DEVELOPING A MODEL FOR ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP: FACULTY THEORIES

OF CAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLABORATION IN SERVICE-LEARNING

PARTNERSHIPS

by

PETER ALAN MOHN

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Educational Methodology, Policy, and Leadership
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Education

December 2015

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Peter Alan Mohn

Title: Developing a Model for Engaged Scholarship: Faculty Theories of Campus Community Collaboration in Service-Learning Partnerships

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in the Department of Educational Methodology, Policy, and Leadership by:

Charles Martinez	Chairperson
Keith Hollenbeck	Core Member
Deborah Olson	Core Member
Daniel Close	Institutional Representative

and

Scott L. Pratt   Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded December 2015

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Peter Alan Mohn

Doctor of Education

Department of Educational Methodology, Policy, and Leadership

December 2015

Title: Developing a Model for Engaged Scholarship: Faculty Theories of Campus
Community Collaboration in Service-Learning Partnerships

This study explores faculty theories of service-learning as a teaching methodology in higher education. While there has been considerable increase in the understanding of how service-learning positively impacts students, there is a shortage of research on faculty experiences utilizing service-learning pedagogy. Because it is known that faculty involvement and commitment is essential to implementing groundbreaking forms of curricula and pedagogy, this research seeks to better understand faculty perspectives of campus community collaboration in service-learning partnerships. The study investigated faculty engaged in service-learning and used a multiple case study design involving descriptive qualitative methods rooted in faculty perspectives utilizing constant comparative analysis and coding in the tradition of grounded theory. Data consisted of interviews, course materials, and documents related to community placement protocol at one large Pacific-Northwest university. Findings across five research questions, which supported previous studies, established that faculty utilizing service-learning pedagogy are motivated by their adherence to values of social justice, individual awareness of positive student outcomes, and dedication to civic responsibility by meeting community defined needs through educational practices. Two new findings, which can augment the research

literature, are (a) the perceived role that institutionally supported outreach to the community could play in restoring public trust, exhibiting genuine awareness of community need, and benefitting the overall credibility of the institutional mission and (b) the identification of faculty tacit theories of why community partners fade away during the student placement and perceived best practices for addressing the problem. Faculty's identification of perceived barriers to implementing and sustaining service-learning pedagogy supported previous research and suggested a new finding that while excellence in pedagogical practices existed within the institution, lack of a centrally supported mechanism for collaboration may have thwarted growth of innovative and beneficial strategies. Research-to-practice suggestions include prospective policy implications for faculty who utilize service-learning in courses or would like to cultivate the professional potential to include a scholarship of engagement into their teaching strategies. Faculty theories of best practices and policy improvements for service-learning pedagogy delineated in the study have potential utility for entities who develop, initiate, organize, and support innovative campus community collaboration.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Peter Alan Mohn

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Education, 2015, University of Oregon

Bachelor of Arts, 2000, University of Oregon

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Community Engagement

Higher Education Organizing

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Organizer, Oregon Higher Education Organizing Project, 2010-2014

Researcher, Educational Policy Improvement Center, 2003-2006

Director of Intercollegiate Forensics, University of Oregon, 1998-2004

Instructor and Director of Forensics, Lane Community College, 2001-2003

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Essential Skills for Organizers I & II, National Labor College, 2011-2012

Higher Education Organizing I & II, AFT, 2013-2014

Graduate Teaching Fellowship, College of Education, University of Oregon,

2003-2006

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude to family, friends, and colleagues who supported me during this project. I would especially like to thank my daughters Greta and Lily for inspiring me daily. I am additionally grateful to my advisor Dr. Keith Hollenbeck, my other committee members, Dr. Charles Martinez, Dr. Deborah Olson, and Dr. Daniel Close and all of the faculty members who participated in this study for sharing their professional experiences, guidance, and insight with me through completion of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Toward a Theory of Campus Community Collaboration

In recent decades, higher education has been dramatically transformed globally by technological innovation and market forces (Shevellar, 2015). The change of pace is altering how education is delivered and the content of what is being taught. The rapid growth of competing and diverse postsecondary institutions, pedagogical approaches, increasing modes of instructional delivery, and the ubiquitous pressures on revenue streams have altered forever who teaches, in what format, and toward what results (Butin, 2010). In the history of the academic profession there has never been a time in which change is occurring so rapidly (Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006; Feal 2006). The rate of transformation in higher education over time clearly indicates that organizational changes have been, on balance, gradual. The pace of change, in recent years, however, has sharply increased (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006) because of technology and market forces. Managing change in the context of rapid structural transformation requires rigorous and critical analysis and rethinking of traditional models of scholarship. Colleges and universities are increasingly called upon to not only meet goals for student learning but concomitantly make meaningful engaged contributions to addressing unmet local national, and global needs (Jacoby, 2015).

