practical experience, design activities and case studies constitute probably the best way for future practitioners to master the way of approaching and dealing with complex situations. (18-19)

Lynton has chosen his words carefully. What future practitioners need to master is not only how to "deal" with complex situations but also how to "approach" them. They must learn to find and to frame what needs to be done, not just to choose between options in an already delimited field. In other words, effective problem solving ultimately depends upon effective problem identification. For this reason alone, the value of direct, unsimulated experience cannot be overemphasized. Indeed, such experience must be regarded as first among equals, as the ground in which the educational process is conceptually and operationally anchored.

It is not the purpose of the present essay to discuss the fine points of experiential educational theory. Nonetheless, it is important for all that follows that we clearly appreciate the complexity of the issue at hand. For what critics like Lynton and Donald Schön (1983, 1987) understand by the pedagogical potential of practical experience goes far beyond any merely illustrative value. As Lynton (1993) explicitly states:

Currently, clinical periods and internships, if they are used at all, are often placed at the end of the professional major because such practical experiences are viewed as an illustration of previously learned theory. The "new epistemology" described by Schön recognizes that actual practice is much more complex, and consists of repeated iteration between a real situation and applicable but inadequate theory. Hence practical experience (or its simulation) should begin early in the curriculum and be used as a primary learning experience from which generalizations are drawn inductively not only in the practicum itself, but also through concurrent and subsequent classroom work. (19)

Thus experience is called upon to play a primary role throughout the learning process and at all levels of expertise. For a student effectively to master "problem identification" as well as "problem solving," the "messiness" of experience should be part of his or her education from the very start. But where is such experience to be found?

The answer to this question brings us back directly to the potential benefits of linking business education and service-learning. For if it is true, as Jackson (1993) has suggested, that America's own economically underdeveloped communities deserve at least the same amount of attention and concern that has been given to developing communities abroad, and if, at the same time, the education of today's business students is best served by increasing their opportunities for hands-on learning, what we have is a classic case of complementary needs. Indeed, given the kinds of competencies business students must acquire and the kinds of assistance many community-based organizations require, business-oriented service-learning would seem to represent a textbook example of the way in which "serving" and "learning," action and reflection, can be combined for the mutual benefit of all involved. Whether a student is enrolled in a course in entrepreneurship, business policy, marketing research, end-user software, accounting information systems, or personal financial management, he or she will discover no dearth of community-based opportunities to "learn by doing."<sup>7</sup>

## Developing "Soft Skills"

In summarizing their findings on "current criticisms of business school curricula," Porter and McKibbin (1988) introduce a caveat that resurfaces throughout their report:

Thus, an examination of a large sample of critical articles and comments would seem to point to more concern with what is left out of the curriculum or not given sufficient attention as compared with what is given too much emphasis. However, some of the critics who point to various sins of "omission" do not go on to give much consideration to how adding topics and subjects will affect the total length of the curriculum. The critical issue of how to fit an ever-expanding list of seemingly important subject matter areas into a curriculum program of finite length seldom gets addressed head on. (64)

And yet, this problem is not as intractable as might at first appear. Indeed, Porter and McKibbin (1988) implicitly put their fingers on a solution when they come to discuss strategies to improve students' "behavioral skills."

One straightforward approach would be to examine course offerings to determine if there are opportunities in the classroom situation to

7. These examples are not merely hypothetical. Class projects in all these areas have been developed in conjunction with the Bentley Service-Learning Center. (See Kenworthy 1996. Note: During the mid-1990s, the Bentley Service-Learning Project became the Bentley Service-Learning Center.)

It is, moreover, important to stress that business-oriented service-learning projects can be developed for courses on a variety of levels, from introductory accounting courses through graduate policy seminars. Indeed, the Bentley program has found great educational—and social—value in being able to offer students projects appropriate for their level of learning at every stage of their academic careers. The "trick," so to speak, is to develop a database of projects sufficiently large and varied to permit an accurate matching of skills level and project requirements. focus on such skills to a greater extent than is now the case.... A second potential major avenue of attack could be through *out-of-class activities related to the educational program*, especially if they can be connected to classroom situations where these real world experiences can be examined with the assistance of an instructor (and other students) such that guided and focused learning takes place. (324–325, emphasis added)

In other words, instead of remaining trapped in a zero-sum game in which some topic must be dropped if a new one is to be introduced, business educators can begin to address the problem of developing broader social skills through the concept of "value-added" activities. And here we return—from still another perspective—to the enormous educational potential of service-learning.

For if, as we saw in the previous section, community-based projects can provide business students with a variety of technical opportunities, they can also facilitate development of a variety of "soft" skills—without the addition of any new, independent curricular unit.<sup>8</sup> Effective teamwork, cross-functional flexibility, interpersonal and communication skills (with people possessing many different levels of technical sophistication), and multicultural sensitivity are just a few of the more important nontechnical skills community-based projects can naturally foster. Of these, the last deserves special attention.

No one concerned with business and/or business education can be unaware of the growing significance of cultural and demographic factors in the conduct of business. Porter and McKibbin (1988) call the increasing number of working women "the biggest single change that will affect [the American labor force] in the two decades to come" (36). Mark McLaughlin (1989), writing in New England Business, emphasizes the necessity of not just "accepting" but actually "valuing" a diverse workforce: "The successful executive of the 21st century will be the one who not only can acknowledge the ethnic diversity of the workforce as a fact of life, but also can recognize it as a potential advantage over more homogeneous competitors in foreign marketplaces" (43). Indeed, McLaughlin, citing Worth Loomis, president of the Hartford Graduate Center and former president of Dexter Corporation, makes it perfectly clear that what is at stake here is nothing less than a "bottom line" issue: "You're not going to do this [adapt to a diverse workforce] because it's the law or because it's the morally right thing to do or for any of a number of reasons. You're doing it because corporations that don't know how to keep and promote and motivate people from minority backgrounds and women are just not going to have a competitive edge" (44).

8. It could, of course, be objected that such an approach merely "passes down" the problem of insufficient space and time from the program to the course level. However, many pedagogical strategies exist to circumvent this danger.

But how can learning to function effectively within a diverse workforce become for business students a formative part of their education unless they themselves have personally experienced a culture in which such diversity prevails? Surely the predominantly white, middle-class, male-oriented culture of most business schools cannot by itself provide sufficient opportunities for such an experience—even if many business schools now make a sincere effort to open their doors to a more diverse faculty and student population. However, in the culture of many community-based organizations, cultural diversity is the norm, rather than the exception. Here, traditional students will have no difficulty finding black, Latino, and female authority figures with whom they must work and from whom they can learn.<sup>9</sup> For many traditional students, such an opportunity to work in a truly diverse environment, with all the attendant risks of stepping out of one's psychological comfort zone, may represent the single best chance they have to learn to appreciate—and value cultural differences.<sup>10</sup>

#### **Business Ethics**

Until this point, the thrust of our discussion has been essentially practical and pragmatic. This was not unintentional. The potential value of linking business education and service-learning can indeed be calculated with regard to "bottom line" benefits. Whether one focuses on service-learning's ability to provide opportunities for hands-on technical experience or its inherent usefulness as a vehicle for such "soft skills" as personal communications and multicultural sensitivity, one can link effective service-learning programs directly to an enhanced ability to increase profits and productivity.

But service-learning, at its roots, is not only concerned with more effective academic learning and greater sociocultural competence, it is also concerned with ethical concepts such as justice, responsibility, and reciprocity. In other words, one of its fundamental strengths lies in its ability to link "doing well" with "doing good"—and it does so in a way that can appeal to people whose values are positioned across the entire political spectrum—from a progressive demand for equal opportunity and social justice to a conservative

9. Relatedly, as the number of women and minorities in business schools continues to grow, these groups can find in community-based organizations important managerial role models. 10. In their comments on the "international dimension" in contemporary business education, Porter and McKibbin (1988) implicitly provide still another argument for ensuring that students develop sensitivity to cultural diversity. While pointing out that "America's future managers need to understand the degree to which U.S. methods are unique rather than universal and the related ethnocentric character of their own attitudes," they note that these same students "need also to appreciate the pluralist nature of the culture in their own society" (320). In other words, international and domestic "parochialism" go hand in hand.

concern about individual responsibility and local control. Where a Jesse Jackson (1993) speaks of a right to access (3), a William F. Buckley, Jr. (1990) speaks of earned privileges (138). However, both speak a language of moral obligation and active citizenship that lends itself directly to the kind of education service-learning promotes.<sup>11</sup>

One of the main reasons service-learning can exercise such wide appeal is that the two educational variables it brings together are as nondogmatic as they are powerful. Neither actions that alleviate a social need or contribute to the common good nor reflection activities that explore the dimensions and implications of one's community involvement presuppose a specific ideological perspective. Nor is a specific ideology needed to turn that combination of action and reflection into a multidimensional learning experience.<sup>12</sup> In this way, service-learning programs have the potential to contribute profoundly to the development of ethical awareness. As Buckley (1990) wrote with regard to a "National Service Franchise" he proposed: "The last thing one would wish a national service program to promulgate is a regimented society, but it is not regimentation to attempt consciously to universalize a continuing concern for one's fellow men" (152). And he goes on to discuss the importance of nurturing "an ongoing civic disposition," of fostering a "sense of solidarity with one's fellow citizens ... [that] will survive the initial term of service" (153).

But if Buckley and others are guardedly optimistic about the formative power of community-based experiences, there is far less reason to be optimistic about the effectiveness of traditional ethics courses as a stand-alone pedagogical strategy. As Ronald and Serbrina Sims (1991) point out in an article entitled "Increasing Applied Business Ethics Courses in Business School Curricula," considerable skepticism exists as to whether "a course on ethics [can] accomplish anything of real importance" (214). Given the fact that learning to "reason more carefully about ethical problems" and "acquiring proper moral values and achieving the strength of character to put these values into practice" are hardly the same thing (214), this is not surprising. Indeed, over the last few decades, a number of studies have tended to confirm the signifi-

11. It is interesting to note how Buckley picks up on the very point here at issue, namely, the potential coincidence of moral responsibility and preprofessional advantage in service work: "We are talking now about twenty-year-olds, and their increased maturity and experience would not only make it easier to train them for more specialized work than that expected of eighteen-year-olds, there would be time, during the first two college years, to give special thought to the nature of national service work done, with the view to wedding it to the profession the student has in mind to pursue—doctor, lawyer, businessman, accountant, government worker, teacher. It could thus be compatible with internships, field work, etc." (149).

12. In this way service-learning differs from ordinary "consulting opportunities" with nonprofits. An element of "intentionality," present from the start, helps take full advantage of a potentially rich experiential opportunity so that an integrated whole—technical and social, skills-related and values-related—results.

cance of this distinction between ethical reasoning ability and putting values into practice.  $^{\rm 13}$ 

But the fact that ethics courses in and of themselves may not lead to ethical behavior should not be read as a denial of their overall value. Though their isolated effect may be limited, they can still play an important role as part of a larger strategy that seeks to engage the imagination as well as reason. Since

in most instances, undergraduate students enter the business school as sophomores and juniors with practically no exposure to moral or ethical issues in business and society in general . . . business schools must keep squarely in mind the educational situation and background of the undergraduate student and should include in the undergraduate curriculum a variety of experiences which assist in the student's moral development. (Sims and Sims 1991, 215)

As almost anyone who has utilized service-learning assignments and projects can attest, few educational experiences impact students so powerfully as faceto-face engagements with disadvantaged populations. Here is one student's response to his first assignment at a soup kitchen:

I've seen homeless people before and not cared for them. Sometimes I would even laugh at them because I thought it was funny how they looked. But something did happen to me once I left the soup kitchen. I can't explain it though. All I know is that on my way back to the subway I saw a homeless person sitting there with a cup held out for change. He had been in the soup kitchen. Without even thinking of what I was doing I reached in my pocket and gave him my change. Not once in my life have I ever done something like that before.<sup>14</sup>

Regardless of one's opinion of the student's charitable gesture, there can be no doubt that his work among the homeless had resulted in what he himself recognized as a breakthrough personal experience. And if critics like the Simses (1991) are correct in postulating that the "general purpose of the teaching of ethics ought to be that of stimulating the moral imagination" (215), then it is hard to see how business schools can even hope to spur the

14. The quotation is from a Bentley University undergraduate's reflective essay.

<sup>13.</sup> As Michael Lane and Associates (1988) suggest, after referencing a number of studies of the relationship between formal ethics training and ethical behavior, "The literature suggests, then, that a business curriculum incorporating ethics may heighten the awareness of students regarding ethical problems and their ability to think and speak about them, at least in the short run. But there is little empirical evidence to suggest that ethical behavior and decision-making are enhanced through ethical education" (224).

development of an ethical dimension in their students' dispositions without recourse to experiences such as the one that affected this student. Whether one's area of concern is hiring and promotion practices, insider trading, or environmental responsibility, the "bottom line" issue is to get students to take seriously something other than the traditional bottom line—in an educational culture where the latter must, perforce, play a defining role.<sup>15</sup>

Hence, the importance of providing students with more than ethical theory as a counterweight to the sometimes overwhelming logic of the marketplace. Unless business students are given *in the course of their regular assignments* an opportunity to internalize not just arguments but also faces and places, personal stories, and encounters that elicit "a sense of moral obligation and personal responsibility" (215), it is unlikely that they will bring to the rarefied air of corporate America an ethical impulse capable of asserting itself. "Widely admired, successful professionals frequently claim that the formative experiences that made a critical difference in their lives were on the margins of ordinary education and between the conventional niches. Those formative experiences function as rites of passage, transformative and affectively powerful. They are monuments people recall years later to justify their leadership and invention" (Krieger 1990, 6).

Indeed, given the practical bent of most business students, the logic of introducing values-related topics through real-world projects is compelling. The fact that those topics can be contextualized as naturally arising from and naturally allied to concrete discipline-based considerations saves them from the very real danger of being regarded as a formal, artificial aside.<sup>16</sup> If, in addition, one can tap retired business professionals to serve as project partners or project leaders, so much the better. According to Washington, DC's Independent Sector, a consortium of charitable organizations, "the business sector is the fastest growing provider of volunteers" (Atkins 1993, 37). Thus, either through a business school's alumni office or through professional assistance organizations such as the Retired Executive Corps, it should be relatively easy to access professionals who themselves model the connection between

15. The importance of accomplishing this is vividly suggested by research that shows a negative correlation between corporate social performance and senior executive graduate management training: "Formal management training . . . may direct executive attention away from the human dimension of managing the work force. That this concentration on other concerns is not simply a product of hardheaded management thinking is evident in the economic performance of the two groups of companies [studied: socially] progressive corporations were on average more profitable than nonprogressive firms" (Kanter 1984, cited in Useem 1986, 99).

In other words, the decisive distinction here is not between profitability and values considerations but between an educational background more exclusively and an educational background less exclusively focused on profitability. Indeed, one could argue, and many have, that going beyond the traditional bottom line actually enhances profitability, at least in the long run. 16. Key, of course, to success in this area is the care given to planning such projects—including their values-related dimension. technical expertise and a sense of civic and ethical responsibility.<sup>17</sup> When one thinks of an integrated approach to business education, it is hard to imagine a more effective combination than business students working with business professionals on technically relevant community-based projects!

## Obstacles and Constraints

If, then, service-learning has so much to offer business education, the question naturally arises: why has this connection not been made more frequently than it has? Although no hard facts are available, several probable explanations suggest themselves.

Perhaps the most important of these is that much of the momentum behind the service-learning movement has been provided by academics, and concepts, tied to the social sciences and the liberal arts. Psychology, sociology, political science, and expository writing have provided many of the movement's leaders and have helped service-learning become associated with programs linked to terms like civic education, democratic renewal, social justice, social action research, and philanthropy. While none of these terms is in and of itself incompatible with business education, they are also not characteristic of it. Indeed, they seem to confirm rather than bridge the cultural gap that divides the business and the nonbusiness disciplines at many institutions.<sup>18</sup>

What further complicates this picture is the fact that, regardless of disciplinary focus, the terminology of the service-learning movement has been anything but clear and consistent. For many faculty on both sides of the cultural divide, the distinction between "service-learning" and "community service" remains blurry, with the "institutional" and/or "discipline-related" overtones of the concept of faculty "service" adding yet another layer of confusion.<sup>19</sup> And if one does finally succeed in clearing up all of the above, one not infrequently encounters the claim that what is here referred to as "service-learning" merely represents practica and nonprofit internships under another name. Such a claim, by minimizing the importance of service-learning's social and personal reflective component as well as the difference between consulting and

<sup>17.</sup> For example, early in the 1990s, the Bentley Service-Learning Center developed good working relations with both the Support Center of Massachusetts/Accounting Assistance Project and Business Volunteers for the Arts/Boston. Both groups showed considerable enthusiasm for serving as socially responsible role models, sensitive to a professional's need "to give back." 18. For a short but illuminating history of the tensions between business and the liberal arts, see Jones 1986, 124–133.

<sup>19.</sup> The ever more frequent appearance of the "compromise" term "community service learning" has not helped this situation—as if what was needed were a further blurring rather than a confident distinction!

collaborating, undercuts the very real value nonprofit internships have in providing a platform on which to build business students' skills and professional awareness.

Still other factors that have impeded the growth of service-learning in the business disciplines include fear of introducing topics in which the instructor has no educational background or "technical" expertise, uncertainty as to how one can effectively monitor and evaluate community-based assignments, a sense of the irrelevance of nonprofit organizations to a business education, and a strict commitment to the priority of traditional research. Without wishing to deny the legitimate concerns that lie behind these and related reservations, what nonetheless strikes one most forcefully about many of these objections is the divergence of opinion they point to between business practitioners and at least some business school personnel. Indeed, with regard to what is perhaps the fundamental issue dealt with in this essay, the desirability of increasing the range of business students' educational experiences, Porter and McKibbin report that the enthusiasm for reform is rather one-sided:

On the basis of our interviews with senior managers in a variety of corporations and professional organizations, we believe that any move by business schools toward broadening the academic experience of their students beyond the technical and functional will find enthusiastic endorsement by many employers. We are less sanguine about our colleagues in academia—there are many hurdles: inertia, suspicion of motives, departmental prerogatives ("turf"), and the opposition of some faculty members who may themselves have been somewhat narrowly educated. (317)

Or, to take an issue specific to service-learning, the educational value of working with nonprofits, it is again members of the business community who have most clearly insisted on the developmental potential of such work. Writing on the front page of the *Wall Street Journal*, Howard Isenberg (1993), general manager of CCL Custom Manufacturing, has suggested that "three to five years of volunteer work can provide management experience most corporations couldn't provide over 20 years, if it came at all." And why this should be so, Isenberg explains in terms of precisely those symbiotic needs we discussed above:

Nonprofits today need people with real insights into budgeting and cash flow, people who understand how to utilize information systems and create human resources programs....

On the other side of the alliance, corporations have promising young managers who don't get a chance to practice those skills because they are not yet high enough on the management hierarchy. Nonprofit organizations provide corporate volunteers a chance to put their skills to work immediately.<sup>20</sup>

But while practitioners from a variety of sectors continue to make clear their preference for a pedagogy closer to practice, faculty accusations "that the change proponents are 'research bashing' are not uncommon. Some faculty dismiss the whole effort as misguided" (Wyer 1993, 16). In business departments no less than in liberal arts departments, a habit of academic insularity makes it difficult to take advantage of even exceptional educational opportunities that require reshaping traditional thinking.

## Models

"Difficult"—but not "impossible." In the last few years, the number of programs moving to link business education with community awareness, community needs, and community-based learning has grown slowly but steadily. For example, Wharton's undergraduate program begins with Management 100, and the course description reads like an excerpt from this essay:

Leadership in business is all about working in teams, and that's how we structure our program. From your very first semester, you start building teamwork skills in Management 100, the hallmark of your freshman year, where you'll work in a team of 10 students to plan and execute a community service project for a Philadelphia non-profit. Imagine what it's like to throw 10 high school leaders into a group where only one person can be in charge! It's a great lesson in group dynamics and will show you that there's more to leadership than leading. Chances are you'll make some of your closest friends, too. (http:// www.wharton.upenn.edu/undergrad/subPage.cfm?pageID=40)

At the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, all undergraduate business majors are required to take Business 200, a tuition-free communityservice course. However, unlike Wharton's Management 100, this course carries no credit (http://www.stthomas.edu/business/degrees/undergraduate/cur rentstudents/studentlife/servicelearning.html). As the course's informational website explains under the heading "Why We Require This Course": "UST

20. All of which is not to deny that there are important differences between for-profit and nonprofit organizations that must be taken into account. Hence, before its volunteer executives can begin working with community-based organizations, Business Volunteers for the Arts/ Boston insists that they go through a special workshop on nonprofit culture. A similar orientation would be useful for all business service-learning students.

[the University of St. Thomas] and the business community agree that businesses need to be socially responsible for the communities in which they participate. Communities are important stakeholders for every business, and the Business 200 program will increase your awareness of the importance of this partnership as you pursue your degree and prepare for a career."

On the graduate level, the University of Michigan's Global Citizenship program enables most incoming MBAs to participate in a two-day communitybased initiative facilitated both by faculty and by local business executives.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, several schools are moving in the direction of a community-based experience as a mandatory part of their MBA orientation program. In 1992, Louis Corsini, dean of Boston College's Carroll School of Management, announced, "Beginning with a two-day orientation next month, Boston College MBA students throughout their course of study will be exposed to various perspectives on the issue of social responsibility. There will be an ongoing symposium, in which political and corporate leaders present social issues and case studies, and MBA students will take a required capstone course on corporate social responsibility" (7).

Still other important initiatives have been described in a variety of publications.<sup>22</sup> But considering the amount of ink that has been spilled over the last decade on the importance of developing a greater sense of corporate social responsibility, what has been attempted remains but a small percentage of what could be done—and what should be done—from the standpoint of both educational potential and community opportunities.

At Bentley University, administration understanding of both these factors has made possible the development of an institution-wide program that seeks to transcend the possibilities of even the best-designed individual unit or course. By carefully tapping into faculty members' own disciplinary interests and providing them with ample logistical support, the Bentley Service-Learning Center has been able to sponsor community-based course units in all of the college's undergraduate departments—including all of its undergraduate business departments. To date, many thousands of business students and over a hundred faculty members have been involved in service-learning initiatives.<sup>23</sup>

How can one account for such success? The explanation is complex, drawing as it must upon the institution's history,<sup>24</sup> levels of support, and indi-

24. A central concept behind the college's founding was the goal of producing "liberally educated business students" (http://www.bentley.edu/ugcatalogue/liberal-studies.cfm), and to this end it not only sponsored one of the country's first centers for business ethics but also experimented with courses seeking to integrate business and liberal arts learning. Also see Jones 1986, 135–136.

<sup>21.</sup> For a full description of this program, see Mercer 1996.

<sup>22.</sup> See, for example, the January 1996 issue of the *Journal of Business Ethics*; Godfrey and Grasso 2000; and the September 2005 issue of the *Academy of Management Learning and Education*.

<sup>23.</sup> For a detailed description of Bentley's program, see Kenworthy 1996.

vidual commitment. Ironically, however, what may have been the decisive factor was nothing other than sound organizational design. Taking Peter Senge's *The Fifth Discipline* as its conceptual starting point, the program's leaders deliberately attempted to build a "learning organization," a structure and a culture within which the needs and the creativity of all stakeholders were constantly recognized and leveraged. What this amounted to in practice was the "enshrinement" of three operating principles: inclusiveness, entrepreneurship, and flexibility.<sup>25</sup>

"Inclusiveness" meant, among other things, that all potential stakeholders were included in initial efforts to inventory needs and resources. Every college department, academic and nonacademic, as well as representative community agencies, was not just invited but encouraged to contribute ideas to the new undertaking. One lasting benefit of this strategy was that it allowed the emerging program continually to form new collaborations and working groups as need arose. Thus the burden of mounting any major initiative was shared and made more manageable.<sup>26</sup>

At least as important as inclusiveness was "entrepreneurship." For the logic of the emerging program never favored centralized control. Indeed, rather than asking faculty members how they could support service-learning, the governing question was always how service-learning could support them, that is, strengthen, deepen, and enhance the pedagogical outcomes they themselves identified as desirable. From the very start, the program won academic legitimacy because it was deliberately founded to serve academic interests. Furthermore, such a prioritizing of academic interests seemed to be the only way to ensure the program's long-term health. Unless it was able to tap into those sources of energy and creativity that spring from the faculty's professional commitments, it would not be able to count on their best efforts.

Finally, there was "flexibility." What this entailed was, first of all, an emphasis on voluntary participation—and the creation of those circumstances that would promote such participation. Thus, for example, faculty members were encouraged to consider a variety of structural options in designing service-learning course components, from "mini" projects that established an almost casual community connection in an otherwise standard class to optional service "tracks" where students could choose to pursue community-based work in lieu of more traditional assignments to major initiatives around which an entire class was organized. Other manifestations of flexibility included a range of strategies for supporting multilayered reflection and careful

<sup>25.</sup> For a more extended discussion of the program's utilization of these principles, see my "Service-Learning as Campus Culture" (1993).

<sup>26.</sup> Many of the reservations raised elsewhere about the difficulty of launching service-learning initiatives have been addressed by such collaborative arrangements. For example, at Bentley the active participation of the Behavioral Sciences Department has provided assistance both in facilitating reflection and in designing tools for assessment.

attention to the degree of personal involvement a faculty member's professional priorities would allow in any given instance.

Initiatives such as Bentley's and those of the other institutions mentioned here and elsewhere in the literature (see note 22) represent an important and promising foundation on which American business schools could establish a new educational culture, a culture that acknowledges business education's responsibility to frame its students' development in a broader social context as well as the educational potential of community-based projects. By linking management skills and community needs, by bringing together concrete action and guided reflection, business schools could collectively constitute an invaluable resource for promoting the public good through entrepreneurial efforts in a market-based society.

When, moreover, one adds to this curriculum-linked work a number of other, more consulting-type initiatives focused on inner-city needs,<sup>27</sup> it becomes clear that the time has come to begin developing a national network of business-oriented service-learning educators able and willing to share strategies, tools, and results. Syllabi from business courses with community-based components or options, techniques for orienting faculty and students to nonprofit issues, strategies for faculty-agency collaboration, approaches to assessment and evaluation—these are just a few of the items that could be gathered to create a database able to generate and facilitate ever more effective business school–community agency partnerships.

#### Conclusion

In an article entitled "The New Management: Business and Social Institutions for the Information Age" (1990), William Halal, a professor of management at George Washington University, postulates that we are now in the midst of a worldwide "managerial revolution"—a revolution encompassing "business, government, and all other institutions" (41).<sup>28</sup> Of the various aspects of the "new management" Halal identifies, most—a rededication to quality and service; less hierarchical, more flexible structures; more participatory leadership—have long since begun to emerge as central features of a new business paradigm.

<sup>27.</sup> Such consulting efforts may or may not be formally linked to an academic program, and most of them do not offer any structured reflection on nontechnical issues. For a good example of this kind of effort, see Cowan 1994, which describes a new initiative led by Michael Porter of the Harvard Business School.

<sup>28.</sup> Halal is, of course, only one of many writers who have explored the contemporary challenge to traditional institutions. It is interesting to note that two of the most thoughtful nonbusiness texts to investigate this area, Capra 1992 and Bellah et al. 1985, arrive at conclusions that are fundamentally compatible with Halal's.

One development, however, a shift in institutional values toward "multiple goals," has remained more "illusive":

The notion that business should serve broader interests beyond sheer profit-making remains an illusive goal . . . because there seems to be a prevailing belief that a tough focus on money is essential to survive the dog-eat-dog world of commerce. The profit-motive has become enshrined as an immutable belief in capitalism, attaining the status of a sacred cow transcending logic. . . .

This is unfortunate because the evidence shows that the concept of a social contract not only serves all needs better—it also enhances profit. (46)

It is also unfortunate because, according to Halal, it helps perpetuate a government-business relationship wherein government is viewed primarily as a "civilizing counterforce" (51) to corporate social indifference.

But as the trends described earlier toward redefining corporations as a coalition of interests become more prominent, opportunities should appear for fundamentally changing this adversarial business-government relationship. If corporations were to assume a broader democratic role in which they were governed to serve all constituencies instead of investors alone, they would absorb the social impacts of the firm to become self-regulating. The net effect might be a major decentralization of economic control.

Thus we arrive back at the place where we began: the imperative of finding—in business-oriented institutions—an appropriate balance between what Porter and McKibbin (1988) describe as "an internal and an external focus" (85). Whether that balance comes from without, imposed by the "external legal/political/ social environment," or from within, the result of a new internalization of social considerations within business organizations, it will have to be achieved. By exploring and exploiting the potential of service-learning to help their students develop on a variety of levels—technical, interpersonal, and ethical—business schools can themselves play a leading role in deciding how.

# 14 Emerson's Prophecy

John Saltmarsh

In the late 1990s, a number of disciplinary associations had become attentive to service-learning as a potent pedagogical practice that had relevance for their members. This was true with the American Historical Association, which co-sponsored the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) volume in the series Service-Learning in the Disciplines. The essay "Emerson's Prophecy" was part of the history volume in the series, Connecting Past and Present: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in History, which appeared in 2000. Indicative of the interest in community-based teaching and learning in the discipline, in 2001, a number of the authors who contributed to the volume presented a session at the annual meeting of the Organization of American Historians on "Academics and the Community: Teaching History through Service Learning."

Since the late 1990s, interest among historians and other faculty in the humanities has continued to grow, particularly as humanities scholars have raised questions about both revitalizing the liberal arts and improving undergraduate teaching and learning. William Cronon's 1998 essay "Only Connect...: The Goals of a Liberal Education," is indicative of the need to rethink both the outcomes of a liberal arts education and the kinds of practices that will achieve the desired outcomes.

This chapter was originally published as John Saltmarsh, "Emerson's Prophecy," in *Connecting Past and Present: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in History*, ed. Ira Harkavy and William M. Donovan, 43–60 (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000).

Additionally, the national association Imagining America has taken a leadership role in advancing the public purposes of the arts and humanities. Its 2008 publication Scholarship in Public is representative of the ways scholars in the arts and humanities are thinking about their disciplines, their roles as scholars, and the kinds of changes that are necessary in higher education to be able to connect the arts and humanities to larger public issues as a means of revitalizing the liberal arts and having their disciplines contribute to a public culture of democracy.

Action is with the scholar subordinate, but it is essential. Without it he is not yet a man. Without it thought can never ripen into truth.... The preamble of thought, the transition through which it passes from the unconscious to the conscious, is action. Only so much do I know, as I have lived. Instantly we know whose words are loaded with life, and whose not.

-Ralph Waldo Emerson, The American Scholar, 1837

## A Noble Dream and the Scholar's Reality

In my training to become a professional historian of American culture, Emerson's 1837 essay "The American Scholar" was part of the canon. That training, in the late twentieth century, is governed by a culture of specialized knowledge and techniques for reaching interpretive conclusions by means of rules of evidence and inference. It adheres to an empiricist conception of historical scholarship through which the historian's task is the rigorous reconstruction of the past through careful examination of the documentary and material record. It is a training that includes internalizing the central, sacred ideal of "objectivity"—"that noble dream"—a creed that provides scientific legitimacy to scholarship, elevating the historian's role as a neutral and disinterested scholar (Novick 1988). Objectivity, observes Parker Palmer, "keeps us from forging relationships with things of the world. Its modus operandi is simple: when we distance ourselves from something, it becomes an object; when it becomes an object, it no longer has life, it cannot touch or transform us, so our knowledge of the thing remains pure" (1998, 51–52).

I was trained to become the American scholar that Emerson prophesied—a scholar whose intellectual work would be dispassionate and detached, one who resisted connecting thought with action. Emerson's essay issues a call for reform of education that argues, writes his biographer, for the "superiority of the whole person to the specialist who accepts the divided self as a necessary effect of the division of labor" (Richardson 1995, 264). Consistent with professional socialization is the teaching of Emerson's essay as a document in American literary nationalism, a lament of America as derivative of European culture, and a declaration of American cultural independence.
We were not invited to interpret the text as a mirror of our training, recognizing that Emerson "was not so much interested in separating America from its European past as he was in separating the individual from his incapacitating education" (Richardson 1995, 264). Training as a professional historian carefully neglected the central argument of the essay and studiously ignored Emerson's admonition that the true scholar would have to remain grounded in the world.

The historian's cult of objectivity lies at the heart of Emerson's prophecy that the American scholar was becoming a divided self, the whole person giving way to the disconnected specialist, the organic unity of both self and knowledge being dissipated, with knowledge and morals occupying separate stations in the scholar's life. In contemporary terms, and by that I mean specifically within the culture of higher education since the end of World War II, Emerson's prophecy is manifested in models of knowledge based upon scientific epistemology emphasizing the detached, rational, analytic observer as the highest judge of truth (Bender 1993). The professional academic's oath of allegiance is to an abstract notion of truth, without commitments, claiming scientific detachment and neutrality. It is a formula for disengagement. Within the historical profession, a shift toward engagement or "relevant" scholarship has been met with a defensive fervor and resistance that makes a virtue of irrelevance (Novick 1988, 417).

Even as the incursions of postmodernism drove the historical profession into an epistemological crisis in the 1980s and 1990s, the reaction has been retrenchment to a position of deeper disengagement instead of a reasoned critique that could open the door to engaged pedagogy. The reaction has been so strong that a new professional organization has emerged, "The Historical Society," to repudiate the relativistic and ideological implications of postmodern theory and techniques and to express dissatisfaction with postmodernist trends within the traditional professional associations, the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians (Keylor 1999). So strong is the cult of objectivity that the debate, or the crusade as it has a tendency to be presented, has been polarized to the simplistic extremes of defense of the virtues of rationality, objectivity, detachment, and respect for documentary evidence on one side and the falsity inherent in a framework of impure inquiry shaped by biases of race, class, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation on the other side. The argument is presented as if there were no legitimate ground for historians who repudiate both the relativist implications of postmodernism and the profession's deep incapacity to engage the past through the present, to enrich historical understanding for a wider public audience and public purpose, and to making history come alive for students.

In the church of professional academics, where, as Saul Alinsky once wrote, "the word 'academic' is synonymous with 'irrelevant'" (1946/1969, ix), the teaching of a history course incorporating community-based experience is

heresy, pure and simple. For many, it has often meant distancing themselves from their profession's roots and strictures. The sociology of this distancing has both personal and political dimensions. For some, their professional academic lives have been incomplete because their personal values are disconnected from their professional lives. They want their teaching to have a purpose, and they recognize that "good teaching cannot be reduced to technique: good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher" (Palmer 1998, 10). Questions of engagement "are not irrelevant," writes one historian, "especially to mid-career academic baby boomers typically ambivalent about turning to the past but increasingly anxious over where we seem to be headed, reluctant to slip into the free fall of disbelief offered by their thirtysomething postmodernist colleagues-a generation crowding 50 that finds itself, to borrow from Matthew Arnold's 'Stanzas from the Grand Chartreuse,' 'Wandering between two worlds, one dead, / The other powerless to be born'" (Cooper 1999, 782). As Peter Novick has written, challenges to the ideal of objectivity are, for historians, "an enormously charged emotional issue: one in which the stakes are very high, much higher than in any disputes over substantive interpretations. For many, what has been at issue is nothing less than the meaning of the venture to which they have devoted their lives" (1988, 11).

For others, who see history as a cornerstone of the liberal arts, their role as educators is to provide a liberal education that should nurture the growth of human beings who can listen, read, talk, write, problem solve, empathize, and work in a community. Students should have the ability to apply knowledge that leaves the world a better place than they found it. To do so they should be able to make connections, between different bodies of knowledge and experience and between theory and practice (Cronon 1998). Faculty recognize that a liberal education of this kind requires a reorientation of their professional role that goes beyond engaged methods of teaching and learning and connects education to citizenship, recognizing that democracy is a learned activity and that active participation in community life is a bridge to citizenship (Boyte and Kari 1996; Sullivan 1995). In addition to the material of a history course and professional skills in using rules of evidence and methods of interpretation, liberal education elevates as well skills of citizenshipcritical thinking, public deliberation, collective action, and community building (Reyes 1998, 36).

To teach a course in American cultural history that includes communitybased experience as an essential part of the "primary" evidence to be analyzed and interpreted is not simply a matter of redesigning the curriculum. It is a shift that goes to the core of the profession, challenging the historian's view of pedagogy, epistemology, and the profession's sacred tenets. It fundamentally challenges the cult of objectivity. Pedagogy is transformed to connect structured student activities in community work with academic study, decentering the teacher as the singular authority of knowledge, incorporating a reflective teaching methodology, and shifting the model of education, to use Freire's distinction, from "banking" to "dialogue" (1970). A connected epistemology recognizes that knowledge creation is a collective act that includes contributions from those from outside the academy and students as well as faculty. Further, truth is not something that is imparted but is discovered through experience, intellectual and practical. At bottom, the greatest challenge comes down to a core assumption: community-based education and scholarship posit engagement and direct relevance as a counterweight to detached objectivity.

The context for this professional reorientation is often a historical understanding of the evolution of higher education in the twentieth century as well as the emergence of professionalism in American culture (Barber 1998; Bender 1993; Mathews 1998; Sullivan 1995). We are trained within and teach within institutions of higher education whose structure, organization, and scientific culture were created in large part in the postwar period in response to a national crisis defined by the Cold War. Yet the ethos of professionalism and expertise that defined higher education's response to that particular national crisis now contributes to public disillusionment with institutions that represent and legitimize a system that no longer addresses the most pressing national needs. The national crisis at the end of the twentieth century is a crisis in our civic life (Bellah et al. 1985; National Commission on Civic Renewal 1998). Neither institutions of higher education nor our professionalization is oriented to addressing this crisis (Damon 1998).

The issue for many students is, increasingly, how their education relates to this deeply felt crisis. In their educational experience, knowledge has been disconnected from their historical identity. For many faculty the question is how to transform education from detachment to engagement, connecting education to citizenship, incubating the renewal of civil society. The answer to this question begins with providing opportunities for students to connect theory with practice, allowing them avenues for action, recognizing, as Emerson did, that "the final value of action, like that of books, and better than books, is that of a resource"(30). Engaged pedagogy trains historians to become the kind of scholar Emerson envied, discovering that "the world,—this shadow of the soul, or *other me*,—lies wide around. Its attractions are the keys which unlock my thoughts and make me acquainted with myself" (29).

### Approaching History Reflectively

When I read that we had to do 20 hours of community service, I was shocked and could not figure out why we had to do community service for the class....[T]hen I realized the importance of community "involvement" for a history class.... From our lectures and discussions we learned a plethora of information about democracy, individualism and most of all community; however, without the first-hand experience, the words we read in the texts would have had little impact our lives. . . . I had a personal attachment to the meaning of the words. —student, final paper

Throughout the course "Approaches to History: The Individual and Community in Democratic America," we interpreted scholarly works—some of the key texts of American cultural history—and we engaged in community service experiences in the neighborhoods surrounding the university as a way of creating meaning from the past. Through seminars, journals, and written work we collectively searched for a broader understanding of one's connection to history, community, and citizenship in a diverse democracy. The students approached their past by placing themselves in a larger historical narrative to become agents of history and participants in their democracy. The students' mode of knowing was based upon relationships, creating connections between them and their subject, connecting themselves physically, intellectually, and emotionally to the things they wanted to know. Incorporating community service into the curriculum connected thought and action, knowledge and moral behavior, theories and personal identity so that, as one student wrote in her journal, she "had a personal attachment to the meaning of the words" in the texts.

This course was designed specifically to incorporate community involvement with an understanding of the context and development of individualism, community, and democracy in American history. In addition to the assigned readings, students were required to engage in a minimum of two hours per week of community service. This course was offered as the senior seminar in the History Department as a required course for history majors, typically completed in their junior or senior year. The class was composed of fourteen students, eleven of whom were history majors, two who were political science majors, and one who was a sociology major. There were six women and eight men, five seniors and nine juniors.

My original intent was to encourage all the students to become involved in service opportunities through the public school system so that we could share a common dialogue during seminars. By our second meeting the students collectively developed the argument that by engaging in diverse service experiences they could learn more from each other and enrich our common reflection. One student worked as a tutor in an ESL program, one student became involved with a youth program at the YMCA, one volunteered at the emergency room at a local hospital, one worked as a teacher's aide in a local public elementary school, two students paired up as teacher's aides in a local private grammar school, one worked in an after-school program, and five students volunteered their time at a voter information/political research organization. (I worked with an eighth-grade youth in a mentoring program.)

Students completed a "Community Involvement Agreement" by the end of the second week of the term that included a description of the nature of their involvement and the signature of the person who was supervising them at their site. Students kept the original and I kept a copy. At the end of the term, all students had to have their supervisors sign off on the agreement indicating that they had fulfilled their commitment.

Students were graded on their written work and presentations. There were seven elements that made up their total grade, including their journals and their community involvement. The students collectively decided how much each component of the course was worth. During the second-to-last week of the course, one student suggested reassessing the point distribution. Consensus was easily reached that two parts of the course should count for more than originally agreed upon, their community service and their journals (their key reflective writing).

### **Community Service-Learning**

Participating in some type of service was essential to learning what was being taught—applying theory to reality. Service provided a greater depth and understanding of the readings. However, I must honestly admit that I was a bit resentful for being pulled from my narcissistic little world to work for the good of others. I got over it though.

The class could not function nearly as well without active participation of the students. Yeah, sometimes it was a real pain-in-the-neck to give up time for community service and traveling back and forth, but it was absolutely essential for beating some of these ideas into this thick head of mine.

By integrating action with learning, we can *observe* history from "inside" so to speak. As all historians are products of their times, this is almost a *necessity* to be a *grounded* historian who can comment on his times and conditions with the authority of experience.

Many of the ideas and terms we learned would not have come into focus or been believed had we not seen them in action for ourselves.

-Course evaluations

Over the last twenty-five years, community service-learning has found justification in educational institutions both as an alternative pedagogy and as a reform movement aimed at transforming the culture of higher education (Barber 1992; Barber and Battistoni 1993; Kendall 1990; Stanton, Giles, and Cruz 1999). Ernest Boyer placed community-based education at the core of the creation of "The New American College," which he describes as "an institution that celebrates . . . its capacity to connect thought and action, theory and practice" (1994). Community service-learning is a pedagogy of reflective inquiry linking students' involvement in community-based service with their intellectual and moral development. In its most fundamental sense, it is a way of connecting practical experience that meets the needs of a community

with academic study through structured reflection. The pillars supporting this definition incorporate nontraditional pedagogy and epistemology (Palmer 1987). Connecting experience in the community to an academic curriculum requires adopting a reflective teaching methodology that integrates cognitive and affective development, or as bell hooks writes, "ways of knowing with habits of being" (1994, 43). The rich theoretical and pedagogical roots of community service-learning are found in the works of John Dewey, Paulo Freire, Robert Coles, Benjamin Barber, Henry Giroux, Parker Palmer, William Perry, Lawrence Kohlberg, Carol Gilligan, Cecilia Delve, Suzanne Mintz, Greig Stewart, and others (Saltmarsh 1996; Delve, Mintz, and Stewart 1990).

Community service-learning incorporates an educational paradigm, according to philosopher Jane Roland Martin, which "integrates thought and action, reason and emotion, education and life" and "does not divorce persons from their social and natural contexts"—or their historical context (1984, 179–183). It requires a shift in pedagogy and epistemology; the relations of teaching and learning shift from procedural knowing to the collective construction of knowledge; the teacher is decentered in the classroom, facilitating problem-posing education as a model for a dialogic search for knowledge; students become self-directed and reflective learners; and teacher and student engage in a relationship of reciprocity where both are equally committed to creating a context for learning. An orientation toward connected knowing legitimizes learning that takes place outside the classroom, recognizes multiple learning styles, and values learning based in experience.

Since this process of giving up old ways of knowing and learning in becoming a reflective historian can often be discomforting—as one student wrote in his course evaluation, "it was painful in the beginning, but the rewards were great"—a reflective teacher aims at educating the whole student and must be aware not only of what they know but the process of transformation toward becoming someone different from who they are. A reflective teacher ensures that the seminar is a place for growth and struggle as well as a place where knowledge is actively and collectively created. Finally, research on service-learning makes clear that its effectiveness as a pedagogy is directly related to both a close connection of community experience to the material of the course and the quality of reflection that facilitates that connection (Eyler and Giles 1999; Eyler, Giles, and Schmiede 1996; Goldsmith 1995).

### **Reflective Journals**

Jane Addams . . . began to address the question that is starting to arise at this point in our class—what does the individual do, what can they do, and what *should* they do.

—journal entry

I just had a heart attack. I thought I lost this journal. Usually I keep both of them together but not this time. Yes, two journals. I found myself feeling certain private thoughts that had to be expressed, so I started another private journal.

—journal entry

[First Entry]:

I never had a journal before, and I don't really know what I should be doing....I never really thought about what is history and how it relates to community.

[Last Entry]:

Today is the last day of class . . . and it is the last day of writing in this journal (I will continue to write in it now that I am hooked on it.)

—journal entry

Reflective journals were a key catalyst for encouraging students to search for the connections between their experiences in the community and their interpretations of the texts. The "learning" piece of community servicelearning emerges through reflective inquiry, and journals can serve as a powerful tool for reflection. Structured reflection is essential; as John Dewey once wrote, "Mere activity does not constitute experience" (1916, 146). Time was spent early in the term discussing the purpose of journals through reading and discussing entries from Thoreau's Journals to explore the process of journal writing. There are a number of guiding principles I adhere to when using journals in a class: (1) Journals are a tool of reflection where critical writing skills can be combined with critical thinking. (2) Journal entries can take many forms-there is no formula for journal writing. (3) Part of journal writing is discovering the voice to reflect in-discovering confident and empowered expression. (4) Sharing journal writing is risky and revealing-it can foster group cohesiveness and provide challenge and support for further reflection (the process is enhanced if the teacher keeps a journal and shares entries with the students). (5) Journal writing does not come naturally—it needs to be nurtured.

Students were required to do a considerable amount of writing for the course. Some assignments were very traditional analytical essays focused on the readings, while others were weekly journal writings. The key to journal writing was that their reflections broke down the pretense of objectivity and emphasized a "live encounter with subjects of study" (Palmer 1998, 37–38). That live encounter with their subject was the basis for how they wrote in their journals about their experiences and the catalyst for developing an engaged style of thinking and writing that translated into how they wrote about the texts they analyzed and how the two connected. Their readings became real and their writing became a live encounter with living texts. Not only was the intellectual quality of their writing extraordinarily high, but the devotion

to the process became increasingly apparent as they truly engaged in their writing. While the veil of objectivity often brings with it the hard-line defense of the preservation of academic "rigor," the rigor of this course was not limited to the intellectual capacity for acquiring the knowledge base of the discipline but included the rigorous intellectual capacity of critical thinking, writing, and action. The students developed a capacity for critical thinking and writing that allowed them to become better historians.

Every effort was made to have the intellectual and emotional struggle that takes place in reflection become safe and habitual. Students were initially asked to write low-intensity kinds of entries in their journals and then share their writing with the group. As this process became more routine and safer, the students moved to a higher level of trust and risked expressing more of their thoughts. At the end of each class, students provided questions for the group that served as the basis for journal entries and later discussions-and as a means of weaving our class meetings together. The journals were "public" in the sense that the students knew that they were expected to share their writing and that I would review the journals as part of their grade. In some cases, this led students to keep a second, "private" journal, because the process of becoming reflective about their lives had become essential to who they were and what they did-and how they learned. Journals were one tool of reflection. The dialogue in the classroom offered another venue for students to reflect upon their experiences in the community and the texts that they read. As reflective learners, they were able to approach the past and the present through a process of asking and examining, first, what happened, second, what does it mean, and third, what do I do with what I know. In this way the past connects to the present and future and their education connects to their capacity as active citizens.

# **Connected Knowing**

I feel that this was one of the most difficult yet rewarding classes I have ever taken.... I feel that *all* students (not *just* history) would benefit from this class in a fundamental way. The issues confronted here are simply too unsettling to be tackled in a traditional academic format. —journal entry

I have become more aware of my surroundings, have learned to look more deeply into the words of writers, and have learned to formulate my own opinions. Perhaps what I like best about this class is that it synthesized all of my years of book learning and applied it to why I was here in the first place. Lately I've been having difficulty justifying the cost of my education versus what I really learned about what is necessary in living. I was beginning to think my time was wasted; that history was a bunch of fluff that had no use in society anymore.... I don't think I ever really *knew* what it meant until I was trying to incorporate my experiences [in the community] with the many readings we worked with.

—journal entry

By approaching history through experience and reflection, I was encouraging the students to become different kinds of scholars (just as I would have to be a different kind of teacher). By the time we read Emerson's "The American Scholar" as part of the course, they quickly identified with the implicit warning Emerson sounded. By engaging in the community, much as they would engage themselves in a written text, the students embraced Emerson's imperative that "you must take the whole society to find the whole man" (25). Their experiences in a homeless shelter, an inner-city elementary classroom, an ESL program, or an after-school program left little mystery to the meaning of Emerson's quips that "character is higher than intellect" (31) and "books are for the scholars' idle time" (28). They understood implicitly; in their educational experience, knowledge had been disconnected from their historical identity. Their experiences in the community allowed the students to unpack each text they were reading in such a way that they had deeper insights into its meaning as well as deeper insights into their educational experience.

Each of the readings assigned in the course was employed to explore a particular cultural context and historical moment as well as to illuminate the themes of individualism, community, and democracy (and their intersection). Similarly, the community-based experiences were the basis for exploring the meaning of these themes as the students encountered them in their lives. For the most part, the assigned readings were no different from what would be expected in a conventional upper-level cultural history course: John Winthrop's Model of Christian Charity, Tocqueville's Democracy in America, Jane Addams's Twenty Years at Hull House, essays by William James and John Dewey, the Lynds' Middletown, David Riesman's The Lonely Crowd, and Christopher Lasch's The Culture of Narcissism. Some readings were less conventional, chosen to provoke discussion around topics of community, activism, and the historian's professional identity-readings such as Thomas Bender's Community and Social Change in America, Michael Ignatieff's The Needs of Strangers, Staughton Lynd's essay "The Historian as Participant," or The Port Huron Statement.

One departure from a traditional curriculum design was the use of the texts to focus upon exploring the meanings of individualism, community, and democracy over the course of American history. Another difference was to assign community service experience as a way to explore the same themes students encountered in the written texts. The key difference was designing the curriculum to connect the students' active participation in a community, their role as democratic citizens, and their personal and professional identity to their education.

For that to happen, my role shifted to a facilitator and contributor to the construction of knowledge in the classroom. Clearly I had a foundation and breadth of specialized knowledge and substantial experience to bring to our discussions. At the same time, each of the students also had a realm of knowledge and experience to contribute, both of which grew over the course of the term. What we collectively created was a transformative learning environment that changed the students, their approach to the discipline, and their relationship to the larger society. A full year after participating in the course, one student reported that "this course changed the way I perceive history. It helped me see how history is tied to current events." "History," claimed another student after a year, "can be so amorphous, ethereal, but this course places history in a construct [and] turned us into *grounded* historians." They had overcome the deadening disengagement and intellectual restrictions of objectivity, and the past ceased to be an object but became, instead, a vital, interactive part of their lives.

# SECTION VI Engaged Departments

# Introduction

**KEVIN KECSKES** 

The twenty-first century liberal arts curriculum must be anti-fractured and applied to real world problems.... We can no longer address these *essential* learning outcomes solely through the general education curriculum; we must address them in the majors, in the disciplines.... The major plays the decisive role.... We must be increasingly self-conscious and self-critical so to be regularly assured that we are focusing on these outcomes in the majors.

-Carol Geary Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges and Universities, keynote speech delivered at Portland State University, Fall Faculty Symposium, September 20, 2007

The task of creating engaged departments is both one of the most important and one of the most challenging facing the service-learning movement. Like other academic initiatives before it, the future of servicelearning will depend to a large extent on its ability to access and to win over the power at the heart of contemporary higher education: the academic department... Will individual faculty interest [in community engagement] seeping up from below and administrative encouragement [for community engagement] trickling down from above finally reach each other at the level of departmental culture or will they instead encounter an impermeable membrane?

--Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh, "The Engaged Department in the Context of Academic Change"

cademic departments are similar to swim teams; aside from the occasional relay team events, swimmers train, compete, and win or lose as individuals. Contrast that sports analogy to another: the soccer team. In the world's most popular sport, players must work together if they hope to achieve a positive outcome; indeed, team members who display excessive individualism-even those with extraordinary skillsare often sidelined, or even removed from the club. In general, individualism, in the first case, and collectivism, in the second, are deeply embedded and understood to be part of the respective natures of the two sports. Assuming these analogies map reasonably well to the nature of academic departments, we should not be surprised that departmental scholar Jon Wergin asked, in 2003, "Why is it that when you talk about departmental collaboration people treat it as an oxymoron? Why is it that, even though I wrote The Collaborative Department (Wergin, 1994) ... ten years ago, I continue to be kidded by colleagues who say that it was the only book of pure fantasy ever published by AAHE [the American Association for Higher Education]?" (42). Yet, despite the generally individualistic nature of members of traditional academic units, substantial progress toward increased departmental engagement has been made over the past few years on two connected fronts: (1) awareness building and (2) measurement.

# Increasing Awareness for Departmental Engagement

Geary Schneider's public comments cited earlier are emblematic of the Association of American Colleges and Universities' (AACU's) increasing focus on the academic department as a critical component in their organizational efforts to update a national focus on the importance of liberal education. While AACU has maintained its historical concern for general education, in recent years the organization has expanded its efforts to transform higher education more broadly. As part of its enlarged awareness-building strategy, and germane to this introduction, AACU hosted in June 2009 its first "Engaged Department Summer Institute." Concomitant with this increased scope, AACU has effectively used national research data on student learning to disseminate compelling evidence in support of "high impact practices." Community engagement strategies, including service-learning, appear prominently in these practices and in this renewed national dialogue. Many additional organizations such as Campus Compact and the American Association of State College and University's American Democracy Project have also worked consistently to increase the nation's awareness of the importance of community engagement and service-learning for higher education. These efforts, in combination with perhaps the most important occurrence of the decade in support of community engagement, led by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, have built considerable awareness of and support for the engagement movement. Independently, each national effort has also included support for change via a specific focus on the academic department.

In 2004, Lee Shulman, then president of the Carnegie Foundation, reminded a small group of higher education leaders assembled at the foundation's offices in the California hills that people pay attention to that which is measured. It is for this reason, Shulman said, he decided to ask the foundation to establish the elective classification for community engagement—to provide educational leaders an opportunity to pay more specific attention to this important topic. Over the next two years, Carnegie scholars worked with leaders from twelve diverse U.S. colleges and universities (including Portland State University) to develop and pilot test this new elective classification framework. Predictably, the debate among the leaders about "what counts" for community engagement and "how to measure it" was lively. Specific to the topic of this introduction, and in part as a direct result of writings by Zlotkowski and Saltmarsh, and others, six specific questions relating to departmental engagement have been included in Carnegie's Community Engagement Framework.

The significance and impact of Carnegie's initiative and the framework in particular cannot be overstated. Several hundred higher learning institutions have formally submitted community engagement evaluation materials as part of the first two classification rounds. Many more institutions, nationally and globally, are currently modifying programming and curricula to position themselves to eventually receive the community engagement classification. Lee Shulman was correct; higher education and specifically the academic departments that institutions comprise are now paying much more attention to community engagement.

Finally, in 2006, I edited *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good.* The central section of the book features case studies from eleven diverse and engaged academic departments. My primary motivation for editing this volume was to build awareness in the field (a) about successful attempts by faculty to create community-engaged departments on diverse campuses nationwide and (b) for the important role that academic departments need to assume in the reform of higher education.

# Assessing Departmental Engagement

The centerpiece of the Carnegie Foundation's classification efforts is assessment, and, as noted above, assessing engagement at the level of the academic department has been formally integrated into the framework. In recent years, three additional assessment efforts have helped validate a focus on the academic department as the locus of change to increase community-engaged activities within the disciplines.

First, in 2003, Andrew Furco published a revised version of his original *Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education.* Under the heading "Revisions to the Rubric," he notes that "the 2003 version maintains the rubric's original five-dimension structure. The new version includes a new 'departmental support' component. This component was added to the rubric to reflect new insights regarding the important role departments play in the advancement of service-learning in higher education (Holland, 2000)."

Second, Sherril Gelmon, Sarena Seifer, and Associates (2005) published their "Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: Institutional Self-Assessment." This important instrument defines "institution" broadly as "a generic term for the level of the organization on which the selfassessment is focused (e.g., a department, college, school, university)." While this tool was not designed exclusively for academic departments, this selfassessment explicitly acknowledges that it may be utilized for that level of analysis and, thus, constitutes a significant expansion of instruments available to academic departments interested in assessing and tracking community engagement in the unit.

Finally, as a result of five years of concentrated engagement work with academic units at Portland State University, and of editing Engaging Departments, I became aware that the field could benefit from a study that (1) brings into sharper focus what is meant by a community-engaged department and (2) provides academic units with an instrument specifically adapted for application at the departmental level. Thus, as part of a national study utilizing a combination of key informant/expert interviews and grounded theory research methodology, I adapted, pilot tested, and validated a new departmental engagement measurement instrument: Creating Community-Engaged Departments: Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement in Academic Departments (Kecskes 2008). This rubric provides a mechanism for the self-assessment of departmental engagement along a continuum of key dimensions and components. In addition to utilizing the self-assessment instrument to track the development of collective, departmental engagement over time, the rubric also can be used heuristically by department chairs and other faculty and administrative leaders to increase understanding about the community-focused agenda of the academic department. Qualitative analysis of study participants' open-ended responses to the rubric suggests that the *combination* of the heuristic (or meaning-making) function with the assessment/tracking function can be particularly powerful for members of the academic department.

## Persistent Perception Problems

Battistoni and Associates (2003) argue, "Departments, like the disciplines they represent, are more often than not seen as part of the problem, not the solution. So minimal has been our awareness of and attention to the department as a factor in the scholarship of engagement that we rarely even encounter calls to address its absence" (12). Indeed, on many campuses I have visited in recent years, the most progressive thinkers often suggest that only through interdisciplinary, interdepartmental work can the deeply transformative work promised by the community-campus engagement agenda be realized. While I respect these sentiments, I view them as incomplete and, ultimately, insufficiently pragmatic. Students spend the majority of their intellectual life inside the academic department. Colleges and universities, on a global scale, remain largely organized according to traditional academic disciplines. Also, faculty embedded in academic departments have enormous capacity. The primary question, then, returns to one undergirding much of Zlotkowski's and Saltmarsh's prescient writing over the years: education for what?

AACU, Campus Compact, AASCU, higher education scholars, progressive campuses, and many other national and local organizations are beginning to find consensus in a response. In this new global century, questions of cultural knowledge, an ability to integrate natural and social sciences in increasingly interconnected, diverse environments, and a focus on personal and social responsibility are ascending. Therefore, given the important, traditional role of academic departments, Zlotkowski and Saltmarsh, and others, are correct to argue that the academic unit must hold a leader's seat at the community engagement higher education reform table. Alongside, not instead of, the reform of academic departments there is much need for interdisciplinary creativity as well. Academic departments are more than a mere set of organizational structures and processes that exist for the sole instrumental purpose of achieving the educational, research, and service goals of the unit. Departments have the potential to become a community of shared values that play a constitutive role in shaping the meaning of the larger campus and external community within which they operate. The time has arrived for academic units-the organizational building blocks of higher education-to reflect and adjust in order to meaningfully respond to the changing needs of society in this new global century. National higher education organizations are calling for this reform; valid instruments are now available to guide the efforts; all that is left to do now is the work itself.

# 15 The Engaged Department in the Context of Academic Change

Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh

In 1998 Campus Compact received from the Pew Charitable Trusts a grant to develop what the Compact called the "pyramid of service-learning." In effect the pyramid was a multidimensional model for institutionalizing service-learning. (Eventually the Compact would use this same model to describe the development of an even wider array of engagement strategies when it launched its Indicators of Engagement initiative. See the framing statement for that essay included elsewhere in this volume.) Not only did this model posit complementary but distinctive roles for presidents, Chief Academic Officiers (CAOs), community service directors, faculty, students, and community partners, it also conceptualized the institutionalization process as falling into three more or less recognizable stages.

The middle stage in this process, building on the achievement of critical mass in stage one, called for a transition from a focus on quantity to a focus on quality. Once an institution had succeeded in assembling some significant number of individuals committed to exploring service-learning as a teaching-learning strategy and vehicle of academy-community partnerships, the next task was to create an infrastructure that would promote

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh, "The Engaged Department in the Context of Academic Change," in *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good,* ed. Kevin Kecskes, 278–289 (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006).

both standards and sustainability in this work. Key to the development of this more advanced focus on quality was the academic department.

The origins of this idea can be traced to a meeting in 1998 at the Pew Charitable Trusts at which Russ Edgerton, then the director of the Education Program, made a persuasive case that institutional transformation could not be effective if it focused only on individual faculty development or if it focused only on metalevel efforts by presidents and other senior leaders. If Campus Compact were serious about transforming institutional practice, he argued, it needed to focus on the faculty's academic home—their departments. An initiative aimed at using the scholarship of engagement as a way of changing departmental culture as part of a still-broader strategy of institutional transformation was something he would—and did—fund.

Hence, between 1999 and 2004, the Compact ran a considerable number of Engaged Department Institutes. These institutes, offered at the national, regional, and institutional levels, were developed to explore concrete ways in which responsibility for community engagement could be deliberately shifted to a larger, more stable unit than the individual faculty practitioner. From a structural standpoint, it was essential that the academic and social potential of service-learning—and of the scholarship of engagement in general—not be mortgaged to the ongoing availability of individual faculty members. But the problem was not just structural. The Engaged Department initiative also represented a deliberate effort to effect a change in institutional culture by going to the heart of that culture: the culture of the academic department.

One of the first higher education institutions to realize the potential significance of this shift from focusing on the individual faculty member to the department as an engaged unit was Portland State University (PSU), and PSU participated in several Engaged Department Institutes at both the national and the institutional levels. Thus, it was only logical that Kevin Kecskes, director of Community Partnerships, should take a special interest in developing resources in this area. In 2006 Kevin edited Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good, and the following essay was written as the final, summary chapter of that volume. Since then, the work of creating engaged departments has continued in several different ways at PSU and elsewhere. There can be little doubt that building engaged departments—moving from individual to collective responsibility for academic-community partnerships will remain one of the key priorities of the civic engagement movement for years to come.

The task of creating engaged departments is one of the most important and one of the most challenging facing the service-learning movement. Like other academic initiatives before it, the future of service-learning will depend to a large extent on its ability to access and to win over the power at the core of contemporary higher education: the academic department.

We have, of course, always known that this day would come. While presidents have lined up to sign Campus Compact's *Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*, the percentage of faculty using communitybased work in their teaching continues to increase, and more and more institutions are moving to establish some kind of office to facilitate campuscommunity collaborations, one overriding question remains: will individual faculty interest seeping up from below and administrative encouragement trickling down from above finally reach each other at the level of departmental culture, or will they instead encounter an impermeable membrane?

That many keen observers of contemporary higher education recognize the pivotal importance of the academic department can be documented without great difficulty. As Donald Kennedy, former president of Stanford University, observed in 1995:

The action is all peripheral: it takes place at the level of departmental faculties.... There is a powerful tradition of local control over most of the things that matter: disciplinary discretion, exercised through the choice of new faculty; curriculum; appointment and promotion criteria; and above all, the character of graduate study.... Departments are the units in which the institution's strategy for academic development is formulated in practice. (12)

Or, as David Damrosch, professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University, makes clear in *We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University* (1995), the "culture" he has in mind is largely generated at the department level.

We cannot address [the shape of the modern university] comprehensively by looking only at the local specifics of student life and work.... Nor, on the other hand, should we go directly to the opposite extreme and attempt a global redefinition of the goals of education.... It is at an intermediate level of academic life that this operational content can be found: in the *structuring* of courses and other forms of academic work, rather than in the specifics of individual offerings or in the generalities of academics' views of life as a whole. (25)

Damrosch's central concern is that the culture of today's academy, grounded in and sustained by the culture that prevails in academic departments, has resulted in a scholarly ideal so individualistic it not only precludes the pleasures of genuine community, it also makes impossible many of the intellectual benefits that derive only from collaborative undertakings. The most widely observed results of this shift toward the norm of the scholar as isolated individual have been the steady erosion of concern for teaching and the increasing rewards given to superstars... A less visible but much more pervasive problem stemming from the ideal of scholarly isolation has been the attendant valuing of certain *kinds* of scholarship, and certain kinds of scholarly interaction generally, to the detriment of others. (87–88)

In short, it is not only a fact of academic life that the culture of academic departments largely sets the tone for academic culture in general, it is also a fact that that departmental culture is, for the most part, relentlessly individualistic—so relentlessly individualistic, most academics have long since ceased to recognize just how pervasive that individualism is.

Thus, whatever obstacles may exist to the development of departments explicitly committed to a scholarship of engagement, they are, in the end, only "surplus" obstacles superimposed on a culture that makes interpersonal engagement—even strictly within the academy itself—unlikely. Indeed, it is interesting, and perhaps illustrative, that Damrosch's text remains resolutely focused on the academy as an implicitly self-contained entity until the very final section of his final chapter, a section called "Scholars in Society." Here he turns his attention to that wider sense of social responsibility that prevailed some one hundred years ago, when the modern university and its academic departments were emerging. The lessons of that period are important because it is a "process of overlay" between intellectuals working within *and outside of* the academy that

creates the conditions for a dynamic interplay between public and academic concerns, a dynamism that was present at the turn of the century when academic life was achieving its modern form in dialogue with the society of its time. If we can create a contemporary academic culture that is as intellectually open as it is becoming socially varied, the next intellectuals can carry much further the interfusion of modes of inquiry, whatever their place of work. Academic and "public" intellectuals are already beginning to engage one another more closely. (211)

How ironic that Damrosch should wait until the very last chapter in his book to introduce the one factor that may hold the greatest promise in helping the academy reconfigure itself as a true community of scholars: its engagement with those *outside* the academy.

In short, the significance of the engaged department as a concept not only is relevant to those who already appreciate the importance of communitybased scholarship; it also has important lessons for higher education reform in general. As Thomas Bender (1993) writes in the concluding essay of his

#### book Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States:

The integrity of academic intellect is not endangered by competing discourses of social inquiry [i.e., nonacademic modes of analysis and assessment]. The risk now is precisely the opposite. Academe is threatened by the twin dangers of fossilization and scholasticism.... The agenda for the next decade, at least as I see it, ought to be the opening up of the disciplines, the ventilating of professional communities that have come to share too much and that have become too self-referential. (143)

To appropriate Bender's image, the academic department is itself a professional community whose future viability very much depends upon its willingness to be "ventilated" by new interests, forces, and collaborations. Far from merely providing an opportunity for specific community-based projects and partnerships, such a ventilating can facilitate the development of more *internally* coherent, psychologically and intellectually satisfying forms of academic community. Bringing new voices to the table can help those already at the table learn new roles and new ways of working.

The attention that Campus Compact has directed toward the engaged department since the late 1990s clearly reflects this recognition of the role of engagement at the department level in larger efforts at reform in higher education. Specifically, with guidance and support from Russ Edgerton at the Pew Charitable Trusts, Campus Compact's initiative on the engaged department emerged from the convergence of a number of developments in servicelearning and higher education.

First, work that was focused on developing discipline-based materials in service-learning drew upon an understanding of faculty culture and professional identity that postulated that faculty were more likely to adopt servicelearning as a pedagogy if it were translated into the conceptual framework of their discipline. This strategy, in turn, was driven by the assumption that faculty would embrace service-learning from within the context of their faculty role and disciplinary identity more readily than through an approach that expected service-learning itself to transform that role and sense of professional self as a condition of its acceptance.

Second, service-learning resonated within professional associations as the disciplines faced both pressure for public relevance and a need to capture and hold student interest through innovative pedagogies and active learning strategies. Disciplinary association interest in service-learning sent a strong message to faculty that it was a legitimate academic undertaking.

Third, there was the growing recognition, referred to earlier, that the department was the unit that controlled the curriculum and that set the standards for defining the roles and rewards of its faculty. At the same time, the department often appeared impervious to centralized campus-wide initiatives aimed at improving undergraduate teaching and learning. However, until then, few if any efforts were aimed at breaking through to the unit most responsible for shaping faculty culture—the department.

These three developments led to an initiative begun in 1998 to focus attention on the department as a unit and to effect institutional change by developing strategies aimed at curricular coherence and faculty collaboration through service-learning and civic engagement. To mount this engaged department initiative, Campus Compact developed an Engaged Department Institute, a forum designed to bring together departmental teams that could develop both strategic goals and specific action plans for incorporating service-learning and civic engagement into their departmental culture.

To lead this initiative, the Compact assembled a team of facilitators that worked together for three years developing and delivering national Engaged Department Institutes. Edward Zlotkowski, professor of English at Bentley University and a senior faculty fellow with Campus Compact, and John Saltmarsh, project director at Campus Compact, initially assembled the team. It included Rick Battistoni, professor of Political Science at Providence College and an engaged scholar with Campus Compact specializing in civic engagement, and Sherril Gelmon, professor of Public Health at Portland State University and an engaged scholar with Campus Compact specializing in assessment and community partnerships. Finally, it was the Compact's good fortune also to connect with Jon Wergin, then professor of Education at Virginia Commonwealth University, whose book The Collaborative Department (1994) had just been published by the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). Wergin had devoted more time and energy than virtually anyone else in higher education to studying the department as a unit. (His book Departments That Work [2003] includes a central chapter on "The Engaged Department.")

Many of the case studies gathered in the present book come from departments that were in some way connected to Campus Compact's engaged department initiative, and all suggest the potential that a department-focused effort has for changing the culture of the academy. Take, for example, a statement made by the Department of Communication at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst: "CSL [community service-learning] has been the basis around which many partnerships have formed among faculty within our own department and in interdisciplinary groups across the area. Participating faculty have reported renewed energy around teaching and community-based research and advocacy, better relationships with students and with community members" (2006, 165).

Similarly, when the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Georgetown University speaks of "set[ting] out intentionally to alter the culture of our department," its immediate focus may be accommodating community-based work, but its willingness to employ "a social movement model of social change, mobilizing and co-opting external resources as well as redirecting internal resources to achieve new ends" implies a far more comprehensive, transformative departmental undertaking.

In short, the process of becoming an "engaged department" mirrors the process of becoming a true *community* of scholars. This community takes joint responsibility for both its programs and its members. Like the Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), it is willing to undertake "a comprehensive academic program and curriculum review," especially of those "requirements that did not work as smoothly as they could" and "sharing between faculty . . . individual efforts" vis-à-vis "off-campus based course offerings and research/creative production" (Macias and O'Bryne 2006, 197) Like the Department of Art at Portland State University, it sees the collaborative process as necessarily reaching out to *all* the department's members, extending support, faculty development activities and grant money to part-time and fixed term members alike and increasing participation "by mentoring individuals . . . sharing syllabi, discussing and supporting projects, co-teaching and teaching paralleled sections of the same course" (Agre-Kippenhan and Charman 2006, 100).

Indeed, essential to the self-renewal process of many of these departments is a new recognition of the importance of their students as members of the department. At Portland State University, the Department of Art's "ability to facilitate and enhance the civic capacity of [its] students" has led it increasingly to turn to them "to help guide" it: "Students have been polled to find out their interests, have worked on tandem research projects, have identified community partnerships, and been leaders in the classroom" (Agre-Kippenhan and Charman 2006, 95–96).

At the same time, the Department of Communication at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst has discovered that "courses ... that emphasize civic engagement are very well received. Students report (via course evaluations and project assessments) that they have better relationships with faculty, have learned and applied course material, will retain course material and are more committed to doing community work in the future." At Stamford University in Alabama, the Department of Communication Studies has made a similar discovery: "Our Exit interviews indicate our majors tend to be satisfied with their experiences in our department, and they've been effective recruiters for our program: in three years, we grew from 28 majors to 65, largely by student word-of-mouth advertising." And, of course, as one would only expect, all of these departments report a significant, new level of attention paid to interactions with their community partners. The Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies at UCLA has begun hosting a "Community Partners Council" at which partners are invited to meet with one another and with faculty to talk about the work of the partnership, ways the partnership could be improved, and any other aspect of the administrative, programmatic or curricular features of engagement.

Such mechanisms make it possible for those inside and outside the academy to begin to work together more as true equals, sharing ideas related to design as well as operations, assuming greater shared responsibility for academic as well as social outcomes. With regard to the latter, social outcomes, we would do well to heed the warning of Ira Harkavy, director of the Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania: "In its 'classic' form, service-learning may function as a pedagogical equivalent of 'exploitative' community-based research." In other words, the fact that faculty mount community-based projects does not in and of itself guarantee that they deal with the community as a genuine partner. Surely the Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling at the California State University, Northridge, is correct when it notes:

Further study in service learning must include a greater focus on community agency perspectives. Research that examines quantitative and qualitative responses by the community agencies must be included with discussions between academicians. Many of the same principles behind the early movement of service learning, such as inclusion and diversity in thought, need to be re-examined to assure a much deeper and longer-lasting relationship between the engaged department and the community. (From unpublished chapter abstract)

Whether one focuses on the integrity, the sustainability, or the impact of academy-community partnerships, it is difficult to see how the national service-learning movement can realize its potential—or even reach the next logical step in its development—without the leadership of engaged departments. Chapter 16, "Characteristics of an Engaged Department," by John Saltmarsh and Sherril Gelmon addresses the elements that provide a necessary foundation for undertaking engaged department efforts.

Relatedly, it has become clear, from the experience of many departments that have moved toward engagement, that there are some clear sustainability indicators for such departments. The success of engaged department initiatives appears to rest on a few key factors:

- *Leadership*: Support of the department chair (advocacy for faculty efforts/creating a supportive environment)
- Collaboration: Departmental curricula designed and delivered in a collaborative way
- *Curricula:* Acceptance of civic engagement as core academic work (faculty provide leadership for improved teaching, learning, and research)
- *Rewards:* Incentives for community-based teaching and research (faculty roles and rewards are consistent with community-based teaching and scholarship)

*Infrastructure:* Institutional infrastructure to support faculty in community-based teaching and learning (service-learning office, staff support)

Whether departments move productively toward engagement or whether they struggle ahead with difficultly will be determined in large part by the strength of these indicators. While the case studies in this book reinforce their importance—in particular, strong chair support, the academic credibility of community-based work, an institutional infrastructure to support departmental efforts—other case studies, where engaged department efforts have shown less success, would reveal departments that undoubtedly have floundered due to deficits related to one or more of these indicators.

It is our belief, a belief strongly reinforced by the cases in this book, that the ability of service-learning to contribute to a renewal of American higher education will depend upon its becoming an integral part of the core work of academic departments. Indeed, as we have already suggested, such work is the future of service-learning. While there have been a number of advances made over the last decade—advances in areas like community partnerships, civic engagement, and student academic leadership—that address the concern raised by Ira Harkavy and his colleagues (Benson, Harkavy and Hartley 2005) and others about service-learning's being "reduced" from a vehicle of education for democratic participation to a merely pedagogical tool, it remains clear that for these advances to have lasting impact they will need to become woven into the fabric of academic departments.

# 16 Characteristics of an Engaged Department

Design and Assessment

John Saltmarsh (with Sherril Gelmon)

Department Institutes, we had the extraordinary opportunity to have a consistent instructional team to design and facilitate the work at the institutes. This allowed for collaborative work and significant reflection on our practice as we took what we learned from one institute to the next. In addition to Edward Zlotkowski and myself, the team was made up of Jon Wergin (a scholar of departmental organization and culture), Rick Battistoni (a leading expert on civic engagement across the curriculum), and Sherril Gelmon (an assessment specialist who was and is a leading figure in advancing service-learning and community engagement nationally and internationally).

When Kevin Kecskes undertook a study of campuses that had participated in the Engaged Department Institutes and asked Sherril and myself to contribute a chapter, it allowed us to step back from years of work on the institutes and reflect on what we had learned. Thus the chapter offers insights into what makes an engaged department, why faculty in a depart-

Sherril Gelmon is Professor of Public Health at the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University in Oregon. This chapter was originally published as John Saltmarsh and Sherril Gelmon, "Characteristics of an Engaged Department: Design and Assessment," in *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good*, ed. Kevin Kecskes, 27–44 (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006). ment would want to work collaboratively toward unit engagement, and the central importance of assessment in advancing an engagement agenda. The importance of assessment cannot be overstated—in fact the design of an engaged department initiative (or any other innovative work) begins with assessment in determining the outcomes of the effort. The outcomes from engagement are multiple and complex, and they require the participation of community partners in their development. This kind of collaborative work with community partners that links the department to socially responsive knowledge of the discipline is the beginning of a department becoming engaged.

Departments are the units in which the institution's strategy for academic development is formulated in practice. —Kennedy, 1995, 12

The department is arguably the definitive locus of faculty culture, especially departments that gain their definition by being their campus's embodiment of distinguished and hallowed disciplines. . . . We could have expected that reformers would have placed departmental reform at the core of their agenda; yet just the opposite has occurred. There has been a noticeable lack of discussion of—or even new ideas about—departments' role in reform. —Edwards, 1999, 17

# Concepts of Engagement: General and Department-Specific

When we talk about an "engaged department," what do we mean by "engagement?" "Engagement" is a term that has been overused in recent years in the context of higher education to the point where it has become necessary to clarify how it is being used. It is perhaps most often used as a way of describing active and collaborative teaching and learning strategies that lead to greater involvement of the student in the processes and outcomes of their education. In this context, engagement refers to the engaged learning on the part of students. This framework refers to processes rather than outcomes, such that engaged learning can take place in any number of ways—discussions, laboratories, simulations—that do not require that the student leave the classroom or the campus and become involved in the local community as part of their learning. Nor does engagement in this context raise the question of the civic purposes of higher education and the design of teaching and learning strategies that lead to civic learning outcomes.

An example of this distinction between engaged learning and civic engagement can be seen with the measurement instrument, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE 2002). The NSSE measures student self-reports of the characteristics of their learning experience, processes, and activities such as the amount of discussion that takes place in the classroom, the amount of contact that students have with faculty (both in and outside the classroom), and the degree to which students participate in active and collaborative activities. One result of the NSSE is that the most potent pedagogy for civic engagement, service-learning, is also identified as a potent strategy for engaged learning. As the NSSE research reports, "Complementary learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom augment the academic program.... Service-learning provides students with opportunities to synthesize, integrate, and apply their knowledge. Such experiences make learning more meaningful, and ultimately more useful because what students know becomes a part of who they are" (NSSE 2002, 11).

The difference here is that service-learning is designed not simply for engaged learning but for civic engagement as well. An essential point made by Russ Edgerton and Lee Schulman in a critique of the 2002 NSSE results is relevant here: "We know, for instance, that students can be engaged in a range of effective practices and still not be learning with understanding; we know that students can be learning with understanding and still not be acquiring the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are related to effective citizenship" (NSSE 2002, 3). Civic engagement moves engagement beyond effective teaching and learning strategies to education for citizenship.

Engagement as part of engaged department initiatives is undertaken in the context of civic engagement that deliberately connects academic knowledge with community-based knowledge, is grounded in experiential and reflective modes of teaching and learning, and is aimed at developing the knowledge, skills, and values that will be necessary for students to become active participants in American democracy. It is the context of engagement in higher education where "civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference" (Ehrlich et al. 2000, vi). The focus on the department as the locus for engagement is the kind of effort directed toward institutional renewal that supports civic engagement.

#### The Department as the Unit of Change

Larger institutional reform efforts, such as the movement catalyzed by Ernest Boyer to redefine faculty roles and rewards, have been undertaken predominantly above and outside the departmental context within which faculty culture resides. Efforts aimed at improving teaching and learning have often been undertaken at the level of the practice of the individual faculty member and have had little impact beyond that individual's classroom and scholarship. It has become increasing clear, as reflected in the analysis by Donald Kennedy and Richard Edwards above, that meaningful reform efforts in higher education will have to penetrate the department.

The department is the academic structure that brings together the institution's unique identity and mission with the professional strictures of disciplinary associations along with the standards and expectations of scholarship. It is, as Edwards writes, "the definitive locus of faculty culture, especially departments that gain their definition by being their campus's embodiment of distinguished and hallowed disciplines" (Edwards 1999, 18). Faculty who are unresponsive to administrative agendas constructed outside the values and disciplinary frameworks of the departments are far more likely to engage in reform that is indigenous to the department. There must be a compelling academic interest in civic engagement if it is to be undertaken by a department as a significant initiative.

### The Imperative for Engagement

There is now a movement within higher education, in the American context and globally, to reclaim the civic purposes of the college and university mission, affirming and implementing the institution's civic responsibility, whether public or private. Engagement has multiple dimensions, expressed by the Association of Commonwealth Universities in this way: "Engagement implies strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world in at least four spheres: setting universities' aims, purposes, and priorities; relating teaching and learning to the wider world; the back-and-forth dialogue between researchers and practitioners; and taking on wider responsibilities as neighbours and citizens" (Bjarnason and Coldstream 2003, 323).

Along with a focus on reclaiming the civic mission of higher eduction ("aims, purposes, and priorities") there have been efforts since the early 1990s to improve teaching and learning on campus. Concurrent with these efforts has been a focus on developing and sustaining authentic community partnerships ("taking on wider responsibility as neighbours and citizens"). Finally, parallel to these trends has been a strong impetus to value diverse forms of knowledge as well as to find ways of creating new knowledge that addresses the social challenges of the twenty-first century ("the back-and-forth dialogue between researchers and practitioners"). These four factors, which one can call the mission imperative, the pedagogical imperative, the partnership imperative, and the epistemological imperative, all have bearing on interest in creating engaged departments (see figure 16.1). For change to occur along the lines of these imperatives, the department becomes the locus for change, not only in terms of knowledge creation and the transmission of that knowledge but also in terms of operationalizing the mission of the institution through core academic functions.



Figure 16.1 The Imperative for Engagement

### The Mission Imperative

Engaged department efforts are driven in part by a movement begun in the early 1980s to refocus American higher education to reclaim its civic purposes. While at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the early 1980s, Frank Newman, an innovative leader in higher education, asserted that "the most critical demand is to restore to higher education its original purpose of preparing graduates for a life of involved and committed citizenship. . . . The advancement of civic learning, therefore, must become higher education's most central goal" (Newman 1985, xiv, 32). Newman's 1985 book *Higher Education and the American Resurgence* captured the early stirrings of the "movement" to revitalize the civic mission of higher education as it was increasingly faced with competing and multiple demands. Newman's last book, nearly twenty years later, *The Future of Higher Education*, echoed

even more forcefully the need to stay true to the civic responsibility of higher education. "Higher education," wrote Newman in the latter book, "must work harder on encouraging the civic education of today's students to ensure the efficacy of tomorrow's democracy" (Newman, Couturier, and Scurry 2004, 129).

In the intervening years between Newman's books, many others embraced the challenge of revitalizing the civic purpose of colleges and universities amid the insidious pressures of the consumerism and commodification of market-driven education. One example of the countervailing weight of the movement for civic engagement is the 1999 Campus Compact Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education, perhaps the most cogent statement on the need for and importance of remaining true to the civic mission of higher education, asserting the role of colleges and universities as "agents and architects of a flourishing democracy" (Presidents' Declaration 1999, 1). The mission imperative for engagement is grounded, fundamentally, in the Deweyian marriage of education and democracy, or as Dewey wrote in 1937, "unless education has some frame of reference it is bound to be aimless, lacking a unified objective. The necessity for a frame of reference must be admitted. There exists in this country such a unified frame. It is called democracy" (Dewey 1937, 415). The mission imperative resists aimlessness and fragmentation and embraces the public purpose of higher education-looking to the academic department as one place, perhaps the most important place, for the academic mission to be implemented.

### The Pedagogical Imperative

Much of the success of service-learning over the past quarter century can be attributed to its effectiveness in improving student learning. A growing body of research indicates that all of the features of quality service-learning lead to improved learning-its experiential aspect, the continual reflection on experience, the testing of abstract theoretical concepts with practical knowledge, the linking of affective and cognitive development, and the application of knowledge (Eyler et al. 2000). These factors and more have led large numbers of faculty from across the disciplines to redesign their courses as service-learning courses. This work has been embraced not only by faculty but also by administrators who seek to improve the quality of education on campus and have encouraged service-learning. Higher education is increasingly being compelled to improve the quality of teaching and learning in such a way that departments are responsible for more than foundational knowledge and professional knowledge, but for socially responsive knowledge as well (Altman 2004). For this kind of change aimed at improving teaching and learning with a civic dimension, civic engagement must become the work of the departments.

John Abbott, director of Britain's Education 2000 Trust, in a 1996 interview with Ted Marchese, editor of *Change* magazine, explained the pedagogical

imperative for civic engagement in this way: "People worldwide need a whole series of new competencies. . . . But I doubt that such abilities can be taught solely in the classroom, or be developed solely by teachers. Higher order thinking and problem solving skills grow out of direct experience, not simply teaching; they require more than a classroom activity. They develop through active involvement and real life experiences in workplaces and the community" (Marchese 1996, 3–4). Departments that have committed themselves to developing curricula that better teach the course content of the discipline as well as developing the civic dispositions of professional practice in the discipline are more likely to embrace civic engagement as core work of the department.

### The Partnership Imperative

In his last writings, in 1996, Boyer made a case for the imperative for partnerships when he wrote that American colleges and universities are "one of the greatest hopes for intellectual and civic progress in this country. I am convinced that for this hope to be fulfilled, the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems, and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I call the scholarship of engagement."

The foundation of creating an institutional culture supportive of community engagement and community-engaged scholarship is the process of reciprocal relationships with community partners. A core value of reciprocity contrasts community engagement that is done "to" or "in" the community with engagement that is collaborative, mutually beneficial, and multidirectional done *with* the community. Reciprocity specifically signals a shift in campuscommunity partnerships toward relationships that are defined by a multidirectional flow of knowledge and expertise in collaborative efforts to address community-based issues. Reciprocity in community relationships has an explicit and intentional democratic dimension framed as inclusive, collaborative, and problem-oriented work, in which academics share knowledge-generating tasks with the public and involve community partners as participants in public problem solving.