Despite being uniquely positioned to take action to solve pressing problems and address community needs, higher education institutions often fail to engage effectively with their communities (Garrison & Jaeger, 20014). Lack of outreach to communities has created a problem for colleges and universities as most include the idea of service or

1

engagement in their respective missions alongside the better understood notions of teaching and research. In an attempt to more effectively reach out to their communities, institutions are looking at high-impact practices that have been widely tested and proven to be beneficial to students from diverse backgrounds and at the same time provide a win-win scenario for the institution, and community (Jacoby, 2015). Service-learning is the most prominent and proven high-impact strategy that colleges and universities use to improve engagement and achieve respective missions and goals (Jacoby, 2015). Service-learning is a form of experiential learning that combines academic coursework with voluntary service in the community. Essential characteristics of service-learning are that the service is integrally linked with the coursework and that, through a deliberate critical reflection process, students actualize the connections between their community placement experiences and the concepts introduced in the coursework (Deeley, 2010). Unlike other variations of experiential learning that are primarily focused on benefitting students only, such as apprenticeships, internships, work placements, field education, or other forms of vocational training, service-learning uniquely aims to equally benefit students and the recipients of their service in the community through a balanced and reciprocal partnership (Deeley, 2010; Mendel-Reyes, 1998). The potential of this innovative and effective pedagogy has been increasingly utilized by colleges and universities to restore public trust, demonstrate awareness of community need and augment the overall credibility of the institutional mission.

The three major facets of most university missions and what is expected of faculty members in higher education are teaching, research and service (Ward, 2003). The teaching role is intrinsic to what it is to be a faculty member and is widely and clearly

understood as a primary focus. Research has become another clear role for faculty. Knowledge and information creation have long been accepted as an essential characteristic of research universities (Ward, 2003; Altbach, 1995; Boyer, 1990). The service role for faculty is far less understood as it has both internal and external dimensions, is extensive, and lacks clear institutional definitions (Ward, 2003; Boice, 2000; Berberet, 1999; O'Meara, 1997). Internal service is represented by service directly to the institution that supports the functioning of the academic profession and is linked to the premise of shared governance. External service refers to the forms of campus community collaboration beyond the campus (Ward, 2003). Extension, service-learning, consulting, and community and civic service are all examples of external service. Community outreach takes shape in various ways and allows for institutions to reach out and communicate to audiences outside of the campus community what higher education can do to address genuine needs.

A major aspect of the marketization and segmentation of higher education has been the standardization of the teaching and learning process within institutions. Scholarship explicating the corporatization of the academy has highlighted a trend of decoupling tasks that were once performed by a single faculty member into a cadre of compartmentalized specialists some writing curricula, others tasked to transform curricula into online versions, others who teach the online curricula, and others who grade the student outcomes within the courses taught. (Butin, 2010; Musselin, 2007).

The growing prevalence of educational policy discourse and advocacy for segmentation of faculty duties dovetailing the push to increase direct assessment and measurement of student outcomes in higher education is integrally connected to and

intersects with the changing nature of faculty work (Butin, 2010). The implication for work in this context is what Butin (2010) framed as the "continuing narrowing of functions, be it within a separate realm (of teaching, research, or service) or the specificity within each realm" (p. 151). The expectations for teaching, in many cases, have shifted from valuing expert educators who can motivate and adapt lessons to the intellectual capacities of a room of students to requiring faculty to show growth on standardized outcome measures that are aligned with predetermined benchmarks (Sanders & Horn, 1998). This expectation linking student outcomes to teacher quality of work mirrors the current K-12 *value-added* policy discussions. Teaching faculty face mounting pressures to provide a measurable quality outcome. At the same time, growing tensions between pedagogical autonomy and this expectation to prove value to paying students and parents constrains choices faculty have about the very nature of their classroom practices. The implications market pressures have on faculty individual curricular choices requires further examination.

Barr and Tagg (1995) predicted a shift from a traditional, passive lecture-discussion approach that they describe as an *Instruction Paradigm* to a more interactive, holistic, engaged, and experiential pedagogy they called a *Learning Paradigm.* This *Learning Paradigm* represented an opportunity to rethink approaches to teaching and learning that can prepare colleges and universities to adapt to technological innovation and market forces. Disciplines once inextricably bound to the *Instruction Paradigm* are beginning to fundamentally rethink educational practices to accommodate engaged scholarship. Adapting to rapid change requires colleges and universities to be responsive to community needs and changing perspectives on research and learning.

Institutions must be willing to allow faculty to introduce a wider range of competencies into their pedagogical practices. Linking academic practice with what is relevant to the public is at the forefront of the developing model of a scholarship of engagement. Colleges and universities have universally embraced the essential value of establishing and maintaining collaborative and significant relationships with diverse communities. Civic education and social responsibility have long been identified as core outcomes of a higher education (Erlich, 2000). This trend in higher education to embrace a *scholarship of engagement* can be actualized in a number of ways including experiential education, service-learning, undergraduate research, the scholarship of teaching and learning movement, or more coherent relationships with local communities (Cooper, 2014; Butin, 2010).

The civil rights movement forwarded the concept of service-learning as a means to challenge the elitist structures in higher education and transform academic institutions into centers of community revitalization (Butin, 2010). Butin argued that "the vision and practices of service-learning are just as necessary and urgent today as they were forty years ago" (p. 152). Because a scholarship of engagement is premised on fostering a reciprocal, collaborative, and meaningful relationship between diverse constituencies, service-learning most clearly, and visibly exemplifies the means by which faculty and students can connect with and attempt to improve their own and others' conditions. An essential characteristic of higher education is the rigorous and critical analysis of issues worthy of study. By serving as sites of analysis for critical and contested issues within current cultural contexts institutions of higher education are uniquely positioned to engage communities. The interdisciplinary, real-world, and consequential characteristics

of service-learning position the pedagogy as an appropriate conduit for developing meaningful connections between colleges and their communities. Gamson (1997) advocated for academic policy makers to facilitate interest in this type of engaged service because it goes beyond internal university service to advance issues involving, the social role of higher education, rethinking faculty work, and institutional restructuring.

Purpose of the Study

The developing model and vision of the *engaged university* that is committed to community engagement and revitalization is transforming higher education (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Institutions are seeking ways to address educational goals for students and at the same time adhere to intrinsic core mission values of service, civic education, and social responsibility. Service-learning appears to be a well suited pedagogy for pursuing meaningful campus community collaboration. Student outcomes for participating in service-learning have been well documented in the literature. Less understood are the perceptions of and the impact on faculty motivated to engage in the pedagogy of service-learning. Cooper (2014) contends that "To more broadly institutionalize and sustain service-learning, it is essential to better understand the issues facing faculty utilizing service-learning" (p. 416). The purpose of this study was to explore perceptions and motivations of faculty who choose to integrate and engage community issues with academically relevant work.

Because the instructor functions in a pivotal role in service-learning activities, it is paramount to comprehend what factors motivate the creation and continuance of service-learning endeavors. My study investigated faculty choosing to engage in service-learning methodology, what core theories participants hold regarding teaching strategies, and

reasons for motivating campus community collaboration. Beyond the words drawn from interview transcripts and course documents, faculty perspectives of campus community collaboration in service-learning elucidated concepts that gave way to theory. The goal of this study, therefore, was to investigate faculty perspectives and motivations for including a service-learning component in curriculum that in turn engendered theories of engaged scholarship that may inform policy choice, formulation, and implementation.

Key Operational Definitions

In this section I present operational definitions of (a) service-learning and (b) scholarship of engagement. Furthermore, I elaborate on these concepts in Chapter II in the Review of the Literature.

Service-learning. A definition common in the literature establishes that service-learning is a course-based, credit-bearing educational practice in which students reflected on the service experience to increase their understanding of course content, gain a greater familiarity with the discipline, and enhance their sense of community responsibility and civic engagement (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995). Billig (2000) similarly defined service-learning as including elements of both a curricular method and service to the community: "a method under which students or participants learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service" (p. 659). These operational definitions have become a model in the field for a balanced framing of service and learning linking the two concepts in evocative ways.

The recent expansion of service-learning as a teaching and learning strategy in contemporary schools and colleges has, additionally, driven investigators to examine the essential characteristics of academic service-learning programs (Cooper, 2014). An

examination of the definitions and conceptualizations in the literature reveals three essential characteristics of service-learning. A service partnership that is responsive to (a) community defined needs, (b) strengthens academic learning and (c) advances students' commitment to civic participation, social justice/responsibility or active democratic citizenship represents the three essential defining features of service-learning (Barber, 1992; Howard, 2003; Jacoby, 2003).

Other scholars reason that an array of service activities and programs fall within the constructs of service-learning (Furco, 1996). This conceptualization holds that programs accentuating the service elements and the served (community service or volunteer activities) would fall on one end of the continuum, and programs that emphasize the learning and the provider of services (field education and internships) would fall on the opposite end (Furco, 1996). The range of possible service-learning organizations using broad definitions has catalyzed an attempt by scholars to distinguish between various types of service programs and articulate criteria for service-learning programs to be legitimate, ethical, and useful (Butin, 2003).

Scholarship of engagement. There is a noticeable absence of a universally agreed upon definition of engaged learning identifiable in the literature. There is also substantial variance in the literature pertaining to the term *engagement.* The problems associated with lacking a clear universally recognized definition are further compounded by the growing popularity of notions of a scholarship of engagement among scholars and practitioners.

The scholarship of engagement is a term used to encompass scholarship in the areas of teaching, research and/or service. The concept refers to a scholarly agenda that

integrates community issues into the disciplinary work of faculty. Community is defined broadly to capture audiences external to the campus that are integral to a collaborative and reciprocal relationship that ultimately contributes to the public good. Community engagement is commonly understood as the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, and global) for the exchange of knowledge and resources in a mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnership.