One characteristic of the reciprocity, according to Boyer (1996c), is that it "means creating a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other . . . enriching the quality of life for us all" (20). That special climate is explicitly and intentionally reciprocal. Reciprocal partnerships, write KerryAnn O'Meara and R. Eugene Rice (2005), call "on faculty to move beyond 'outreach.' . . . What it emphasizes is genuine *collaboration*: that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared. It represents a basic reconceptualization of faculty involvement in community-based work" (28). Departments that have shifted their work to collaboration with community partners recognize that their academic work is enhanced because of the partnerships and that their work and the social purpose of the discipline can have greater impact through collaborative efforts.

### The Epistemological Imperative

More than the mission imperative, and more than the pedagogical imperative, perhaps the most compelling interest in civic engagement from a faculty perspective-and hence, in the departmental context-is the question of epistemology. Referring to Boyer's work, Donald Schön wrote that "the new scholarship requires a new epistemology" (Schön 1995, 27). In fact, it may be that a new epistemology requires a new scholarship and a new pedagogy. From a faculty perspective, the creation or production of new knowledge is their foremost interest; from this will flow research agendas and curriculum design. As an example of how this hierarchy of interest can manifest itself on campus, consider this personal experience of working with faculty at a highly selective liberal arts college on advancing civic engagement and servicelearning. Few, if any, of the faculty who participated were interested in community-based teaching because it created a richer classroom environment and better teaching and learning. Fewer still were interested in connecting their discipline-based courses to the community to help actualize the civic mission of their institution. Yet, when the question of how to best create new knowledge advancing their disciplinary frameworks and presenting opportunities for scholarship was raised, there was deep resonance. The question of interest to the faculty-and this is how they framed it as the question they wanted discussed as part of a strategic planning process—was this: "For the sake of creating new knowledge, what is the intellectual space for complementary epistemologies at \_\_\_\_ college?"

Interest in addressing this kind of question is, as Mary Walshok has written, "influenced by the ways academics think about knowledge and factor experiences and expertise outside the academy into society's total knowledge development and dissemination process." Universities "will not integrate the experiences and expertise of individuals and institutions outside the academy," she continues, "without a deeper appreciation of the invaluable resources they represent." Within the space created for complementary epistemologies is the opportunity to bring together academic knowledge with community-based knowledge in a way that counters the traditional epistemological boundaries that "treat experience as separate from knowledge rather than as a form of knowledge" (Walshok 1995, 13–14).

In bringing together academic knowledge with community-based knowledge, faculty such as the ones at the college mentioned above and others are seeking an epistemology appropriate to engaged teaching and scholarship that makes "room for the practitioner's reflection in and on action. It must account for and legitimize not only the use of knowledge produced in the academy but the practitioner's generation of actionable knowledge" (Schön 1995, 28). An engaged department will be shaped in large part by the epistemological imperative—the recognition, as Walshok has written, that "knowledge—particularly useful knowledge that can be applied in the economy and society—is something more than highly intellectualized, analytical, and symbolic material. It includes working knowledge, a component of experience, of hands-on practice knowledge" (Walshok 1995, 14).

## Building an Engaged Department

Campus Compact's experience since the late 1990s in conducting Engaged Department Institutes suggests that there are certain key characteristics that a department (or comparable academic unit) must be able to demonstrate to successfully undertake and implement an engaged department initiative (Battistoni et al. 2003).

First, the department should have a cadre of faculty, preferably including at least some senior individuals, who have experience with community-based education. These may be faculty who have been teaching courses incorporating service-learning or who have been involved in community-based research and have at least some experience with a reflective teaching methodology and with establishing and maintaining community partnerships. Engaged department work is not introductory work; it involves experienced faculty who are prepared to take their individual efforts and contribute to a collective departmental effort. An engaged department agenda includes unit responsibility for engagement-related activities, departmental agreement on the concepts and terminology that allow faculty to explore the dimensions of engaged work most effectively, and a departmental plan of how best to document, evaluate, and communicate the significance of engaged work.

Second, and related to the first characteristic, faculty in the department should have experience with community partnerships to the extent that relationships with community partners are strong enough to include them in the engaged department initiative. As with the first characteristic above, faculty who are in the initial steps of establishing partnerships and who have little experience with exploring reciprocal relationships and developing community voice in the educational process are not likely to be sufficiently prepared to play a major role in a departmental initiative. Engaged department work is most effective when community partners are a part of the development of the unit's objectives from the beginning and are viewed as co-educators of students engaged in community-based learning.

Finally, a key characteristic of a department that is prepared to undertake civic engagement as a collective strategy is the institutional environment of the campus, including the leadership and support of academic administration. Engaged departments are more likely to develop effectively if there is an infrastructure on campus such as an office of service-learning, intended to support faculty in community-based teaching and scholarship. An institutional environment in which definitions of scholarship have been reconsidered, allowing for community-based scholarship and the scholarship of teaching and learning to be considered legitimate academic work, is more likely to foster engaged department efforts. Moreover, it has become clear that the support of the chair of the department is a key indicator of the success of the engaged department efforts. It is the role of the chair to provide leadership around improving teaching and learning, for encouraging and supporting community-based scholarship, and for advocating for resources and support for the department's engagement initiatives.

### Assessing Departmental Engagement

Departments that make a commitment to "engagement" must be able to demonstrate the impact of the various activities they choose to pursue. How do they ensure the quality of the learning experience for students? What is the evidence of this quality? How do they monitor the impact on community participants? What is the information base that then allows the department to make improvements to enhance community benefit and strengthen the community partnership? What data are available to justify resource investments? What is the knowledge base that is used by the department to inform the improvement and expansion of such programs?

These questions all relate to a fourth imperative: having a defined strategy for assessment and evaluation that ensures the department can conceptualize its desired impacts, design appropriate methods for measuring and/or observing these impacts, have a coherent plan for analysis and synthesis of findings, and strategically report these results in order to maintain and improve the departmental engagement agenda.

Descriptions of assessment strategies and methods are available in detail elsewhere (see Bringle, Phillips, and Hudson 2004; Gelmon 2003; Gelmon et al. 2001; Holland 2001). In the context of this volume, a formulation for assessment is based upon the key concepts presented in the earlier chapter by Battistoni in this monograph as well as other fundamental components of departmental engagement.

### Civic Learning Outcomes

If a primary strategy for departmental engagement is to develop or enhance civic learning outcomes among students, then from an assessment perspective the department must begin by clearly articulating *exactly* what those outcomes are. These must be stated in terms that are clear and, as described in the earlier chapter, refer to knowledge, skills, and values. As articulated earlier in this chapter, potential measurable or observable outcomes must also
relate to the desired results—demonstration of civic learning, a departmental commitment, engaged faculty, and so on. The challenge for many is to identify relevant methods to measure or observe these outcomes—some of which may be apparent during or at the end of a specific learning experience (such as a course or a field experience), while others may appear over time with increasing experience and articulation.

#### Civic Knowledge

We often "measure" knowledge through routine assessments, whether a simple pretest/posttest, or through more rigorous academic methods such as essays, examinations, or oral presentations. In the context of civic knowledge, the assessment must be broad enough to address the many factors defined for civic knowledge-core content areas, knowledge of issues, understanding of root problems, understanding of place. These factors must then be contextualized in terms of relevant disciplinary frameworks or perspectives. Many disciplines have their own styles of teaching, learning, and assessment (such as the portfolio developed by an art student, or the question-and-answer methods used by law school professors), and the assessment of civic knowledge should be framed within the relevant context. No single model can be used but rather should build upon what is common in the discipline with adaptation to account for the relevant elements of civic knowledge. Ironically, the core elements of civic knowledge (such as building an understanding of root social or community problems) might be similar across a number of departments working in a common community, yet each department would likely follow its own assessment strategies that would be relevant to its distinctive style of teaching and learning, assessment, and expectations.

In addition to the elements of knowledge, there are related skills that can be assessed that are linked to the elements of civic knowledge. How do students engage in problem solving? What are their skills in critical analysis, and how are these demonstrated? What opportunities are presented for reflection, and is it feasible to assess the "quality" of these reflections? An excellent resource for a variety of methods to assess student experiences can be found in Bringle, Phillips, and Hudson (2004).

#### **Civic Skills**

A number of civic skills have been articulated that link to the various civic engagement frameworks. As with civic knowledge, these skills will vary by disciplinary context—with some common elements, but potentially with different expressions by discipline. Also, the level of learner and breadth of their previous experience is an important factor to account for in measuring or observing skills. A novice will have much less expertise than someone who has had multiple "engaged" experiences and has developed mastery of many of the challenging elements of such work. Undergraduate students may show less skill development than graduate students; however, many students come to higher education today with significant community-based experience through their K–12 education and as a result quickly demonstrate skills and abilities related to working with and in communities which may *not* be as evident for the more advanced student who has never had such experiences before.

#### **Civic Values**

Measuring values may be more of a challenge for some departments than measuring knowledge, but the strategy is identical. Departments need to begin by clearly articulating the values that they hope or expect students to gain from civic engagement experiences. They can then develop an assessment metric that enables students to self-assess prior to, during, and after the experience (or if a short experience, through a more simple pre-post strategy). Similarly, departments should as a collective articulate what the departmental values are with respect to engagement and can then monitor and assess change over time. As Battistoni describes (2006), espoused values are very influenced by institutional mission as well as by departmental areas of emphasis and disciplinary values.

#### Specific Measurement Strategies

In order to pursue an assessment agenda, the department must carefully consider each strategy it is adopting as part of its work as an engaged department and then determine the appropriate assessment methods for each strategy whether these are curriculum-based activities or other professional or personal development activities. For course-based activities, one would typically use methods of student learning assessment that include papers, examinations, presentations, reflections, and other means but could augment these with specific methods to explore the experience—surveys, interviews, focus groups, reflective writing, and observations. In field-based experiences and integrative capstones, it is common to see a reflective portfolio as a method of assessment; the introduction of focused questions that help the students to self-assess their personal experience and provide an opportunity to comment on community interaction can augment the assessment value of such portfolios.

As Battistoni suggests, there are common characteristics among all of the various strategies such as placement quality, curricular applications, or practice implications that might lead to relevant assessment methods. These point to the importance of incorporating questions or discrete assessment items into rubrics that will provide insights into these characteristics. Of vital importance is the expression of multiple voices—the student's, the community partner's, and the faculty's overseeing the experience. Thus in thinking about measurement strategies it is also important for departments to clearly identify

the multiple potential sources of information to ensure that a variety of perspectives is obtained, giving a full spectrum (or "360 degrees") of opinions and observations.

Departments (or comparable units) also may benefit from conducting an overall self-assessment to gain insights into their level of development with respect to service-learning, civic engagement, and community-engaged scholarship. Useful examples of self-assessment tools designed to measure baseline institutional status and change over time are now available in the public domain, and include Furco (2003) and Gelmon, Seifer, and Associates (2004). These formats could be easily used by departments as valuable mechanisms for baseline self-assessment and for tracking change over time.

#### Community-University Partnerships

An essential element of engagement for many departments is the establishment, nurturing, and enhancement of partnerships with a variety of community organizations. If these are essential to the department's engagement activities, then attention must be given to incorporating the partners' perspectives into assessment—both by seeking out community perspectives for data collection and ideally by engaging them in values clarification and the design of measurement strategies (Gelmon 2003; Holland 2001). Partners' perspectives should be a substantial portion of the assessment agenda and should not be limited to assessing the partnership itself but also should include inviting the community perspective on student, faculty, and institutional roles and activities (Gelmon et al. 2001). Of course, engagement may be successful only if a department has partners with whom to engage; the assumption is, therefore, that the department has been committed to developing effective partnerships and has partners to involve in the assessment process (Battistoni et al. 2003).

#### Faculty Commitment, Development, Rewards

A final area that is essential to take into account when assessing departmental engagement relates to faculty commitment, development, and rewards. The role of faculty will evolve as they gain experience and comfort in creating and facilitating various community engagement experiences—in the classroom, through community-based research, and in mentoring students in specific field experiences, internships, or capstones. However, faculty need reassurance that work related to an engagement agenda will be recognized within their department, their institution, and their discipline as a valid focus of their curricular and scholarly efforts. There is increasing evidence that institutions are changing to support faculty engagement as reflected in mandates, rewards, and incentives, but faculty still need encouragement and motivation to become involved in engagement activities that may seem different from traditional disciplinary work (Gelmon and Agre-Kippenhan 2002). Therefore,

another area of emphasis for departments is to carefully assess their definitions of faculty roles, support for faculty (through faculty development, for example), and methods of reward and recognition.

#### Implementing Assessment

Regardless of the area of focus within the overall assessment of departmental engagement, it is necessary to identify core concepts, measurable or observable indicators, relevant methods for data collection, and appropriate sources of information and then articulate these into a coherent plan for analysis and reporting. Departments that adopt a comprehensive assessment plan as part of their engagement agenda will be able to demonstrate evidence of accomplishments, as well as challenges and resultant learning, and should be most effective in securing commitments of resources and energy to support ongoing engagement initiatives. The chapters that follow illustrate a variety of departmental approaches to engagement.

# SECTION VII The Engaged Campus

## Introduction

BARBARA A. HOLLAND

rom the very start of the "engagement movement" in the late 1980s, the rhetoric used by engagement's advocates included an emphasis on institutionalization. The very nature of engagement as a concept—the connection of knowledge to public purposes through partnership relationships—implied a need for permanence and commitment to a fundamental change in the relationship between higher education and society. At that time, higher education was just emerging from its exploration of a series of management movements, such as Total Quality Management, inspired by the notion that "higher education should be run more like a business," and like those concepts, engagement in its early days was often painted with the brush meant to label it as a passing fad.

Some twenty years later, it would be difficult to find evidence to support a view of engagement as a faddish innovation. The evidence of its beneficial impacts on teaching, learning, research, and academic-societal relationships is overwhelming, and it has been integrated into accreditation and classification systems. However, the struggle for institutionalization of engagement still goes on at the institutional level, in part perhaps because institutionalization is a very lofty and rather polite term for a much more challenging or even frightening concept: organizational change. As one who has chosen to specialize in organizational change in higher education (which some would call an oxymoron), I recognize that much of my work and the work of others, like those presented in this section of the book, are really focused on a call for significant organizational change in higher education institutions—change in their purpose, focus, intentions, behavior, values, actions, and commitment to others outside the academy.

The essays in this section explore several themes relating to how engagement has changed higher education. The first strong theme running through the set is an exploration of the often competing views of the purposes of American higher education with the intent of positioning engagement as a contemporary strategy for helping colleges and universities connect to the world beyond them. John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski link higher education to the idea of "public good" by framing academic institutions as organizations with a moral purpose—organizations that see themselves as more than mechanistic producers of new knowledge and a workforce oriented toward economic gain.

In "A New University with a Soul," John Saltmarsh responds to a 2000 op-ed piece in which Arthur Levine offers higher education his vision of a market-driven, technology-based future. Saltmarsh's response emphasizes the relationship between education and democracy and weaves a compelling argument that the market model will not succeed without the "soul" created by attention to the higher purpose of developing an educated citizenry.

This thoughtful essay can now be seen as a prediction of the dramatic effect engagement has had on higher education and views of its purposes. American higher education has always occupied contested terrain open to continuous debate about what kinds of purposes or aims should dominate—those of markets, society, culture, or politics. The social context of this debate is wonderfully illustrated by Clark Kerr's *The Uses of the University*, published in its fifth edition in 2001, because Kerr has had to keep updating the book as public issues have evolved since its first edition in 1963! Perhaps each generation of academics inevitably feels that it is living through a time of unusually significant change, but history reveals that higher education is a dynamic and constantly evolving sector as society seeks to shape education to reflect contemporary issues and demands. The engagement debate, along with the teaching to learning movement, has been a major force for change in higher education over the last two decades, and much of the effect of that change is measured in these essays.

Thus, the second theme that emerges in this section is that engagement has contributed to a more diverse system of higher education. Engagement involves relationships between academic institutions and external sectors of society, be they profit, not for profit, government or community. Engagement done well (institutionalized) inevitably will be a unique reflection of each institution's internal and external context. The historic roots and developmental experiences of the campus and the community determine the opportunities and challenges that will be addressed through engagement activities as well as the nature and structure of the relationships themselves. Edward Zlotkowski illustrates this with two essays that analyze the special circumstances that define engagement in the context of community colleges and minority-serving institutions. In each of these sectors he finds that the founding purposes and historic relationship between these institutions and their students and communities inspire a unique interpretation of the role of engagement. In particular, he draws our attention to the role of cultural values and traditions in framing an institution's approach to engagement, especially with regard to the value placed on the student learning experience and the value of educational opportunity for the nearby community. The concept of "integrity" is shown to be an essential factor in determining the ability of a community college or minority-serving institution to develop and sustain an agenda of community and civic engagement. To be engaged, Zlotkowski observes, a college or university must be true to itself. The development of an engagement agenda often is a return to the historic roots of the institution.

A third theme emerges from Zlotkowski's candid comments about the challenge of understanding the diversity of institutional cultures and approaches in the context of a project meant to discern specific "indicators" of best practice in the institutionalization of engagement. There is and always will be a point of tension between the need for guidelines and frameworks that inform good practice in engagement and the fact that contextual factors compel each institution to develop an engagement agenda that respects its particular context and values. This tension is what effects diversification across higher education and, I would argue, results in greater respect and appreciation across the entire sector for different institutional types and missions, not to mention a greater overall capacity for change.

The "Indicators of Engagement" essay by Elizabeth Hollander, Saltmarsh, and Zlotkowski was in its time an important publication because it established a clear set of indicators of "highly successful examples of programs, policies and organizational and administrative structures" related to engagement. Derived from analysis of the experience of many different types of institutions, the indicators were posited as a framework to help any institution develop and/or monitor its engagement agenda. The most important impact of this work lay in its utility in informing, along with other frameworks by other scholars, the development of the Carnegie Foundation's Elective Classification for Community Engagement.

Launched in 2006, this classification scheme provides the contemporary template for describing institutional engagement through an instrument that by design directs attention toward factors and strategies associated with institutionalization. The process of application and review reinforces the constructive tension between attention to best practices and the unique mission and context of each college or university and its communities of interest. The lessons learned by applicant institutions and the impact of the first round of classifications have been reviewed and analyzed in a recent volume of *New* 

*Directions* (Sandmann, Thornton, and Jaeger 2009). The editors of the volume caution that the analysis should not be seen as an assessment of the state of engagement in the United States but as an opportunity to understand best practices in its institutionalization. However, whether intended or not, the classification scheme itself and this useful analysis of its implementation provide a clear portrait of the positive impacts of engagement on institutional diversity and intentionality.

Overall, these essays remind us that engagement has come a long way very quickly and has had a dramatic and measurable impact on higher education's culture and values as well as on educational policy. From the beginning, engagement was in many ways a call for colleges and universities to become more distinctive, intentional, and coherent in their mission, actions, and decisions, especially with regard to the impact of higher education on societal issues.

This call to intentionality and diversification was made necessary, as Saltmarsh notes, by education policies and financial strategies imposed in the 1980s that created a very narrow view of research and selectivity as *the* determinants of academic reputation. This, in turn, helped turn students more into consumers than learners. The essays assembled here by Saltmarsh and Zlotkowski document important benchmark ideas and arguments that were essential to framing the case for engagement as a positive force for change in higher education—change that was necessary to ensure the sector would be sufficiently diverse and responsive to a wide range of societal expectations and purposes.

The emergence of community engagement as a widely understood aspect of the mission of every tertiary institution, to the degree appropriate to its mission and context, has produced positive outcomes beyond the expectations of engagement's advocates. As foreshadowed in these essays, American higher education's struggle with the relevance of community engagement as a form of scholarly work has produced both a more diverse system and one that is now more adaptable and open to change than it has ever been.

## 17 Indicators of Engagement

John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski (with Elizabeth L. Hollander)

n 2000, when the book manuscript that would become Learning to Serve: Promoting Civil Society through Service-Learning was being developed, Campus Compact was contacted about contributing to the volume. After inquiring about the other contributors and looking over the prospectus, we were concerned that some of the practices being highlighted in the book were not what we would have assessed to be best practices or exemplary models. After a conversation with one of the co-editors of the volume, Richard Lerner, he graciously invited John to come to Tufts and talk with him about the book. In the course of that conversation, Richard asked what it was that he and others should be looking for as the characteristics of an engaged campus. John explained that he did not have empirical data, but he did have, along with Edward and Liz Hollander, the then executive director at Campus Compact, a good deal of experience on the ground on campuses across the country and had a pretty good sense of what practices contributed to institutionalized campus engagement. Thus, Richard asked, "Why don't you

Elizabeth L. Hollander is former Executive Director of Campus Compact. This chapter was originally published as Elizabeth L. Hollander, John Saltmarsh, and Edward Zlotkowski, "Indicators of Engagement," in *Learning to Serve: Promoting Civil Society through Service Learning*, ed. Maureen E. Kenney, Lou Anna K. Simon, Karen Kiley-Brabeck, and Richard M. Lerner, 31–49 (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002). Reprinted with kind permission of Springer Science and Business Media. write a chapter on the indicators of civic engagement on colleges and universities?"

Back at the Compact, we worked to describe the indicators of engagement. We drew on Andy Furco's evolving work on an assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning and talked with colleagues who were developing approaches to institutional assessment of civic engagement. We drew heavily on our collective experience in the field. It was from this knowledge of campus practices that we developed the indicators and illustrated them with concrete examples from campuses across the country. While many of the examples are now dated, the indicators hold up well and have been reflected in as well as influenced a number of subsequent institutional assessment instruments.

Most notably, the indicators of engagement we developed emerged nearly intact in the "framework" developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the elective classification offered by the foundation, a classification for Community Engagement. Since 2006, 196 campuses have undertaken a rigorous application process documenting campus practices along a number of indicators divided into three areas: institutional commitment and culture, curricular engagement, and outreach and partnerships. With the Carnegie Classification, we now have a standard assessment instrument that not only assesses campus engagement efforts but provides a blueprint for institutional action in becoming an engaged campus.

#### The Emergence of the Engaged Campus

Campus engagement with local communities can take many forms, emerge from a variety of motives, and have vastly different roots depending upon institutional culture, history, and geography. A historically black college has a rationale for engagement that differs significantly from that of a land-grant university, which differs again from that of a private university in an urban center. From decade to decade, to a greater or lesser degree, holding close to or wavering from their mission, each institution shapes its public purpose accordingly. Over time, experiments in engagement have produced highly successful examples of programs, policies, and organizational and administrative structures that in concrete and visible ways can be identified as "indicators" of engagement. These indicators have emerged from experience with a range of institutional engagement strategies over the past quarter century.

For Campus Compact, a national coalition of college and university presidents committed to the civic purposes of higher education, key elements of an engaged campus have emerged from the experiences and examples of hundreds of institutions across the United States. At its beginning, Campus Compact's perspective on campus engagement centered on community service, which was embraced by both students and campus administrators as a counterweight to the characterization of then contemporary students as members of a self-centered "me generation." Students' creation of COOL (Campus Outreach Opportunity League) in 1984 and the Compact's founding by college and university presidents in 1985 implicitly affirmed that students were seeking and that campuses were willing to provide opportunities for altruistic, socially responsible activity through community service (Morton and Troppe 1996; Stanton, Giles, and Cruz 1999).

By the late 1980s, service-learning had risen to prominence, marking a distinct evolution from community service to service that was integrated with academic study. During the early 1990s, service-learning spread across college campuses as a pedagogy of action and reflection that connected students' academic study with public problem-solving experiences in local community settings. As increasing numbers of faculty became involved in redesigning their syllabi to incorporate service-learning, new questions emerged regarding such larger institutional issues such as the definition of faculty roles and rewards, the value of community-based teaching and research, definitions of faculty professional service, strategies for maintaining community partnerships, and the role of the university in assisting community renewal (Eyler and Giles 1999; Jacoby et al. 1996; Rhoads and Howard 1998; Zlotkowski 1998a).

By the mid-1990s, these service-learning developments had converged with a range of critical and often contested issues—pedagogical, epistemological, institutional, and political-in higher education. Campuses had increasingly come to be viewed as disconnected from social concerns and unresponsive to public needs, indeed, as largely deficient in meeting their civic obligations. When the National Commission on Civic Renewal issued its 1998 report on civic disengagement, it offered no role for higher education in providing solutions aimed at rebuilding civic life (Damon 1998; National Commission on Civic Renewal 1998). Instead, the report in many ways echoed what the community organizer Saul Alinsky had written in the late 1940s about higher education's relationship to community building, namely, that "the word 'academic' is often synonymous with irrelevant" (Alinsky 1969). However, while a contemporary could have objected that Alinsky's critique failed to reflect the significant contribution higher education was making to meeting the country's international crisis during the 1940s, no such mitigating consideration was available in the 1990s.

Indeed, during the Cold War years institutions of higher education were highly responsive in helping to meet the needs of the country as defined by the struggle with communism and allowed themselves to become in large part structured and organized around the demands of the military-industrial complex. This meant that their culture celebrated science and technology, their faculty emphasized objectivity and detachment, and their value system elevated the role of the scientifically educated expert over that of ordinary citizens in public affairs (Bender 1993; Mathews 1998).

Yet the crisis we now face at the beginning of a new century is a crisis in our civic life. Success in addressing the Cold War meant that colleges and universities became shaped in ways that are not necessarily those needed to meet the challenge of transforming our civic life. Ironically, the very ethos of professionalism and expertise that defined higher education's response to that situation now contributes to public disillusionment with institutions that represent and legitimize a system that no longer addresses our most pressing national concerns (Boyte 2000; Sullivan 1995). For this reason, many higher education institutions, in their struggle to meet our need for civic renewal, have found themselves returning to their founding missions, which often express the aim of serving American democracy by educating students for productive citizenship. At the same time, they look to pedagogies of engagement such as service-learning to prepare students with the knowledge and skills needed for democratic citizenship. Furthermore, service-learning not only transforms teaching and learning but also has the potential to surface a broader vision of the engaged campus (Hollander and Saltmarsh 2000; Campus Compact 1999a). Such a campus, centrally engaged in the life of its local communities, reorients its core missions-teaching, scholarship, and servicearound community building and neighborhood resource development.

- *Pedagogy* is centered on engaged teaching, that is, connecting structured student activities in community work with academic study, decentering the teacher as the singular source of knowledge, incorporating a reflective teaching methodology, and shifting the model of education, to use Paulo Freire's distinction, from "banking" to "dialogue" (Dewey 1916a; Friere 1970; Saltmarsh 1996).
- Scholarship is oriented toward community-based action research that addresses issues defined by community participants and that includes students in the process of inquiry (Boyer 1990).
- *Service* is expanded beyond the confines of department committees, college committees, and professional associations to the application of academic expertise to community-defined concerns (Lynton 1995).

This vision of the engaged campus also suggests a wider democratic practice, one that goes beyond a reorientation of the institution's professional culture and a revisiting of its academic mission to include changes in institutional structure and organization. Reciprocal, long-term relationships in local communities imply institutional structures—what Mary Walshok calls "enabling mechanisms" (Walshok 1995)—to connect the campus to the community. Faculty roles are reconsidered, as is the reward structure, to acknowledge, validate, and encourage a shift in teaching, scholarship, and service toward community engagement. Additionally, traditional campus divisions such as those between student affairs and academic affairs, and between various disciplines and departments are suspended in the interest of a broader view of educating students as whole individuals whose experience of community engagement is not artificially delimited by disciplinary distinctions. Further, the institution embraces a view of the campus as connected to, not as separate from, the local community. Such a view reconceptualizes the resources of the college or university as community-related resources, impacting issues like community economic development, hiring, purchasing, and the investment of capital in community revitalization (Ehrlich 2000). It is this larger sense of institutional alignment that Ernest Boyer had in mind when he employed the concept of "the scholarship of engagement," by which he meant "connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems." Higher education, claimed Boyer, "must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems, and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I call the scholarship of engagement" (Boyer 1996).

## Indicators of Engagement

When Campus Compact is called upon to assist a campus in moving toward deeper engagement with a local community, our response is shaped by the experience of our member campuses over years of experiments and challenges and draws on a wide range of experiences and examples. We look specifically for the existence of certain institutional activities, policies, and structures. These, as they stand individually, can be considered "indicators of engagement." Any number of these indicators occurring together on a campus suggests wider institutional engagement and the emergence of an "engaged campus." However, it is unlikely that all will be apparent on any one campus. These indicators should not be regarded as prescriptive; their value lies in the possibilities they suggest. They include

- 1. *Pedagogy and epistemology*: Are there courses on campus that have a community-based component that enhances the acquisition and creation of disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge (service-learning courses)? Is gaining knowledge through experience accepted as an academically credible method of creating meaning and understanding?
- 2. *Faculty development*: Are there opportunities for faculty to retool their teaching methods to employ a reflective teaching methodology that maximizes the value of integrating community-based experiences with the academic aims of a course? Is there administrative support for faculty to redesign curricula to incorporate community-based activities and reflection on those activities?

- 3. *Enabling mechanisms*: Are there visible and easily accessible structures on campus that function both to assist faculty with community-based teaching and learning and to broker the relationships between community-based organizations (community partners) and various curricular and co-curricular activities on campus?
- 4. *Internal resource allocation*: Is there adequate funding available for establishing, enhancing, and deepening community-based work on campus—for faculty, students, and programs that involve community partners?
- 5. *External resource allocation*: Is there funding available for community partners to create a richer learning environment for students working in the community and to assist those partners to access human and intellectual resources on campus? Are resources made available for community-building efforts in local neighborhoods?
- 6. *Faculty roles and rewards*: Do the tenure and promotion guidelines used at the institution reflect the kind of reconsideration of scholarly activity proposed by Ernest Boyer, whereby a scholarship of teaching and a scholarship of engagement are viewed on a par with the scholarship of discovery (Boyer 1990, 1996)?
- 7. *Disciplines, departments, interdisciplinarity*: Is community-based education relegated to a small number of social science disciplines, or is it embedded in the arts and humanities, hard sciences, technical disciplines, professional studies, and interdisciplinary programs as well? To what extent does it exist only on the margins of the curriculum, or has it been allowed to penetrate to the institution's academic core?
- 8. Community voice: How deeply are community partners involved in determining their role in and contribution to community-based education, and to what degree can they shape institutional involvement to maximize its benefits to the community?
- 9. Administrative and academic leadership: Do the president, provost, and trustees visibly support campus civic engagement in their words and deeds? To what degree have the president and academic leadership been in the forefront of institutional transformation that supports civic engagement? To what degree is the campus known as a positive partner in local community development efforts?
- 10. *Mission and purpose*: Does the college's or university's mission explicitly articulate its commitment to the public purposes of higher education and higher education's civic responsibility to educate for democratic participation? Are these aspects of the mission openly valued and identified to reinforce the public activities of the campus? Are they viewed merely as rhetoric, or is there substantive reality to match such stated purposes?

What follows are concrete examples of the kinds of activities, policies, and organizational and administrative structures that mark a campus's deepening engagement in local communities. For each indicator, the examples provided are not meant to suggest any kind of comprehensive overview but merely to provide specific examples of increasingly widespread practices.

### Pedagogy and Epistemology

At the core of wider institutional engagement lies an academic commitment to the kind of teaching, learning, and knowledge creation that foster active civic engagement. Courses with a service-learning or community-based component signify adoption of an engaged pedagogy. Yet, embedded within such a curriculum is a reflective teaching methodology that decenters the instructor and in doing so recognizes that the authority of knowledge in the classroom is shared among faculty members, students, and partners in the community. Since such a reconceptualization of authority necessitates multifaceted reflection upon all knowledge-producing activity, faculty need to develop an array of strategies for encouraging deep reflection by students (Eyler and Giles 1999).

At Portland State University in Oregon,<sup>1</sup> the university's commitment to community-based public problem solving as part of its land-grant mission creates a strong academic connection to the community. Students in their second and third years pursue clusters of inquiry dealing with a theme related to their major and relevant to the Portland community. Most of these courses involve some kind of service-learning or action research project. In the fourth year, seniors must complete a capstone experience, a project that uses a team of students from several different disciplines to address a community-based problem or issue. All undergraduate students must make a connection between their academic work and the surrounding community before they graduate (Campus Compact 1999b).

At St. Joseph's College, a small Catholic, liberal arts college in Standish, Maine, over 25 percent of the full-time faculty embrace service-learning as a legitimate method of gaining knowledge. The college's vice-president for academic affairs has included service-learning in his strategic plan for academic learning with the goal that all students will experience this method of learning during their undergraduate education. Further, he is working with the faculty to infuse service-learning into the core curriculum. At a very different institution, the University of San Diego, approximately sixty classes use service-learning during each academic year, including courses that are offered both semesters

<sup>1.</sup> All of the examples in this essay were provided to illustrate the campus practice of the indicators of engagement. Since the essay was written in 2002, many of the specific campus practices have evolved and the data describing them may have changed.

and those that have more than one section. Over fifty faculty members have incorporated service-learning into their courses, and between 450 and 500 students participate in those courses each semester. Courses are offered in the schools of business and education, and many arts and sciences departments. These include anthropology, biology, chemistry, communication studies, English, fine arts (music and studio arts), foreign languages (French, German, Italian, and Spanish), gender studies, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology. There are service-learning business courses in accounting, economics, information systems, marketing, and management.

## Faculty Development

For community-based education to take hold on campus, faculty must have opportunities to develop new teaching skills. The traditional teaching approach faculty adopt involves lectures that aim to deliver a certain disciplinary knowledge-base. For faculty confidently to incorporate community-based learning into their courses, they need curriculum development incentives such as grants or temporary reductions in teaching load as well as a chance to attend on-campus workshops and seminars or regional and national conferences that will help them gain new skills. Faculty development must be taken seriously as a component of institutional engagement (Holland 1999; Zlotkowski 1998a).

An increasingly common faculty development strategy provides faculty stipends to redesign discipline-based courses to include a service-learning dimension. In this model, the stipend is accompanied by a commitment by the faculty member to attend a series of workshops on experiential learning theory, reflection, community partnerships, and other key elements of communitybased education. Further, the participating faculty commit to teaching their redesigned courses at least twice. There are two assumptions behind this model. First, the initial offering of the course should be treated as an experiment, and the faculty member encouraged to reflect on the successes and challenges he or she has experienced and then make needed adjustments. Second, faculty who develop competency in community-based teaching and recognize the enhanced learning potential of this approach will continue to teach service-learning courses.

Early in the development of its service-learning program, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) adopted a model of offering course development stipends to faculty, a model that had been used successfully at the University of Notre Dame. Faculty were offered stipends of \$1,000 to support the creation, implementation, or improvement of servicelearning courses. Faculty recipients agreed to participate in three campus workshops during the year of the award. At the University of San Diego, all faculty members interested in service-learning attend a one-day curriculum development workshop facilitated by experienced faculty members on the foundations of service-learning. During the semester that faculty integrate service-learning for the first time, they attend a second workshop. Faculty members receive \$250 for participating in the two workshops. They also receive \$250 for revision of their syllabi and \$250 for writing evaluation reports. All beginners have an experienced faculty "facilitator" as a resource person who meets with them several times during the semester and is available for assistance. In this way, the university works toward the goal of building a critical mass of faculty committed to service-learning.

At St. Joseph's College, each semester faculty are selected to receive course development grants and each semester a faculty development workshop is offered. Topics have included an introduction to service-learning, reflection and academic integration, assessment of student learning outcomes, working with community partners, and discipline-specific approaches to servicelearning. Grant funding has been secured to bring in leading national servicelearning practitioners and community partners to facilitate the workshops. Additionally, faculty have participated in the problem-based service-learning workshops offered each summer by the Maine Campus Compact, and the vice president for academic affairs has participated in regional meetings of provosts to discuss service-learning and strategies for faculty development.

#### Enabling Mechanisms

The single most important mechanism for facilitating community-based learning is a centralized office that performs a wide variety of functions. Indeed, so important is this particular mechanism that there exist few genuinely engaged campuses that do not have one. However, both its location or configuration and functions vary enormously from campus to campus.

Although many schools have some kind of "volunteer center" operating out of student affairs, most schools that become serious about developing a comprehensive engagement profile find it highly advantageous to locate such a center on the faculty affairs side of the institution, or at least to establish formal links between a more traditionally located center and academic administrators. Indeed, the degree to which a center has succeeded in developing effective, widely respected programming linked to scholarship and the curriculum is one important indicator of its institution's commitment to the concept of an engaged campus. Almost every school profiled in *Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education* (Zlotkowski 1998a) features a center under the authority of the provost or academic dean. When a different arrangement is involved, as in the case of the University of Utah, it still features multiple links to those responsible for academic programming.

Aside from the location of such a center on the institution's organizational chart, its relationship to other offices responsible for assisting faculty and students is another important consideration. Sometimes an office that facilitates service-learning and other forms of engaged scholarship also facilitates other kinds of community-based activities, for example, traditional extracurricular community service and traditional internships. The advantage of bringing together under the same roof different kinds of partnering efforts is that such an arrangement helps the institution better keep track of and coordinate its relationships with the community. On other campuses, the office that facilitates academic partnering is linked with faculty development (Portland State University) or student career services (Michigan State University).

Naturally, the location and linkages that define a center also help define the kinds of services it provides. Clearly its single most common function is to serve as a clearinghouse for faculty-community collaborations. Examples of this function range from a relatively passive indexing of what is available in the off-campus community to providing assistance with transportation, orientation, and reflection to highly proactive attempts to build and sustain long-term partnerships based equally on faculty and community needs. However, some centers also assist faculty in learning about what is being done in comparable academic programs at other institutions. An increasingly frequent and especially promising function of many centers is to locate and train students capable of serving as faculty-community liaisons (University of San Diego and Miami-Dade Community College). Regardless of their specific functions, centers must develop the documents and procedures that allow them to organize and document their work.

#### Internal Resource Allocation

Nothing is more common than for a college or university to recognize the benefits of engagement—and to try to capitalize on those benefits—without making any substantive investment in the resources such engagement requires. Many potentially fine programs have been initiated with the help of grants, only to crumble away once their external source of funding has dried up. Few schools would consider trying to reap the benefits of corporate or alumni support without first investing in a development or alumni office, and yet, when it comes to community engagement, this is precisely what they often try to do. Internal institutional funding is, therefore, one significant measure of an institution's commitment to engagement.

This being said, it is important to note that internal resources come in many forms, not the least important of which is space. How much space and where on campus a school is willing to dedicate space to organizing its engagement activities often says more than any catalog copy about the real significance the school attaches to them. Another indication is its willingness to tap already existing resources to strengthen those activities. When Bentley University in Waltham, Massachusetts, first began developing a service-learning program in the early 1990s, its provost not only made it clear that summer scholarship funds should be used to support quality work in this new area, he also made it possible for the program to "employ" graduate students through a reallocation of graduate assistantships and undergraduate work-study placements. While the program's line items for operations and staff grew modestly over the course of several years, a redistribution of already budgeted resources made it possible for the program to accomplish far more than the annual growth in those line items would have suggested.

#### External Resource Allocation

Investing resources off campus in community building has a significance in (1) demonstrating a commitment to the value of reciprocity in campus-community partnerships and (2) recognizing the erosion of boundaries between the campus and community. The broader educational value of external resource allocation is that the institution, in its economic relations, models the values instilled in community-based academic study.

Increasingly, there are examples of campuses that are investing in their surrounding communities as a way of demonstrating their civic engagement and leveraging other resources for improving challenged communities. These investments are, in some cases, direct financial contributions that may be as large as the \$20 million that Harvard has invested as seed funds for low and moderate income housing development in Cambridge, Massachusetts, or the \$8 million that Trinity College in Connecticut has invested in a "learning corridor" adjacent to the campus, or as modest as the \$150,000 in small business development funds pledged by President Theodore Long of Elizabeth College in Pennsylvania to the Elizabethtown Economic Development Corporation. Similarly, in the mid-1990s, Georgetown University in Washington, DC, purchased \$1 million worth of stock in City First Bank of DC. In 1999, City First opened its doors to service Washington's low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, seeking to increase home ownership and establish stable, mixed-income communities, by providing the financing needed to upgrade housing stock and strengthen the base of local small businesses. In each of these cases, the campus served as one of a variety of actors (public, corporate, and nonprofit) investing in community improvement.

Development of campus structures designed to serve both campus and community is another increasingly common strategy for external resource allocation. For example, Metropolitan State University in St. Paul, Minnesota, developed a shared-use building that serves as a joint community-university library and includes a job resource center, a youth/adult study center, a children's reading room, and a community learning and meeting room. At De-Paul University in Chicago, a downtown department store has been renovated into a mixed-use facility that includes city government office space, a retail mall, and campus classrooms and support facilities. Increasingly, campus athletic facilities are open to community use, particularly in the summer.

Other, more indirect ways in which campuses are extending resources to their communities come in the form of purchasing and hiring policies that favor local residents and businesses. The University of Illinois at Chicago has experimented with both neighborhood hiring and the use of local vendors. The University of Pennsylvania has sought, in all of its construction projects, to increase the participation of minority- and female-owned firms.

## Faculty Roles and Rewards

Faculty are at the core of any higher education institution, and faculty roles and rewards are at the core of faculty life. No matter how genuine a school's commitment to engagement as articulated in its mission, that commitment will probably amount to little, at least in the long run, if the school is unwilling to address the specific ways in which it formally recognizes a faculty member's contribution to that commitment. Logistical and technical assistance is essential, as is the availability of other resources, but if valuable, communitybased work is nowhere explicitly rewarded, faculty engagement will perforce remain peripheral.

The last decade has seen recognition of this fact in the ever-increasing number of schools that have adopted some variant of Ernest Boyer's expanded understanding of scholarship (Boyer 1990). West Virginia University, for example, revised its promotion and tenure guidelines in 1998 to allow faculty to renegotiate their contracts. Faculty can now, with the agreement of their department chair and college dean, work to achieve excellence in teaching and service instead of teaching and research. To assess the degree to which this and other programs on campus are helping students develop civic competencies and habits, providing opportunities for faculty to engage in true civic partnerships, and encouraging faculty to engage in community-based teaching and action research, the university has begun an evaluation process that will gradually expand into a full civic assessment program.

Portland State University notes that "scholarly accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and community outreach all enter into the evaluation of faculty performance" (Zlotkowski 1998a, G-7). Indiana University– Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) includes in its faculty annual report a category called "Volunteer Community Service" that recognizes "voluntary, civic responsibilities . . . deem[ed] relevant to [one's] professional work." Not to be included under this heading is "service to the community as a citizen rather than as a professional whose work can be assessed by peers" (IUPUI Faculty and Librarian Annual Report).

## Disciplines, Departments, Interdisciplinarity

No one would deny the importance of quality community-based work in nursing, teacher education, and sociology. However, institutions where the vast majority of engaged projects are located in areas like these can hardly be said to have made significant progress toward campus-wide engagement. While the fact that the anthropology department at the University of Pennsylvania boasts a demonstrated commitment to work in West Philadelphia is commendable, the fact that the university's history department can also make such a claim probably tells us more about Penn's determination to become a truly engaged campus. Colleges and universities need to avail themselves of resources such as the American Association for Higher Education's twenty-one-volume series on service-learning in the disciplines (1997–2006) and Amy Driscoll and Ernest Lynton's *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach* (1999), to ensure that community-based work is not seen as the concern of only a few "naturally appropriate" disciplines (Driscoll and Lynton 1999).