An increasing number of research universities are striving to advance campus-based civic and community engagement. The network has grown to twice its size in recent years (Partridge, 2007). The literature identifies community-engaged scholarship, research, educating students for civic engagement, and *institutionalizing* engagement at all levels as priorities for advancing engagement at research universities (Stanton, 2007).

In summary, my study focused on examining faculty perspectives, perceptions, and motivations for including a service-learning component in their curricular choices. By interviewing faculty involved in service-learning pedagogies and exploring details of course structure and community engagement I gained a more detailed perspective on emerging theories of engaged scholarship from practitioners utilizing the strategy. My study does not focus on the student learning outcomes from participating in engaged scholarship. Nor does this study explore the community partner's outcomes from participating in a reciprocal campus community partnership. Better understanding how faculty perceive, experience and value service-learning as a pedagogy was the primary focus of this study. I further discuss the emphasis on faculty perspectives as an

underreported aspect of the research agenda for service-learning in Chapter II, Review of Literature.

Organization of This Dissertation

My dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter I introduced the need and purpose of studying the scholarship of engagement inherent in service-learning pedagogy, providing research questions and a truncated explication of key constructs. Chapter II expanded on the discussion of constructs with a review of literature on service-learning outcomes and faculty perspectives of the scholarship of engagement as it related to service-learning pedagogy. This conceptual framework linked previous research on faculty perspectives of service-learning and established student outcomes associated with this scholarship of engagement with the current dissertation study.

Chapter III articulated the methodology used in my study: the research philosophy, approaches, design, data collection, and data analysis procedures used to develop the conceptual model of service-learning as scholarship of engagement. Finally, Chapter IV outlined results of the study. Chapter V presented a discussion of the study results including a review of findings, limitations to the study and threats to validity, implications, and examination of possible future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To construct a framework for my dissertation study, I identified research on service-learning as engaged scholarship in higher education. The most essential characteristic of engaged scholarship in service-learning partnerships is collaboration. Collaboration is collective action at its core and connotes "a mutually beneficial relationship between two or more parties to achieve common goals by sharing responsibility, authority, and accountability for achieving results" (Chrislip & Larson, 1994, p. 5). Collaboration is also commonly understood to mean working together typically on work "of an intellectual nature" (Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1989, p. 191). Distinct from a program, agenda, or result, collaboration involves looking not only at the outcomes of our efforts but also at the process by which those results are achieved (London, 2012). Collaboration is the indispensable catalyst of innovation because it unifies multiple perspectives around one common goal. Innovative change "doesn't happen without a collaborative approach…and innovation does not thrive without collaboration. It is the interplay of diverse approaches that, in the end, yields truly unique, creative solutions" (Robins Foundation, 2014, p. 1). A conceptual framework provided a foundation and point of reference for data analysis and the formulation of theory.

Service-learning has been characterized in the extant literature as a philosophy, a pedagogy, a program, and an experience (Deeley, 2010; Anderson 1998; Mendel-Reyes, 1998; Jacoby, 1996). As an experiential scholarship of engagement, service-learning combines academic coursework with voluntary service in the community (Butin, 2010;

Jacoby, 2003). Essential characteristics of service-learning are that the community engagement activities are integrated with coursework and by engaging in critical reflection in a classroom context, students actualize connections between their service experiences and the content of the coursework (Deeley, 2010). The aim to both benefit student and the recipients of their service in the community sets service-learning apart from other types of experiential learning that aim to benefit the student only such as internships, field education, vocational training, and work placements (Deeley, 2010). Volunteerism, on the other hand, is primarily focused on the recipient of the voluntary activity and does not include a classroom based structured learning component. While experiential learning theory, specifically the Experiential Learning Model (Kolb, 1984), primarily emphasized benefits to students, service-learning is predicated on a reciprocal relationship in which meeting community needs are balanced with conscious educational growth for teacher, student, and community partner (Jacoby, 2003; Kendall, 1990). Service-learning emphasizes reciprocity and balance collaboratively integrating service and learning goals for positive outcomes for all stakeholders.

The literature documenting positive outcomes of service-learning in higher education clarified that "it is by now a given that service-learning is a potentially powerful mode of engaging students, supporting communities, and bridging the theory-practice divide to foster meaningful scholarship in action" (Butin, 2015, p. 5). Recognizing unrealized potential and inherency for developing new models to manage change in recent years, scholars have surmised that higher education institutions frequently fail to engage effectively with their communities (Garrison & Jaeger, 2014; Butin, 2010; Driscoll, 2009; O'Meara, 2007; Ward, 2005). Consequently, this lack of

proactive engagement has negative implications and presents significant problems for colleges and universities, as the majority of these institutions tout the idea of service or engagement in their mission statements (Garrison & Jaeger, 2014).

The faculty component of service-learning has been less explicated in the literature. Student outcomes have been well documented. Implications for faculty have been far less reported. Other research has examined barriers to conducting effective service-learning (Bulot & Johnson, 2006). Importantly, faculty perspectives have been largely overlooked throughout the research literature. A significant gap in the research may pose problems as higher education institutions seek to implement service-learning programs. Identifying best practices and implementing the best quality programs possible appears to require a better understanding of faculty perspectives of the service-learning pedagogy. "Further qualitative research would be beneficial to good practice in the pedagogy of service-learning, in addition to highlighting potential problems that may be alleviated or prevented. This would serve to advocate its viability in higher education, in addition to enhancing its credibility as a potentially transformative pedagogy" (Deeley, 2010, p. 51). Maximizing potential for positive outcomes may require a closer look at the faculty role in engaged scholarship.

Student Outcomes Research

It is well established in the literature that service-learning programs, on balance, have been beneficial to the community partners accepting services, on the higher education institution offering the engaged curriculum options, and on the student participants exhibiting benefits, personally, socially, or academically (Celio, Durlak, & Dymnicki, 2011; Billig, 2009; Conway, Amel, & Gerwien, 2009). The area of student

outcomes associated with service-learning programs has received the most attention from researchers (Celio et al., 2011). Several research studies, including three extensive meta-analyses, suggested that student participation in service-learning is associated with positive results in five areas: (a) civic education and social responsibility, (b) academic achievement, (c) social skills, (d) attitudes toward self, and (d) attitudes toward school (Celio et al., 2011; Billig, 2009; Conway et al., 2009; Sax, 2004; Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2006; Astin & Sax, 1998).

Civic Education and Social Responsibility

Two central aspirations long championed by institutions of higher education have been civic education and social responsibility (Cooper, 2014; Erlich, 2000). Humanitarianism and civic education have additionally long been identified as a significant and desirable outcome that faculty, student affairs professionals, and other administration stakeholders should work hard to instill in students (Cooper, 2014; Keeling, 2003).

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement's (2012) report, *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future,* pointed to service-learning as a proven, powerful pedagogy to support civic learning and engagement (Garrison & Jaeger, 2014; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2012). Service-learning is recognized as one of the most effective types of service for actualizing positive civic and philanthropic outcomes (Hatcher, 2015; Perry & Katula, 2001). A study by Astin and Sax (1998) submitted that participating in service activities during the undergraduate years significantly improved student academic development, life skill development and a sense of civic responsibility.

14

Additional studies supported earlier findings that service-learning might have had positive effects on civic education and social responsibility. Increased understanding of the importance of civic participation and social awareness as a result of participation in service-learning has been supported consistently in the literature (Garrison & Jaeger, 2014; Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001; Butin, 2010; Kendrick, 1996). A study by Cooper, Cripps, & Reisman (2013), found that significant changes in students' attitudes regarding their potential for making a difference in the community showed a "positive correlation between service-learning experiences and development of *civic responsibility*" (p. 413). Service-learning according to the conclusion of the Astin and Sax (1998) study "represents a powerful vehicle for enhancing student development…while simultaneously fulfilling a basic institutional mission of providing service to the community" (p. 262).

Increases in Racial and Cultural Understanding

When students become engaged with individuals who have different life experiences from their own, service-learning has the potential to actualize principles of multicultural education (Hildebrand & Schultz, 2015; Harrison, 2013; Desrochers, 2006; Galvan & Parker, 2011). Service-learning appears to have had a positive and sustaining effect on reducing stereotypes and facilitating cultural and racial understanding (Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001; Boyle-Baise & Kilbane, 2000; Astin, Sax & Avalos, 1999; Astin & Sax, 1998). Current research additionally revealed that service-learning may support course objectives for transcending stereotyped perspectives and actualizing cultural and racial understanding (Eyler et al. 2001; Curran, 1999; O'Grady, 1998). The literature supported earlier findings of, on balance, positive outcomes in the area of

cultural and racial understanding despite some variance depending on student characteristics.

Studies by Myers-Lipton (2002; 1996) proposed that service-learning students showed larger decreases in racial prejudice and increases in racial understanding over time than students who did not participate in service-learning. Positive outcomes in the area of cultural and racial understanding are well documented in the service-learning literature. Given the positive potential for student learning and interaction with diverse communities "it appears implementing service-learning within coursework can hold great promise for contextualizing instruction in authentic settings…to effectively solve real-world problems as change agents who focus on helping to create a socially just world" (Hildebrand & Shultz, 2015, p. 274).

Academic Achievement

Meta-analyses of service-learning research spanning the past decade indicated that the teaching strategy contributes significantly to academic, as well as personal, social and civic outcomes (Hatcher, 2015; Finley, 2011; Conway, Amel, & Gerwein, 2009). Research comparing service-learning to other types of high-impact teaching practices supported the claim that engaged scholarship may be the most effective strategy to reach deep learning (Hatcher, 2015; Finley, 2011). Intellectual and ethical development have been consistently observed outcomes in the service-learning research literature (Cooper, 2014; Deeley, 2010; Eyler et al., 2001; Novak, Markey, & Allen, 2007; Astin & Sax, 1998).