Even more difficult to achieve is unit ownership of outreach efforts, regardless of the discipline or department involved. Campus Compact's "Engaged Department Toolkit" (Battistoni et al. 2003) represents one important resource available to help transform engagement from something of interest only to individual faculty practitioners to a commitment made by an entire academic unit. Only when such a commitment has been made can students and community partners rely upon the availability of faculty to maintain the integrity of community-based programs. Although specially endowed units like the Feinstein Center for Public Service at Providence College have for years been able to make this commitment, schools like Calvin College, with its well-established record of academically based service, has only more recently begun planning for such a commitment by a range of departments across the curriculum.

Institutionalization of this kind can also lay the foundation for more community-based academic work that draws upon several disciplines. As the AAHE series on service-learning in the disciplines makes clear, we already have many fine examples of community-based capstone experiences in which students are expected to use the natural interdisciplinarity of off-campus work as an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to integrate skills and concepts from different areas of academic study. Less common are programs such as Purdue's EPICS program (Engineering Projects in Community Service), which folds a variety of disciplinary perspectives into an engineering core. But as Boyer suggested in his now famous sketch of "The New American College" (1994), the engaged campus of the future will "organize cross-disciplinary institutes around pressing social issues" (A48) as a matter of course.

#### **Community Voice**

Establishing and maintaining meaningful community partnerships as part of a broader vision of civic engagement requires the development of trust, longterm commitments, and formal obligations on the part of all involved (Campus Compact 2000; Holland and Gelmon 1998). While partnerships take time to develop, there are certain initial strategies that can be implemented from the beginning to foster deeper, more lasting relationships. A common starting point is the creation of an advisory committee with significant representation from the community. The makeup of such a committee typically includes faculty, administrators, the campus community service director, students, and community partners. The committee functions in such a way as to involve community partners in joint strategic planning and in fostering dialogue between the campus and community, particularly around mutual campus-community understandings. Community partners can also be invited to assist in curriculum development and in course instruction.

At IUPUI, community partners have been involved in providing important guidance and feedback in the development and maintenance of the servicelearning program. Community representatives have served on the Service Learning Advisory Committee, Service Learning in University College Advisory Committee, Community Service Scholars selection committee, and Universities as Citizens Summer Institute planning team. Agency personnel also work with individual faculty on the design, implementation, and administration of service-learning classes. At Providence College, community partners have played a significant role in strategic planning for community-based education and have been involved in curriculum development. Community partners have also been given a stipend to team-teach service-learning courses with faculty.

Similarly, at St. Joseph's College, community partners participate in needs assessment and evaluation meetings, have met with faculty to help design courses, supervise and evaluate students, and participate in workshops offered to enhance their knowledge of service-learning, effective supervision and partnerships, community asset-mapping, and other areas. There are also opportunities for community partners to come into the classroom to facilitate orientation and the discussion of particular topics, as well as to teach a course themselves.

#### Administrative and Academic Leadership

Essential to accomplishing all of the indicators of engagement identified here is leadership from the top that actively endorses and supports engagement efforts. In the best of all possible worlds, the trustees, the president, and the provost (or academic equivalent) would all be enthusiasts. The trustees and presidents can raise funds to support civic engagement and can provide a bully pulpit for fostering it. At Swarthmore College, a trustee committee on social responsibility was formed to reflect on the institutional mission to "prepare and motivate students to engage issues of social responsibility facing our communities and societies and to see their own paths as responsible citizens toward shaping a more inclusive, just and compassionate world." At Tufts University, former President John DiBiaggio worked for ten years to develop a "college" of public service and citizenship and raised \$10 million from the eBay corporation to support it. At Alcorn State University, Clinton Bristow led a "communiversity" effort, a type of initiative that is especially common at historically black colleges. At the University of Vermont, Judith Ramaley led an effort to increase engagement (building on her experience in transforming Portland State University) and instituted such practices as an "Introduction to Vermont" program for new faculty. At Miami-Dade Community College, Eduardo Padrón has made real a commitment that his institution is indeed the "community's college" through such efforts as a technology learning center located in a local church. These presidents are only a few examples of many presidential leaders at every type of institution committed to the civic engagement of higher education. Nearly 400 presidents have signed the *Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education* (Campus Compact 1999a).

However, leadership specific to academic affairs is also key. At IUPUI, former provost William Plater led the effort to create a promotion and tenure system that recognizes, documents, and rewards the scholarship of engagement. At DePaul University, Richard Meister, former executive vice president for Academic Affairs, built community engagement into the university's five-year strategic plan and reinforced and celebrated engagement at every opportunity (e.g., convocation addresses). Increasingly, professional development opportunities related to civic engagement and the scholarship of engagement are being offered for chief academic officers. Such opportunities reflect a recognition of the important role these leaders play in bringing engagement from the "margins to the mainstream" in the academy.

#### Mission and Purpose

There is hardly a campus in America that does not have a mission statement that speaks in some way to the role of higher education in providing education for civic engagement. In some cases, reference is made to producing leaders or socially useful graduates. For example, Harvard University expects "that the scholarship and collegiality it fosters in its students will lead them in their later lives to advance knowledge, to promote understanding, and to serve society" (Harry R. Lewis, Dean of Harvard College, February 23, 1997, from http://www.harvard.edu/help/noframes/faq110\_nf.html). Georgetown University "educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life, and to live generously in service to others" (http://www.georgetown.edu/admin/publicffairs/factsheets/mission.html).

Other campuses have mission statements that make it even more explicitly clear that engagement is a central enterprise. For example, at California State University, Monterey Bay, a relatively new school in the California State system, the institution's vision statement announces, "The identity of the University [will] be framed by substantive commitment to a multilingual, multicultural, intellectual community distinguished by partnerships with existing institutions, both public and private, and by cooperative agreements which enable students, faculty and staff to cross institutional boundaries for innovative instruction, broadly defined scholarly and creative activity, and coordinated community service" (http://www.monterey.edu/vision/).

The mere presence of a mission supporting civic engagement does not, of course, ensure that such a mission has a real and dynamic impact on the life of the institution and the community. In many cases, schools that wish to reassert their civic purpose undertake a review of their mission and foster wide-spread discussion of it. Some, like Olivet College in Michigan, have devised an updated vision statement based on the school's founding principles (in this case from 1844) and then sought adoption of the vision by key constituencies such as faculty and trustees.

## Self-Assessment as an Engagement Strategy

One of the first challenges facing a campus that wishes to extend and deepen its commitment to civic engagement is to discover what already exists on campus. Adopting a deliberate process of self-discovery can be, in itself, a very useful exercise; the process of self-assessment is as important as the product. If approached with care, this process can honor the faculty, staff, and students who are already engaged in the community through volunteerism, servicelearning, community-based research, and other forms of civic partnering. Because of the decentralized nature of higher education, unearthing what is already going on is not always easy to do. It requires a significant commitment by the administration and time for department-by-department research. Further, any survey of faculty requires assiduous follow-up. On a large campus it can take the better part of an academic year to find and document community engagement activities. However, once a report has been compiled and published, it often causes other faculty, staff, and students to step forward because they do not want their course or program to be overlooked. This is particularly true if a sense of excitement and pride has been built on campus regarding these activities. Increasingly, campus inventories are becoming Web-based documents that can be added to and changed. Once an inventory of engagement activities has been created, it can be employed as a valuable campus-wide catalyst to a dialogue about what engagement means and can mean to different constituencies within the institution.

Large universities like the University of Wisconsin–Madison, the University of Maryland at College Park, or Harvard University, each of which has done a full inventory of its outreach activities, have benefited from this process (see www.wisc.edu/wiscinfo/outreach, www.umd.edu/academic/partner ships.html., and www.hno.harvard.edu/community/). Each has found that the process gives its institution a way to tell constituents—including board members, legislators, local community activists, and alumni—what the campus is contributing. It also makes clear how strategic or focused these activities are and how much they reflect the particular strengths and mission of the institution.

Two contrasting approaches to institutional self-assessment are those that took place at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee and the University of Minnesota. At Wisconsin, a new chancellor, Nancy Zimpher, challenged her entire staff and faculty to come up with a series of ways to assist the city of Milwaukee within 100 days. She then sorted out those ideas and moved aggressively to implement the "Milwaukee Idea" (based on the famous "Wisconsin Idea" [1897] of the engaged campus). She also made herself available to meet with many organizations and leaders from the city to explore her school's interest in partnering.

The benefits of this approach were that her campus quickly gained a reputation in Wisconsin and across the nation for its interest in being of and for the city in which it is located. This, in turn, brought in new funds, increased student applications, and resulted in a range of exciting, innovative programs. It energized students and faculty. The down side was a concern that the effort was too driven by publicity and might not last. However, there is still a Milwaukee Idea office charged with broadening and deepening the effort. One specific result of this new commitment to civic engagement was a "Cultures and Communities" initiative to design foundation courses that would "connect students to the rich diversity of our urban communities" (Cultures and Communities, n.d.).

At the University of Minnesota, a self-examination of the institution's civic involvement was modeled on an earlier examination of issues related to cultural diversity. In this model, the provost's office issued a multifaceted charge to the institution that included defining civic engagement as well as identifying communities to work with, ways to leverage current civic activities to take advantage of the teaching and research strengths of the university, criteria for strategic investments, and practical suggestions for strengthening undergraduate and graduate students' interest in civic engagement (Charge letter from Bob Bruininks, Exec. VP and Provost, September 9, 2000, website p. 2). The leaders of this assessment effort believed that involving the campus broadly in a discussion of the meaning of civic engagement and its manifestations was most likely to gain the attention of senior faculty.

More difficult than compiling an inventory of activities is undertaking an assessment of the quality and depth of such efforts. How can a campus think about the quality and depth of its civic engagement? What should a campus take into account: the student learning experience, the faculty research agenda, the community impact, and the extent to which the community is determining what needs to be addressed? Several discovery and assessment tools have been developed that can help a campus start a conversation about its level and type of engagement as well as inventory and assess its activities (Bringle and Hatcher

1999; Holland 1997). Campus Compact itself has devised a civic self-assessment instrument that is framed as a series of questions a campus can ask about the student experience, faculty and staff culture, presidential leadership, and institutional engagement (Campus Compact 1999a). Campuses that have used this instrument include the University of Maryland, College Park, and the University of Utah. While no two campuses will answer the questions posed in the civic self-assessment in the same way, the process enables each campus to see its public role in a new light.

As institutions of higher education continue to shape their civic identities and define their public purposes, they will adopt strategies of engagement that will, to a greater or lesser degree, transform their campuses. An engaged campus is not a vague idea that lacks concrete definition and form. Over the last decade, there have emerged clear indicators of civic engagement, and they are increasingly visible at colleges and universities around the country.

## 18 Minority-Serving Institutions as Models

Edward Zlotkowski

ampus Compact's Indicators of Engagement project (2002–2005), funded by the Carnegie Corporation in New York City, sought to do with higher education institutions something roughly analogous to what the American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) monograph series on service-learning in the academic disciplines and the Compact's own work with academic departments which was funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts had attempted to do. In each case, the goal was to try to advance civic engagement by identifying best practices across a certain kind of academic unit. In this case the unit was the academic institution itself, identified by institutional type. Two factors complicated this plan.

To begin with, the proposed undertaking was not needed in the same way as had been the case with disciplines and departments. By 2000– 2001, many national associations organized to serve a specific kind of institution had begun creating valuable resources to meet the engagement needs of their members. These groups included the American Association of Community Colleges, the Council of Independent Colleges, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the

This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, "Conclusion," in *One with the Community: Indicators of Engagement at Minority-Serving Institutions*, by Edward Zlotkowski, Rosalyn Jacobs Jones, Margarita Maria Lenk, Jennifer Meeropol, Sherril B. Gelmon, and Katrina H. Norvell, 149–154 (Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2005). Available at www.compact.org/publications.

United Negro Fund (working with private historically black colleges and universities [HBCUs]). By the time the three-year grant had reached its midway point, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities had launched an especially ambitious effort to promote civic engagement on its member campuses, while other, more ad hoc groups had begun exploring the special needs and strengths of research-intensive universities, Jesuit schools, and institutions linked by geographical location.

Secondly, as one might readily assume, the very existence of these specialized associations created a delicate political situation. Why, they might well ask, should Campus Compact be concerning itself with issues that properly "belonged" to them? What was its "agenda"? At best, working in other groups' backyards looked like redundancy; at worst, it suggested overreaching. Still, it would be hard for the Compact to move forward without some at least tacit approval from these groups.

In most instances, that approval was, in fact, forthcoming. However the project may have looked from the outside, it was in the end neither redundant nor imperialistic. For unlike more sector-specific associations, the Compact was less interested in creating practical resources than in understanding what was most distinctive about each sector's engagement profile. What kinds of engagement came more naturally, less naturally? Where were there special opportunities and special challenges? Such an analysis would, of course, constitute a very valuable resource. However, it would be a resource that complemented rather than challenged the work of type-specific associations.

Originally, the Compact had hoped to investigate at least four distinctive kinds of schools over a four-year period: two-year institutions, minorityserving institutions (MSIs), liberal arts colleges, and comprehensive public universities. Although there was strong interest in research-intensive universities, there was also concern that the Compact's resources were insufficient to work with such large, highly decentralized institutions. As it turned out, funding was even more limited than had been anticipated, and it was possible to follow the original plan of investigation with only two kinds of schools: community/technical colleges and HBCUs. Barbara Holland, the editor of Metropolitan Universities, offered to let the Compact guest edit a special "Indicators of Engagement" issue of the journal, and this issue appeared in April 2006. Negotiations with another funder to shift from liberal arts colleges to faith-based institutions eventually failed to come to fruition. What was left of the original plan were the two volumes here represented.

Just as essentially the same set of indicators was used with both two-year and historically black schools, so the actual process of working with the featured schools in each category was essentially the same. In a variety of ways the Compact solicited online applications from schools interested in participating. This solicitation was both open and directed. While certain institutions seemed obvious choices because of the well-established quality of their programs, every effort was made to find appropriate participants not on everybody's list of "the usual suspects."

While this solicitation-selection process was underway, especially qualified supplementary personnel were brought on board. These individuals were called "engaged scholars," and they had special expertise and experience visà-vis one of the two higher education sectors being studied. Eventually, these engaged scholars visited two-thirds of the selected schools and helped produce the reports that eventually became the basis of the final texts. Donna Duffy and Bob Franco were the engaged scholars for the two-year schools, and Rosalyn Jones and Margarita Lenk for the MSIs. Jennifer Meeropol, the project director, and Steve Jones, an assistant director in the office of Integrating Service with Academic Study, also made important contributions to the final text. Sherril Gelmon, the project's research consultant, assisted by Katrina Norvell, contributed a special methodology appendix to each volume.

As the principal author for both volumes, I had the task of turning the field reports into final text. I also took responsibility for drafting most of each text's concluding chapter. Just as the AAHE monograph series allowed me to move beyond my professional background in the humanities in order to appreciate better the ways in which other disciplinary areas approached engagement, so my participation in the Indicators of Engagement project allowed me to understand better how engagement works at many different kinds of institutions. This, in turn, has led me to be very wary of many of the general pronouncements made about the practice of civic engagement at any given time. Just as faculty-scholar researchers naturally bring many of their discipline's perspectives and values to their understanding of engagement, so many also generalize on the basis of, for example, research-intensive universities or selective liberal arts colleges, failing to recognize that much of what seems normative to them is, in fact, foreign to other important academic cultures. I am grateful to the Indicators of Engagement project, as well as to the two-year and MSIs that participated in it, for helping me see so many things about the theory and practice of civic engagement that I would otherwise have missed.

## MSIs as Models

It is ironic that colleges and universities that are sometimes regarded as being on the fringe of American higher education should, in many ways, be closer to one of its founding beliefs than most of their mainstream peers. That belief postulates that education for the common good is of fundamental—not peripheral—importance and that to be truly educated means to recognize and embrace actively one's social and civic responsibilities. From this perspective, one can only regard the founding of tribal schools, the establishment of the MSI designation, and the strong reassertion of service as central to the HBCU experience—all events of the last few decades—as educational phenomena of potentially great significance. As has happened so often in American history, the example of those frequently excluded from the mainstream could well be one of the factors that help all of us rediscover our core democratic ideals.

Such a rediscovery can happen, of course, only if the academic establishment first recognizes and then is willing to learn from these "alternative" institutions. Indeed, facilitating such recognition, and even emulation, was one of the primary goals Campus Compact set for itself in trying to better understand the distinctive indicators of engagement one finds at minority-serving schools. Although their "best practices" are certainly worthy of acknowledgment in and of themselves, they also have the potential to teach the rest of us lessons we very much need to learn. When one considers the changing demographics of the country, one might even want to go further and argue that our failure to learn from MSIs could have consequences for higher education as a whole.

To be sure, not all the practices and strategies we have found lend themselves easily to transfer. For example, much of the strength of tribal colleges derives from their being grounded directly in reservation communities. For mainstream institutions, this is not an option. Similarly, many HBCUs are able to connect new students to a history of service that speaks to a specifically African American tradition of self-improvement. Majority white institutions obviously cannot draw on this powerful source of motivation and pride. Still, there are many practices that can be adapted by non-MSIs even if they can't simply be transferred intact. And there are still other practices that might be used to make non-MSI programming more effective for all students.

## An Integrated Approach to Engagement

At a time when institutional mission statements and institutional practice often seem only marginally related, it can come as a kind of culture shock to find campuses where a school's official commitment to the common good actually does guide both institutional decision making and academic programming, where even top administrators "walk the walk" when it comes to service, and a faculty member's community "portfolio" is essential to his or her academic success. Such a high degree of integrity—linking mission statement, institutional policy making, and academic expectations—has several important implications. For example, community problem solving as an institutional priority strengthens the resolve of many MSIs not to shy away from issues of political power. Unlike the majority of mainstream institutions, even those with strong service-learning programs, MSIs may well insist that service cannot be seen as an end in itself but must be viewed in relation to larger issues of public resource allocation. Since many minority communities lack adequate resources as a direct result of political decisions and priorities, such a broader understanding of engagement makes minority students more likely to recognize the systemic nature of contemporary social problems and to include advocacy in their service efforts.

However, this broader focus does not imply a devaluing of what one can learn from direct service. At many mainstream institutions, civic engagement as an institutional value has been finessed through a combination of academic theory focused on national and international issues, and extracurricular service activities that speak to more local concerns. Such an arrangement sends several counterproductive messages, one of the most unfortunate of which is that community-based experiences may be personally enriching but are not necessary to understand policy and decision making.

At MSIs, institutional integrity dictates that direct community engagement be valued in all venues—within the curriculum and outside it; as a preprofessional, discipline-specific experience and as a vehicle of personal development; as a complement to theory and as a testing of theory. As a result, students at these schools are less likely to see service as unrelated to the formal processes of representative democracy or, of equal importance, as unrelated to one's choice of a career. Surely it is not coincidental that MSIs graduate a large number of students who go into service professions.

Furthermore, the range of student-related engagement activities these schools support is itself complemented by a spectrum of initiatives that lie outside traditional campus culture. MSIs sponsor or closely collaborate with Community Development Corporations (CDCs), provide meals and health services for community members, provide assistance to the families of students and potential students, share their facilities and resources with community groups, and advocate for the community with a variety of power brokers. Few mainstream campuses model the engaged campus in so many of its dimensions.

Indeed, among mainstream institutions, perhaps only a few dozen community colleges come close to a comparable blurring of the boundaries between campus and community, and in many instances, these community colleges are also MSIs, in fact if not in name. Perhaps one of the most important reasons for this is that at MSIs one is far more likely to experience a culture and a set of attitudes not organized around the contemporary American cult of individualism. Engagement at MSIs does more than suggest greater generosity, deeper charity, and more determined social activism; it also suggests a fundamentally different approach to the relationship between the individual and the collective, with the former seen as a subset of the latter rather than its opposite. As a sign outside Fort Peck tribal college in Montana announces, the college is there to serve "individuals," "families," "community," and "tribes."

Thus, we return to the question of applicable "lessons." Given the fact that the cultural philosophy informing many MSIs differs in some fundamental ways from that informing most mainstream institutions, how can the latter learn from the former? Clearly, the kind of community solidarity MSIs demonstrate is not something one can simply orchestrate; it is too closely tied to a collectivist tradition mainstream America simply does not reflect. But if practice can influence values just as values inform practice, there may be at least two features of the MSI engagement experience that other kinds of schools should carefully consider.

In the first place, any school that seeks to emulate the MSI approach to community engagement should place the development of sustained *personal* relationships with all stakeholders close to the top of its agenda. This means seeing engagement as grounded not just in a general sense of obligation and social justice but also in a personal demonstration of interest and concern. The students, organizations, and community members one works with are not simply partners in a contractual arrangement or in a cause; they are friends and neighbors, people with whom one wishes to share a bond of trust and affection, people with whom one breaks bread, people one "knows by name."

Such relationships should never be confused with "getting things done," however important it may be, in the end, to get things done. Instead, they imply taking the time to cultivate feelings of familiarity and comfort. What sustains both student and community development is felt personal recognition, and such felt personal recognition cannot be achieved without a major personal investment. "Family" is an essential, if not necessarily explicit or literal, concept in this approach. No individual stands alone; each is embedded in an extended set of relationships that define who he or she is and what he or she can and should do. One cannot simply cut through this set of relationships to get to the heart of the matter: the defining nexus *is* the heart of the matter.

Partially for this reason, MSIs often stress a close connection between service or community engagement and student character development. How a person develops, what he or she becomes is the ultimate guarantor that that person stands for more than individual success. At many MSIs, service is also closely linked to some kind of spirituality. Spirit is invoked, acknowledged, renewed as a matter of course. Hence, any mainstream service program that fails to recognize how powerfully affective, personal, and even religious factors can inform student engagement may well fail to draw significant minority student participation.

A second consideration, related to this willingness to prioritize personal relationships and personal development, is an analogous appreciation of the power of learning through experience. Many researchers have spoken to the fact that the concrete and the immediate play an important role in helping students become fully engaged in the learning process (see Zlotkowski, "Service-Learning and the First-Year Experience," in this volume). In this way considerations related to academic engagement and conditions related to civic or community engagement show a large area of overlap, and factors that allow MSIs to excel in promoting community development also allow them to excel in promoting their students' general academic development. Roberto Ibarra's concept of "multicontextuality" (2001) and Robert Sternberg's concept of "successful intelligence" (1996) help us understand the ways in which an overly narrow, insufficiently flexible framing of the learning process has served to undermine student academic engagement, especially minority student engagement.

A deep respect for the power of learning through experience also reinforces the importance of substantive, mutually respectful campus-community partnerships. Because experience matters, the community must also be recognized as a powerful partner in the educational process. Students do not work in the community simply to "give back"; they work in the community because there is no better place for them to learn things fundamental to being an educated person. Thus, the "giving," if that is the word one chooses to use, goes in both directions: the campus *needs* the community at least as much as the community needs the campus. Few mainstream institutions are willing to acknowledge such a deep level of interdependency. Instead, they insist on seeing themselves as self-contained educational entities, providing all the "expertise" their students need.

Furthermore, most majority white institutions have available physical and technical resources most MSIs—and most noncampus community organizations—can only dream of. Such a resource discrepancy between town and gown can reinforce a view of the academy as not only the sole source of real expertise but also as an institution essentially independent of local circumstances. Why value lived knowledge when one can access every conceivable kind of information through one's PC without ever leaving campus? The illusion of technical self-sufficiency works to thwart the discovery of the fundamental *educational* importance of partnerships.

#### Working with MSIs

As the observations made in this essay clearly suggest, working with MSIs was for everyone in the Compact's Indicators of Engagement project a deeply rewarding experience. Especially for that reason, a word needs to be said about the challenges of such work. It is our hope that what we have learned from and about our own practice may prove useful to others who wish to work with engaged MSIs.

In retrospect, we would have to conclude we did not model the kind of reciprocal partnership the MSIs led us to appreciate more thoroughly. We already had a "tool," the Indicators of Engagement, and an agenda, testing their relevance for MSIs, long before we had our first contact with any individual school. That meant our MSI "partners" did not get an opportunity to influence the design of the project. Although we made every effort to "listen eloquently" to what they shared with us, the fact remains that we were listening eloquently to questions we brought to campus, not to questions the schools and we had identified together. To be sure, we reviewed the indicators with minority scholars before we began working with specific campuses. Still, we did not provide those campuses much of an opportunity to see the project as theirs as well as ours.

Consultation with minority scholars, a constant monitoring of our own assumptions, a willingness to listen carefully to what we were told, a strong desire to do justice to the achievements of MSIs—all these safeguards and measures were certainly appropriate. In the end, however, they were not enough. Complicating the process were some of the same cultural considerations discussed above. Ideally, both sides would have developed bonds of familiarity and trust even before we began working together. Ideally, our work would have been an outgrowth and reflection of those bonds. But the realities of the situation made achieving such a situation difficult. We simply did not have a history of close collaboration and achieved trust to draw upon. To be sure, we did, whenever possible, draw upon the assistance of individuals who did have such a history, but we needed more contact and more time.

All of this is not to suggest that we encountered anything but friendliness on the part of those we worked with. It is probably not an exaggeration to say that everyone involved came to respect the integrity of our aims and motives. However, good working relationships and meaningful partnerships are not the same thing. It is certainly our hope that we as well as others will learn from this project on multiple levels and in multiple ways.

## 19 Community Colleges as Models

Edward Zlotkowski (with Donna Killian Duffy and Robert Franco)

# Community Colleges and Democratic Infrastructure

ommunity colleges are positioned to become not just a component but a central building block in America's democratic infrastructure. By implementing service-learning and civic engagement strategies, they are demonstrably improving the quality of life in the communities they serve while at the same time enhancing learning outcomes for an increasingly diverse student population. Indeed, they are frontline institutions in the struggle to create a truly inclusive twenty-first-century democracy.

And yet, despite their commitment to the common good—a commitment clearly confirmed by their community partners—the significant role they play in sustaining our democratic traditions often goes unrecognized.

Donna Killian Duffy is Professor of Psychology and Coordinator of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at Middlesex Community College, Bedford and Lowell, Massachusetts. Robert Franco is Director of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Professor of Anthropology at Kapiolani Community College, Honolulu. This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, Donna K. Duffy, and Robert Franco, "Conclusion: Community Colleges and the Promise of a Diverse Democracy," in *The Community's College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Institutions*, by Edward Zlotkowski, Donna Killian Duffy, Robert Franco, Sherril B. Gelmon, Katrina H. Norvell, Jennifer Meeropol, and Steven Jones, 77–83 (Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2004). Available at www.compact.org/publications.
In state after state they are the educational institutions that feel most severely the effects of budget cutbacks. For example, from 2001 to 2003, Virginia cut \$55 million in state funds from the budget for its community colleges (Morse 2003, B08). In California, a state law (Proposition 98) mandating that community colleges receive 10.9 percent of the money set aside for K–14 education did not prevent their receiving in 2003–2004 only 9.6 percent of available funds (Hebel 2003, A21). Relatedly, when major foundations look for models and pilot programs to support, they usually turn to four-year schools, often the very schools whose endowments already give them every fiscal advantage. Thus, instead of investing in that educational sector where both the need and the potential for public engagement are greatest, public and private resources are channeled away from where they could, arguably, do the most good.

Take, for example, the role of community colleges in educating underprepared students. Unlike the education of "upwardly mobile individuals" (Sullivan 2000, 21), the education of students from underserved communities is an issue that affects far more than the individuals directly involved. Indeed, according to Alexander Astin (2000), "if we fail to develop more effective means for educating 'remedial students,' we will find it difficult to make much headway in resolving some of our most pressing social and economic problems" (130). For this reason, he regards the education of such students as "the most important educational problem in America today" (130).

Astin may well be right, especially since demographic trends (Kipp in Gladieux and Swail 1998) suggest that as we approach 2010, the college-age population will be increasingly *less* well prepared for educational success.

While the pool of high school graduates and college students will increase substantially . . . the most rapid growth will occur among groups traditionally more likely to drop out of school, less likely to enroll in college-preparatory course work, less likely to graduate from high school, less likely to enroll in college, and least likely to persist to earn a baccalaureate degree. (112)

Hence, as Gladieux and Swail conclude:

If demography is destiny, colleges have their work cut out for them. . . .

America is still an ongoing experiment in diversity, and higher education's part of the social contract has been to extend the possibility of a better life to new groups in society. It will be in the enlightened self-interest of institutions to invest more heavily in partnerships with school systems to expand the potential college-bound and qualified pool. Reaching out to help motivate and prepare more students for college is a long-term investment that will pay off for higher education and the nation. (112) For community colleges to meet the challenge of the underprepared student for a disproportionately large percentage of those students will show up on community college campuses—they will need not only increased funding but a new level of recognition and respect as befits their critical civic role. Such recognition and respect must include a clear understanding of the distinctive forms civic engagement and service-learning take in a community college context.

### **Distinctive** Profile

The primary goal of the research reported on in *The Community's College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Institutions* was to try to identify some of the specific ways in which Campus Compact's Indicators of Engagement are operationalized at community colleges. On the basis of the findings described in this text, we suggest the following nine observations provide a conceptual frame within which civic engagement and service-learning at community colleges can best be understood and appreciated.

- 1. The community college can itself be viewed as a community-based organization: it is *of*, not simply *in*, a particular place.
- 2. Community-based course assignments complement a mission in which "to reach" and "to teach" are two facets of a single responsibility.
- 3. The culture of a community college, especially as *modeled* by its president and her or his administration, together with hiring practices that stress participation in that culture, plays a critical role in generating and sustaining faculty interest in community-based work.
- 4. The primacy of teaching and learning as an institutional focus helps elevate pedagogical effectiveness above purely disciplinary concerns.
- 5. Civic engagement strategies often relate to and help deliver workforcereadiness skills.
- 6. Both student demographics and the faculty teaching load affect the kinds of community-based assignments offered in service-learning courses.
- 7. The relative absence of "mission creep" and the relative irrelevance of research university norms allow for a more flexible understanding of faculty roles and rewards.
- 8. Effective "enabling mechanisms," and a willingness to fund them even in difficult economic circumstances, are in most cases essential to the success of service-learning as an institutional strategy.

9. One especially important way in which the college assists the community is by acting as an "honest broker" and an "active listener." As a result, relationships are truly reciprocal.

These observations, in turn, can be bundled into three general points.

First, as observations (1) and (9) suggest, civically engaged community colleges understand themselves as actual members of their communities—to a far greater extent than is true for most liberal arts colleges and most universities. Hence, insofar as a renewal of civic commitment is emerging as a hallmark of the contemporary academy, community colleges have a singular opportunity to explore what Ernest Boyer (1996b, 20) called a "special climate in which the academic and the civic cultures communicate more continuously and creatively with each other." Through this exploration they can also make a significant contribution to the academy as a whole.

Second, observations (2), (3), and (7) point to the possibility of an *institutional* commitment to civic engagement sufficiently strong and sufficiently comprehensive to inform how the institution works in all its constituent parts. Whereas the cultural norm of the research university, in which disciplinary identity and individual achievement trump all other considerations, frequently makes itself felt even at other kinds of four-year institutions, this is not the case at engaged community colleges. Shared vision and collective action are by no means impossible. Given effective administrative leadership, the relative absence of a disciplinary "guild" mentality leaves room for a civic effort that can be owned by every college constituency, if not by every individual constituency member.

Third, the actual practice of service-learning—as suggested by observations (4), (5), (6), and (8)—follows a path somewhat different from that followed at most four-year schools. Community-based assignments can deliver valued skills and insights not closely linked to a course's specific content. Student engagement and motivation "count" as valid assignment outcomes. Civic, preprofessional, and academic considerations blur in this fluid field of objectives served by an infrastructure that provides not only logistical assistance but a placement process that further deemphasizes a narrow understanding of course relevance. In short, what is seen as academically valid service-learning includes more than would be possible at many other kinds of institutions.

# Service-Learning and the Needs of a Diverse Student Body

That the identity, culture, and pedagogical profile of community colleges lend themselves so well to community-based work is fortunate for several reasons. Perhaps the most important goes back to the observations made above regarding the increasing number of underprepared students community college need to deal with. If it is fair to assume that most of these students "lack confidence in their intellectual abilities and are uncomfortable with abstract ideas" (Schroeder 1993, 24), their "path to excellence" may well entail "a practice-totheory route, not the more traditional theory-to-practice approach" (24). In that case, more deliberate and extensive utilization of teaching-learning strategies like service-learning could be critical in helping them succeed academically. While more intellectually confident and competent students could use their community-based experiences to develop higher-order thinking skills (Abbott 1996), less advanced students could find in their experiences both personal motivation and a concrete sense of achievement.

Relatedly, the fact that community-based work can address the needs of both more- and less-developed learners makes it an invaluable part of institutional "bridge" strategies. As Bailey (2003, 4) has noted, closing the opportunity gap and raising the bar of achievement will require "finding and exploiting complementarities" in community colleges' multiple missions. In connecting academic study with meaningful community service, service-learning represents just such a complementarity. While it helps students develop academically, it also exposes them to experiences that can better inform their choice of majors and careers. While acquiring intellectual skills valued by their professors, students simultaneously learn skills and work habits highly valued by potential employers. Thus, the multiple responsibilities of the community college preparation for work, for citizenship, and for academic transfer—can be addressed in an integrated, naturally interconnected manner.

#### Recommendations

While it is of great importance that we recognize and make room for the distinctive forms civic engagement and service-learning take at community colleges, it is also important that we recognize some of the distinctive challenges they face in attempting to improve their practice. Thus, for example, our research suggests that community colleges would be well served if their understanding of service-learning, its rationale, and its uses were more carefully articulated and monitored. Precisely because community colleges are engaged with their communities in so many different ways and on so many different levels, they may find it easier to let one form of engagement slide into another. When this happens with service-learning, and service-learning is allowed to slide into either community service or traditional preprofessional field work, its distinctive academic and civic benefits are compromised. While the greater flexibility most community colleges allow for service-learning practice represents a strength, that strength can turn into a liability if extended too far. Academic "quality control" is a must if the community college contribution to civic renewal is to be both substantive and widely acknowledged.

Another area that deserves more attention is academy-community collaboration. While college-community collaboration in general represents an obvious community college strength, we found in some instances less consultation than might be desirable. For example, many community colleges convene practitioner advisory groups to help with the design and implementation of preprofessional programs. However, we found little to suggest that community partners are similarly consulted in the design of service-learning programs. Their *academic* role seems to be limited to helping to facilitate reflection. Similarly, the community is less well represented on relevant college committees and in relevant strategic planning processes than we might have predicted. Nor do many colleges seem to have the resources to compensate community partners for their assistance, whatever its extent, aside from recognition luncheons and the like.

Given the extent to which the colleges featured in *The Community's College* do collaborate with the community, pointing out such omissions may seem ungenerous. Nevertheless, insofar as community colleges really do set a standard for substantive college-community partnering, it is important we keep in mind the full spectrum of possible collaborations, even if at present some seem rather utopian.

Not at all utopian is the issue of adjuncts and their role in achieving an engaged campus. Since approximately two-thirds of community college faculty are adjuncts (Phillippe and Patton 2000), many of whom teach the introductory core courses in English and math, any comprehensive engagement strategy must take the special needs of this group into account. Books such as The Invisible Faculty (Gappa and Leslie 1993) and Ghosts in the Classroom (Dubson 2001) describe the adjunct experience as undefined and inequitable. Indeed, the use of "invisible" and "ghosts" in these titles suggests that many adjuncts enjoy little visibility within their own college communities. Complicating matters further is the fact that adjuncts themselves are a varied group. They may be people with careers who have taught courses for decades, individuals who want to work only a limited number of hours each week, or faculty who teach part-time at multiple institutions in hopes of securing a full-time position. While this diversity of circumstances can actually yield new opportunities for community engagement, and new opportunities for adjuncts to distinguish themselves, such opportunities need to be deliberately cultivated.

Since not all adjuncts have offices or phones on campus, making contact with them and establishing a reliable connection with them are critical first steps. Then, providing a menu of options for them to learn more about service-learning and civic engagement—for example, online orientations, departmental mentors, and college workshops—can help address their varying circumstances. Many will welcome an invitation to participate in servicelearning projects, and some may even serve as links to new service sites or resources in dealing with emerging local issues. Indeed, adjuncts who also work at community agencies can quickly become true pioneers in establishing "thick" academic-community collaborations and in creating partnership models for others to follow. The dual identity of these faculty members/community partners can help them emerge as cultural brokers, translating between the academic lexicon and community realities. Their understanding of the nuances of both cultures can be invaluable in keeping implementation problems to a minimum and in leading to more successful collaboration strategies. For example, a local principal who teaches a course on urban schools can engage her college students in addressing real K–12 problems while, at the same time, strengthening their commitment to civic responsibility. Rather than remaining invisible, adjuncts can come to play a central role in defining a campus that is truly engaged with its surrounding community.

#### Conclusion

As the profiles included in *The Community's College* suggest, institutional mission and civic mission are, for many community colleges, one and the same. In this regard, these schools provide a model of how all institutions of higher education can better fulfill their civic mission. Furthermore, as we have noted, the work of community colleges all too often goes unrecognized and underappreciated not only by policy makers but also by administrators and faculty at four-year institutions. It is our hope that this text will serve community colleges not only as a useful guide to excellence in civic and community programming but also as a testimony to their special strengths and special importance in helping all of us move forward with the work of a diverse democracy.

## 20 A New University with a Soul

John Saltmarsh

This essay was written in response to an op-ed by Arthur Levine, then president of Columbia Teachers College, that appeared in the New York Times, March 13, 2000, entitled "The Soul of the New University." His essay was, as likely intended, provocative. At Campus Compact, where I was directing the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study at the time, it created something of a buzz generating a number of internal conversations as well as conversations with colleagues across the country. The feeling was widely shared that Levine's piece required a response and that it offered an opportunity to present a different future for higher education.

His essay, and I think the response as well, are reflective of the tremendous upheaval being felt by higher education in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Levine and his critics can agree, as he wrote, that "today's pace of economic, social and, above all, technological change has put higher education in danger of falling behind again. And this time, pressures from outside are likely to force those of us who shape the academy not only to adapt our institutions, but to transform them." At Campus Compact, by the late 1990s, we were focusing attention not

This chapter originally appeared as John Saltmarsh, "The New University with a Soul," TOMORROW'S PROFESSOR (SMLISTSERV), May 2, 2000, at http://sll.stanford.edu/projects/ tomprof/newtomprof/index.shtml.

on improving service-learning as pedagogical practice per se but on reforming American higher education because the model of an epistemology of technical rationality, teaching through lecture, research that serves the ends of promoting faculty, and purpose defined by private gain in the economic marketplace was not only failing an increasing number of students but devaluing the civic mission of higher education. A different model grounded in engaged teaching and learning, public scholarship, and the civic as well as academic purposes of higher education was possible.

As Levine's essay made clear, there were countervailing arguments about what the future of higher education should be. The one he presents is driven by technology and is best provided through for-profit providers in which campuses are obsolete and the model for the future is the University of Phoenix. Those who see a different future for higher education, one grounded in the civic purposes of higher education, see colleges and universities as placebased institutions that are linked to and have obligations to their local communities. They also have a purpose that links education to the health and sustainability of democracy. In a Deweyian sense, as rooted institutions, they can provide the opportunity for education to be tied to the practice of community through face-to-face interactions around collective problem-solving in the communities of which the campus is a part. To fulfill this mission of educating students as participants in democratic community life, colleges and universities as they currently exist will need to be transformed. On the one hand, it is a profoundly different kind of institutional transformation than the one envisioned by Levine. On the other hand, consistent with Levine's analysis, if higher education does not transform itself to fulfill its democratic purposes, it will become obsolete and irrelevant to civic renewal in the twenty-first century.

One cannot reread this essay without being acutely aware of some of the ironies that surround it. One is that I took advantage of new electronic forms of publishing to disseminate the essay. This was the first time that I had published electronically, in this case in a moderated listserve called Tomorrow's Professor, created by a faculty member at Stanford University. Through this means, the response to Levine was published quickly (on May 2, 2000) and instantly reached tens of thousands of subscribers worldwide. Technology could clearly disseminate information widely and rapidly. At the same time, its limitations were apparent, as something would have to happen face-toface, in the context of a place, with a civic purpose, for the full import of the message of the piece to be discussed, debated, and tested in experience. The other obvious irony of the piece is the reference to the Campus Compact project on bridging the digital divide funded by MCI WorldCom. By July of 2002, MCI WorldCom was bankrupt and embroiled in a massive accounting scandal, one of a number that shook the financial world. The people who perpetrated this corporate fraud were smart individuals, educated in our most prestigious institutions. But something was missing-something about

public purpose and democratic values, about community and social responsibility. What was missing would not likely be remedied by the kind of university Levine envisioned. Perhaps it would be addressed if colleges and universities took the civic learning of their students seriously and became the kind of civically engaged campuses that could foster a public culture of democracy.

American higher education is in the midst of a profound transformation. For some, like Arthur Levine, president of Teacher's College at Columbia University, college and university education as we know it is a relic of the past, irrelevant to the economic developments and desires for individual career advancement in the global economy. The real business of the "mature industry" of higher education is to serve the marketplace of information economies. This, he claims, can best be done through online technology by the profitmaking sector. Quaint campuses, classroom lectures, and a community of scholars are irrelevant to the business of education.

For others, higher education has a different purpose, and a historical tradition, that is tied to education for effective citizenship. In this view, higher education should have a central role to play in the health of our democracy but has been deficient in rebuilding the civic life of the country. Our institutions of higher education were shaped in the era following World War II in a way that is not readily adaptable to meeting the need of transforming civic life. The structure, organization, administration, and academic culture of campuses embraced science and technology, emphasized a cult of objectivity and detachment, and elevated the role of the scientifically educated expert over ordinary citizens in public affairs. This ethos of professionalism and expertise that defined higher education's response to the national crisis of the Cold War now contributes to public disillusionment with institutions that represent and legitimize a system that no longer addresses the most pressing national needs. Ivory towers, inert knowledge, and credentialed students are irrelevant to the civic purpose of education.

The vision that Professor Levine has embraced in his essay "The Soul of a New University" (2000) is proffered as a radical departure from what exists but may be simply a continuation of the existing problem. The modern university has come to operate on the model of research, knowledge dissemination, and skills development as tools for economic development. Students are increasingly viewed as consumers who demand, as Levine explains, "convenience, service, quality, and affordability." What is missing in this commodification of higher education are the larger questions of social, political, and moral purpose. Hence it is not unexpected that, in Levine's vision, there is no consideration of civic agency, citizenship skills, or democratic participation as essential, or even marginal, ingredients that make up the soul of the new university. The soul of the new university is defined by a commitment to the private market, the training of individual entrepreneurs, and the marketability of technical skills while ignoring their contribution to civic life. It is a vision that is emblematic of academia unreflectively following market trends, not an effort to redefine the university to make it relevant to the needs of civic renewal and the reinvigorating spirit of democracy.

Others are embracing a different vision, one that simmers with the promise of democracy and a revival of the civic mission of the university. It is a vision of higher education with a soul. It is apparent in leadership provided by higher education associations such as Campus Compact, the American Association for Higher Education, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and others. It is reflected in a declaration signed by over 300 college and university presidents who are dedicated to reclaiming the historical mission of higher education to contribute to a flourishing democracy. A 1999 Fourth of July Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education challenges "higher education to reexamine its public purposes and commitments to the democratic ideal" and "to become engaged, through actions and teaching, with its communities." To fulfill this commitment, there is a need to have campuses, as living institutions, that can profoundly influence the renewal of civic life and assist in rebuilding communities. Trinity College, the University of Southern California, the University of Pennsylvania, Union College, Georgetown University, and numerous others are finding pathways to campus engagement. They are pioneering a relevancy to the lived experience of democracy that cannot be achieved online, where the direct and fundamentally human importance of face-to-face interaction with those other than ourselves cannot be achieved.

The academic leaders who have signed the declaration are committed to a vision of an engaged campus that recognizes the importance of technology in education and the economy. They are concerned with both the appropriate use of technology in education and the social and economic inequality inherent in the "digital divide." A recent initiative undertaken by Campus Compact with support from MCI WorldCom is designed specifically to support the use of technology to meet educational objectives, foster active engagement of students in community building, develop civic competency, and further career aspirations. There is a place for technology in institutions of higher education as actual places, living communities where people interact with each other in complex, multidimensional ways out of a robust concern for democracy. What John Dewey wrote in 1929 in reference to the radio can be applied today when we consider how computers should be used: "The enemy is not material commodities, but the lack of will to use them as instruments for achieving preferred possibilities."

Levine's for-profit, virtual university focuses on cost efficiency, not effective education. It ignores all the accumulated research on effective learning and instead advocates information transfer, privileging learning by rote in the development of inert knowledge over more active, participatory, experientially based, and reflective teaching and learning. What the leveling effect of the market accomplishes in this case is potentially greater access to the worst processes of education.

Perhaps Professor Levine's piece should be read as biting satire instead of crackpot realism. He, after all, the author of an important book on the social values of a generation of youth, is undoubtedly a closer reader of Henry Adams than is indicated by his overlooking Adams's concerns for the future of democracy, and he serves as president of an institution steeped in the historic traditions of higher education's role in renewing democracy, a tradition influenced by America's most important educational philosopher, John Dewey. In this vein, his satire has just the right tone, for example, offering managed health care as illustrative for higher education, "a poorly managed nonprofit industry that was overtaken by the profit-making sector." The corollary is offered uncritically, as if managed care is a decent and humane way to provide medical coverage in this country. Designed to be provocative by offering an absurd argument presented rationally, Levine's article should be a catalyst for others to take up the question he raises at the end of the satire: "What is the purpose of higher education?" The answer is of profound national importance.

## SECTION VIII Over a Decade Later

### Introduction

Ira Harkavy

have long been impressed by the work of Edward Zlotkowski and John Saltmarsh. Their contributions to the service-learning and civic engagement movement have been highly significant, perhaps indispensible. Edward, through his writings, development, and editing of the series *Service-Learning across the Disciplines* and talks and trainings at colleges and universities across the country, in my judgment, played the preeminent role in connecting service-learning to departments and disciplines. Functioning as something like an itinerant Methodist circuit rider during America's second Great Awakening, he spread the "gospel" wherever it needed to be spread. He functioned, to mix metaphors, like a Johnny Appleseed, seeding and helping the movement to take root. Indeed, during my own time on the hustings, at campus after campus, Edward had preceded me, preparing fertile ground for conversation and action.

John's impacts, although produced over a shorter timeframe, are also most impressive. As director of Campus Compact's National Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study, John substantially broadened the movement's intellectual scope and reach. Through the *Campus Compact Reader*, articles, chapters, journal issues, and convening meetings and conferences, he enriched and disseminated understandings of service-learning and civic engagement from a position that had extraordinary influence in advancing the movement. He functioned as the primary figure in something like a "national civic engagement salon" centered at Campus Compact. His contributions and Edward's, of course, have continued and continue to be significant. But much of this book appropriately focuses on their collaborative work when John directed the national project on Integrating Service with Academic Study at Campus Compact and Edward served as a senior scholar with the project while continuing as a faculty member at Bentley University. The chapters that follow, however, were developed after that collaboration and involve largely a look forward. And in reading these chapters, my respect for their individual and collective work increased.

In their later work, John and Edward explicitly focus on the primary problem confronting American higher education: how can American higher education realize its democratic purposes and help American society realize its founding, historic, democratic promise for all Americans? To put it another way, Saltmarsh and Zlotlowski are effectively applying a principle advanced by Francis Bacon that the first and most essential step in any attempt to bring about change is to have identified the right goal. "It is," Bacon wrote in 1620, "not possible to run a course aright when the goal itself is not rightly placed" (Benson 1972). In my judgment, the "rightly placed" goal for higher education is precisely to help America realize in concrete practice the democratic, egalitarian promise of the Declaration of Independence. I also agree with John and Edward that the American higher education system, as currently constituted, does not contribute to the development of democratic communities and schools-to a genuinely democratic America. In one of the chapters that follow, "Students as Colleagues: Introduction," Edward, Nicholas Longo, and James Williams forcefully make that point: "Our country needs a recommitment to its democratic ideals and the academy needs to redefine its special contribution to our democracy."

As difficult as it is to identify the right goal and problem to be solved, it is more difficult to identify the steps needed to solve the problem. As I read John's and Edward's later writings, they focus on three things that need to be done if colleges and universities are to become genuinely democratic institutions that genuinely contribute to American democracy:

- 1. Teach democratically. (Develop and implement a democratic pedagogy.)
- 2. Produce knowledge democratically. (Develop and implement a democratic epistemology that has democratic effects for the university, communities, and society.)
- 3. Act democratically. (Develop and implement inclusive, participatory democratic strategies for democratic change on campus and in the community.)

Each of the three chapters in this section addresses and illuminates each of the three points cited above. Nonetheless, Edward's framing piece and "Students as Colleagues: Introduction" mostly concern pedagogy, while John's "Engagement and Epistemology" is about knowledge generation, and "Looking Back, Looking Ahead" sharply raises the issue of democratic action.

Although Edward and his collaborating authors largely frame their arguments in terms of increasing the impact of service-learning on the university and society, their concerns are far more encompassing. "Students as Colleagues: Introduction" fundamentally challenges the dominant teachinglearning-research paradigm in American higher education, indeed, in American schooling. For Zlotkowski and associates, colleges and universities need to radically change how they teach and learn. At its center, that radical change entails transforming students from passive consumers of information to active producers of knowledge, changing their role from junior participants in projects to engaged collaborators who bring important, in fact essential, skills, abilities, experiences, and knowledge. In unequivocal terms, they state, "Civic engagement in the full sense requires that students not only implement faculty and community agendas, but also ... have a substantive opportunity to *shape* those agendas." This is a full-throated call for active, democratic learning-for putting the ideals of democracy into practice in the classroom and the community through the serious, sustained engagement of students as collaborators, with faculty and community members, working to solve significant real-world problems.

Just as Zlotkowski proposes an active problem-solving service-learning that engages students as collaborating colleagues, Saltmarsh, building on Donald Schön's pioneering work (1995), as well as more recent scholarship, argues for an "engaged epistemology" that involves faculty, students, and community members in an ongoing process of democratic learning designed to improve the conditions of life. In "Engagement and Epistemology," John defines genuine knowledge as encompassing and respecting academic, practitioner, and community perspectives. Each of these perspectives is required if knowledge is to help solve the highly complex problems affecting American society and its communities.

Although this combination, even integration, of perspectives is required if knowledge is to contribute to "the relief of man's estate" (Bacon's goal for learning), the current structure, policies, and culture of higher education make such integration impossible to achieve (Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett 2007). Saltmarsh, therefore, necessarily calls for a radical change in American higher education: "The kind of engagement that is aligned with a shift in epistemology cannot flourish and be sustained within the existing institutional arrangements. Authentic, democratic engagement will require the remaking of colleges and universities into institutions that support, model, and encourage engaged faculty practice and student learning." Echoes with Zlotkowski's strategy for reducing impediments to democratic pedagogy are unmistakable.

Identifying strategies for change is at the center of the final chapter in this section and book. Democratic pedagogy and epistemology are important themes

as they are in the previous chapters. In "Looking Back, Looking Ahead," however, John and Edward introduce a series of additional ideas and approaches designed to significantly advance the civic engagement movement. Among them is the need to radically change the current prestige hierarchy of higher education, in which research-intensive universities (and faculty from these institutions) dominate and legitimize discourse and action, including the work of the civic engagement movement itself. Zlotkowski captures this sentiment in very clear terms: "Comprehensive public universities, nonelite liberal arts colleges, minority-serving institutions, community colleges, faculty with 4-4 or even 5-5 teaching loads, adjunct faculty, students—these are all academic constituencies whose input is routinely bypassed or ignored. We are in the ironic situation of arguing for democratic dialogue and a non-expert-driven culture in and through forums that mimic the very cultural characteristics we criticize."

To accomplish this change, John and Edward press the case for an inclusive movement that values and engages faculty and graduate and undergraduate students across the range of higher education, as well as community members, in the hard work of both helping to solve community problems and transforming not only individual colleges and universities but also the American higher education system itself. This is a demanding task indeed. But it is one that returns us to the primary problem that John and Edward, in effect, have identified for themselves and for the civic engagement movement in general: how can American higher education realize its democratic purposes and help American society realize its founding, historic democratic promise for all Americans? To solve that problem, an energized movement is a necessary, if not a sufficient, condition. It needs to be a movement that John powerfully and simply describes: "I would like to see faculty working with students and community partners not only enacting better teaching and learning and impacting community life, but I want to see them acting as change agents to deliberately and actively change the culture of the institutions they work within."

The limitation of John's and Edward's "Looking Back, Looking Ahead" is that it looks too far ahead. They never specify what *specifically* needs to be done by whom (organization, group, or individual) to develop the kind of democratic civic engagement movement they (and I) believe needs to be developed. Practitioners of engaged, problem-solving scholarship, including Henry Taylor Jr. and Linda McGlynn (2008, 2009), Harry Boyte (2008), Gar Alperovitz, Steve Dubb, and Ted Howard (2008), and Robert Bringle, Julie Hatcher, and others (2009) have been paying increased attention to the question of what is to be done, along with the even harder question of *how* to advance the movement.

In both *Dewey's Dream* (Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett 2007) and *The Obesity Culture* (Johnston and Harkavy 2009), University of Pennsylvania colleagues and I proposed that university-assisted community schools constitute the best practical means for democratically transforming universities,

schools, and communities in order to develop participatory democracy. We did so to stimulate democratic dialogue and generate counterproposals as to *how* to develop and advance a participatory democratic civic engagement movement. John and Edward have, in prose and action, stimulated and made important contributions to just such a dialogue in the past. The civic engagement movement in 2010 and beyond would benefit enormously from their weighing in again on *how specifically* the movement might be advanced. I can think of no more valuable voices to add to that crucial conversation.

### 21 Students as Colleagues

Enlarging the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership

Edward Zlotkowski (with Nicholas Longo and James Williams)

**E** ver since I began working on issues related to the first-year college experience, I have become more and more interested in the student experience of service-learning and service-learning's potential to help develop a new generation of civic leaders. Indeed, as I grew more fully aware of the extent of the service background many students now bring to college, I not only became concerned that their first-year experience of college-level civic engagement would prove to be something of a disappointment (the focus of "Taking Service Seriously") but also came to believe that colleges and universities were missing an important opportunity to develop the leadership potential of their more experienced students.

By 2004, this idea, fed by my awareness of the major program responsibilities shouldered by my home institution's student service-scholars, had become the driving force behind a determination to identify and publish a book on best practices in this area. Luckily for me, Nicholas Longo

Nicholas Longo is Assistant Professor of Public and Community Service Studies and Director of the Global Studies Program at Providence College in Rhode Island. James Williams graduated from Princeton University with a major in Public and International Affairs in 2006; as a student, he chaired the university's Student Volunteers Council and served as an Engaged Student Scholar at Campus Compact. This chapter was originally published as Edward Zlotkowski, Nicholas V. Longo, and James R. Williams, "Introduction," in *Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership*, ed. Edward Zlotkowski, Nicholas V. Longo, and James R. Williams, 1–11 (Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006). Available at www.compact.org/publications. was a staff member at Campus Compact at that time, and Nick had just led the Compact's Raise Your Voice campaign, an initiative to encourage student leadership in on- and off-campus civic engagement. Nick knew many more student leaders than I did, and together we had extensive firsthand familiarity with what was happening with civic engagement on America's campuses. Nick agreed not only to partner with me on the proposed book but also to identify a current student leader who could bring to the project a student's perspective. That student leader turned out to be James Williams, a junior at Princeton in the fall of 2004 when the project began to take on some definition.

As was the case with the American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) series on service-learning in the academic disciplines, Students as Colleagues was meant to serve as a catalyst to activity, in this case, an expansion across campuses nationwide of the role of students in facilitating and leading service-learning programs. At first I thought this would be a relatively easy task in comparison with disciplinary acceptance of service-learning. Service-learning as a pedagogy and structures to support it were far less marginal in 2004 than in 1995 when the AAHE project was at a similar stage of development. Furthermore, institutions would seem to have nothing to lose and everything to gain by viewing their own students as program resources and providing them with new opportunities to develop leadership skills. Unfortunately, however, this has not been the case. More often than not, my request that student service leaders be invited to participate in service-learning trainings meets with a brace of regrets and only token accommodation. Perhaps the problem here, as in the case of first-year programs, is the gulf that too frequently divides faculty and student affairs. Perhaps the idea of faculty-student service partnerships just needs more time to catch on.

Except for the essays in this collection I co-authored with John Saltmarsh, the introduction to Students as Colleagues: Widening the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership is the most collaborative piece I have included. Although I drafted a sizable portion of the text and was responsible for its final shape, my co-editors, Nicolas Longo and James Williams, made substantial contributions. Indeed, since their perspectives and experiences were quite different from mine, they enriched the introduction in ways I could not have done on my own.

#### Service-Learning Today

By many measures, the adoption of service-learning as a legitimate teachinglearning strategy in American higher education has been a remarkable success story. Over the course of the 1990s, we saw the founding and flourishing of the Corporation for National Service as well as the Community Outreach Partnerships Centers (COPC) program coming out of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We have seen the phenomenal growth of Campus Compact from a few hundred members to over one thousand institutions, and the founding of affiliated state compacts in almost two-thirds of the states. We have seen the publication of twenty-one volumes in the former American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) series on service and the academic disciplines (Zlotkowski 1997-2006)-a series that helped prepare the way for many other discipline-specific publications and initiatives. Indeed, we have seen the disciplinary associations themselves begin to take on the work of engagement, from major initiatives at the National Communication Association to more limited but nonetheless significant developments in the sciences and the humanities (see Zlotkowski, "Civic Engagement and the Academic Disciplines" in this volume). Associations organized by institutional type-associations such as the American Association of Community Colleges, the Council of Independent Colleges, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the private historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) working through the United Negro College Fund—have launched significant engagement efforts designed to redefine higher education in a post-Cold War world. So extensive has the servicelearning literature become that it is now too large for any single individual to master.

Indeed, looking back at a short piece by Arthur Levine entitled "Service on Campus" (1994), one is tempted to conclude that the cyclical pattern of rising and falling interest in campus-based service that Levine refers to may finally have been transcended: "The historical reality is that student volunteer movements tend to be a passing phenomenon in higher education, rising and falling on campuses roughly every 30 years." To be sure, Levine's reference is technically to "student volunteer movements," and the fact that service-learning is not a "volunteer" activity but a required or elective academic assignment goes a long way toward accounting for its extended and still growing appeal. In fact, Levine himself explicitly recognizes the fundamental importance of making faculty a central feature of any campus service movement that hopes to sustain itself.

And yet, despite its obvious success in enlisting faculty in service initiatives and in thus moving service closer to the core work of academic institutions, service-learning still has a way to go before it can be said to have begun fulfilling its promise. While the data suggest that currently perhaps 10 percent of all faculty make at least occasional use of service-learning in their courses (annual Campus Compact member surveys at www.compact.org/stats/2004), that number needs at least to double before this approach will be able to exert a truly transformative influence on academic programming. Furthermore, we still have not succeeded in creating the kind of continuity and critical mass among service projects that will help bring about measurable, substantive community results. It is our contention, in organizing and editing the present book, that service-learning's academic and social impact will, in fact, not be achieved until the circle of service-learning leadership is further extended to include students themselves. This contention may at first seem surprising, even paradoxical. After all, wasn't it the shift from student- to faculty-led initiatives that made possible today's level of success? Doesn't genuine institutionalization demand that service be linked to the curriculum, and doesn't the curriculum imply faculty ownership? Why focus on students when we still need to achieve deeper and broader faculty commitment?

To address questions like these, it is critically important to understand that what we here propose and document does not in any way imply a retreat from service-learning as a fully legitimate academic undertaking. Indeed, it is to deepen its academic as well as its social impact, to further the process of its institutionalization that we suggest the time has now come to revisit the roles students can and should play in making service-learning a basic feature of American higher education. To understand why this is so, it might be useful to turn again briefly to the movement's history.

#### The National Service Movement

In 1996, Goodwin Liu, a Stanford student during the expansion of that institution's Haas Center for Public Service during the late 1980s and, in the first half of the 1990s, an administrator with the new Corporation for National and Community Service in Washington, DC, was invited to become a fellow in residence at Providence College's Feinstein Center for Public Service. Liu's project was to review the rise of the contemporary service movement on American campuses and to try to identify its constituent phases and emphases. This he did in a perceptive essay entitled "Origins, Evolution, and Progress: Reflections on a Movement" (1996).

According to Liu's analysis, the contemporary service movement owes its origin to an attempt to counteract a pervasive stereotype: "Our story begins with the generational stereotype of college students in the 1980s. The 'me generation' label is especially familiar to those of us who came to social consciousness during this period.... It was against this backdrop that students of a different sort made their mark" (5–6). COOL (the Campus Outreach Opportunity League) in particular succeeded in focusing "national attention on students who belied the 'me generation' stereotype, and stories of a new wave of student volunteerism began to appear in the press" (6). Thus, in a very literal sense, it was students who "catalyzed the contemporary service movement in higher education" (6).

For Liu, this student-led period lasted from the early 1980s to the early 1990s, and even before it ended, it began to be complemented—and ultimately supplanted—by other developments: first, the mobilization of institutional resources to support student interest in service and second, the spread of academic service-learning. It was the first of these developments that gave rise to Campus Compact and the Corporation for National and Community Service. It was the second that made room for faculty participation and conferred on the movement academic legitimacy. Indeed, toward the end of his essay, Liu speculates that the second half of the 1990s might well see additional steps "to put service squarely within the academic mainstream"—steps such as "increased attention to service-learning within disciplinary associations and individual departments, revised criteria for faculty promotion and tenure, stronger integration of service-learning into humanities and natural science disciplines, and more widespread evidence of its cognitive impact" (13). Every one of these possibilities has, in fact, been realized.

Indeed, it is precisely because both institutionalization and academic legitimization have proceeded so well over the last ten years that we suggest the time has come to expand "the circle of service-learning leadership." While it is undeniably true that much remains to be done in and through faculty, administrators, and professional staff, to focus exclusively on these campus constituencies at this point might well be counterproductive. Just as the service movement at an earlier point needed resources students alone *could not* supply, so, it is our contention, the movement has now reached a point where it needs resources only students *can* supply. In the pages that follow we explore briefly three different rationales that help explain our need to rethink and expand the role of student leadership in academic service-learning.

#### Students as Enablers

The first rationale can be dubbed "instrumental." One of the by-products of the rapid growth of service-learning in higher education has been that the need for "enabling mechanisms" (Walshock 1995) to support it has in many instances outstripped available resources. Since service-learning requires faculty not only to reconceptualize the way in which they approach the teaching-learning process but also to factor into their thinking and planning a whole new set of community-based concerns, it is often seen, at least initially, as very time-intensive. Indeed, even when faculty have become comfortable with service-learning's new conceptual demands, they still must find ways to deal with a not inconsiderable host of new practical and logistical considerations.

For this reason service-learning rarely takes root or achieves any kind of broad currency at an institution unwilling to invest in supporting infrastructure, for example, an office that facilitates campus-community connections; helps address transportation needs; offers assistance with student orientation, reflection, and evaluation; and provides print and Web-based forms, guidelines, and models. Furthermore, while these resources can be to some extent generic, every academy-community collaboration ultimately must be personalized and treated as distinctive if it is to have the full educational and social impact intended.

Such personalization, of course, is very difficult to support with a finite staff and a limited budget. Even when the number of faculty who need such support is not large, those charged with assisting them are often overtasked. Thus we arrive at a kind of catch-22: the kinds of results that lead administrators to invest in service-learning are themselves dependent on the willingness of those same administrators to invest in service-learning up front.

Fortunately, professional staff are not the only reliable source of faculty assistance. As many of the programs included in this book make clear, carefully selected, well-trained undergraduates can play a decisive role in making academic-community collaborations powerful, successful experiences for all involved. Nor is there a single model for how to find and train students who are willing and able to play such a key facilitating role. One can, in fact, envision an entire spectrum of faculty-student relationships—from relatively simple assistance with logistical matters to full teaching "assistantships." All that is essential is a willingness to step outside the box (or circle) of seeing the student role in service-learning as primarily reactive and dependent on faculty control.

However, it is not just the campus side of service-learning initiatives that skilled students can support. On many campuses, there are far more students who are familiar with local organizations and community issues than faculty. Such students are in an ideal position to bring their knowledge and experience to bear in ensuring that service-learning projects also help advance the interests of community partners. Indeed, by serving as site supervisors, students can actually focus and coordinate the contributions of different courses and various disciplines to advance a single project or a whole organization. In this way, students can function as the community's eyes and ears on campus while at the same time serving as the campus's representative at a particular community site.

Finally, we should point out that the willingness and ability of undergraduates to assume substantive service-learning responsibilities both on campus and in the community represents an excellent opportunity to bring student affairs and faculty affairs into better alignment. For some time now, top administrators at many institutions have recognized that treating student academic work and general student development as largely discrete areas is neither economical nor effective. Indeed, many schools have already moved to address this problem by administratively linking student and faculty affairs—placing the former under a provost or academic VP, decentralizing student development programs, and creating positions that effectively bridge the two divisions.

If any kind of program were ever tailor-made to support such an organizational rationalization, it would have to be service-learning. Since servicelearning projects necessarily promote "whole person" development—requiring students to link academic, interpersonal, and affective skills to achieve multidimensional results—they speak as much to the concerns of student affairs professionals as they do to those of faculty. Indeed, students who are able to play a substantive role in linking academic learning with real-world problem-solving represent in many ways an ideal type. What they have learned in noncurricular programs like "Emerging Leaders" is as important as what they have learned in and through their academic assignments.

### Students and the Promise of Democratic Participation

Once one begins to explore the importance of holistic student development, one begins to transcend an essentially instrumental rationale for student service-learning leadership. Our second rationale speaks directly to student empowerment. Students have begun to demand vocally that higher education take seriously its public mission to support student civic engagement and not simply focus on professional skills and workforce preparation. Few documents speak more clearly to this demand than the *Oklahoma Students' Civic Resolution* (2002), a public statement issued by student leaders from colleges and universities across Oklahoma:

We declare that it is our responsibility to become an engaged generation with the support of our political leaders, education institutions, and society.... The mission of our state higher education institutions should be to educate future citizens about their civic as well as professional duties. We urge our institutions to prioritize and implement civic education in the classroom, in research, and in service to the community.

Students in Oklahoma wrote this resolution to give voice to their civic aspirations and presented it to the governor, state legislators, college and university presidents, and other civic leaders throughout the state. Students want multiple opportunities to be *producers*, not merely consumers, of the public good.

The Oklahoma Students' Civic Resolution was developed in the context of Campus Compact's efforts to understand better the civic experiences of college students by listening directly to their concerns and by giving them the tools and resources they need to tackle public issues on their campus and in their communities. There can be no question that this generation of college students cares deeply about community issues and sees service-learning as an important avenue for civic participation. Civic engagement in the full sense requires that students not only implement faculty and community agendas but also have a substantive opportunity to *shape* those agendas. Students must be genuine partners in service-learning for it to realize its full potential civic and academic. Achieving such a role has provided the rationale for two related civic initiatives: the drafting of *The New Student Politics* and the founding of the Raise Your Voice campaign.

Both these efforts began with a March 2001 conversation among thirtythree student leaders from around the country gathered at the Wingspread conference center in Racine, Wisconsin. This multiday meeting led to an important, student-written document, *The New Student Politics* (Long 2002), in which students discuss their perspectives on democracy and the role of the student voice in higher education.

In *The New Student Politics* students argue that service-learning is an essential mechanism for democratic participation. Sarah Long, the lead student author, sums up what service-learning educators have long recognized, namely, that the nature of one's education is "changed immeasurably through a community-based perspective" (7). The Wingspread students concluded that students see service-learning "as a primary vehicle for connecting service and broader social and political dimensions" (9).

The Wingspread document includes several recommendations for making service-learning more substantive. Students do not want one-time programs; rather, they prefer the opportunity to build and maintain strong relationships with the community through ongoing service-learning experiences. Students want their professors to commit to work with the community and to "know the community and community-based organizations well enough to facilitate deep reflection in the course material" (7). They also propose that professors co-teach courses, when appropriate, with community partners; suggest that "there should be less emphasis on the number of hours of service required to complete a course, and more concern for a quality experience" (7); and recommend that the number of students in a service-learning course should be limited to maximize discussion.

Finally, a major theme of the Wingspread gathering was the importance of student voice. Creating platforms for this voice is a high priority for students, and as the authors of Students as Colleagues illustrate, there are many promising, and substantive, ways to include students directly in the educational process. Students want their voices to be heard and valued; they want to be respected as the partners of faculty, staff, and administrators on campus. What they do not want is token representation. Students at Wingspread were critically aware that they are often treated like "fine china" and simply brought out to impress trustees and honored guests. At the same time they have relatively little knowledge of the way power works on campus. To become more effective and empowered citizens, they need to learn better to navigate their institutions. "Many of us who try to navigate the bureaucracy often lack access to the institutional system and find progress to be painstakingly slow and difficult. We often don't understand the inner-workings of our institution until we are well into our college careers; by then it is often too late to put this knowledge to work in attempting to make changes on campus" (11-12).

In order to address this problem, students suggest that colleges and universities build public cultures and engaged campuses in which service-learning can play an important role. They also suggest that their institutions "can encourage engagement by providing space, resources, recognition, information, transportation, and other forms of support" (9). One of their most important recommendations concerns the development of community service scholarships, a topic explored in the first section of this book.

In the fall of 2002, using the results of the Wingspread gathering as a starting point, Campus Compact launched Raise Your Voice, a national campaign to increase college student participation in public life, funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. Over a two-year period, students from over 400 college and university campuses made civic contributions by participating in statewide student leadership teams, mapping opportunities for civic engagement on their campuses, leading public dialogues, writing public issue statements, and meeting with elected officials.

All this activity has led to many insights into practices that promote student voice on campus as well as the structures necessary to connect servicelearning with substantive civic engagement. Two of the central lessons have been

- Creating safe, respectful, and democratic spaces allows students to develop, use, and own their voices on a host of public issues, including reforming higher education;
- Training, mentoring, and supporting students in their civic development using the many tested, effective interventions (i.e., peer-to-peer persuasion, hubs for civic engagement on campus, collaboration between civic engagement approaches, and connection with the curriculum) leads to deep levels of involvement that go beyond simplistic notions of volunteerism and allow young people to become engaged and responsible civic actors.

These lessons have also guided the development of the present book.

Clearly one of the most difficult hurdles for students to overcome in becoming both academically and civically empowered is the more or less exclusive control faculty have over the curriculum. Hence, much student activism on campus has been co-curricular, and it is here that space has been created for students to develop their leadership capacities. But the curriculum remains decisive in determining what ultimately "counts" on campus: regardless of the quality of student co-curricular work, degrees are awarded on the basis of what happens in and through credit-bearing academic units. Thus, it is notable that, in the chapters that follow, we find students exercising leadership *as part of the curriculum* with institutional support and encouragement. Contributing authors describe well-designed programs that allow students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community partners to work together as genuine colleagues. In the course of doing so, they inspire and encourage us to rethink the role of students in higher education.

#### A New Generation

Our third rationale speaks directly to the potential of the current generation of students and identifies why *now* is the right time to begin expanding the circle of service-learning leadership. Each generation of students is unique, reflecting the paradigms and culture of its age and defined by intergenerational relationships with parents and grandparents. Each generation is also shaped by the events of its time—and this generation has come to maturity at the same time as the national service-learning movement.

It is widely recognized that today's students are actively involved in community service activities (curricular and co-curricular), and while the tone and nature of campus activism have changed since their parents' time, today's students roam freely with an awareness of their parents' era of student activism and empowerment. While rarely seeking a voice and a seat at the table in a demanding fashion, today's students still possess a desire, drive, and passion for meaningful participation in community concerns. Indeed, research suggests that the current generation of students has both an interest in social concerns and collaborative ventures greater than that of their immediate predecessors *and* a determination to play a much more active role in addressing community issues. According to researchers at the University of California at Los Angeles's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI 2005):

Two out of three entering freshmen (66.3%) believe it is essential or very important to help others who are in difficulty, the highest this figure has been in the past 25 years. Further, an all-time high of 83.2% volunteered at least occasionally during their high school senior year. The survey also reported a record high of 67.3% who planned to continue volunteering in college. Students are not interested only in helping others through service; they believe it is important to act on different levels. One in four (25.6%) feels it is important to participate in community action programs, the highest figure since 1996; 33.9 regard becoming a community leader as important; and 41.3% believe it is important to influence social values. (15)

Such an interest in engagement is, perhaps, not surprising given the fact that many of today's college students have been exposed to service-learning and student engagement since they were quite young. Not only have servicelearning efforts been cropping up in high schools and middle schools, being integrated into graduation requirements, senior projects, coursework, and internships, and becoming part of major school reform efforts (Furco 2002), but other, more overtly political forms of civic engagement have been on the rise as well.

For example, K–12 school districts like the Portland Public Schools in Portland, Oregon, have seen students coalesce around education funding issues to claim a greater role in the development and delivery of their own education. In this particular instance, students even won passage of policies that mandate their participation in budget making, the curriculum, hiring, and other kinds of academic decision making. (See, for example, "Student Representative Duties" at http://www.pps.k12.or.us/directives-c/pol-reg/1/20/012\_P .pdf.) Other school districts have made similar strides in involving relatively young students in decision-making processes.

In short, more than ever before students are arriving on college campuses with the experience needed to actively engage in community-based work and with an expectation of playing a leadership role in shaping academic and community-based learning (Duckenfield 2002). The fact that much precollegiate service work serves primarily to bolster college application résumés (see, for example, Jones and Hill 2003; see also Zlotkowski, "Taking Service Seriously," in this volume) should not blind us to the fact that an impressive minority of new students bring with them the kinds of skills, experiences, perspectives, and energy that lie behind the successful examples described in *Students as Colleagues*.

To see how this is playing out on a given campus, we need look no further than to the example of one of the volume's co-editors, James Williams, a graduate of Princeton University. Before attending Princeton, James had the good fortune of having had middle and high school experiences that were rich in service-learning as an integral part of his curriculum. In addition, he was able to play critical leadership roles in pushing for greater student voice and involvement in his school's decision-making processes. Hence, when he enrolled at Princeton, he was immediately drawn to service and leadership opportunities on campus. As a freshman, he became part of the Executive Board of the Student Volunteers Council, the largest student-led organization on the Princeton campus-a community service clearinghouse with 700 volunteers active in forty-seven weekly projects. Later that same year, he sought, and won, election to the university's Policy and Governance Council, joining the Priorities Committee, which sets Princeton's operating budget. He also became part of the student government, various service committees, and the Community-Based Learning Initiative (CBLI), Princeton's service-learning office.

However, James noticed that Princeton was not at the forefront of the academy's service-learning efforts, though the service-learning program on campus was noteworthy and had been rapidly expanding. Through his position on the advisory board of CBLI and as board chairman of the Student Volunteers Council, he began to play a leadership role in helping students develop, integrate, and enrich academic service-learning opportunities. In fact, it was largely because of student demand, particularly with regard to Princeton's immensely popular service-learning writing seminars, that the university began to see ever-greater interest in and ever-more-sustained involvement with service-learning projects. Slowly, the institution was changing, and it was through the empowered deliberation, participation, and involvement of its students that that change occurred.

Reluctance to change and to grant students meaningful participation in shaping the curriculum has been the story at many colleges and universities. However, there is one area in which, on many campuses, students have already had considerable success in demonstrating engaged academic leadership, responding to faculty guidance rather than following formal prescriptions. That area is community-based research. At Princeton and many other schools, senior papers, term projects, and major reports allow students the opportunity to engage in meaningful, original research that makes a public contribution and helps create new community assets. The vast variety, creativity, and intellectual depth of these efforts are a testament to the power of involving students more deeply in the fabric of the academy, in this case, in its scholarship and research. Rather than posing a threat to faculty interests, student-engaged research can serve to connect the community, the faculty, and the university in a productive alliance. The final section of *Students as Colleagues* features powerful examples of this kind of work.

#### Conclusion

Students as Colleagues covers a lot of ground. In it one can find students serving as staff members and site coordinators, handling those logistical and practical responsibilities that facilitate the actual implementation of quality service-learning projects. One can find students training students, empowering their peers to succeed both in the classroom and in the community. One can also find students working closely with faculty to design, implement, and assess course-based community work—even playing a key role in defining course-based work. All of these activities, taken together, constitute a continuum of opportunities for students to be viewed and treated as colleagues, respected and valued for the unique and vital contributions that they alone can bring to the service-learning movement.

Faculty, staff, and community partners could hardly ask for a more promising group of collaborators than today's students represent. Working together, these constituencies have it in their power to renew not only servicelearning but the higher purposes of the academy. If, as Dewey once said, "democracy must be reborn in every generation, and education is its midwife" (1899), the time could not be more opportune. Our country needs a recommitment to its democratic ideals, and the academy needs to redefine its special contribution to our democracy. It is our hope that this book, by bringing together some of the finest examples of how student leadership is helping to create new and renewed academy-community alliances, may itself contribute to the renewal of both the academy and our democracy. At the very least we hope it will add to and deepen our understanding of what it means to educate students for citizenship.

## 22 Engagement and Epistemology

#### John Saltmarsh

n his 2008 book Democratic Professionalism, Albert Dzur interprets Dewey's understanding of the practice of democracy in everyday life as La means for reorienting professional practice in ways that restore public trust through the facilitation of democratic values, what Dzur calls the "democratic values of task sharing and lay participation" (132). Applying these values to academics as educational professionals, Dzur frames task sharing and lay participation in community-based work in terms of reciprocity and collaboration—as in the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification definition: "the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity." Dzur's work builds on William Sullivan's 1995 book Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America, which holds up the concept of "civic professionalism" as a way of looking at the implications of reorienting professional work in the twenty-first century toward democratic ends.

These and other writings have generated inquiry into academic culture and its civic dimensions, raising deep epistemological questions about how knowledge is generated in the academy, what qualifies as legitimate knowledge, and what are the political implications of the dominant epistemology of the research culture of higher education. These questions served as the impetus for and focus of a meeting held at the Kettering Foundation in February 2008, which in turn prompted the publication of two published works: a "Democratic Engagement White Paper" (Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton 2009) and a book edited by John Saltmarsh and Matthew Hartley (forthcoming, 2011), "To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education. Both the white paper and the book explore the politics of academic epistemology, ways to deepen the democratic dimensions of community engagement, and kinds of institutional transformation needed on campus to accomplish democratic ends.

This renewed focus on the civic dimensions of academia, as our colleague Nadinne Cruz has noted, has "shifted the battle" from a struggle of practice and structure (pedagogy and infrastructure to support community-based work) that defined the 1990s to a new struggle over policy and culture (faculty roles and rewards and epistemology). This is a very different encounter and requires a different intellectual response. We are seeing some of that response in works like Dzur's, in the more recent book by Frank Fischer, Democracy and Expertise: Reorienting Policy Inquiry (2009), and in Harry Boyte's work for the Kettering Foundation, "Civic Agency and the Cult of the Expert" (2009). This chapter serves as a kind of bridge linking explorations of service-learning pedagogy to broader questions of epistemology and the need to refocus attention on the kinds of changes in institutional culture that are necessary if civic engagement is going to shape a model for democratic action in our colleges and universities.

The pursuit of knowledge itself demands engagement. Increasingly, academics in many disciplines are realizing that their own intellectual territory overlaps with that of other knowledge professionals working outside the university sector. . . A greater number of academics need to define their territory more widely and accept that they share much of it with other knowledge-professionals; engagement with those beyond the ivory tower may greatly enrich their own thinking. Increasingly, academics state that the search for formal understanding itself, long central to our mission, is moving rapidly beyond the borders of disciplines and their location inside universities. (Bjarnason and Coldstream 2003, 323)

#### A Quiet Revolution

During the decade from the mid-1980s through the mid-1990s, four academic leaders—Ernest Boyer, Ernest Lynton, Eugene Rice, and Donald Schön—formed a remarkable intellectual cadre at the core of a wider group of intellectuals, academics, and educators, all centered around the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which was led at the time by Boyer. Collectively, they thought through the challenges of higher education, its mission and purpose, how to bring about change so that colleges and universities would be more responsive to the needs of society, how to improve the undergraduate experience, and how to redefine the faculty role, particularly the core faculty responsibilities around research and scholarship in the generation of new knowledge.

Their early work broke new ground and was highly influential in shaping reform in the academy. Schön's The Reflective Practitioner: How Practitioners Think in Action (1983) and Educating the Reflective Practitioner (1987) challenged the dominant forms of professional preparation and the norms associated with the kinds of knowledge valued in the academy, and highlighted the need for change not only in practice but in organizational culture in higher education. Lynton's work in the 1980s, most notably New Priorities for the University: Meeting Society's Needs for Applied Knowledge and Competent Individuals (with Sandra Elman, 1987), was directed at the responsiveness of the academy to social issues. His writing at that time examined the institutional structures that created incentives for faculty to use their expertise to address social concerns, grounded in the fundamental belief that "the essence of universities" was "to be the prime source of intellectual development for society" (1). Beyond basic research, he argued for more application and dissemination of knowledge and more value assigned to the faculty's service role as it involved "professionally based technical assistance and policy analysis" (148). Rice worked closely with Boyer in formulating the arguments in Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), which claimed that if higher education was to take seriously its "civic mandate," then the way for that to happen was to reorient the most important thing that defined faculty work in the dominant culture of the research university-research and scholarship. Scholarship Reconsidered offered a broadened conception of scholarship that included the more traditional scholarship of discovery but also the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of application. While all this work was in many ways pathbreaking, it was also shaped by the dominant values of the academy. Schön's work was practice-oriented and had not yet addressed the logic of his argument for institutional change. Lynton's work complemented Boyer's by reorienting the faculty service role (further developed in Making the Case of Professional Service), but it still reflected the dominant values of university-centric, highly rationalized expert knowledge being applied externally to society. Similarly, in Scholarship Reconsidered, application of expert academic knowledge defined even the "new" scholarship of application.

At the same time, the logic of these leaders' arguments suggested that their agenda was not sufficient. By 1994, Lynton fundamentally challenged the core epistemological assumptions of the academy in his essay "Knowledge and Scholarship," in which he explored two key ideas: the flow of knowledge and an ecosystem of knowledge. Interrogating the flow of knowledge, Lynton noted that "the current primacy of research in the academic value system" fostered a "persistent misconception of a uni-directional flow of knowledge, from the locus of research to the place of application, from scholar to practitioner, teacher to student, expert to client" (87). Such a "linear view of knowledge flow," he added, "inevitably creates a hierarchy of values according to which research is the most important, and all other knowledgebased activities are derivative and secondary" (88). "In short," he wrote, "the domain of knowledge has no one-way streets" (88). The logic of a multidirectional flow of knowledge led Lynton to conceptualize "the eco-system of knowledge" (88), in which "knowledge . . . is everywhere fed back, constantly enhanced. We need to think of knowledge in an ecological fashion, recognizing the complex, multifaceted and multiply-connected system," and to recognize that "knowledge moves through this system in many directions" (88-89). At the heart of a socially responsive reorientation of the academy was an awareness of how knowledge was generated and a recognition that a shift in epistemology had implications for institutional change.

Schön took the same position, which he presented forcefully in his 1995 *Change* magazine article, "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology." Following the logic that flowed from "the new forms of scholarship" Boyer described, Schön concluded that the new scholarship should "challenge the epistemology built into the modern research university" (27). Boyer's reconsideration of scholarship fundamentally questioned "what counts as legitimate knowledge and how you know what you claim to know" (27). What concerned Schön was that colleges and universities in the United States are dominated by technical rationality—what he called their "institutional epistemology" (27)—which shuns other ways of knowing. "Educational institutions," he wrote, "have epistemologies" (27), and

all of us who live in research universities are bound up in technical rationality, regardless of our personal attitudes toward it, because it is built into the institutional arrangements—the formal and informal rules and norms—that govern such processes as the screening of candidates for tenure and promotion. Even liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and other institutions of higher education appear to be subject to the influence of technical rationality by a kind of echo effect or by imitation. (32)

For Schön, all the work being done by Boyer to change higher education by broadening what was viewed as legitimate scholarly work in the academy raised issues not only of scholarship but, fundamentally, of epistemology. If faculty are to engage in new forms of scholarship, Schön observed, then "we cannot avoid questions of epistemology, since the new forms of scholarship ... challenge the epistemology built into the modern research university.... If the new scholarship is to mean anything, it must imply a kind of

action research with norms of its own, which will conflict with the norms of technical rationality—the prevailing epistemology built into the research universities" (27). Perhaps more than Lynton, Schön recognized that legitimizing a different epistemology would lead to wrenching battles in the academy because the change it required went to the core of the paradigm that had dominated American higher education since the late nineteenth century. "Introducing the new scholarship into institutions of higher education," he claimed, "means becoming involved in an epistemological battle" (32).

Boyer, too, followed the logic of his early work and absorbed the intellectual contributions of his colleagues in his seminal piece "The Scholarship of Engagement," published posthumously in 1996. With the scholarship of engagement, Boyer reoriented the earlier framing of the scholarship of application and in doing so exposed an epistemological shift and an emphasis on institutional change. What in Scholarship Reconsidered was a focus on how individual faculty define their scholarly work became a focus on the institution as a whole and its responsibility to the wider society in "The Scholarship of Engagement" (1996a). "At one level," Boyer wrote, "the scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems" (32). But on "a deeper level," engagement, in contrast to application, involved the creation of "a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and creatively with each other" (33). Engagement made room for a different way of knowing which was needed in order for the university to "to serve a larger purpose" (22).

Rice, who in many ways engineered the emergence of engagement as a counter-normative reframing that had wide-ranging implications for reform, weighed in on the need for new ways of knowing, new ways of defining scholarship, and a new faculty role in his *Making a Place for the New American Scholar* (1996). For Rice, "the assumptive world of the academic professional and the reward system that supports it fosters for many a disconnection from one's own institution, community and societal needs" (11). But a different kind of scholar was emerging, a "new American scholar," someone who "is open to multiple sources of knowledge" (30). "A broader view of scholarly work," he wrote, "will open faculty to seeing the different approaches to knowing" that would lead to complementary and mutually enriching ways of knowing in the generation of new knowledge, "not as a zero-sum game where one approach wins and the other loses" (16). Rice was getting underneath the reconsideration of scholarship to expose its origins in the reconsideration of epistemology.