Additional findings of engagement in the classroom, retention and deeper understanding of complex social problems have been supported in the extant literature

documenting student outcomes (Bringle, 2010; Eyler et al., 2001; Batchelder & Root, 1994). A growing body of evidence has purported that the scholarship of engagement represented by service-learning practices has significantly transformed educational practices and the lives of the students involved (Hatcher, 2015; Butin, 2015; Colvin & Tobler, 2013). Moreover, this transformation can lead to improved academic achievement (Celio, Durlak, & Dymnicki, 2011; Billig, 2009; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Harwood & Radoff, 2009; Markus, Howard, & King, 1993).

Students participating in service-learning appeared to be more likely to learn more efficiently, more effectively, and remember more of what they had learned than those without service-learning experiences (Hatcher, 2015; Cohen & Kinsey, 1993). Another study indicated that students drawing upon many senses in the process of learning were able to apply learned information in more meaningful ways (Weinreich, 2003). Engaged scholarship was purported to tie theory and practice, affective cognitive learning, and institutions with communities (Butin 2015; Jacoby, 2006). A deeper understanding of social issues and problem solving, and enhanced academic outcomes overall have been persistent and lasting outcomes realized by students who participate in service-learning courses (Hatcher, 2015; Mobley, 2007; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997).

Evaluating Service Learning

The first criteria for any evaluation of an innovative pedagogy should be its impact on student learning (Pribbanow, 2005). The impact service-learning has on students and student learning has been well documented (Pribbanow, 2005; Schneider, 2000; Bringle Games, & Malloy, 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Astin & Sax, 1998; Rhoads & Howard, 1998; Meyers-Lipton, 1996; Kendrick, 1996). The impact service-learning

has on faculty has been largely unreported. Because skilled faculty participation is essential to effective service-learning outcomes, understanding implications of faculty experience is relevant to any discussion of best practices and effective program implementation. There remains, however, "a dearth of studies exploring how participating in service-learning impacts faculty…scant research exists to inform understanding how implementation of this approach affects faculty teaching and learning" (Pribbanow, 2005, p. 25). A better understanding of faculty perspectives of service-learning may yield new theories and strategies for creating and supporting the educational environments that encourage faculty professional development and continuous learning (Pribbanow, 2005). In turn, an improved understanding of the working environment for faculty may translate to a vastly improved quality of education and the teaching and learning enterprise as a whole. Implementation and long term maintenance of effective service-learning faces substantial barriers. Lack of institutional support and inadequate faculty involvement and preparation thwart effective service-learning implementation (Ward, 2003). Regardless of obvious roadblocks, "many faculty on campuses across the country do implement service-learning, and much can be learned from them" (Pribbenow, 2005, p. 25).

Faculty Perspectives

There is an overarching understanding among researchers, administrators, policy makers, practitioners and other institutional agents of change that direct faculty involvement in development and perpetuation of innovative educational practices and pedagogy is essential to successful implementation and institutionalization of best practices (Butin, 2015; Cooper, 2014; Pribbenow, 2005; Checkoway, 2001; Bringle,

Games, & Malloy, 1999). Because the instructor functions in a pivotal role in service-learning activities, it is paramount to comprehend what factors motivate the creation and continuance of service-learning endeavors. Central to the practice of all service-learning at all levels of schooling are instructors. Whether the curriculum is mandated by administration or included as an individual option, teachers in the classroom are charged with facilitating students in serving the community and reciprocally learning from the process of engaged experience. The design and quality of service-learning programs plays a critical role in the resulting quality of experience. Ultimately, the success of service-learning projects appears to be directly linked to the knowledge, skill, and creativity of the instructor (Wade, 2006; Nathan & Kielsmeier, 1991). Increased understanding of instructor perspectives of service-learning methodology is potentially useful not only for faculty and administration considering implementation of such engaged pedagogies, but also for teacher educators, in-service trainers, program coordinators and others who work in partnership with instructors on service-learning projects (Wade, 2006). For service-learning to be successfully institutionalized, faculty must actively and substantially participate making it necessary "to understand faculty motivation for using service-learning, a research area where critical questions remain" (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002, p. 5). While scholars have acknowledged the need to further examine faculty experiences implementing service-learning pedagogy as part of a national research agenda for service-learning, fewer than 10 studies have been conducted that explicate faculty perspectives (Cooper, 2014; Eyler & Giles, 1998;).