By the end of the 1990s, a quiet revolution was stirring. Engagement had emerged as a core value in the academy, and it raised not only issues of mission, improved teaching and learning, and campus-community partnerships, but also the fundamental issue of epistemology. The reconsideration of epistemology and the counterbalance that relational, contextual, participatory, and localized ways of knowing offered in relation to traditional academic epistemologies catalyzed an "epistemological battle" that continues to ripple through higher education. Engagement has revealed the significance of broadening ways of knowing that challenge the academy to create organizational cultures and institutional structures that will support it and its underlying epistemology.

In more recent years an understanding of "engagement" has become refined in ways consistent with the shift initiated by Boyer, Lynton, Rice, and Schön. KerryAnn O'Meara and Rice, in *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered* (2005), assess the developments in engagement in higher education since the publication of Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*. They make the case that Boyer's scholarship of application "builds on established academic epistemology, assumes that knowledge is generated in the university or college and then applied to external contexts with knowledge flowing in one direction, out of the academy." In contrast, they explain that the

Scholarship of Engagement . . . requires going beyond the expert model that often gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration . . . calls on faculty to move beyond "outreach," . . . asks scholars to go beyond "service," with its overtones of noblesse oblige. What it emphasizes is genuine *collaboration*: that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared. It represents a basic reconceptualization of faculty involvement in community-based work. (27–28)

Collaborative scholarship marks a counterbalancing of traditional academic knowledge generation (pure, disciplinary, homogeneous, expert-led, supplydriven, hierarchical, peer reviewed, and almost exclusively university-based) with engaged knowledge generation (applied, problem-centered, transdisciplinary, heterogeneous, hybrid, demand-driven, entrepreneurial, networkembedded, etc.) (Gibbons et al. 1994). Collaborative knowledge generation legitimizes knowledge that emerges from experience, what Donald Schön called practice knowledge, or actionable knowledge: "The epistemology appropriate to [engaged learning and scholarship] must make room for the practitioner's reflection in and on action. It must account for and legitimize not only the use of knowledge produced in the academy, but the practitioner's generation of actionable knowledge" (1995, 26). Legitimate knowledge, according to Mary Walshok in Knowledge without Boundaries, "is something more than highly intellectualized, analytical, and symbolic material. It includes working knowledge, a component of experience, of hands-on practice knowledge" (1995, 14). This reconceptualization is also central to the civic dimensions of higher education. It is associated with campus-community "partnerships that possess integrity and that emphasize participatory, collaborative, and democratic processes" (Bringle, Hatcher, and Clayton 2006,
258). Collaboration reinforces—and instills—"the norms of democratic culture . . . determined by the values of inclusiveness, participation, task sharing, lay participation, reciprocity in public problem solving, and an equality of respect for the knowledge and experience that everyone contributes to education and community building" (Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton 2009, 6).

# Pedagogy, Scholarship, and Institutional Change

Schön's writings help provide a framework for connecting shifts in epistemology to changes in pedagogy and scholarship within a broader framework of changes that extend to shifts in institutional culture. Schön's most influential writings focus on reflective practice and are grounded in Dewey's educational thought. He describes a way of knowing and a form of knowledge that are associated with practice and action:

In the domain of practice, we see what John Dewey called inquiry: thought intertwined with action—reflection in and on action—which proceeds from doubt to the resolution of doubt, to the generation of new doubt. For Dewey, doubt lies not in the mind but in the situation. Inquiry begins with situations that are problematic—that are confusing, uncertain, or conflicted, and block the free flow of action. The inquirer is in, and in transaction with, the problematic situation. He or she must construct the meaning and frame the problem of the situation, thereby setting the stage for problem-solving, which, in combination with changes in the external context, brings a new problematic situation into being. (1995, 31)

Here, Schön identifies practitioner knowledge, or "knowing in action" (27), which represents a particular way of constructing and using knowledge. He uses the example of community-based scholarship to make his point. "If community outreach is to be seen as a form of scholarship," he writes, "then it is the practice of reaching out and providing service to a community that must be seen as raising important issues whose investigation may lead to generalizations of prospective relevance and actionability" (31).

This requires institutional change. "The problem of changing the universities so as to incorporate the new scholarship," Schön explains, "must include, then, how to introduce action research as a legitimate and appropriately rigorous way of knowing and generating knowledge.... If we are prepared to take [on this task], then we have to deal with what it means to introduce an epistemology of reflective practice into institutions of higher education dominated by technical rationality" (31–32). Schön links issues of scholarship to what he calls "the epistemological, institutional, and political issues it raises within the university." He further connects questions of scholarship and epistemology to "institutional arrangements—the formal and informal rules and norms of the campus, or the institutional culture." He argues that "in order to legitimize the new scholarship, higher education institutions will have to learn organizationally to open up the prevailing epistemology so as to foster new forms of reflective action research" (34).

Schön's insights into new forms of scholarship are useful in thinking about new forms of pedagogy. In the same way that a new scholarship requires a new epistemology, a new pedagogy—localized, relational, practice-based, active, collaborative, experiential, and reflective—requires a new epistemology consistent with changed pedagogical practice. Schön offers a framework that suggests that a shift in epistemology (how knowledge is constructed, how we know what we know, and what is legitimate knowledge in the academy) will lead to a change in how knowledge is organized in the curriculum, in how the curriculum is delivered through instruction (pedagogy), in how knowledge is created and shared, and in the institutional cultures that support change in all these educational dimensions. Each relates to the other, none can be considered in isolation, and all are linked to issues of institutional transformation (see Figure 22.1).

Community-based pedagogy raises issues of institutional change that are centered in questions of epistemology, as the framework suggests. An example of this framework in practice comes from a group of multidisciplinary faculty at a small liberal arts college who were teaching community-based experiential courses and conducting community-based action research. The campus was involved in a strategic planning process, and the faculty determined that the central question they wanted to discuss was the following: "For the sake of creating new knowledge, what is the intellectual space for complementary epistemologies at X College?" Their statement begins with knowledge generation. These faculty wanted to legitimize a different kind of epistemology that aligned with their conception of how knowledge is constructed and how learning occurred in their classes. The "intellectual space" alluded to broader systemic issues at the institution, linking "complementary epistemologies" with interdisciplinarity, community-based teaching and learning, and engaged scholarship, as well as the structures, policies, and cultures of the institution. They were constructing knowledge with their students and in their research in ways that valued highly contextualized, relational, and localized ways of knowing. They sought legitimacy for bringing together-in a complementary way-this kind of knowledge with more traditional, rationalized, analytical ways of knowing. The situation on this campus is not unlike what is happening on many campuses, where introducing new forms of knowledge generation and learning into institutions of higher education, Schön suggests, "means becoming involved in an epistemological battle. It is a battle of snails, proceeding so slowly that you have to look very carefully in order to see it going on. But it is happening nonetheless" (32).



Figure 22.1 Epistemology and Its Implications

One dimension of this "epistemological battle" is the perspective that views students as assets to the educational process, challenging the deficit-thinking that characterizes a traditional epistemological perspective. Learner-centered education embraces student assets because the experience and knowledge that students contribute to the learning process, the diversity of their cultural perspectives, and the authority of knowledge that they possess necessarily contribute to the construction of new knowledge. The educational value of diversity is enhanced proportionate to the greater ethnic, racial, cultural, religious, gender, and socioeconomic diversity present in the educational setting (Barr and Tagg 1995; Ibarra 2001; Valencia 1997). This means that a conventional university education

cannot offer nearly enough on its own to a huge range of students with starting-points, aspirations, and destinations immensely varied but mostly well outside the confines of the theoretical discipline.... [It is necessary] to situate our university courses as far as possible in the context of the students' experience at work and in the world they come from, go back to, and where they expect to exercise understanding and practical intelligence. To do that means rooting much of our teaching in our own engaged understanding of that world. (Bjarnason and Coldstream 2003, 335)

Community-based teaching, learning, and scholarship are grounded in the position that knowledge is socially constructed and that the lived experience and cultural frameworks that the teacher and learner bring to the educational setting form the basis for the discovery of new knowledge. This position is antithetical to the dominant epistemological position, which sees knowledge as objectified and separate from the knower, thus assigning little value to the knowledge and experience that the learner brings to the learning environment (Belenky 1986; Gibbons et al. 1994).

Another dimension of this learner-centered position is that the student is fundamentally a knowledge producer instead of a knowledge consumer, an active participant in the creation of new knowledge. In order to facilitate socially constructed knowledge, an educational design is needed that fosters active participation in teaching and learning-that is, in a Freireian sense, everyone involved is both a teacher and a learner (Freire 1970). Instruction, therefore, is designed to be active, collaborative, and engaged rather than passive, rote, and disengaged (in a deficit model, there is no need to involve the student except as the recipient of knowledge that is "out there" and that needs to be brought, by the instructor at the center of the classroom and in sole possession of authority of knowledge, to the student, typically in a lecture format) (Barr and Tagg 1995). The civic corollary to this epistemological position is that education instills active participation in learning and in civic life; students, as knowledge producers, are educated to become active participants in democratic life instead of being spectators to a shallow form of democracy (Dewey 1916; Ehrlich 2000).

The positioning of the student as a knowledge producer is associated with the design of educational experiences that reinforce democratic values and experiences. What does democracy mean in an educational environment? The work of Myles Horton (1998; Jacobs, 2003), Paulo Freire (1970), and bell hooks (1994) establishes the position that democracy enters the process of teaching and learning through a framework of equality, defined as the equal respect for the knowledge and experience of all participants in the learning process. What this means is that we recognize that it is disingenuous to suggest an equality of power (we still give grades) but that we do recognize, in Freire's words, an equality in "the authority of knowledge" in our classes—an authority of knowledge we share with students and community partners. When Myles Horton designed a learning strategy at Highlander Folk School in the 1930s, he understood that "one of the best ways of educating people is to give them an experience that embodies what you are trying to teach" (1998, 68). This meant creating a "circle of learners" (decentering the teacher) with the commitment of all the participants "to respect other people's ideas" (71). This kind of educational design for democracy, influenced by Dewey and Jane Addams, played itself out in the Citizenship Schools that became a catalyst for action during the civil rights era. Equal respect for the knowledge and experience of everyone involved in learning presupposes a shift in epistemology. Horton explained it this way:

The biggest stumbling block was that all of us at Highlander had academic backgrounds. We thought that the way we had learned and what we had learned could somehow be tailored to the needs of poor people, the working people of Appalachia....We still thought our job was to give students information about what we thought would be good for them....We saw problems that we thought we had the answers to, rather than seeing the problems and the answers that the people had themselves. (68)

Ordinary citizens from communities in the South came to Highlander with the goal of collectively working toward the solution of a public problem. They each came with a body of knowledge and experience that had relevance to the problem at hand. And they participated in a process of learning from each other and creating new understanding and knowledge to take back to their communities to address social issues. While at Highlander, ordinary citizens participated with an authority of knowledge that was respected by others. They participated in community-based public problem solving through a process that afforded equal respect for the knowledge and experience that everyone brought to the educational enterprise. It is this process of democratic knowledge creation that is at the heart of our work as educators integrating pedagogies of engagement with civic engagement.

### Attending to Epistemology

Attention to questions of epistemology suggest that civic engagement scholars and practitioners could productively turn their attention to the implications of engaged epistemology—what Laura Rendón calls "participatory epistemology" (2009, 35)—for teaching, learning, and scholarship. At the same time, attention to shifts in epistemology highlights the importance of linking changes in practice with changes in institutional structures, policies, and cultures. The kind of engagement that is aligned with a shift in epistemology cannot flourish and be sustained within the existing institutional arrangements. As bell hooks noted in *Teaching to Transgress*, "We have to realize that if we are working on ourselves to become more fully engaged, there is only so much that we can do. Ultimately the institution will exhaust us simply because there is no sustained institutional support" (1994, 160). Authentic, democratic engagement will require the remaking of colleges and universities into institutions that support, model, and encourage engaged faculty practice and student learning. Additionally, attention to questions of epistemology also creates space for exploring the relationship between the ways in which knowledge is traditionally generated in the academy and the fostering of a public culture of democracy. Attending to epistemology allows for interrogating the political implications of academic, expert-centered, hierarchical, technocratic forms of generating knowledge. Examining the epistemological implications of civic engagement has the potential to advance and deepen the core purposes of higher education and to make real the relationship of higher education to the vitality of democracy in the United States.

## Conclusion Looking Back, Looking Ahead

#### A Dialogue

John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski

ver the course of the years that we have been working together on advancing service-learning and civic engagement in higher education, we have had the opportunity for protracted reflection around strategies, solutions, and priorities. We have collaborated on the intellectual architecture of engagement through what Peter Senge would call the role of designers—we have worked to design the programs and resources for practitioners (faculty, administrators, staff, students, and community partners) to effectively bring engagement into their work. As a continuation of reflection on advancing civic engagement, we are using this final chapter to have a dialogue to consider strategies, solutions, and priorities for the next decade. Through dialogue we are able to explore different perspectives, challenge each other's thinking, and work to cocreate knowledge and action aimed at revitalizing the democratic purposes of higher education.

JS: I can't help but feel that something has changed in the arc of history for civic engagement in higher education. It is a sense of drift in the movement, a sense that the energy for change on campus has stalled out. I look across the landscape of higher education and it seems that civic engagement work is not fulfilling its democratic promise and that much of the transformative work associated with institutional engagement has been accommodated to the dominant cultures and structures of higher education. It seems like it is time to explore a fresh conceptual and

analytical frame in which to do our work going forward. This suggests that we may need to raise new questions: Are we co-creators of knowledge, or do we operate out of a division between producers and consumers of knowledge? Is it the role of academics to deliver expertise or to utilize knowledge in facilitating the essential public work of democratic deliberation and problem solving? These questions suggest inquiry into academic culture and its civic dimensions, especially interrogating deep epistemological questions about how knowledge is generated in the academy, what is legitimate knowledge, and what are the political implications of the dominant epistemology of the research culture of higher education. It is these questions and concerns that led to a meeting at the Kettering Foundation in February 2008 and to a "Democratic Engagement White Paper" [Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton 2009] as well as a book edited with Matthew Hartley, "To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education [forthcoming 2011], all of which explore the politics of academic epistemology and ways to deepen the democratic dimensions of community engagement and kinds of institutional transformation needed on campus to accomplish democratic ends. Perhaps this conceptual reframing can help us understand how to approach the next phase of engagement work. As our colleague Nadinne Cruz has noted, "the battle has shifted" from a focus on practice and structure (pedagogy and infrastructure to support communitybased work) that defined the 1990s to a new struggle over policy and culture (faculty roles and rewards and epistemology). This is a very different encounter and it requires a different intellectual response.

EZ: I agree that we need to renew our thinking and our practice vis-à-vis civic engagement in higher education, but I see this need as no different from the challenge faced by every other change movement. In other words, I am not so sure that there is something wrong or that something has stalled. We could have predicted an eventual need for renewal fifteen years ago—and regardless of the specific direction the movement would eventually take. Framing the present as a response to a deficit seems to me to reproduce precisely the mentality we so often warn against when we discuss off-campus communities and community-campus partnerships.

Indeed, given all that has happened since 1995, what justifies this fear that somehow even more should have changed in such a short period of time? I think there is a real danger in feeding a kind of intellectual panic. Focusing so intensely on what *hasn't* taken place seems to me to undermine our creativity and our sense of options. Instead of seeing everywhere opportunities to advance the work incrementally, we become desperate to find some conceptual silver bullet that will somehow make everything all right. Such a search not only leads to a destructive competition to name that concept or strategy; it also serves to discourage those still trying to find a way into the movement in the first place. After all, if the movement's

proponents don't think it is working, why should new practitioners invest time and energy in it?

But I also have more specific concerns about the anxiety you identify. I am afraid it is skewed to and by the interests of the academic research community. In my opinion that community is disproportionately represented among those usually thought of as leaders of the civic engagement movement. These are, for the most part, white males with light teaching loads who work at research-intensive institutions or institutions that aspire to that profile. Together with a few female and minority individuals, not infrequently themselves from research-intensive or elite liberal arts institutions, these are the people who most often speak to and for civic engagement in the academy. Indeed, if anything *hasn't* changed, it is the makeup of this leadership group—a group that includes no strong minority perspective, no student leaders, no reliable community voice, no adjunct faculty, and few individuals from two-year institutions.

One serious consequence of this undemocratic view from the top is that the concerns and priorities of many faculty who would like to find a way to integrate more community and civic engagement into their work find little resonance in the big-picture conversations that wind up defining where the movement is and what it needs. If "the battle has shifted" away from a focus on practice and structure, it certainly is not because we have oversaturated the resource market. It would not be difficult to identify a dozen specific ways in which "classroom faculty," if I may be permitted that term, could be assisted in embracing civic engagement more easily and effectively—from case studies that clarify difficult situations to protocols for training student assistants to discipline-specific civic reflection materials. If we need a culture change—and I agree with you that we do—we will not get it by theorizing ourselves into the thinking of a privileged few. I am much more confident in the power of culture change from the bottom up.

JS: An asset approach is always a better way at getting at sustained change, and I'm glad that you have brought this in as what might be a guiding principle for future work. I want to make sure that we are able to create an institutional environment in which the assets—underrepresented faculty and students and their community partners—can thrive and do their best work. My concern is that the history of higher education, particularly over the past half century, tells us that despite all the right reasons and often a deep sense of urgency, significant reform efforts tend to go nowhere. And while I agree with you that the civic engagement work has come a remarkably long way in a relatively short amount of time, I don't see that it has been coupled with systemic change, and thus it has an inevitable tendency to reproduce the characteristics of the existing system. I'm concerned that systems and structures of higher education are changing the civic engagement work more than the civic engagement work on the ground is changing higher education. When that happens, I see the faculty who are our most valuable assets either experiencing a kind of colonial oppression or leaving higher education.

So I not only would like to see faculty working with students and community partners enacting better teaching and learning and impacting community life; I would also like to see them acting as change agents to deliberately and actively change the culture of the institutions they work within. And if they are going to be agents of change, then it is helpful to have a clear sense of what it is they want to create. Thus, the definitional work is, I think, critically important. It is the work of naming the problem as a way of shaping a more democratic future. As Paul Hawken writes in his most recent book, "To be sanguine about the future, however, requires a plausible basis for constructive action: you cannot describe possibilities for the future unless the present problem is accurately defined" [2008, 1]. So I think there is important work to be done in accurately defining the present problem, which I see as a problem of both democratic practice and institutional change.

So your insights lead me in three directions. One is to focus attention on the kinds of resources that faculty across disciplines need to deepen civic engagement practice and to involve students and community partners more deeply in engagement work. Perhaps case studies could include cases that couple practice with leadership and tactics for bringing about change.

A second direction is focusing particular strategies on particular institutional types. I'm more and more convinced that greater attention needs to be paid to faculty work in public colleges and universities—the campuses representative of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), where increasing numbers of our low-income, firstgeneration students of color and ethnically and culturally diverse students go to college and where innovative teaching and learning are more valued and rewarded. These are institutions that are characterized as "stewards of place" because the outcome of how their students are educated determines the civic health of local communities. The creation of the resources you are suggesting should be tailored with and for the faculty in these institutions.

The third direction is a particular focus on our research universities. I'm increasingly convinced that the larger system of higher education is held hostage to the elite, disengaged, prestige culture of research universities. I don't see it as a viable strategy to try to change these institutions. What we might do is focus within them on the way future faculty (many of whom will teach at AASCU campuses) are trained—in other words, focus on graduate education. What if there were more opportunities, more models, and more resources for graduate students to be prepared as engaged faculty? This would mean opportunities for graduate students, at the master's and doctoral levels, to take courses that provide them with a basis for active and collaborative teaching and learning methods; ways to discover and capitalize on student assets; ways to engage communities, teach democratically, integrate teaching, scholarship, and service, and understand the culture of higher education and

organizational change strategies so that they can help create institutional environments that will sustain engaged practice. Maybe infiltrating graduate education at research universities will prove to be one of the few ways to impact their culture. More importantly, it may be a way to prepare the faculty who will teach at campuses that strive to be stewards of place.

EZ: I could not agree more with your singling out the importance of public institutions, especially regional universities. I would also like to emphasize the importance of community colleges because here, even more than at four-year comprehensives, the broadest demographic spectrum of students finds its way into higher education. Hence the potential of these schools to impact the way in which people come to understand and value civic engagement is especially great. As Eduardo Padrón, president of Miami Dade College-and Miami Dade remains a predominantly two-year collegeonce wrote, "If you were to ask me what Miami Dade College does, I would reply that our fundamental purpose is to preserve democracy" (as quoted in The Community's College [Zlotkowski et al. 2004, 22]. However, for schools whose faculty teach four or five courses a semester, definitional clarity and epistemic articulation are simply not "where the action is." I remember a conversation I had with a community partner while visiting a community college in Massachusetts. I asked her what made her partnership with this school special. She replied that that school actually worked with her to address concrete problems. This, she suggested, was very different from her experiences with a nearby university that more often than not wanted to explain to her why she was not approaching a problem correctly.

Perhaps one of the reasons higher ed reform movements so often fail is because they, like the civic engagement movement, tend to get fixated on change at and from the top. The working assumption-in fact, an assumption often explicitly articulated—is that we must get the research-intensive universities to "lead us," or else we will go nowhere. This was precisely the advice I received over and over again when I set about putting together the American Association for Higher Education series on service-learning in the academic disciplines. The series, I was told, needed the legitimacy of top-tier scholars. But, in fact, what the series needed was to collect and publicize as many credible, if not always stellar, examples of how one could actually use servicelearning in discipline-based courses. Had I followed the advice only to seek out individuals from elite institutions, the series would never have made it into print. There is, of course, much excellent community-based teaching and learning at research-intensive schools, but much of what now occurs there has been furthered by a "culture" of already demonstrated possibilities. Actions created that culture; only later did that culture itself begin to create actions. We don't seriously expect bankers to lead the charge for greater income equality or the oil companies to agitate for greater environmental awareness. Why should things be different in higher education? Why should we expect

those that profit the most from the prevailing system to lead the way to "systemic" change? When the majority of those working in higher education finally wake up to the fact that we *give* an elite minority the power to speak for our culture, change will not seem nearly so utopian a prospect. I am disappointed at how often conferences on civic engagement tap someone from an elite, research-intensive university to deliver the keynote. Are there really no other faculty, students, or community members whose voices are worth paying special attention to?

In the end, I do not believe you and I have any significant theoretical or philosophical differences, but I think I am far more impatient than you with the energy that continues to be poured into concerns several removes from the level of concrete resource creation and strategies that meet the needs of the vast majority of faculty and students. Investing heavily in "defining" the problem should not, I believe, be allowed to distract attention from many other strategies that could have far greater, far more immediate impact. Among these I would name the following. First, as I already indicated, I agree with you completely about the importance of helping AASCU-type institutions move forward with their civic agendas. Whatever we can do to help teaching-intensive schools identify and create the specific kinds of resources their faculty, students, and community partners need to advance a civic agenda, we should do. I am wary here of appearing to claim more knowledge and insight than I in fact possess. The initiatives these schools have already launched are impressive, and the task of those outside those schools is simply to acknowledge, learn, and contribute wherever possible.

Second, we should develop a national campaign to develop a much wider variety of specifically *civic* resources. These cannot be too practical. We need much more "pull out and use" material than is currently available. For many faculty, the admonition to incorporate a genuinely civic dimension into their work runs headlong into the fact that they don't even understand what specifically we're asking them to do. Furthermore, the farther publications and other resources are from "off the rack" use, the easier it is to continue doing what one already knows how to do. I'd like to see many more civic anthologies and readers with study questions, annotated case studies, discipline-specific civic models, and well-articulated syllabi with an explicitly civic dimension-tools so well designed, hard-pressed faculty would feel free to experiment with them without having to "reinvent the wheel." Third, we need finally to turn the corner on "students as colleagues." However deaf an administration or senior faculty group may be to younger faculty, it cannot afford to ignore well-grounded, articulate student demands. There is plenty of evidence to indicate that students do not, for the most part, find their gen ed courses satisfying, that they respond powerfully to links between traditional course content and contemporary public concerns (whether or not the course has a service-learning component), that "hands-on" is by far the preferred learning style for today's students, and that students crave

opportunities to develop agency and leadership. In other words, our students are potentially among our most important allies, and yet, for the most part, we continue to talk about them, not to and with them. We organize conferences to discuss the "student dimension" but do not ask students to help us organize those conferences—or even to attend them. Our student civic engagement strategy needs to be infinitely more (a) intentional, (b) nuanced, and (c) respectful. Many of us are still operating with a mindset about students that became anachronistic almost a decade ago.

Finally, we have yet to recognize fully the potential of the technological resources now available to us. This failure goes hand-in-hand with both our neglect of student allies and our academic establishment-oriented strategies. I am personally pathetically limited in my use of technology, but I recognize what others have done and can do. If I were thirty years younger, it would be technology-based or technology-related initiatives that I would make an essential part of all my organizing work and academic and community outreach.

JS: In listening to you I am most struck by how much is changing with civic engagement and with higher education. While higher education as an industry driven by the debilitating culture of research universities struggles to reinvent itself as it is faced with new challenges, there is also remarkable opportunity for an adaptive response of innovation, experimentation, and civic purpose. While I am not convinced that the larger industry is really ready to commit to a balancing of the cosmopolitan with the local in a way that shifts higher education to a more socially responsive stance, I am convinced that the next generation of students and scholars has already made the shift. I guess the question for me is whether higher education will adapt to become the institutional home where they can thrive or whether they will find ways to live their lives of commitment outside the academy. The next-generation work is already being addressed by colleagues such as Nick Longo and KerryAnn O'Meara and is emerging in the literature-I think also of Gary Rhoades et al.'s 2008 article on "Local Cosmopolitans and Cosmopolitan Locals: New Models of Professionals in the Academy." The next-generation work has been simmering around us for some time now; I think of the influence that Roberto Ibarra's work (Beyond Affirmative Action [2001]) has had on our thinking about diversity and civic engagement and the need to reframe the culture of higher education to make it a place where a wide range of culturally diverse undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty can thrive.

As you pointed out, one of the dimensions of this next-generation work is that it will look at students differently—taking seriously their contribution to teaching and learning and who they are as learners. The next generation of the "students as colleagues" work that was begun while we were both affiliated with Campus Compact includes exploring the deeper implications of relocating students as co-producers of knowledge, valuing the knowledge and experience they contribute to the educational process, sharing authority for the process of knowledge generation and pedagogy, and allowing them to practice and experiment with a public culture of democracy as part of the work of higher education. From an asset-based perspective, the student is fundamentally a knowledge producer instead of a knowledge consumer, an active participant in the creation of new knowledge—and therefore can and should contribute to the educational design as well, working as collaborators *with* faculty. Perhaps next-generation work includes the collaborative generation of resources that facilitate civic engagement through students as colleagues across the curriculum. I would also like to see the next generation of students as colleagues work include more intentional emphasis on capacity building for what Harry Boyte has called "civic agency" that can be directed not only to community change but to campus change as well.

A second dimension of next-generation work involves graduate students and graduate education. An increasing number of graduate students are pursuing advanced degrees after undergraduate experiences that included community service, service-learning, or both. They are more politically aware and active than previous generations and are looking to connect their academic passions with their commitments to social justice and community building. They are asking questions about the public relevance of their disciplines as they pursue practica and design research projects. For those who aspire to become academics, they are looking for ways to build capacity around engaged teaching and learning particularly as they connect to community, and they aspire to create integrated faculty lives around teaching, scholarship, and service. These graduate students are looking for mentors and role models to help them shape their professional identity as engaged academics. They are also attuned to issues of disciplinary and institutional cultures and the knowledge and skills needed to navigate academia in order to create lives as engaged scholars. Next-generation work for graduate students includes building networks of engaged graduate students (as seen in the Graduate Student Network of the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement [IARSLCE]), providing opportunities for graduate students to present their work and connect with early career and senior scholars, and offering programs as part of graduate studies that address professional development in teaching and engagement (for example, Michigan State University offers graduate certificates in both College Teaching and Civic Engagement).

A third dimension of next-generation work involves early career faculty. What is unique about the next generation is that faculty come to engagement very differently from the generation of faculty who implemented civic engagement in their teaching and scholarship in the 1990s. The typical career path for many faculty (the two of us included) was to go through very traditional academic training and enter into fairly linear career tracks as assistant professors and work toward tenure without much if any exposure to service-learning or civic engagement (or discussions about improving undergraduate education or the civic purposes of higher education). Then at some point, usually post-tenure when there was both dissatisfaction with educational effectiveness and less risk involved with innovation, faculty might be exposed to civic engagement, experiment with incorporating it into their work, and reshape their professional identity across the faculty roles. The next generation approaches the work with a different trajectory, having begun engagement as undergraduates and having brought questions of public relevance and action into their graduate studies so that they began their faculty careers with inclinations toward engaged teaching and learning and collaborative knowledge generation with those outside the campus. They are a generation less likely to accommodate their work to the systems of higher education and more likely to challenge the systems as they learn to navigate the hazards. The next generation of early career faculty work includes the kind of resource generation that you have talked about so that strong inclination can be matched by available pedagogical and scholarly instruments to be put into action. It also includes research that explores the lived professional experiences of these faculty and their role in shaping civically engaged, democratic colleges and universities.

Across all three dimensions of next-generation work are the digital proclivities that allow technology to connect and advance civic engagement in ways that were unthinkable to earlier generations. As we think about resource development, we should factor in the kinds of resources that can best be developed electronically. Undergraduate students, graduate students, and early career faculty are past the divide that separated the generation of academics who largely resisted technology from those who reluctantly found ways to incorporate it into their professional lives. Not only is the next generation technologically sophisticated, but the use of technology is second nature. In a project I am part of at the University of Massachusetts at Boston, we are using Web 2.0 technology to increase student civic engagement. The students, graduate students, and next-generation faculty have created a curriculum that seamlessly weaves together digital storytelling with social network mapping and community engagement to address social issues in the local neighborhoods.

Next-generation work also connects the local and the international in ways that acknowledge the global realities of the twenty-first century. There is no meaningful distinction between local and international. Students on campus have national identities that are reflected in the neighborhood near campus as well as in countries overseas. Students who want to understand the cultures of immigrant populations in the local community have opportunities to provide service to the communities in the home country and connect that service with the representative populations locally. Global competencies reflect these connections and the importance of making the connections between the local and international. In next-generation work, thinking globally will allow for acting both locally and internationally without excluding or privileging one or the other. The local is global and vice versa.

Finally, next-generation work approaches engagement with a strong connection to, even seamlessness with, the work of diversity on campus. Asset-based approaches that validate the contributions of culturally, socially, economically, racially, ethnically, and sexually diverse students include valuing their community experiences and bringing those experiences to bear on their education. A greater diversity of students also brings a greater diversity-and awareness of-learning styles and attention to how students learn as it relates to whether students persist and succeed academically. It is also clear that culturally, ethnically, and racially diverse faculty express tendencies toward shaping their research agenda and academic careers with attention to social issues and community connections and are seeking academic homes that validate their scholarly identities. Next-generation work takes it as axiomatic that civic engagement cannot be done effectively without a strong commitment to diversity and that diversity on campus cannot be meaningfully accomplished without a strong commitment to community engagement. Next-generation work weaves together diversity and engagement as the foundation for educational participation and success in a diverse democracy.

EZ: I very much agree with just about every point you make in this summary of next-generation work. I especially appreciate the way in which you identify the specific constituencies we must focus on to advance civic engagement and the way in which you stress their potential to make a difference. The strategy implicit in this recommendation allows us to begin immediately to build a larger community of civic engagement proponents and practitioners, and, just as importantly, allows us to begin to draw on both the energy and the vision of the coming generations. It seems to me generational change is a lever we often underestimate in our eagerness to find "the right answer"—be it a key concept, a satisfactory definition, or an underlying theory. If the pragmatists are correct in seeing all truth as essentially instrumental and best judged in terms of its effectiveness in achieving a given end, we cannot even know what intellectual tool will work best for those just emerging now as the academy's future leaders. All we can do is bring them into the circle of decision making as quickly as possible.

With this imperative in mind, I return to the topic with which our dialogue began, namely, your "sense that the energy for change on campus has stalled out." If you are right, I can think of no better way to counter that loss of energy than to insist on the need to bring new voices, new experiences, new generational perspectives into the civic engagement movement. Whatever else we may learn from the "history of ideas," we must begin with the recognition that ideas have always been embodiments—regardless of a thinker's philosophical position—not just of his or her individual experiences but also of the experiences of his or her culture. Thus, in *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* [1990], Stephen Toulmin argues that "the standard picture of Descartes' philosophical development as the unfolding of pure *ésprit* untouched by the historical events of his time . . . gives way to what is surely a more lifelike and flattering alternative: that of a young intellectual whose reflections opened up for people in his generation a real hope of *reasoning* their way out of political and theological chaos" [71, original emphasis].

In other words, the ahistorical theorist becomes the historical problem solver, and generational awareness becomes an indispensible strategic tool. I am reminded in this regard of the many studies that have recently appeared challenging the now widespread assumption that young people are civically indifferent [e.g., Dalton 2008; Zukin et al. 2006]. One of the most important points these studies make is that it simply will not do to take definitions of citizenship held by earlier generations and insist that they also be used for young people today. Once one moves away from that "one size fits all" mentality, it turns out that today's young people are in some ways even *more* civically involved than their predecessors.

This, of course, does not mean there is no generational continuity, that everything has to be reinvented every few decades. It would be foolish for those of us who helped bring the civic engagement movement to this point to underestimate the importance of well-constructed theories, concepts—even epistemologies—that can help all of us adjust our thinking and actions to what seems to matter most. No doubt the call for an epistemological shift with which you opened this dialogue has great potential to help the next generation of scholar-teachers understand better where we are coming from as well as one potentially important way forward. Naturally, there will also be other key conceptual shifts we have not yet identified. Indeed, even the prevailing expert-based paradigm must not be overlooked in its potential to contribute to the common good, if not to democratic dialogue in a strict sense.

What seems to me most important is that we not go about creating new litmus tests to replace the old ones. Just as there are many legitimate ways in which service-learning can help students become more civically engaged—even when they have not moved far beyond a traditional "service" model—so we must be open to a variety of theoretical bases that can support engaged academic work. The attitudes of those undertaking that work need not strike us as optimal from any perspective for that work to have genuine value. I am reminded here of Keith Morton's observation, in his essay "The Irony of Service" [1996], that community partners often seem to prefer a "project" approach to partnerships over one overtly grounded in a concern for social justice. Surely Paul Light is correct when he points out in a recent commentary in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* [September 7, 2009] that there are many valuable ways to involve college students in community service. The same can be said for the broader concept of civic engagement.

In conclusion, I would stress again that for me all the key considerations and decisions are deeply political, with a small "p." What disturbs me about much of the current talk about the need to create a new "culture" is not the specifics of what is being proposed; I probably agree with the vast majority of those specifics. What disturbs me is the siphoning off of energy from the hard work of political organizing, of effectively reaching out to the three constituencies you identify to help them acquire the tools they need now to make civic engagement a part of their daily intellectual lives. What disturbs me is the continuing assumption that the research-intensive university must be the place where "the real action" is and that research university–based theorists and researchers are those best able to speak to where the civic engagement movement is and where it should go. In short, what disturbs me most is the fundamentally undemocratic "culture" out of which much of the current critique has grown.

You may well be correct in arguing that we will never succeed in making civic engagement an essential feature of American higher education unless we challenge the intellectual assumptions-the very epistemology-that undergird the academy as it has traditionally operated. But I am even more convinced that we will never succeed in introducing a new conceptual paradigm unless we make a more democratic perspective and practice the very foundation on which we ourselves operate. Comprehensive public universities, nonelite liberal arts colleges, minority-serving institutions, community colleges, faculty with 4-4 or even 5-5 teaching loads, adjunct faculty, students-these are all academic constituencies whose input is routinely bypassed or ignored. We are in the ironic situation of arguing for democratic dialogue and a non-expert-driven culture in and through forums that mimic the very cultural characteristics we criticize. If the civic engagement movement has lost some momentum-which is not the same thing as saying it has plateaued—it may be that a "fresh conceptual and analytic frame," to return to the phrase you used in your opening statement, will be only as important as it is broad-based, as it succeeds in reflecting the views and the experiences of more than "the usual suspects." But becoming more genuinely democratic will require of all of us more than we have thus far been willing to give.

### References

Abbott, J. 1996. The search for next-century learning. AAHE Bulletin 48 (7): 3-6.

- Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. 1998. *Engineering criteria* 2000. Available at www.abet.org.
- Addams, Jane. 1899. The subtle problems of charity. Atlantic Monthly 83 (496): 163-178.
  - —. 1902. The new social spirit. *National Council of Jewish Women, proceedings,* 16–22.
  - —. 1910. Charity and social justice. National Conference of Charities and Corrections, proceedings, 1–18.
    - -. 1910 [1981]. Twenty years at Hull House. New York: Macmillan.
  - ——. 1912. A modern Lear. In *The social thought of Jane Addams*, ed. Christopher Lasch, 105–123. New York: Bobbs Merrill.
- Adler-Kassner, L., R. Crooks, and A. Watters. 1997. Service-learning and composition at the crossroads. In Writing the community: Concepts and models for servicelearning in composition, ed. L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks, and A. Watters, 1–17. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Alberti, J. 2001. Returning to class: Creating opportunities for multicultural reform at majority second-tier colleges. *College English* 63 (5): 561–584.

- Alinsky, Saul D. 1946. Reveille for radicals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ———. 1969. Reveille for radicals. New York: Vintage. (Original work published in 1946.)
- Alperovitz, G., S. Dubb, and T. Howard. 2008. The next wave: Building university engagement for the 21st century. *Good Society* 17 (2): 69–75.
- Altman, I. 2004. Socially responsive knowledge. Campus Compact Reader (Fall). Available at www.compact.org/reader.
- American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). 1997–2006. AAHE's series on service-learning in the disciplines. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. 2002. *Stepping forward as stewards of place*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- American Political Science Association (APSA). 1998. APSA Task Force on Civic Education in the 21st Century: Expanded articulation statement: A call for reactions and contributions. PS: Politics and Political Science 31 (3): 636.
- Anderson, J. B., K. J. Swick, and J. Yff, eds. 2001. *Service-learning in teacher education: Enhancing the growth of new teachers, their students, and communities.* New York: AACTE Publications.
- Applegate, J. L., and S. P. Morreale. 1999. Service-learning in communication: A natural partnership. In Voices of strong democracy: Concepts and models for service-learning in communication studies, ed. D. Droge and B. O. Murphy, ix-xiv. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
  - . 2003. Creating engaged disciplines. AAHE Bulletin 53 (9): 7-10.
- Arries, J. F. 1999. Critical pedagogy and service-learning in Spanish: Crossing borders in the freshman seminar. In Construyendo puentes (building bridges): Concepts and models for service-learning in Spanish, ed. J. Hellebrandt and L. T. Verona, 33–47. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Association of American Colleges (AAC). 1991. *Reports from the fields*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Astin, A. W. 2000. The civic challenge of educating the underprepared student. In *Civic responsibility and higher education*, ed. T. Ehrlich, 124–146. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Astin, A. W., and L. J. Sax. 1993. How undergraduates are affected by service participation. Journal of College Student Development 39 (3): 251–263.
- Astin, A. W., L. J. Sax, and J. Avalos. 1996. Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.
- Atkins, Andrea. 1993. Mixing business with volunteer work. *Hemispheres* (December): 37–38, 42.
- Bacon, N. 1997. Community service writing: Problems, challenges, questions. In Writing the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in composition, ed. L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks, and A. Watters, 39–55. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Bailey, T. 2003. Community colleges in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. CCRC brief 15. New York: Community College Research Center.
- Barber, B. 1992. An aristocracy of everyone: The politics of education and the future of America. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  - —. 1997. Afterword. In *Experiencing citizenship: Concepts and models for service-learning in political science*, ed. R. M. Battistoni and W. E. Hudson, 227–235. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- ——. 1998. A place for us: How to make society civil and democracy strong. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barber, Benjamin R., and Richard Battistoni. 1993. A season of service: Introducing service learning into the liberal arts curriculum. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 26, no. 2 (June): 235–262.
- Barr, R. B, and J. Tagg. 1995. From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change* 27, no. 6 (November–December): 12–25.
- Battistoni, R. 1995. Service learning, diversity, and the liberal arts curriculum. *Liberal Education* 81, no. 1 (Winter): 30–35.
  - —. 1998. Making a major commitment: Public and community service at Providence College. In *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education*, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 169–188. Bolton, MA: Anker.

—. 2002. Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for faculty in all disciplines. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

- Battistoni, R. M., S. B. Gelmon, J. A. Saltmarsh, J. F. Wergin, and E. Zlotkowski. 2003. *The* engaged department toolkit. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Battistoni, R. M., and W. E. Hudson, eds. 1997. Experiencing citizenship: Concepts and models for service-learning in political science. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Becher, T., and P. R. Trowler. 2001. *Academic tribes and territories*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Belenky, Mary F., Blythe M. Clinchy, Nancy R. Goldberger, and Jill M. Tarule. 1986. Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swindler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1985. *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bender, Thomas. 1978. Community and social change in America. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
  - ——. 1993. Intellect and public life: Essays on the social history of academic intellectuals in the United States. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Benson, L. 1972. Toward the scientific study of history. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Benson, L., I. Harkavy, and M. Hartley. 2005. Integrating a commitment to the public good into the institutional fabric. In *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*, ed. A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, J. C. Burkhardt, and Associates, 185–216. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Benson, L., I. Harkavy, and J. Puckett. 2007. Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform—civil society, public schools, and democratic citizenship. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bergstrom, M. J., and C. Bullis. 1999. Integrating service-learning into the communication curriculum at a research university. In Voices of strong democracy: Concepts and models for service-learning in communication studies, ed. D. Droge and B. Ortega Murphy, 25–33. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education
- Bernstein, Jeffrey L. 2010. Citizenship-oriented approaches to the American government course. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 13–35. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with Matthew Fisher and Rebecca Nowacek].
- Berry, W. 1987a. Does community have value? In *Home economics*, 179–192. San Francisco: North Point Press
  - . 1987b. Home economics. New York: North Point Press.
- Bjarnason, S., and P. Coldstream, eds. 2003. *The idea of engagement: Universities in society*. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities.
- Bounds, E. M., B.A.B. Patterson, and T. Pippin. 2002. On en/countering the other. In From Cloister to Commons: Concepts and models for service-learning in religious studies, ed. R. Devine, J. A. Favazza, and F. M. McLain, 55–67. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Boyer, E. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
  - . 1994. Creating the new American college. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 9): A48
    - —. 1996a. The scholarship of engagement. Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences 49 (7): 18–33.

—. 1996b. From Scholarship Reconsidered to Scholarship Assessed. Quest 48 (2): 129–139.

- ——. 1996c. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1): 11–20.
- Boyte, H. 1993. Practical politics. *The Atlantic* (March). Reprinted in *Education for democracy: Citizenship, community, and service*, ed. B. Barber and R. Battistoni, 172–177. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.

—. 2000. The struggle against positivism. *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 86, no. 4 (July–August): 46–51.

- ——. 2004. Everyday politics: Reconnecting citizens with public life. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
  - —. 2008. Against the current: Developing the civic agency of students. *Change* (May–June). Available at http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/May-June %202008/full-against-the-current.html (accessed October 26, 2009).
- Boyte, H., and H. Farr. 1997. The work of citizenship and the problem of service-learning. In *Practicing democracy: Concepts and models of service-learning in political science*, ed. R. Battistoni and W. Hudson, 35–48. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Boyte, H., and N. Kari. 1996. Building America: The democratic promise of public work. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bringle, R., and J. Hatcher. 1996. Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal* of Higher Education 67:221–239.
- ——. 1999. *Campus assessment of the scholarship of engagement*. Indianapolis: Center for Public Service and Leadership, Indiana University–Purdue University.
- Bringle, R., J. A. Hatcher, and P. H. Clayton. 2007. The scholarship of civic engagement: Defining, documenting, and evaluating faculty work. *To Improve the Academy* 25:257–279.
- Bringle, R., J., J. A. Hatcher, R. McIntosh, and S. Jones. 2009. George Washington Community High School: Analysis of a partnership network. New Directions in Youth Development 122 (Summer): 41–60.
- Bringle, R., M. A. Phillips, and M. Hudson. 2004. The measure of service-learning: Research scales to assess student experiences. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bromell, N. 1995. What next? Thought and action in intellectual work. *American Quarterly* 47, no. 1 (March): 102–115.
- Brown, C. A., and S. A. McReynolds. 2000. Community and environmental compatibility in the York River Watershed: A project-based interdisciplinary service-learning course. In *Life, learning, and community: Concepts and models for service-learning in biology,* ed. D. C. Brubaker and J. H. Ostroff, 83–98. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Brown, J. S. 2008. Foreword: Creating a culture of learning. In Opening up education: The collective advancement of education through open technology, open content, and open knowledge, ed. T. Iiyoshi and M.S.V. Kumar. Available at http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?ttype=2&tid=11309&mode=toc.
- Brown, L. 2000. Service-learning and field biology in postcolonial perspective: The Bahamas Environmental Research Center as a case study. In *Life, learning, and community: Concepts and models for service-learning in biology,* ed. D. C. Brubaker and J. H. Ostroff, 127–140. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Bruinicks, Bob. 2000. Charge letter from Bob Bruininks, Executive Vice President and Provost, to the Civic Engagement Task Force, September 29, 2000, website p. 2. Available at www1.umn.edu/civic/index.html.

- Buckley, William F., Jr. 1990. *Gratitude: Reflections on what we owe to our country*. New York: Random House.
- Bulcroft, K., C. Werder, and G. Gilliam. 2002. Student voices in the campus conversations. *Inventio* 1, no. 4 (Spring). Available at http://doit.gmu.edu//inventio/issues/Spring\_2002/Bulcroft\_1.html (accessed August 31, 2009).
- Burke, Michael C. 2010. Enumeration, evidence, and emancipation. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 132–146. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with David Geelan and Rona Halualani].
- Burns, W.M.D. 2002. Knowledge to make our democracy. Liberal Education 88 (4): 20–27.
- Business schools pursue the business of rebuilding urban economies. 1993. *Newsline* 24, no. 1 (Fall): 1–7.
- Campus Compact. 1999a. The presidents' declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
  - . 1999b. Service matters: The engaged campus. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- ------. 2000. Benchmarks for campus/community partnerships. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Capra, Fritjof. 1992. The turning point. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Carlebach, S. W., and J. A. Singer. 1998. Applying service-learning to the problem of prejudice: A psychology and theater course. In With service in mind: Concepts and models for service-learning in psychology, ed. R. G. Bringle and D. K. Duffy, 190–199. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Cartwright, Carol. 1992. Plenary wrap-up of the 1992 annual conference of the American Association for Higher Education [tape available from the AAHE].
- Clinchy, Blythe McVicker. 2000. On critical thinking and connected knowing. In *The practice of change: Concepts and models for service-learning in women's studies*, ed. Barbara J. Balliet and Kerrissa Heffernan, 9–18. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Coles, R. 1987. Dorothy Day: A radical devotion. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
  - . 1989a. The call of service: A witness to idealism. New York: Houghton-Mifflin.
- ——. 1989b. The call of stories: Teaching and the moral imagination. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- ——. 1994. Putting head and heart on the line. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 26): A64.
- Conville, R. L., and S. C. Weintraub, eds. N.d. Service-learning and communication: A disciplinary toolkit. Washington, DC: National Communication Association.
- Cooper, D. 1999. Academic professionalism and the betrayal of the land-grant tradition. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42 (February): 776–785.
- Corsini, Louis. 1992. MBA's [sic] get lesson in urban issues. Boston Sunday Globe, August 9, p. 7.
- Cowan, Alison Leigh. 1994. Helping business in the inner city. *New York Times*, June 2, p. C1–2.
- Coye, D. 1997. Ernest Boyer and the new American college: Connecting the "disconnects." *Change* 29, no. 3 (May–June): 21–29.
- Coyle, E. J., and L. H. Jamieson. 2000. EPICS: Service-learning by design. In *Projects that matter: Concepts and models for service-learning in engineering*, ed. E. Tsang, 59–74. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Cronon, W. 1998. "Only connect...": The goals of a liberal education. *American Scholar* 67, no. 4 (Autumn): 73–80
- Cultures and communities: Learning for the new century. N.d. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Available at www.uwm.edu/milwaukeeidea/cc.

- Cushman, Ellen. 1999. The public intellectual, service learning, and activist research. College English 61 (3): 328–336.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2008. *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Damon, William. 1998. The path to a civil society goes through the university. Chronicle of Higher Education 45, no. 8 (October 16): B4–5.
- Damrosch, D. 1995. We scholars: Changing the culture of the university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Day, Dorothy. 1924. The eleventh virgin. New York: Albert and Charles Boni.

Daynes, Gary, and Nicholas Longo. 2004. Jane Addams and the origins of service-learning practice in the United States. *Michigan Journal for Community Service Learning* 11 (1): 5–13

Deegan, Mary Jo. 1988a. Jane Addams and the men of Hull House. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

—. 1988b. *Jane Addams and the men of the Chicago School*, 1892–1918. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Definition of civic engagement. N.d. Available at http://www.pcc.edu/resources/service -learning/faculty/civic-engagement.html.

Delve, C., S. Mintz, and G. Stewart, eds.1990. Community service as values education, New Directions for Teaching and Learning series 50 (Summer), 7–30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. 1893 [1971]. Teaching ethics in the high school. In *The early works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, 56. Vol. 4. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
——. 1899. *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

—. 1902a [1990]. Educational lectures before Brigham Young Academy. In *The later works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, 213–350. Vol. 17. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

—. 1902b [1976]. The school as a social centre. In *The middle works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, 80–96. Vol. 2. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

—. 1908 [1978]. Ethics. In *The middle works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Vol. 5. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

—. 1910 [1986]. How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process. In *The later works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Vol. 8. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

—. 1913 [1979]. Education from a social perspective. In *The middle works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, 113–127. Vol. 7. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

—. 1916a [1944]. Democracy and education. New York: Free Press.

—. 1927a. *The public and its problems*. Chicago: Gateway.

—. 1927b [1954]. *The public and its problems: An essay in political inquiry*. Athens, OH: Swallow Press.

—. 1930a. From absolutism to experimentalism. In *The philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. John J. McDermott, 1–12. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

—. 1930b [1984]. In response. In *The later works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, 420–421. Vol. 5. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

—. 1932a [1985]. Monastery, bargain counter, or laboratory in education. In *The later* works of John Dewey, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, 99–111. Vol. 6. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

—. 1932b [1985]. Ethics. In *The later works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Vol. 7. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press

—. 1937 [1987]. Education and social change. In *The later works of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, 408–417. Vol. 11. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

. 1938. Experience and education. New York: Collier.

- —.1964. *John Dewey on education: Selected writings*, ed. R. D. Archambault. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ——. 1966. *Democracy and education*. New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1916.)
- DeZure, D. 1996. Closer to the disciplines: A model for improving teaching within departments. *AAHE Bulletin* 48 (6): 9–12.
- Diamond, R. M., and B. E. Adam, eds. 1995. *The disciplines speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional and creative work of faculty.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Donovan, B. M. 2000. Service-learning as a tool of engagement: From Thomas Aquinas to Che Guevara. In Connecting past and present: Concepts and models for service-learning in history, ed. I. Harkavy and B. M. Donovan, 149–158. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Driscoll, Amy, and Ernest Lynton. 1999. *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Drucker, Peter F. 1993. Post-capitalist society. New York: HarperCollins.
- Dubson, M., ed. 2001. *Ghosts in the classroom: Stories of college adjunct faculty—and the price we all pay.* Livingston, TX: T&T Publications.
- Duckenfield, M. 2002. Look who's coming to college: The impact of high school service-learning on new college students. In *Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility*, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 39–50. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Dzur, A. W. 2008. Democratic professionalism: Citizen participation and the reconstruction of professional ethics, identity, and practice. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Edgerton, Russell. 1997. Higher education white paper. Unpublished paper for the Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Edwards, R. 1999. The academic department: How does it fit into the university reform agenda? *Change* (September–October): 17–27.
- Ehrlich, T. 1995. Taking service seriously. AAHE Bulletin 47, no. 7 (March): 8–10.

, ed. 2000. *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

- Ehrlich, T., and E. Hollander. 2000. *Presidents' declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Elie, Paul. 2003. *The life you save may be your own: An American pilgrimage*. 1st ed. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Elison, J. 2002. The two cultures problem. Paper presented at the Research University as Local Citizen conference, October 6–7.
- -------. 2003. "Let's do it": Local and global engagement. *Imagining America Newsletter* 4 (Fall): 1–2.
- Ellsberg, Robert ed. 2008. *The duty of delight: The diaries of Dorothy Day*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 2002. Jane Addams and the dream of American democracy: A life. New York: Basic Books.
- Enos, S. L., and M. L. Troppe. 1996. Service-learning in the curriculum. In Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices, ed. B. Jacoby, and Associates, 156–181. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Erickson, Bette LaSere, Calvin B. Peters, and Diane Weltner Strommer. 2006. *Teaching firstyear college students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Erickson, J. A., and J. B. Anderson, eds. 1997. Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Ewell, P. T. 1997. Organizing for learning: A new imperative. AAHE Bulletin 50 (4): 3-6.
- Eyler, J., and D. Giles, Jr. 1999. Where's the learning in service-learning? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, J., D. Giles, and A. Schmiede. 1996. *Practitioner's and Community guide to reflection in service learning*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.
- Eyler, J., D. Giles, Jr., C. Stenson, and C. Gray. 2000. At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993–2000. 3rd ed. Available at www.compact.org/resources.
- Eyler, J., S. Root, and D. E. Giles, Jr. 1998. Service-learning and the development of expert citizens: Service-learning and cognitive science. In With service in mind: Concepts and models for service-learning in psychology, ed. R. Bringle and D. Duffy, 85–100. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Farrell, John C. 1967. *Beloved lady: A history of Jane Addams' ideas on reform and peace*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Feffer, Andrew. 1993. *The Chicago pragmatists and American progressivism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fink, L. D. 2003. Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fischer, F. 2009. *Democracy and expertise: Reorienting policy inquiry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fisher, I. S. 1998. We make the road by walking: Building service-learning in and out of the curriculum at the University of Utah. In Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 210–231. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Fisher, Matthew A. 2010. Educating for scientific knowledge, awakening to a citizen's responsibility. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 110–131. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with David Geelan and Carmen Werder].
- Fox, R. L., and S. A. Ronkowski. 1997. Learning styles of political science students. PS: Political Science and Politics 30 (4): 732–737.
- Francis, M. C., T. C. Mulder, and J. S. Stark. 1995. Intentional learning: A process for learning to learn in the accounting curriculum. Sarasota, FL: Accounting Education Change Commission and American Accounting Association.
- Freeland, R. M. 2009. Liberal education and effective practice: The necessary revolution in undergraduate education. *Liberal Education* 21 (1): 6–13.
- Freire, Paulo. 1970. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.
  - . 1971. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. 2003. *The comprehensive program* FY 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Furco, A. 1996. Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning*, Jodi Raybuck, ed., 2–6. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

—. 2002. High school service-learning and the preparation of students for college: An overview of research. In *Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility*, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 3–14. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

-----. 2003. Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Gadotti, M. 1994. Reading Paulo Freire. Albany: State University of New York.

Gappa, J., and D. Leslie. 1993. The invisible faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garbus, Julia. 2002. Service-learning, 1902. College English 64 (5): 547-565.

- Geelan, David. 2010. Science, technology, and understanding: Teaching the teachers of citizens of the future. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 147–164. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with Rebecca Nowacek and Howard Tinberg].
- Gelmon, S. 2003. Assessment as a means of building service-learning partnerships. In *Build-ing partnerships for service-learning*, ed. B. Jacoby, and Associates, 42–64. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gelmon, S., and S. Agre-Kippenhan. 2002. A developmental framework for supporting evolving faculty roles for community engagement. *Journal of Public Affairs*, Supplemental Issue 1: *Civic Engagement and Higher Education* 6:161–182.
- Gelmon, S., and R. Battistoni. 2006. Civic engagement: Conceptual frameworks for health management. In *Promoting civic engagement in health management education: Concepts and Cases*, ed. M. Stefl, S. Gelmon, and A. Hewitt, 7–27. Arlington, VA: Association of University Programs in Health Administration.
- Gelmon, S., B. A. Holland, A. Driscoll, A. Spring, and S. Kerrigan. 2001. Assessing the impact of service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and practices. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Gelmon, S. B., S. Seifer, J. Kauper-Brown, and M. Mikkelsen. 2004. *Community-engaged* scholarship for health collaborative: Institutional self-assessment. Seattle: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

—. 2005. Building capacity for community engagement: Institutional self-assessment. Seattle: Community Campus Partnerships for Health. Available at http://depts .washington.edu/ccph/pdf\_files/self-assessment-copyright.pdf (accessed August 21, 2009).

- George, Henry, Jr. 1905. The menace of privilege: A study of the dangers to the Republic from the existence of a favored class. New York: Macmillan.
- Gibbons, M., C. Limoges, S. Schwartzman, H. Nowotny, M. Trow, and P. Scott. 1994. *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
- Gilbert, M. K. 2000. Educated in agency: Student reflections on the service-learning classroom. In *The practice of change: Concepts and models for service-learning in women's studies*, ed. B. J. Balliet and K. Heffernan, 117–138. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Giles, D., and J. Eyler. 1994. The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1 (1): 77–85.
- Gilligan, C. 1982. In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gladieux, L. E., and W. S. Swail. 2008. Postsecondary education: Student success, not just access. In *The forgotten half revisited: American youth and young families*, 1998–2008, ed. S. Halpern, 101–114. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.
- Gleason, P. 2008. Creative tension: Shepherding the evolution of a community of practice. International Commons, the Newsletter of the International Society of the Scholarship

of Teaching and Learning 3, no. 2 (May). Available at http://www.issotl.org/Inter national\_Commons\_3\_2.pdf.

- Godfrey, Paul C., and Edward T. Grasso, eds. 2000. Working for the common good: Concepts and models for service-learning in management. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Goldsmith, S. 1995. Journal reflection: A resource guide for community service leaders and educators engaged in service learning. Washington, DC: American Alliance for Rights and Responsibilities.
- Greenleaf, R. K. 1977. Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. New York: Paulist Press.
- Guskin, A. E. 1994. Restructuring the role of faculty. *Change* 26, no. 5 (September–October): 16–25.
- Hadlock, C. 2001. Memo to faculty. Bentley University e-mail.
- Halal, William E. 1990. The new management: Business and social institutions for the information age. *Business in the Contemporary World* 2, no. 2 (Winter): 41–54.
- Hall, Peter Dobkin. 1992. Inventing the nonprofit sector and other essays on philanthropy, voluntarism, and nonprofit organizations. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Halpern, Robert. 1995. Rebuilding the inner city: A history of neighborhood initiatives to address poverty in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Halualani, Rona Tamiko. 2010. De-stabilizing culture and citizenship: Crafting a critical intercultural engagement for university students in a diversity course. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 36–53. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with Howard Tinberg and Carmen Werder].
- Hansen, E. J. 1998. Essential demographics of today's college students. AAHE Bulletin 51 (3): 3–5.
- Harkavy, I. 2000. Service-learning, academically based community service, and the historic mission of the urban research university. In *Connecting past and present: Concepts and models for service-learning in history*, ed. I. Harkavy and B. M. Donovan, 27–41. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Harkavy, I., and L. Benson. 1998. De-Platonizing and democratizing education as the bases of service learning. In *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection*, ed. R. A. Rhoads and J.P.F. Howard, 11–20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harward, D. 1994. Directions of learning. Compact Current 8 (5): 1-2.
- Hatcher, J. A., R. G. Bringle, and R. Muthiah. 2002. Institutional strategies to involve firstyear students in service. In Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 79–90. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Hawken, Paul. 2008. Blessed unrest: How the largest social movement in history is restoring grace, justice, and beauty to the world. New York: Penguin.
- Hearn, J. C., and M. A. Anderson. 2002. Conflict in academic departments: An analysis of disputes over faculty promotion and tenure. *Research in Higher Education* 43 (5): 503–529.
- Hebel, S. 2003. California's budget woes lead colleges to limit access. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 50 (7): A21.
- Hellebrandt, J., J. Arries, and L. T. Verona, eds. 2004. Juntos: Community partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese. AATSP professional development series handbook, Vol. 5. Boston: Heinle.
- Hellebrandt, J., and L. T. Verona, eds. 1999. *Construyendo puentes (building bridges): Concepts and models for service-learning in Spanish*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

- Herzberg, B. 1994. Community service and critical teaching. CCC: College Composition and Communication 45, no. 3 (October): 307–319.
- Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). 2005. The American freshman: National norms for fall 2005. Los Angeles: University of California.
  - —. 2009. The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 2007–2008 HERI Faculty Survey. U.S. faculty: Civic engagement, diversity important goals for undergraduate education. Available at http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/pr-display.php?prQry= 40 (accessed July 27, 2009).
- Hirsch, D., and E. Lynton. 1995. Bridging two worlds. *NSEE Quarterly* 20, no. 4 (Summer): 10–11, 28.
- Holland, B. 1997. Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Fall): 30–41.
  - —. 1999. Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 4 (1): 37–43.
  - 2000. Institutional impacts and organizational issues related to service-learning. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (Special Issue): 52–60.
  - —. 2001. A comprehensive model for assessing service-learning and communityuniversity partnerships. In *Developing and implementing service-learning programs*, ed. M. Canada and B. Speck, 51–60 New Directions for Higher Education series 114 (Summer). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Holland, Barbara, and Sherril Gelmon. 1998. The state of the "engaged campus": What have we learned about building and sustaining university-community partnerships? *AAHE Bulletin* (October): 3–6.
- Hollander, Elizabeth, and John Saltmarsh. 2000. The engaged university. Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 86, no. 4 (July–August): 29–31.
- hooks, b. 1994. *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Horton, M. 1998. The long haul: An autobiography. New York: Teachers College.
- Howard, D. L. 2001. Teaching through tragedy. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 20). Available at http://chronicle.com/jobs/2001/09/2001092001c.htm.
- Howery, C. B. 1999. Sociology, service, and learning, for a stronger discipline. In *Cultivating the sociological imagination: Concepts and models for service-learning in sociology*, ed. J. Ostrow, G. Hesser, and S. Enos, 151–155. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Huber, M. E., and J. E. Freed. 2000. *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Huber, M. T. 2009. Teaching travels: Reflections on the social life of classroom inquiry and innovation. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 3, no. 2 (July). Available at http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/v3n2.html (accessed July 27, 2009).
- Huber, M. T., and P. Hutchings. 2005. *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ibarra, R. A. 2001. *Beyond affirmative action: Reframing the context for higher education.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- ——. 2001–2002. At the crossroads of cultural change in higher education. NACME Journal (Fall): 58–66.
- Ignatieff, M. 1984. *The needs of strangers: An essay on privacy, solidarity, and the politics of being human.* New York: Penguin.
- Isenberg, Howard. 1993. Nonprofit training for profitable careers. Wall Street Journal, September 13, p. 1.

- Jackson, K., ed. 1994. *Redesigning curricula: Models of service-learning syllabi*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Jackson, Rev. Jesse. 1993. Abstract of plenary address of 1993 AACSB annual meeting. Newsline 24, no. 1 (Fall): 2–7.
- Jacobs, D., ed. 2003. *The Myles Horton reader: Education for social change.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Jacoby, Barbara, and Associates. 1996. Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jewler, A. J. 1989. Elements of an effective seminar: The University 101 program. In The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college, ed. M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, and B.O. Barefoot, 198–215. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnston, F. E., and I. Harkavy, 2009. The obesity culture: Strategies for change-public health and university-community partnerships. Cambridgeshire, UK: Smith-Gordon.
- Jones, B. W. 1998. Rediscovering our heritage: Community service and the historically black university. In Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 109–123. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Jones, Susan R., and Kathleen E. Hill. 2003. Understanding patterns of commitment: Student motivation for community service involvement. *Journal of Higher Education* 74, no. 5 (September–October): 516–539.
- Jones, Thomas B. 1986. Liberal learning and undergraduate business study. In *Educating managers: Executive effectiveness through liberal learning*, ed. Joseph S. Johnston, Jr., and Associates, 124–142. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kecskes, K., ed. 2006. Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- ——. 2008. Measuring community-engaged departments: A study to develop an effective self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of community engagement in academic departments. Ph.D. diss., Portland State University.
- Kendall, Jane C., and Associates. 1990. Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service. Vols. 1 and 2. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Kennedy, D. 1995. Another century's end, another revolution for higher education. *Change* 27, no. 3 (May–June): 8–15.
- Kenworthy, Amy. 1996. Linking business education, campus culture and community: The Bentley service-learning project. *Journal of Business Ethics* 15:121–131.
- Kerr, C. 1963/1995. The uses of the university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keylor, W. 1999. Clio on campus: The Historical Society at Boston University. *Bostonia* (Summer): 20–23.
- Kezar, Adrianna J., Tony C. Chambers, and John C. Burkhardt, eds. 2005. Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kimball, B. 1995a. The condition of American liberal education: Pragmatism and a changing tradition. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
  - —. 1995b. Toward pragmatic liberal education. In *The condition of American liberal education: Pragmatism and a changing tradition*, ed. R. Orrill, 3–122. New York: College Board.
- ——. 1997. Naming pragmatic liberal education. In *Education and democracy: Re-imagining liberal learning in America*, ed. R. Orrill, 45–67. New York: College Board.
- Kinnell, J. C. 2000. Educational benefits associated with service-learning projects in biology curricula. In *Life, learning, and community: Concepts and models for service-learning in biology*, ed. D. C. Brubaker and J. H. Ostroff, 7–23. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

- Kirlin, M. 2002. Civic skill building: The missing component in service programs? PS: Political Science and Politics 35 (3): 571–75.
- KnowledgeWorks Foundation. 2008. 2020 Forecast: Creating the future of learning. Available at http://www.futureofed.org/ (accessed July 28, 2009).
- Kolb, D. 1984. *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1985. Learning styles inventories. Boston: McKerr.
- Kolvenbach, Peter-Hans, S. J. 2000. *The service of faith and the promotion of justice in American Jesuit higher education*. Available at http://www.scu.edu/ignatiancenter/bannan/ eventsandconferences/ justiceconference/nationalconference/kolvenbach.cfm.
- Kraft, Richard J., James C. Kielsmeier, and Association for Experiential Education. 1995. Experiential learning in schools and higher education. Boulder, CO/Dubuque, IA: Association for Experiential Education.
- Kraft, Richard J., and James Krug. 1994. Review of research and evaluation on service learning in public and higher education. In *Building community: Service learning in the academic disciplines*, ed. Richard J. Kraft and Marc Swadener, 197–212. Denver: Colorado Campus Compact.
- Krieger, Martin H. 1990. Broadening professional education: On the margins and between the niches. *Liberal Education* 76, no. 2 (March–April): 6–10.
- Kuh, G. D. 2008. High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them and why they matter. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Available at https://www.aacu.org/leap/hip.cfm.
- Kupiec, T., ed. 1993. Rethinking tradition: Integrating service with academic study on college campuses. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Lamb, C. H., J. B. Lee, R. L. Swinth, and K. L. Vinton. 2000. Learning well by doing good: Service-learning in management education. In Working for the common good: Concepts and models for service-learning in management, ed. P. C. Godfrey and E. T. Grasso, 161–178. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Lane, Michael S., Dietrich Schaupp, and Barbara Parsons. 1988. Pygmalion effect: An issue for business education and ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics* 7, no. 3 (March): 223–229.
- Lasch, Christopher, ed. 1965. The social thought of Jane Addams. New York: Bobbs Merrill.
- Levine, A. 1989. Who are today's freshmen? In *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college*, ed. M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, and Associates, 15–24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
  - . 1994. Service on campus. Change 26 (July/August): 4-5.
- . 2000. The soul of a new university. New York Times, March 13, p. A21.
- Levine, A., and J. Cureton. 1998a. When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
  - ——. 1998b. What we know about today's college students. *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience* 3 (1): 4–9.
- Levine, Daniel. 1971. Jane Addams and the liberal tradition. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
- Lewin, Kurt. 1951. Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers. 1st ed. New York: Harper.
- Light, Richard J. 2001. *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lima, M. 2000. Service-learning: A unique perspective on engineering education. In *Projects that matter: Concepts and models for service-learning in engineering*, ed. E. Tsang, 109–117. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Liu, G. 1996. Origins, evolution, and progress: Reflections on a movement. *Metropolitan* Universities: An International Forum 7 (1): 25–38.

- Long, Sarah E. 2002. The new student politics: The Wingspread statement on student civic engagement. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Longo, Nicholas. 2005. Recognizing the Role of Community in Civic Education: Lessons from Hull House, Highlander Folk School, and the Neighborhood Learning Community. CIRCLE working paper 30 (April).
  - ——. 2007. Why community matters: Connecting education with civic life. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lubove, Roy. 1965. The professional altruist: The emergence of social work as a career, 1880–1930. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lynton, E. A., and S. Elman. 1987. *New priorities for the university: Meeting society's needs for applied knowledge and competent individuals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lynton, Ernest A. 1993. New concepts of professional expertise: Liberal learning as part of career-oriented education. Working paper 4 (Fall). Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- ——. 1994. Knowledge and scholarship. Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum 5 (1): 9–17.
  - ——. 1995. Making the case for professional service. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Marchese, T. 1995. It's the system, stupid. Change 27, no. 3 (May-June): 4.

. 1996. The search for next-century learning. AAHE Bulletin 48 (7): 3-6.

- Marks, Helen M., and Susan Robb Jones. 2004. Community service in the transition: Shifts and continuities in participation from high school to college. *Journal of Higher Education* 75, no. 3 (May–June): 307–339.
- Martin, J. R. 1984. Changing the educational landscape: Philosophy, women, and the curriculum. New York: Routledge.
- Mathews, David. 1998. *Creating more public space in higher education*. Washington, DC: Council on Public Policy Education.
- May, Henry. 1959. *The end of American innocence: The first years of our own time*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McGoldrick, K., and A. L. Ziegert, eds. 2002. *Putting the invisible hand to work: Concepts and models for service learning in economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- McKanan, Dan. 2008. The Catholic worker after Dorothy: Practicing the works of mercy in a new generation. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- McKinney, K. 2007. Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning: The challenges and joys of juggling. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- McLaughlin, Mark. 1989. A change of mind. New England Business 11, no. 4, sec. 1 (April): 42-44.
- Meier, Deborah, and George H. Wood. 2004. *Many children left behind: How the No Child Left Behind Act is damaging our children and our schools*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mercer, Graham. 1996. The global citizenship MBA orientation program: Action learning at the University of Michigan business school. *Journal of Business Ethics* 15:111–120.
- Miller, B., and B. F. Gentile. 1998. Introductory course content and goals. *Teaching of Psychology* 25 (2): 89–96.
- Mills, C. W. 1959. The sociological imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Minnich, E. 1996. *Liberal learning and arts of connection for a new academy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Morone, J. 2001. E-mail memo to faculty. Bentley University.
- Morse, G. C. 2003. Virginia's community colleges: Ready, willing. But not enabled. Washington Post, August 10, p. B08.

- Morton, Keith, and Marie Troppe. 1996. From the margins to the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics* 15, no. 1 (January): 21–32.
- Musil, C. M. 2003. Educating for citizenship. Peer Review 5 (3): 4-8.
- National Commission on Civic Renewal. 1998. A nation of spectators: How civic disengagement weakens America and what we can do about it. College Park: University of Maryland.
- National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition. Newsletter and journal indices. Available at http://sc.edu/fye/journal/journalindex.htm.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). 2002. From promise to progress: How colleges and universities are using student engagement results to improve collegiate quality. Available at http://nsse.iub.edu/2002-annual-report.
- NERCHE Report. N.d. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Newman, F. 1985. *Higher education and the American resurgence*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
  - —. 2000. *Saving higher education's soul*. Providence, RI: Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World. Available at http://www.nerche.org/futures project/publications/soul.pdf.
- Newman, F., L. Couturier, and J. Scurry. 2004. *The future of higher education: Rhetoric, reality, and the risks of the market*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- The new student politics. 2001. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Noddings, N. 1984. Caring: A feminist approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Novick, P. 1988. That noble dream: The "objectivity question" and the American historical profession. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press.
- Nowacek, Rebecca S. 2010. Understanding citizenship as vocation in a multidisciplinary senior capstone. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 91–109. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with Michael Smith and Michael Burke].
- O'Connell, T. 2002. A matter of experience: Service-learning and the adult student. In *Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility*, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 51–61. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- okhighered.org. 2002. Oklahoma students' civic engagement resolution. Available at http:// www.okhighered.org/campus-com/cc-pdfs/civic%20engagement%20resolution.pdf.
- O'Meara, K. A., and R. E. Rice, eds. 2005. Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Osborne, D., and T. Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ostrow, J. 1994. Sticking to our principles in research. *NSEE Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (Spring): 4–5, 28–29.

—. 1999. Service-learning and the teachability of sociology. In *Cultivating the sociological imagination: Concepts and models for service-learning in sociology*, ed. J. Ostrow, G. Hesser, and S. Enos, 1–9. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

- Palazzolo, D. J. 1997. Research methods. In *Experiencing citizenship: Concepts and models for service-learning in political science*, ed. R. M. Battistoni and W. E. Hudson, 109–118. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Palmer, P. 1997. Community, conflict, and ways of knowing: Ways to deepen our educational agenda. *Change* 29, no. 5 (September–October): 20–25.

- —. 1998. The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Phillippe, K. A., and M. Patton. 2000. National profile of community colleges: Trends and statistics. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Plater, W. M. 1995. Future work: Faculty time in the 21st century. Change 27 (3): 22-33.
- Policy Center on the First Year of College. N.d.(a). Foundations of excellence. Available at http://www.firstyear.org/.

—. N.d.(b) Project origins for foundations of excellence. Available at http://www .fyfoundations.org/projectOrigins.aspx.

- Porter, Lyman W., and Lawrence E. McKibbin. 1988. Management education and development: Drift or thrust into the 21st century? New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Presidents' declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education. 1999. Campus Compact. Available at www.compact.org/resources.
- Principles of good practice in combining service and learning. 1989. Reprinted in Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, ed. Jane C. Kendall, and Associates, 40. Vol. 1. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Puckett, John, and Michael Johanek. 2007. *Leonard Covello and the making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if citizenship mattered*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Putnam, R. 1993. The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *American Prospect* 13 (Spring): 35–42.
  - —. 1995. Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6, no. 1 (January): 65–78.
    - —. 2001. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

—. 2008. The rebirth of American civic life. Boston Globe, March 2. Available at http:// www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial\_opinion/oped/articles/2008/03/02/the\_rebirth \_of\_american\_civic\_life/.

- Quandt, Jean B. 1970. From the small town to the great community. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rahn, W. 1998. Generations and American national identity: A data essay. Prepared for presentation at the Communication in the Future of Democracy Workshop, Annenberg Center, Washington, DC, May 8–9.
- Rama, D. V., and E. Zlotkowski. 1996. Service-learning and business education: Creating conceptual bridges. NSEE quarterly 21:10–11, 26–27.
- Ramaley, J. A. 2000. Embracing civic responsibility. AAHE Bulletin 52 (7): 9-13.
- Ravencroft, S. P. 1998. Teaching professional accounting ethics with service-learning. In Learning by doing: Concepts and models for service-learning in accounting, ed. D. V. Rama, 167–189. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Rendón, L. I. 2009. Sentipentsante (sensing/thinking) pedagogy: Educating for wholeness, social justice and liberation. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Report of the AAHE, ACPA, and NASPA Joint Task Force on student learning.1998. Washington, DC: AAHE, ACPA, and NASPA Joint Task Force.
- Reyes, M. 1998. A pedagogy for citizenship: Service learning and democratic education. In Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection, ed. R. Rhoads and J. Howard, 21–30. New Directions for Teaching and Learning series 73. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rhoads, Robert, and Jeffery Howard, eds. 1998. *Academic service-learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning series, 73 (Spring). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rice, R. 1991. The new American scholar: Scholarship and the purposes of the university. *Metropolitan Universities* 1 (Spring): 7–18.

—. 1996. *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education New Pathways Project.

Richardson, R. 1995. Emerson: The mind on fire. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Richmond, J. 2002. The University of Rhode Island's new culture for learning. In Servicelearning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 65–77. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Robertson, E. 1992. Is Dewey's educational vision still viable? In *Review of research in education*, 335–381. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Rorty, Richard. 1980. *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. 2d printing [with corrections]. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

——. 1982. Consequences of pragmatism: Essays, 1972–1980. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ryan, Alan. 1995. John Dewey and the high tide of American liberalism. New York: Norton.

Saltmarsh, John. 1991. Scott Nearing: The making of a homesteader. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

—. 1996. Education for critical citizenship: John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 3 (Fall): 13–21.

- ——. 1998. Exploring the meanings of community/university partnerships. NSEE Quarterly 23 (Summer): 6–7, 21–22.
- Saltmarsh, J., D. E. Giles, Jr., K. O'Meara, L. Sandmann, E. Ward, and S. M. Buglione. 2009. Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In *Creating our identities in servicelearning and community engagement*, Barbara E. Moely, Shelley H. Billig, and Barbara A. Holland, eds. A volume in Advances in service learning research. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.
- Saltmarsh, J., and M. J. Hartley. Forthcoming 2011. "To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Saltmarsh, J., M. Hartley, and P. H. Clayton. 2009. *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Sandmann, L., C. Thornton, and A. Jaeger, eds. 2009. Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions. New Directions in Higher Education series 147 (Fall). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schmotter, James W. 1992. Business schools after the cold war. Chronicle of Higher Education 38, no. 29 (March 25): A44.
- Schneider, Carol Geary. 2000. Educational missions and civic responsibility: Toward an engaged academy. In *Civic responsibility and higher education*, ed. Thomas Ehrlich, 98– 123. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Schön, D. 1983. *The reflective practitioner: How practitioners think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
  - . 1987. Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schroeder, C. C. 1993. New students-new learning styles. Change 25 (5): 21-26.
- Selznick, P. 1992. *The moral commonwealth: Social theory and the promise of community.* Berkeley: University of California.
- Senge, Peter M. 1990. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sigmon, Robert. 1990. Service-learning: Three principles. In Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, ed. Jane C. Kendall, and Associates, 56–64. Vol. 1, Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Simmons, J. A. 2000. An environmental science approach to service-learning in biology. In Life, learning, and community: Concepts and models for service-learning in biology, ed. D. C. Brubaker and J. H. Ostroff, 25–30. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Sims, Ronald R., and Serbrina J. Sims. 1991. Increasing applied business ethics courses in business school curricula. *Journal of Business Ethics* 10, no. 3 (March): 211–219.
- Smith, Michael B. 2010. Local environmental history and the journey to ecological citizenship. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 165–184. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with Jeffrey Bernstein and Michael Burke].
- Smith, Michael B., Rebecca S. Nowacek, and Jeffrey L. Bernstein, eds. 2010. *Citizenship* across the curriculum. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Smith, P. 1990. Killing the spirit: Higher education in America. New York: Penguin.
- Snow, C. P. 1959/1993. *The two cultures*. Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Snyder, R. Claire. 2008. Should higher education have a civic purpose? Historical reflections. In Agent of democracy: Higher education and the HEX journey, ed. David W. Brown and Deborah Witte, 53–75. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.
- A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook, version III. 1996. Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.
- Spence, L. D. 2001. The case against teaching. Change 33 (6): 10-19.
- Stanton, T. K. 1990a. Integrating public service with academic study: The faculty role. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

—. 1990b. Service-learning: Groping toward a definition. In *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*, ed. Jane C. Kendall, and Associates, 65–67. Vol. 1. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

- Stanton, Timothy, Dwight Giles, and Nadinne I. Cruz. 1999. Service-learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sternberg, R. J. 1996. Successful intelligence: How practical and creative intelligence determine success in life. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Stevens, Charles S. 2003. Unrecognized roots of service-learning in African American social thought and action, 1890–1930. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 9 (2): 25–34.
- Student representative duties. N.d. Available at http://www.pps.k12.or.us/directives-c/ pol-reg/1/20/012\_P.pdf.
- Sullivan, William M. 1995. Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in *America*. New York: Harper Collins.
- 2000. Institutional identity and social responsibility in higher education. In *Civic responsibility and higher education*, ed. Thomas Ehrlich, 19–36. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Taylor, H., Jr., and L. McGlynn. 2008. Solving the Dewey problem: Where do we go from here? *Good Society* 17 (2): 56–62.

<sup>—. 2009.</sup> The connection: Schooling, youth development and community building: The Futures Academy case. *New Directions in Youth Development* 122 (Summer): 19–40.

- Teaching matters: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1997 professors of the year. 1997. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 31): A29.
- Tinberg, Howard. 2010. We are all citizens of Auschwitz: Intimate engagement and the teaching of the Shoah. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 73–90. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with Jeffrey Bernstein and Michael Smith].
- Toulmin, Stephen. 1990. Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity. New York: Free Press.
- Trigwell, K., and S. Shale. 2004. Student learning and the scholarship of university teaching. *Studies in Higher Education* 29 (4): 523–536.
- Troppe, M. 1996. Two cases of institutionalizing service learning: How campus climate affects the change process. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Tsang, E. 2000. Introduction. In Projects that matter: Concepts and models for servicelearning in engineering, ed. E. Tsang, 1–12. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- University of Utah. 1998. Educating the good citizen: Service-learning in higher education. In Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education, ed. E. Zlotkowski, J-1–J-13. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Useem, Michael. 1986. What the research shows. In *Educating managers: Executive effectiveness through liberal learning*, ed. Joseph S. Johnston, Jr., and Associates, 70–101. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Upcraft, M. L., J. N. Gardner, and Associates. 1989. The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Upcraft, M. L., J. N. Gardner, and B. O. Barefoot. 2005. *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A Handbook for improving the first year of college*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Valencia, R., ed. 1997. *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. London: Falmer Press.
- Van de Ven, A. H. 2007. Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1899 [1979]. The theory of the leisure class. New York: Penguin Books.
- Veysey, L. R. 1965. The emergence of the American university. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vogelgesang, L. J., E. K. Ikeda, S. K. Gilmartin, and J. R. Keup. 2002. Service-learning and the first-year experience: Outcomes related to learning and persistence. In Servicelearning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility, ed. E. Zlotkowski, 15–26. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Walshok, Mary L. 1995. Knowledge without boundaries: What America's research universities can do for the economy, the workplace, and the community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ward, H. 1999. Why is service-learning so pervasive in environmental studies programs? In Acting locally: Concepts and models for service-learning in environmental studies, ed. H. Ward, 1–12. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Werder, Carmen. 2010. Fostering self-authorship for citizenship: Telling metaphors in dialogue. In *Citizenship across the curriculum*, ed. M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein, 54–72. Bloomington: Indiana University Press [including a concluding dialogue with Matthew Fisher and Rona Halualani].
- Wergin, J. F. 1994. The collaborative department: How five campuses are inching toward cultures of collective responsibility. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

- —. 2003. Departments that work: Building and sustaining cultures of excellence in academic programs. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- West, C. 1989. The American evasion of philosophy. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Westbrook, Robert B. 2005. *Democratic hope: Pragmatism and the politics of truth*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Westbrook, Robert B., and American Council of Learned Societies. 1991. John Dewey and American democracy. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Williams, D. 1993. Reforming accounting education. Journal of Accountancy 175 (August): 76–82.
- Williams, D., K. Kecskes, C. Carey, A. Smith, C. Reynolds, and R. Craddock. 2006. Student leadership models at Portland State: Partnering with faculty and community. In *Students as colleagues: Expanding the circle of service-learning leadership*, ed. E. Zlotkowski, N. V. Longo, and J. R. Williams, 181–191. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Wilshire, B. 1990. The moral collapse of the university: Professionalism, purity, and alienation. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Workman, L., L. S. Davis, and D. A. Anderson. 1998. Materials from service-learning practica in nursing service administration. In *Caring and community: Concepts and models* for service-learning in nursing, ed. J. S. Norbeck, C. Connolly, and J. Koerner, 159–168. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Wutzdorff, Allen. 1993. Service learning belongs. NSEE Journal (Summer): 33.
- Wyer, Jean C. 1993. Change where you least expect it: Accounting education. *Change* 25, no. 1 (January–February): 12–17.
- Zinn, H. 1996. An interview with Howard Zinn. Spare Change, October 16, p. 1.
- Zlotkowski, Edward. 1993. Service-learning as campus culture. In *Rethinking tradition: Integrating service with academic study on college campuses*, ed. Tamar Y. Kupiec, 47–51. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
  - —. 1995. Does service-learning have a future? *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning* 2:123–133.
  - —. 1996a. A new voice at the table? Linking service-learning and the academy. *Change* 28, no. 1 (January–February): 20–27.
  - —. 1996b. Opportunity for all: Linking service-learning and business education. *Journal* of *Business Ethics* 15:5–19.
  - —. 1997. Forward. In *AAHE's series on service-learning in the disciplines*, ed. E. Zlotkowski, v-vii. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
  - —, ed. 1997–2006. Service learning in the disciplines. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
  - —. 1998a. Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education. Bolton, MA: Anker.
  - —. 1998b. A service learning approach to faculty development. In *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection*, ed. Robert A. Rhoads and Jeffrey Howard, 81–89. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zlotkowski, E., D. K. Duffy, R. Franco, S. B. Gelmon, K. H. Norvell, J. Meeropol, and S. Jones. 2004. The community's college: Indicators of engagement at two-year institutions. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Zlotkowski, E., R. J. Jones, M. M. Lenk, J. Meeropol, S. B. Gelmon, and K. H. Norvell. 2005. One with the community: Indicators of engagement at minority-serving institutions. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Zlotkowski, E., N. V. Longo, and J. R. Williams. 2006. *Students as colleagues: Expanding the circle of service-learning leadership*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

- Zuckman, Jill. 1995. Gingrich urges a total remake of government. *Boston Globe* (City Edition), April 8, p. 1.
- Zukin, C., S. Keeter, M. Andolina, K. Jenkins, and M. X. Delli Carpini. 2006. A new engagement? Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen. London: Oxford University Press.

## Contributors

## AUTHORS

**John Saltmarsh** is Director of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) and a faculty member in the Higher Education Administration Doctoral Program in the Department of Leadership in Education in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Massachusetts, Boston.

Edward Zlotkowski is Professor of English and founding Director of the Bentley Service-Learning Center at Bentley University. He writes and speaks extensively on a wide range of service-learning and civic engagement topics and served as general editor of the American Association for Higher Education's twenty-one-volume series on service-learning in the academic disciplines.