Faculty Perceptions of Service, Scholarship, and Teaching

What is known about how faculty view service-learning as scholarship is both limited and informative. Schnaubelt and Stratham (2007) investigated faculty perceptions of the relationship between the constructs of service and scholarship, with particular attention to the implications of organizational action aimed at changing perceptions. The study supported earlier findings and suggests that the service role for faculty is often not well defined or valued. The results additionally recommended that policy changes intending to broaden definitions of service and foster organizational and administrative support are reflected in faculty perceptions on individual campuses. Faculty appeared to be aware of institutional perspectives of and levels of support for service-learning pedagogy on campus. Institutional initiatives aimed at broadening the notion of service and strengthening rewards for it were associated with successful implementation of service-learning projects. Schnaubelt and Stratham encouraged replication of their study across disciplines, states, and institutions and proclaimed "research is needed to understand faculty attitudes and perceptions of the concept of *engaged scholarship*…This research can help inform and shape approaches to a more sustainable integration of community-based scholarship in post-secondary education" (p. 29). The implications for decision makers implementing service-learning pedagogy in higher education are clear. Schnaubelt and Stratham emphasized that even more important than informing program implementation efforts is providing "opportunities for faculty to reflect on their role and the assessment and rewards of multiple forms of scholarship. These things are far too important to leave to the whims of market forces or political influence" (p. 29). As technological innovation and market forces transformed the nature of faculty work,

successfully adopting new innovative pedagogies such as service-learning appeared to shed light on ways academic administrators can facilitate the process and actively manage change.

An earlier study by Stanton (1994) examined the experience of faculty after a faculty development seminar on service-learning pedagogy and built upon previous research on instructional improvement efforts linked to service-learning pedagogy, and on faculty professional initiatives in general. Stanton created and led a week-long seminar at Stanford University. The seminar was intended to motivate faculty interest in connecting student public service with academic study and provide faculty members with the knowledge and resources required to design courses that utilize the service-learning pedagogy. Data were collected from seminar participants through interviews conducted over one year after the seminar to assess the impact of development efforts on quality and use of the service-learning pedagogy. The study sought to determine what aspects of the seminar helped or hindered subsequent service-learning curriculum development and what institutional context factors (e.g., mission, emphasis on teaching versus research, etc.) participants identified as helping or hindering this work (Stanton, 1994).

Other research in the area of faculty perceptions examines how service-learning shapes and influences teaching and learning. Designed to address the lack of research on how service-learning pedagogy impacts faculty, Pribbenow's (2005) study identified six themes that helped to explain how implementation of service-learning programs affected faculty. Pribbenow found that service-learning pedagogy directly impacted faculty theories toward teaching and learning. The research revealed that "in broad strokes, service-learning pedagogy led many faculty to more meaningful engagement in, and

commitment to, teaching" (p. 27). Pribbenow's study builds on Zltkowski's (1998) argument that service-learning pedagogy is faculty development. Pribbenow relied on Kolb's Experiential Model to develop an approach to faculty learning and professional development that is much like student learning experiences. Pribbenow (2005) concluded that faculty development "begins with preparation, continues through implementation, and includes evaluation that cycles around to further preparation. To this extent, it mirrors the major components of students' service-learning experiences: preparation, meaningful action, reflection, and evaluation" (p. 35). In this sense, findings of the Pribbenow study showed that service-learning pedagogy may improve teacher effectiveness and provide positive outcomes for faculty and student reciprocally.

The more meaningful commitment to teaching that faculty developed through experiences with service-learning appeared to be associated with the other five themes established in the Pribbenow (2005) study. In addition to a more inspired commitment to teaching, faculty members implementing service-learning experienced more meaningful connections and relationships with students, greater awareness of student learning processes and outcomes, greater understanding and utilization of constructivist teaching and learning methodologies, improved comprehension of theoretical concepts and greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners. Because service-learning pedagogy is predicated on the essential characteristics of preparation, community action, classroom reflection, and evaluation, students come to understand their experiences from what they have learned inside and outside the classroom. The study supported the concept that reflecting on these experiences strengthened connections as "faculty, in turn, gained new insights into cognitive, emotional, and social dimensions of students'

22

development…using service-learning pedagogy led to deeper connections and relationships with students as learners…increased awareness of and respect for students developed as a result of service-learning, leading to enhanced connections" (p. 28). Through the process of placement in community partnerships, and then relating experiences through writing, classroom debriefing, and meaningful reflection techniques, faculty had the opportunity to better understand student perspectives opening the possibility for better connections and communication between faculty and students. The literature has consistently affirmed that this type of increased student-faculty interaction, on balance, improves student learning outcomes (Pribbenow, 2005; Astin, 1993; Kuh, Schuh, & Whitt, 1991; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Faculty teaching experiences and insight into student learning experiences, in turn, were shown to be concomitantly enhanced.

Because service-learning increases student-faculty interaction, faculty inevitably become more aware of student learning experiences. One of impacts faculty related in the Pribbenow (2005) study was that "implementing service-learning made them more aware of how students were learning in and experiencing the course…Deeper awareness often developed from the need to pay close attention to the service-learning experiences in which students were engaged" (p. 29). Participating faculty also found that assessing learning became easier with more opportunities to discuss student experiences. Community placements "provided students with a real experience, allowing them to become more fully engaged in classroom discussions…a practice that gave faculty an opportunity to assess students' learning" (p. 30). Becoming more aware of how students learn pushed faculty participants to rethink traditional views of knowledge transmission

and classroom design. Moving away from dependence on lectures and text to a more student-centered approach became necessary to properly adapt to the ways students were genuinely learning.