## SECTION INTRODUCTION CONTRIBUTORS

**Donna Killian Duffy** is Professor of Psychology and Coordinator of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at Middlesex Community College, Bedford and Lowell, Massachusetts. She received the Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning in 1999 for her work connecting service in the community to student learning in classrooms.

John N. Gardner serves as President of the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education and as Executive Director of the Policy Center on the First Year of College. He is also Senior Fellow of the National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition and Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Library and Information Science at the University of South Carolina. In 1986 Gardner was selected by the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) as one of twenty faculty members in the United States who "have made outstanding leadership contributions to their institutions and/or American higher education." In 1996 he received the Academic Leadership Award "for exemplary contributions to American higher education" from the Council of Independent Colleges. In 2002 the American College Personnel Association, one of the nation's two major professional organizations for student affairs officers, awarded him its highest honor, the Lifetime Achievement Award.

**Ira Harkavy** is Associate Vice President and founding Director of the Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania. He is the recipient of Campus Compact's Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service Learning (2002), the University of Pennsylvania's Alumni Award of Merit (2004), a Fulbright Senior Specialist Grant (2005), and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania's Heritage Award (2006). Under his directorship, the Netter Center for Community Partnerships received both a Best Practices/Outstanding Achievement Award from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of Policy Development and Research (2000) and the inaugural William T. Grant Foundation Youth Development Prize sponsored in collaboration with the National Academy of Sciences Board on Children, Youth, and Families (2003).

**Barbara A. Holland** is Professor and Pro–Vice Chancellor for Engagement at the University of Western Sydney in Australia. In 2006 she received the Research Achievement Career Award from the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement.

Kevin Kecskes is Associate Vice Provost for Engagement and Director for Community-University Partnerships at Portland State University in Oregon. In 2010 Kecskes received an Early Career Award honorable mention from the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement.

Keith Morton is Professor of Public and Community Service Studies and American Studies and Associate Director of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service at Providence College in Rhode Island. He is on the editorial board of the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* and was recognized by the National Society for Experiential Education as a Higher Education Leader of the Year in 2001 and a Pioneer in 2005.

KerryAnn O'Meara is Associate Professor of Higher Education in the College of Education at the University of Maryland, College Park. She received the 2008 International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement Early Career Research Award for her exploration of organizational contexts that support faculty community engagement.

**R. Eugene Rice** serves as Senior Scholar at the Association of American Colleges and Universities and on the faculty of Antioch University's doctoral program in Leadership and Change. For ten years he was Director of the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards and the New Pathways projects at the American Association for Higher Education. Rice has also served as Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, where he worked on a national study of the scholarly priorities of the American professoriate and collaborated with the late Ernest Boyer on the Carnegie report *Scholarship Reconsidered. Change* magazine's survey of America's higher education leaders recognized Rice as one of a small group of "idea leaders" whose work has made a difference on a national level.

## Index

AAHE Bulletin, 86, 188 Abbott, John, 143–144, 188–189, 271 Academy of Management, 89n13,

- 218–219
- Academy of Management Learning and Education, 233, 234n22
- Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), 109, 215
- Adam, Bronwyn E., 206; *The Disciplines* Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty (with Diamond), 205
- Adams, Henry, 322
- Addams, Jane, 35–38, 48, 57–67, 70–74, 245, 352; "A Modern Lear," 62; "The Subtle Problems of Charity," 61–62; *Twenty Years at Hull House*, 62, 66, 248
- Adler-Kassner, Linda, 195
- Albert, Lou, 207
- Alberti, John, 22
- Alcorn State University, 299
- Alinsky, Saul, 240, 287
- Alperovitz, Gar, 326
- "Alternative Spring Break," 96
- American Accounting Association, 223
- American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, 104, 220

American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), 4, 10–11, 13, 17, 18, 25, 31, 137, 168, 180, 188, 189, 208, 221, 252, 262, 321; AAHE *Bulletin*, 86, 188; AAHE series on service-learning in the disciplines, 4, 18, 25, 89, 104, 136–137, 156, 161, 187–190, 198, 201–202, 207–212, 238,

- 297, 303, 305, 323, 330–331
- American Association of Community Colleges, 18, 23, 31, 303, 331
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), 31, 171, 304, 255, 357; and American Democracy Project, 133, 252
- American Chemical Society, 205, 213
- American Council on Education, 30
- American Democracy Project, 133, 252
- American Historical Association, 238, 240
- American Institute of Biological Sciences, 158, 206, 213
- American Political Science Association (APSA), 172, 207; APSA Task Force on Civic Education in the 21st Century, 172, 193
- American Psychological Association, 159, 206

"The American Scholar," (Emerson), 46, 239, 248 American Sociological Association, 157 American Studies Association, 216 Antioch University, 17, 194 Arnold, Matthew, 241 Arries, Jonathan, 161-162 Arts of Citizenship Program, 213 Association of American Colleges (AAC), 156-157,206 Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), 29, 156, 251-252, 255, 321; Engaged Department Summer Institute, 252 Association of American Geographers, 205 Association of Commonwealth Universities, 269 Astin, Alexander, 19, 115, 116, 161, 312; A Social Change Model of Leadership Development, 115 Astin, Helen, 115; A Social Change Model of Leadership Development, 115 Atlantic Monthly, 61 Atlantic Philanthropies, 4, 11, 171 Augsburg College, 116 Avalos, Juan, 118 Bacon, Francis, 324 Bacon, Nora, 190, 192 Bailey, Thomas, 315 Barber, Benjamin, 82, 103, 108, 222n5, 245 Barr, Robert, 6, 117, 188; "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education" (with Tagg), 188 Bates College, 118 Battistoni, Richard, 4, 33-34, 82, 86n6, 90, 108, 126, 222n5, 255, 262, 266, 275, 277; Civic Engagement across the Curriculum, 33, 108, 126, 266; The Engaged Department Toolkit (Battistoni et al.), 209 Becher, Tony, 185 Belenky, Mary, 44 Bellah, Robert, 10, 221, 236n28; Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life, 221 Bender, Thomas, 59, 158, 202, 248, 260-261; Community and Social Change in America, 248; Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States, 158, 202, 261

Benson, Lee, 3, 6, 36, 168; *Dewey's Dream:* Universities and Democracies in the Age

of Reform (with Harkavy and Puckett) 36, 326 Bentley Service-Learning Center, 225n7, 231n17, 234 Bentley University, 4, 92n16, 116, 229n14, 234, 234n23, 235n26, 262, 294, 324 Bernstein, Jeffrey L., 121, 124-128; Citizenship across the Curriculum (with Smith and Nowacek), 78, 120, 121 Berrigan, Daniel, 71 Berry, Wendell, 53, 221 Boston College, 234 Boston College Carroll School of Management, 234 Boston Globe, 125, 142 Bounds, Elizabeth M., 125 Bourdieu, Pierre, 37 Bowling Alone (Putnam), 125, 142 Boyer, Ernest, 11, 21, 43, 81, 90, 97, 102, 112, 142, 199, 204-205, 244, 268, 272, 289, 290, 297, 314, 343–347; "The New American College," 81, 102, 244, 297; "The Scholarship of Engagement," 21, 346; Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, 21, 112, 344, 346-347 Boyte, Harry, 20, 53, 326, 361; "Civic Agency and the Cult of the Expert," 343; "Democracy and the Struggle against Positivism in the Age of the Smart

- Brevard Community College, 115
- Bringle, Robert, 95, 97-99, 107, 110
- Bristow, Clinton, 299

Machine," 20

- Bromell, Nicholas, 93n17
- Bronx Community College, 145
- Brown, Christine, 196
- Brown, John Seeley, 76
- Brown, Luther, 196
- Buckley, William F., Jr., 228; "National Service Franchise," 228
- Burke, Michael, 123–124, 126, 128–129 Burns, David, 213
- California State University, Monterey Bay, 299
- California State University, Northridge, 264
- California State University system, 208
- The Call of Service (Coles), 36
- Calvin College, 297
- Campus Compact, 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 18, 21, 25, 29, 31, 80–81, 84, 88, 96, 98, 104, 116, 121, 130, 202, 207–208, 221, 221n3,

- 252, 255, 257–259, 261–262, 266, 271,
- 274, 285–286, 289, 293, 297, 302, 304,
- 306, 313, 318–319, 321, 323–324, 330–331, 333, 335, 337, 360–361;
- Campus Compact Indicators of
- Engagement project, 5, 76, 257, 303, 305,
- 309, 313; Campus Compact *Reader*, 323;
- Campus Compact Summer Institute,
- 92n16; Declaration on the Civic
- Responsibility of Higher Education, 259,
- 271, 299, 321; Engaged Department Institutes, 208, 258, 262, 266; *Engaged Department Toolkit*, 209, 297; Thomas
- Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning, 29
- Campus Opportunity Outreach League (COOL), 1, 287, 332
- Capra, Fritjof, 221n2, 236n28
- Carlebach, Stevenson, 196
- Carlyle, Thomas, 37
- Carnegie classification system, 190
- Carnegie Corporation, 303
- Carnegie Foundation Elective Classification for Community Engagement, 1, 76, 283, 286, 342
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 11, 29, 103, 120, 142, 253, 270, 343
- Carter, Jimmy, 142
- Cartwright, Carol, 221
- Catholic Worker: Catholic Worker farms, 70; Catholic Worker houses, 58; *Catholic Worker* newspaper, 69; movement, 57, 65
- The Catholic Worker after Dorothy Day: Practicing the Works of Mercy in a New Generation (McKanan), 36
- Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student: A Handbook for Improving the First Year of College (Upcraft, Gardner, Barefoot), 137
- Chambers, Tony, 201
- Change Magazine, 271, 345
- Chapman, Chris, 147
- Chickering, Arthur, 117
- Chronicle of Higher Education, 81, 364
- Citizenship across the Curriculum (Smith, Nowacek, and Bernstein), 78, 120, 121
- Citizenship Schools, 352
- "Civic Agency and the Cult of the Expert" (Boyte), 343
- Civic Engagement across the Curriculum (Battistoni), 33, 108, 126, 266

- Civic engagement movement, 2–5, 13, 41, 121, 183, 186, 258, 323, 326–327, 356, 358, 364–365; civic engagement, defined, 7, 268
- Civic learning, 2, 6, 28–34, 101, 129, 267, 270, 275–276, 320
- Civic professionalism, 32, 108, 184, 204, 342
- *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education* (Ehrlich), 174, 201
- Civil Rights Movement, 25, 36

Clayton, Patti, 3, 343, 355; "Democratic Engagement White Paper" (with Hartley and Clayton), 343, 355

Clearinghouse for the Scholarship of Engagement, 112. *See also* Scholarship of engagement

- Clinchy, Blythe, 180
- Coles, Robert, 44, 71, 87n7, 245; *The Call* of Service, 36
- *The Collaborative Department* (Wergin), 252, 262
- College of William and Mary, 161
- Colleges and Universities as Citizens, 95
- Columbia Teachers College, 318, 320
- Columbia University, 203, 259, 320

Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service (Kendall), 1, 79, 83, 139, 145, 191, 222

- Community and Social Change in America (Bender), 248
- Community Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), 12, 184, 212–214
- "Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: Institutional Self-Assessment" (Gelmon, Seifer, et al.), 254
- Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC), 18, 330–331

The Community's College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Colleges (Zlotkowski et al.), 313, 316–317, 358

- "Community Service and Critical Teaching" (Herzberg), 89
- Conference on College Composition and Communication, 216
- Connecting Past and Present: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in History (Donovan and Harkavy), 238
- Construyendo Puentes (Building Bridges): Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Spanish, 208

Cornell University, 220n1 Corporation for National and Community Service, 18, 221, 330, 332-333 Corsini, Louis, 234 Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity (Toulmin), 364 Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), 171 Coye, Dale, 102 Coyle, Edward, 197 Creating Community Engaged Departments: Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement in Academic Departments, 254 Creating Significant Learning Experiences, 76 Cronon, William, 238; "'Only Connect ...': The Goals of Liberal Education," 238 Crooks, Robert, 195 Cruz, Nadinne, 343, 355; Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future (with Stanton and Giles), 37 Cultivating the Sociological Imagination: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Sociology, 204 The Culture of Narcissism (Lasch), 248 Cureton, Jeanette, 142; "What We Know about Today's College Student" (with Levine), 141 Damrosch, David, 259-260; We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University, 259 Day, Dorothy, 35-36, 38, 57-61, 64, 67-74; The Eleventh Virgin, 70. See also Catholic Worker Daynes, Gary, 56 Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education, 259, 271, 299, 321 Delve, Cecilia, 245 Democracy and Education (Dewey), 44, 47, 49, 50, 52, 68 Democracy and Expertise: Reorienting Policy Inquiry (Fisher) 343 "Democracy and the Struggle against Positivism in the Age of the Smart Machine" (Boyte), 20 "Democratic Engagement White Paper" (Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton), 343, 355 Democratic Professionalism (Dzur), 342 Denison Settlement House, 37

DePaul University, 295, 299 Dewey, John, 2, 7, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42–54, 57–61, 63–64, 66–68, 71–74, 107, 245–246, 248, 271, 321, 322, 340, 348, 351; on associated life in community, 46–47, 68; on charity, 49, 63–64; *Democracy and Education*, 44, 47, 49, 50, 52, 68; on embodied intelligence, 46; *Ethics*, 48; *How We Think*, 50; and Hull House, 48, 63; *Individualism Old and New*, 47; and Jane Addams, 48; on

reflection, 50–51, 246; on social reconstruction, 52 Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in the Age of Reform

(Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett) 36, 326

- Dexter Corporation, 226
- DeZure, Deborah, 209
- Diamond, Robert, 205–206; *The Disciplines* Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty (with Adam), 205
- DiBiaggio, John, 298
- Dickson, Alec, 37-38
- The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty (Diamond and Adam), 205
- Donovan, William, 161; Connecting Past and Present: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in History (with Harkavy), 238
- Driscoll, Amy, 297
- Drucker, Peter, 218–219
- Dubb, Steven, 326
- Duffy, Donna, 305
- The Duty of Delight: The Diaries of Dorothy Day (Ellsberg), 36
- Dzur, Albert, 7, 342; Democratic Professionalism, 342

eBay, 299

- Edgerton, Russ, 4–5, 12, 17, 19, 34, 180, 193, 258, 261, 268; "Higher Education White Paper," 193
- Educating the Reflective Practitioner (Schön), 334
- Education 2000 Trust, 143, 188, 271
- Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, 75
- Edwards, Richard, 267-269
- Ehrlich, Thomas, 85–86; Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, 174, 201
- "Elements of an Effective Seminar: The University 101 Program" (Jewler), 139

The Eleventh Virgin (Day), 70

- Elie, Paul, 36; The Life You Save May Be Your Own, 36
- Eliot, Charles William, 9
- Eliot, George, 87
- Elison, Julie, 213, 216
- Elizabeth College, 295
- Ellsberg, Robert, 36; The Duty of Delight: The Diaries of Dorothy Day, 36
- Elman, Sandra, 81, 91; New Priorities for the University: Meeting Society's Needs for Applied Knowledge and Competent Individuals (with Lynton), 344
- Elon University, 131
- Elshtain, Jean, 78; Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy, 36
- "Embracing Civic Responsibility" (Ramaley), 210
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 185, 239, 240, 242, 248; "The American Scholar," 46, 248
- Emory University, 25
- Engaged campus, 6–7, 30, 42, 93, 208, 216, 285–286, 288–289, 293, 297, 301, 302, 307, 316, 321
- Engaged departments, 7, 208, 254, 258, 260–265, 267–268, 270, 274–275, 277
- *The Engaged Department Toolkit* (Battistoni et al.), 209
- Engaged Research: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research (Van De Ven), 219
- Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good (Kecskes), 210, 253, 254, 258

Engineering Projects in Community Service (EPICS), 197, 214–215, 297

- Erickson, Bette, 163; *Teaching First-Year College Students* (with Peters and Strommer), 163
- Ernest A. Lynton Award for the Scholarship of Engagement, 112
- "Essential Demographics of Today's College Students" (Hansen), 144, 157
- Ethics (Dewey), 48
- European Union, 188
- Evenbeck, Scott, 132
- Ewell, Peter, 144, 163, 165, 188, 192, 195, 199–200; "Organizing for Learning: A New Imperative," 163, 199
- Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Political Science, 207

Experiential education, 24, 43, 46, 79, 91, 107, 194 Eyler, Janet, 107, 146; Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service Learning (with Giles and Schmiede), 107 Facebook, 76 Faculty Priorities Reconsidered (O'Meara and Rice), 347 Farrell, John, 61 Feinstein Institute for Public Service, 4, 55, 114, 116, 297, 332 Fink, L. Dee, 76; creating significant learning experiences, 254 First-Year Civic Engagement: Sound Foundations for College, Citizenship and Democracy, 170 Fisher, Frank, 343; Democracy and Expertise: Reorienting Policy Inquiry, 343 Fisher, Matthew, 123-124 Ford Foundation, 98 Fort Peck tribal college, 307 Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, 10.13"Fostering Self-Authorship for Citizenship: Telling Metaphors in Dialogue" (Werder), 122 Foucault, Michel, 37 Foundations of Excellence in the First College Year, 134, 154, 169, 171, 176, 177, 179 Fourth-credit option, 106 Fox, Richard, 156, 160 Franco, Robert, 305 Frankel, Charles, 53 Franken, Al, 128 Freeland, Richard, 188 Freire, Paulo, 37, 44, 55, 167, 242, 245, 288, 351 The Freshman Year Experience (Gardner), 139, 142 "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education" (Barr and Tagg), 188 Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, 11 Furco, Andrew, 254, 278, 286; Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education, 254

*The Future of Higher Education* (Newman), 270

Gaebler, Ted, 80; Reinventing Government, 80 Gamson, Zelda, 117 Gandhi, 38 Gardner, John R., 129, 131, 137, 139, 142-143, 154-155, 169-171; The Freshman Year Experience, 139, 142 Geelan, David, 124-125, 127; "Science, Technology, and Understanding: Teaching the Teachers of Citizens of the Future," 122 Geertz, Clifford, 22, 205 Gelmon, Sherril, 254, 262, 264, 266, 278, 305 Gentile, Barbara, 9, 166 George Washington University, 236 Georgetown University, 14, 262, 295, 299, 321 Georgia Tech, 214 Gerencser, Sally, 56 Ghosts in the Classroom, 316 Giles, Dwight, 37, 107, 146, 244; Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service Learning (with Eyler and Schmiede), 107; Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future (Stanton, Giles, and Cruz), 37 Gilligan, Carol, 44, 245 Gingrich, Newt, 81 Giroux, Henry, 245 Gladieux, L. E., 312 Great Depression, 161 Greenleaf, Robert, 115-116; on servant leadership, 115 Guskin, Alan, 103, 117, 194; "Restructuring the Role of Faculty," 117, 194 Haas Center, 80, 98, 332 Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life (Bellah et al.), 221 Halal, William, 236; "The New Management: Business and Social Institutions in the Information Age," 236 Hall, Peter Dobkin, 38; Inventing the Nonprofit Sector and Other Essays on Philanthropy, Voluntarism, and Non-profit Organizations, 38 Halpern, Robert, 38; Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States, 38

Halualani, Rona, 77, 125, 129 Hansen, Edmund, 144, 157; "Essential Demographics of Today's College Students," 144, 157 Harkavy, Ira, 3, 6, 12, 36, 168, 199, 203, 264–265; Connecting Past and Present: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in History (with Donovan), 238; Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in the Age of Reform (with Benson and Puckett) 36, 326; The Obesity Culture (with Johnston), 326; "Service-Learning, Academically Based Community Service, and the Historic Mission of the American Urban Research University," 203 Hartford Graduate Center, 226 Hartley, Matthew, 3, 343, 355; "Democratic Engagement White Paper" (with Saltmarsh and Clayton), 343, 355; "To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education (with Saltmarsh), 343, 355 Harvard Business School, 236n27 Harvard University, 229, 300 Harward, Donald, 85n5 Hatcher, Julie, 97-99, 107, 110, 326 Hawken, Paul, 357 Herzberg, Bruce, 89; "Community Service and Critical Teaching," 89 Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Views for a National Movement, 2.01"Higher Education White Paper" (Edgerton), 193 Highlander Folk School, 56, 351 Hill, Kathleen, 176; "Understanding Patterns of Commitment" (with Jones), 176 Hirsch, Deborah, 91n15 Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Holland, Barbara, 304 Hollander, Elizabeth, 283, 285 hooks, bell, 245, 251; Teaching to Transgress (hooks), 252 Horton, Myles, 36, 38, 351-352 Howard, Ted, 326 Howery, Carla, 157, 204, 352 How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process (Dewey), 50

Huber, Mary, 75, 78

Hull House, 48, 52, 57–58, 61–66, 73. *See also* Addams, Jane Humanities Out There, 213

Ibarra, Roberto, 164 Ignatieff, Michael, 248; *The Needs of Strangers*, 248

Imagining America (IA), 184, 213–214, 239 "Increasing Applied Business Ethics Courses in Business School Curricula" (Sims and Sims), 228

Independent Sector, 230

- Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), 23, 95–96, 150–151, 292, 296, 298–299
- Indicators of Engagement project, 5, 76, 303, 305, 309

Individualism: Old and New (Dewey), 47

Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States, (Bender), 158, 202, 261

Intentional Learning: A Process for Learning to Learn the Accounting Curriculum, 109

International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE), 236

"Into the Streets," 96

Inventing the Nonprofit Sector and Other Essays on Philanthropy, Voluntarism, and Non-profit Organizations (Hall), 38

Invisible College, 79, 80, 88, 88n11

The Invisible Faculty, 316

"The Irony of Service" (Morton), 364 Isenberg, Howard, 232

Jackson, Jesse, 222, 224 Jacoby, Barbara, 95, 98, 141; Service Learning in Higher Education, 95, 98 James, William, 37, 248; "The Moral Equivalent of War," 37 Jamieson, Leah, 197 Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy (Elshtain), 36 Jewler, A. J., 140; "Elements of an Effective Seminar: The University 101 Program," 139 Johanek, Michael, 56 John Dewey and American Democracy (Westbrook), 36, 41 Johns Hopkins University, 203 Johnson and Johnson, 88

Jones, Susan, 176; "Understanding Patterns of Commitment" (with Hill), 176 Journal of Business Ethics, 219, 234n22 Journal of Public Affairs, 14 Journal of the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, 133, 175 Juntos: Community Partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese, 208 Kapiolani Community College, 23 Kecskes, Kevin, 210, 258, 266; Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good, 210, 253, 254, 258 Kendall, Jane, 43, 83-85, 91, 191, 245; Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service, 1, 79, 83, 139, 145, 191, 222 Kennedy, Donald, 89n12, 91n14, 259 Kennedy, John F., 38 Kerr, Clark, 17-18, 282; The Uses of the University, 282 Kettering Foundation, 342-343, 355 Kezar, Adrianna, 201 Kielsmeier, James, 38 Kimball, Bruce, 23, 43, 139; "Naming Pragmatic Liberal Education," 23; "Toward Pragmatic Liberal Education," 139 King, Martin Luther, 38 King Lear, 105 Kingsley, Charles, 37 Kinnell, John, 160 Kirlin, Mary, 34 Kleiner, Brian, 147 "Knowledge and Scholarship" (Lynton), 344 Kohlberg, Lawrence, 245 Kolb, David, 38, 44, 191, 194 Kolb Experiential Learning Cycle, 90, 194 Kolvenbach, Peter-Hans, 25-26, 129, 175, 179 - 180Kraft, Richard, 38 Kuh, George, 11, 75, 121 Laboratory School, 67 Lamb, Christine, 197 Lane, Michael, 229n13 Lasch, Christopher, 248; The Culture of

Narcissism, 248 Learning to Serve: Promoting Civil Society

through Service-Learning (Lerner), 285

Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Teacher Education, 207 Lee, James, 197 Lemoyne-Owen College, 23 Lenk, Margarita, 305 Leonard Covello and the Making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if Citizenship Mattered (Puckett), 56 Lerner, Richard, 285 Levine, Arthur, 3, 19, 96, 141-142, 282, 318-320, 331; "Service on Campus," 331; "The Soul of the New University," 318; "What We Know about Today's College Student" (with Cureton), 141; When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Students, 11 Lewin, Kurt, 38 Liberal Education magazine, 90 The Life You Save May Be Your Own (Elie), 36 Light, Paul, 364 Light, Richard, 187; Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds, 187 Lima, Marybeth, 160 Limbaugh, Rush, 128 Liu, Goodwin, 332-333; "Origins, Evolution, and Progress: Reflections on a Movement," 332 "Local Cosmopolitans and Cosmopolitan Locals: New Models of Professionals in the Academy" (Rhoades et al.), 360 The Lonely Crowd (Riesman), 248 Long, Sarah, 336 Long, Theodore, 295 Longo, Nicholas, 36, 56, 130, 324, 329, 330, 360; Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership (with Zlotkowski and Williams), 5, 116, 130, 324–325, 330, 339, 340; Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life, 36, 56 Loomis, Worth, 226 Louisiana State University, 160 Lowell Bennion Center, 16, 143 Lubove, Roy, 60 Lumina Foundation, 171 Lynd, Staughton, 248; "The Historian as Participant," 248 Lynton, Ernest A., 12, 24, 81, 90, 91, 91n15, 220n1, 223-224, 297, 343-347;

"Knowledge and Scholarship," 344; Making Outreach Visible, 297; Making the Case for Professional Service, 344; New Priorities for the University: Meeting Society's Needs for Applied Knowledge and Competent Individuals (with Elman, 1987), 344 Lynton Award for the Scholarship of Engagement, 112. See also Scholarship of engagement Maine Campus Compact, 293 Making a Place for the New American Scholar (Rice), 110, 346 Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds (Light), 187 Management Education and Development: Drift or Thrust into the 21st Century? (McKibben), 104 Many Children Left Behind (Meier), 38 Marchese, Theodore, 6, 91n14, 188–189, 271; "The New Conversations about Learning," 6 Marks, Helen, 176 Marquette University, 23, 36, 126 Mars Hill College, 23 Martin, Jane Roland, 45, 245 Mason, George, 196 Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), 214 Massachusetts Support Center Accounting Assistance Project, 109 The Masses, 57

- Mathematical Association of America (MAA), 156–157, 160
- Maurin, Peter, 57, 65, 69
- May, Henry, 59
- McGlynn, Linda, 326
- MCI WorldCom, 319, 321
- McKanan, Dan, 36; The Catholic Worker after Dorothy Day: Practicing the Works of Mercy in a New Generation, 36
- McKibbin Lawrence E., 104, 220, 225–226, 227n10, 232, 237; Management Education and Development: Drift or Thrust into the 21st Century, 104
- McLaughlin, Mark, 226
- McReynolds, Samuel, 196
- Meeropol, Jennifer, 305
- Meier, Deborah, 38; Many Children Left Behind, 38
- Meister, Richard, 299
- Metropolitan State University, 151, 295

- Metropolitan Universities journal, 304
- Miami-Dade College, 23, 116, 208, 294, 299 Michigan Journal of Community Service
- Learning, 35, 80, 95, 201
- Michigan State University, 111, 209, 294, 361
- Middlemarch, 86–87
- Middlesex Community College, 118
- Middletown, 248
- Miller, Benjamin, 166
- Mills, C. Wright, 11; "On Intellectual Craftsmanship," 11
- "Milwaukee Idea," 301
- Minnich, Elizabeth, 216
- Minority-serving institutions (MSIs), 5, 145, 216, 283, 306, 308–309, 326, 365
- Mintz, Suzanne, 245
- Model of Christian Charity (Winthrop), 248
- "A Modern Lear" (Addams), 62
- Montana State University, Bozeman, 146
- "The Moral Equivalent of War" (James), 37
- Morton, Keith, 4, 55, 88n11, 114, 221n3, 364; "The Irony of Service," 364
- Multiversity, 18
- Mumford, Lewis, 57
- Musil, Caryn McTighe, 31
- "Naming Pragmatic Liberal Education" (Kimball), 23
- National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 18, 303, 331
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), 31
- National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 144
- National Commission on Civic Renewal, 287
- National Communication Association (NCA), 18, 211–212, 216, 331
- National Council of Teachers of English, 216
- National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, 137, 170
- National Science Foundation (NSF), 213
- "National Service Franchise" (Buckley), 228
- National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE), 1
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), 11, 34, 121, 136, 267

- National Youth Leadership Council, 38
- The Needs of Strangers (Ignatieff), 248
- Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, 36, 203, 264
- "The New American College" (Boyer), 81, 102, 244, 297
- A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen (Zukin), 125
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 112
- Newman, Frank, 12, 21, 29, 30, 270–271; The Future of Higher Education, 270; Higher Education and the American Resurgence, 270
- "The New Management: Business and Social Institutions in the Information Age" (Halal), 236
- New Priorities for the University: Meeting Society's Needs for Applied Knowledge and Competent Individuals (Lynton and Elman, 1987), 344
- "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology" (Schön), 273, 245
- The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Civic Engagement, 125, 179, 336
- New York Times, 125, 318
- 9/11, 10, 14, 15, 125, 142, 177
- North Carolina State University, 29
- Northeastern University, 4
- Northern Kentucky University, 22
- Norvell, Katrina, 305
- Novick, Peter, 241
- Nowacek, Rebecca, 121, 123, 126, 128–129; *Citizenship across the Curriculum* (with Smith and Bernstein), 78, 120, 121; "Understanding Citizenship as Vocation in a Multidisciplinary Senior Capstone," 123
- The Obesity Culture (Johnston and Harkavy), 326
- Ohio Campus Compact, 80
- Oklahoma Students' Civic Engagement Resolution, 174, 176
- Olivet College, 300
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, 272, 347, 360; Faculty Priorities Reconsidered (with Rice), 347
- "On Intellectual Craftsmanship" (Mills), 11
- "'Only Connect ...': The Goals of Liberal Education" (Cronon), 238
- Organization of American Historians, 238, 240

"Organizing for Learning: A New Imperative" (Ewell), 163, 199 "Origins, Evolution, and Progress: Reflections on a Movement" (Liu), 332 Osborne, David, 80 Ostrow, James, 83n1, 195 Padrón, Eduardo, 299, 358 Palmer, Parker, 12, 20, 96, 239, 245 Patterson, Barbara A. B., 25 Peace Corps, 38 Pearl Harbor, 143 Perry, William, 245 Peters, Calvin, 163; Teaching First-Year College Students (with Erickson and Strommer), 163 Pew Charitable Trusts, 4-5, 11, 180, 193, 202, 208, 257-258, 261, 303, 337 Pippin, Tina, 25 Plater, William, 96, 190, 299 Plato, 168 Poe, Edgar Allen, 16 Policy Center for the First Year of College, 170 - 171Porter, Lyman W., 104, 220 Port Huron Statement, 248 Portland State University, 23, 118, 151-152, 208, 210, 251, 253-254, 258, 262-263, 291, 296 Positivism, 20, 167 Power, Dan, 56 Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service Learning (Eyler, Giles, and Schmiede), 107 Pragmatism, 35, 42-44, 46, 49 Princeton University, 340 "Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service with Learning," 83-84 Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study (ISAS), 35, 43-44, 46, 49 Providence College, 4, 55, 89, 114, 262, 297-298 PS: Political Science and Politics, 82 Puckett, John L., 36; Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in the Age of Reform (with Benson and Harkavy) 36, 326; Leonard Covello and the Making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if Citizenship Mattered, 56 Pullman Strike, 62 Purdue University, 214 Putnam, Robert, 53, 125, 142; Bowling Alone, 125, 142

Putting the Invisible Hand to Work: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Economics, 208 Raise Your Voice campaign, 130, 330, 336-337 Ramaley, Judith, 210, 299; "Embracing Civic Responsibility," 210 Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States (Halpern), 38 Reciprocity, 7, 45, 98-99, 107, 140, 192, 227, 245, 272, 295, 243, 342, 348 Reflections: A Journal of Writing Service-Learning, and Community Literacy, 208 The Reflective Practitioner: How Practitioners Think in Action (Schön), 334 Reinventing Government (Gaebler), 80 Rendón, Laura, 352 Report of the AAHE, ACPA, and NASPA Joint Task Force on Student Learning, 144 "Restructuring the Role of Faculty" (Guskin), 117, 194 Retired Executive Corps, 230 Rhoades, Gary, 360; "Local Cosmopolitans and Cosmopolitan Locals: New Models of Professionals in the Academy," 360 Rhodes, Nancy, 80 Rice, Eugene, 13, 17, 81, 90, 110-111, 272, 343-344, 346-347; and the assumptive world of the academic professional, 17, 22, 110, 111, 346; Faculty Priorities Reconsidered (with O'Meara), 347; Making a Place for the New American Scholar, 110, 346 Riesman, David, 248; The Lonely Crowd, 248 Ronkowski, Shirley, 156, 160 Root, Susan, 146 Ruskin, John, 37 Rutgers University, 82

Saltmarsh, John, 4, 9–12, 14, 55, 131, 183–185, 251, 253, 255, 262, 264, 282–284, 323–325, 330, 343; "Democratic Engagement White Paper" (with Hartley and Clayton), 343, 355; Scott Nearing: The Making of a Homesteader, 11; "To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education (with Hartley), 343, 355

- Salvation Army, 69
- Sanchez, Oscar Arias, 132
- Santa Clara University, 25
- Sax, Linda, 118, 161
- Schmiede, Angela, 107; *Practitioner's Guide* to *Reflection in Service Learning* (with Eyler and Giles), 107
- Schneider, Carol, 173-174, 251
- Scholarship in Public, 239
- Scholarship of engagement, 1, 4, 6, 8, 13, 14–15, 20, 24, 95, 120, 202, 209–212, 255, 258, 260, 299, 347; Clearinghouse for the Scholarship of Engagement, 112; Ernest A. Lynton Award for the Scholarship of Engagement, 112; Ernest Boyer and the scholarship of engagement, 21–22, 204–205, 272, 289, 290; Ernest Boyer's essay "The Scholarship of Engagement," 21, 346
- "The Scholarship of Engagement" (Boyer), 21, 346
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), 77–78, 120, 121–122, 275
- Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professoriate (Boyer), 21, 112, 344, 346–347
- Schön, Donald, 6, 12, 20, 38, 91, 108, 145, 189, 222n4, 224, 273, 343, 345–349; *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, 334;
  "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology," 273, 245; *The Reflective Practitioner: How Practitioners Think in Action*, 334
- Schroeder, Charles, 144, 157, 193
- Schulman, Lee, 11, 34, 103, 105, 268

Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER), 213–214

- "Science, Technology, and Understanding: Teaching the Teachers of Citizens of the Future" (Geelan), 122
- Scott, David, 168
- Scott Nearing: The Making of a
- Homesteader (Saltmarsh), 11 Scudder, Vida Dutton, 37
- Seifer, Sarena, 254, 278
- Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education (Furco), 254
- Selznick, Philip, 44
- Senge, Peter; 23, 93, 193, 354; The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization, 93

September 11, 2001, 10, 14, 15, 25, 142, 177

- Servant leadership, 115-116
- Service-learning, 5, 6, 7, 11-12, 24-25, 28-31, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42-44, 46-47, 50-51, 54, 55-56, 75-76, 78, 79-80, 81-84, 84n3, 85, 86n6, 87, 87n9, 88, 89n13, 90-91, 91n14, 92, 92n16, 95-96, 97-119, 120-121, 130, 134-136, 137, 139-143, 154-155, 156, 160, 171, 183, 185, 188, 190-192, 196-199, 202-203, 224, 225n17, 226, 227-234, 245, 252, 254, 258, 261-262, 264-294, 298, 311, 319-340, 343, 354, 361, 364; and business, 218-219, 224, 227-228, 228n12, 229-231, 231n17, 232-237; and community colleges, 313-316; courses, 2, 114; defined, 97-98, 222n5; and disciplines, 4, 89, 156, 160, 184, 187, 204, 207-209, 211-212, 214, 232, 297, 303, 323, 330, 358; in faculty review, 2; and faculty roles, 3; and the first year, 132, 133, 137-138, 139-153, 154-155, 169, 170, 177, 194, 308; history of, 35-36, 37; institutionalizing, 254, 257, 286; introductory courses, 162, 165, 168, 169, 178-179, 194; and movement, 3, 86, 88, 88n11, 89, 90, 93, 94, 221, 223, 231, 251, 258; option, 160; problem-based, 293; program, 4, 23, 34, 38, 93, 111, 113, 115, 130, 172, 181, 222, 306; research on, 3, 361; and student leadership, 329-340
- "Service-Learning, Academically Based Community Service, and the Historic Mission of the American Urban Research University" (Harkavy), 203
- Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future (Stanton, Giles, and Cruz), 37

Service-Learning and the First Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility (Zlotkowski), 137–138, 154–155, 170, 176

- Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices (Jacoby), 95, 98
- Service-Learning in Teacher Education: Enhancing the Growth of New Teachers, Their Students, and Communities, 207 "Service on Campus" (Levine), 96
- Settlement House movement, 35, 36, 56

- Shakespeare, 11
- Shale, Suzanne, 77
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 11, 18
- Shoah, 122, 129
- "Should Higher Education Have a Civic Mission? Historical Reflections" (Snyder), 173
- Sigmon, Robert, 222n5
- Simmons, Jeffrey, 195
- Sims, Ronald, 228; "Increasing Applied Business Ethics Courses in Business School Curricula," 228
- Sims, Serbrina, 228; "Increasing Applied Business Ethics Courses in Business School Curricula," 228
- Singer, Jefferson, 196
- Smith, Michael B., 121–122, 124, 128; *Citizenship across the Curriculum* (with Nowacek and Bernstein), 78, 120, 121
- Snow, C. P., 219
- Snyder, R. Claire, 173; "Should Higher Education Have a Civic Mission? Historical Reflections," 173
- A Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Astin and Astin), 115
- Social Gospel movement, 69
- Socially responsive knowledge, 17, 24, 143, 192–193, 267, 271
- "The Soul of the New University" (Levine), 318
- Southern Methodist University, 160
- Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), 212
- Speech Communication Association, 89n13 Stamford University, 263
- Stanton, Timothy, 37, 80, 85, 98, 191, 222n5; Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future (with Giles and Cruz), 37
- Sternberg, Robert, 309
- Stevens, Charles S., 38
- Stewart, Greig, 245
- St. Joseph's College, 291, 293, 298
- Strommer, Diane, 163; *Teaching First-Year College Students* (with Erickson and Peters), 163
- Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership (Zlotkowski, Longo, and Williams), 5, 116, 130, 324–325, 330, 339, 340
- "The Subtle Problems of Charity" (Addams), 61–62

- Sullivan, William, 7, 12, 159, 204; Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America, 159, 342
- Swail, Watson Scott, 312
- Swarthmore College, 298
- Swinth, Robert, 197
- Tagg, John, 6, 117; "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education" (with Barr), 188 Task Force on Civic Education for the Next Century, 207 Taylor, Henry, Jr., 326 Teaching First-Year College Students (Erickson, Peters, and Strommer), 163 Teaching Tolerance project, 212 Teaching to Transgress (hooks), 252 Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning, 29 Thoreau's Journals, 246 Tinberg, Howard, 129; "We Are All Citizens of Auschwitz: Intimate Engagement and the Teaching of Shoah," 122 Tinto, Vincent, 121 Tocqueville, Alexis de, 248; Democracy in America, 248 Tomorrow's Professor, 318, 319 "To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education (Saltmarsh and Hartley), 343, 355 Total Quality Management, 281 Toulmin, Stephen, 364; Cosmopolis: The
- Hidden Agenda of Modernity, 364
- "Toward Pragmatic Liberal Education" (Kimball), 139
- Trigwell, Keith, 77
- Trinity College, 295, 321
- Troppe, Marie, 88n11
- Trowler, Paul, 185
- Tsang, Edmund, 165, 215
- Tufts University, 29, 298
- *Twenty Years at Hull House* (Addams), 62, 66, 248
- Twitter, 76
- 2020 Forecast: Creating the Future of Learning, 77
- "Understanding Citizenship as Vocation in a Multidisciplinary Senior Capstone" (Nowacek), 123

"Understanding Patterns of Commitment" (Jones and Hill), 176 Union College, 321 United Negro College Fund, 18, 304, 331 University-assisted community schools, 326 University of California, Berkeley, 10 University of California, Irvine, 213 University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), 125, 134, 142, 263, 338 University of Chicago, 63, 67, 203 University of Colorado, 38 University of Illinois, Chicago, 64, 296 University of Maryland, College Park, 300, 302 University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 151, 168, 262–263 University of Massachusetts, Boston, 362 University of Minnesota, 20, 36, 301 University of Northern Kentucky, 111 University of Notre Dame, 292 University of Pennsylvania, 6, 42, 118, 203, 264, 296-297, 321, 326 University of Phoenix, 319 University of Rhode Island (URI), 148-149 University of Rochester, 23, 139 University of San Diego, 291-292, 294 University of South Carolina, 137 University of Southern California, 321 University of St. Thomas, 233-234 University of Texas, El Paso, 214 University of Utah, 16, 26, 143, 192, 293, 302 University of Vermont, 299 University of Washington, 212, 214 University of Wisconsin, Madison, 300 University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 23, 301 U.S. Department of Education, 32 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 18, 331 The Uses of the University (Kerr), 282 VALUE Project (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education), 29 Van De Ven, Andrew, 6, 219; Engaged Research: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research, 219 Vinton, Karen, 197 Vocation, 123, 126 Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program (VITA), 207 Votruba, James, 111

Walshok, Mary, 24, 273-274, 288, 347; Knowledge without Boundaries, 24, 347 Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy, Rutgers University, 82 Ward, Harold, 198 Watters, Ann, 195 "We Are All Citizens of Auschwitz: Intimate Engagement and the Teaching of Shoah" (Tinberg), 122 Werder, Carmen, 128; "Fostering Self-Authorship for Citizenship: Telling Metaphors in Dialogue," 122 Wergin, Jon, 252, 262, 266; The Collaborative Department, 252, 262 West, Cornel, 13, 52 Westbrook, Robert, 36, 41; Democratic Hope: Pragmatism and the Politics of Truth, 36; John Dewey and American Democracy, 36, 41 West Virginia University, 296 Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 233 "What We Know about Today's College Student" (Levine and Cureton), 141 When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Students (Levine), 11 Whitehead, Alfred Lord, 161 Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life (Longo), 36,56 Williams, Doyle, 223 Williams, James, 324, 330, 339; Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership (with Zlotkowski and Longo), 5, 116, 130, 324-325, 330, 339, 340 Wingspread Conference Center, 88, 125, 127, 336-337 Winthrop, John, 248; Model of Christian Charity, 248 Women's movement, 25 Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America (Sullivan) 159, 342 Writing across the curriculum (WAC), 127 Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition, 190

Wall Street Journal, 232

YMCA, 69, 243 YouTube, 76

- Zimpher, Nancy, 301 Zinn, Howard, 216 Zlotkowski Edward, 4, 9, 10–12, 75–77, 131–135, 183–184, 253, 255, 262, 266, 282–284, 323, 325–326; The Community's College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Colleges (Zlotkowski et al.), 313, 316–317, 358; Service Learning across the Disciplines; Service-Learning and the First Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic
- Responsibility, 137–138, 154–155, 170, 176; "Service-Learning as Campus Culture," 235n25; Students as Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership (with Longo and Williams), 5, 116, 130, 324–325, 330, 339, 340; Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence, 95, 293
- Zukin, Cliff, 125; A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen, 125