Adopting a new approach to teaching requires an awareness of the need for strategies that advance principles that validate the student experience in knowledge creation. Faculty identified service-learning as a manifestation of constructivist pedagogy that connects teaching to students' ways of knowing and constructing understanding (Pribbenow, 2005; Magolda, 2003). Participants in Pribbenow's (2005) study identified participation in service-learning as increasing awareness of potentially ineffective strategies and develop new constructivist perspectives. One faculty member surmised that "lecturing is maybe the least effective method of pedagogy, especially for greater student participation and initiative" but despite wanting to adapt to a more student-centered perspective he realized that until he began using service-learning he "didn't know how. I didn't know how I could do that" (p. 31). Another faculty participant exhibited an increased commitment to constructivist teaching approaches in her explanation of thinking about course structure that "anytime I'm thinking about a course or syllabus, I'll give some thought to, 'Is there any way I could incorporate service-learning as a component?'" (p. 32). Asking this question exhibits an understanding that service-learning represents a different approach to teaching and learning. Emphasis on guided discussion and reflection combined with community placement and commitment to a reciprocal symbiotic relationship between service and learning demonstrates a deviation from traditional methods of teaching, ways of thinking about how students learn, and ways of knowledge construction.

Faculty involved in service-learning inevitably become more aware of the community sites at which their students might be placed. Faculty members' greater comprehension of the community and students' community experiences offer opportunities to develop better understandings and ability to communicate theoretical concepts. Pribbenow (2005) came to understand the pedagogical implications as "nearly all faculty interviewed mentioned increased awareness of community organizations and, in many cases, better understanding of their needs. For these faculty, this increased awareness allowed them to be more productive in the classroom and more aligned with their students by making available new relevant examples and contexts for connecting theory and practice" (p. 32). By creating situations in which students' community based stories become an integral aspect of classroom discussion, everyone involved becomes more familiar with community issues and how they relate to concepts introduced in the course.

Another key finding and the sixth theme developed in the Pribbenow (2005) study was that faculty members involved in service-learning shared interactions and connections with other faculty utilizing service-learning pedagogy. This increased involvement in a community of teachers and learners was associated with faculty participation in service-learning. While not directly linked to pedagogy, the finding has relevance for teaching and learning. The majority of faculty members interviewed related that service-learning "had introduced them to other faculty who shared a common cause…The sense of community and collegiality created from these interactions connected faculty to each other, enhanced their commitment to the institution, and assisted some in overcoming isolation. These three effects gave faculty a sense of greater

involvement in a community of teachers and learners" (p. 33). The author emphasized the importance of bringing faculty together around relevant pursuits and suggested that the service-learning appears to be an effective vehicle for increasing faculty collaboration and interconnection. All six themes identified in the study contributed to the literature on faculty perspectives on service-learning in relevant ways. The study offers valuable insight for participants in innovative pedagogy in higher education. It was Pribbenow's hope articulated in the conclusion of the study that the focus on faculty "will matter to those committed to better understanding and supporting faculty—one of higher education's most important resources" (p. 35).

In another study, Cooper (2014) investigated faculty perspectives to better understand how service-learning might shape and influence teaching and learning strategies. Cooper explored possible reasons why faculty members became involved in service-learning, the perceived impact on reward systems such as the promotion and tenure process, potential barriers and benefits experienced by participants and what factors sustained them in their teaching roles. The study took a different direction than previous studies in that the research investigated faculty perceptions of the possible influences that have hindered or facilitated continued participation in service-learning over a period of 10 years. Cooper's study supported earlier findings that suggest that faculty are motivated to participate in service-learning for a multiplicity of factors, primarily the potential outcomes that service-learning provides and the opportunity to work in an interdisciplinary fashion. The study additionally supported earlier findings that service-learning can have positive and negative impacts on promotion and tenure and that institutionalization and organizational support is critical for engaging faculty in

service-learning (Cooper, 2014). The four broad themes were discussed with participants. Cooper's findings supported earlier research outcomes and suggest that faculty engage in service-learning for many reasons including having specific goals, appropriate theory and institutional support (Cooper, 2014; McKay & Rozee, 2004; Abes et al., 2002). Influences emerging from the Cooper (2014) study were prior experiences with service-learning, previous experience in the nonprofit sector, and commitment to civic engagement to connect students and communities to solve real-world problems.

Perceived Barriers to Incorporation of a Service-Learning Component

Abes, Jackson, and Jones' (2002) study examined factors that deter faculty use of service-learning. The researchers began their investigation to explicate possible reasons why despite mounting research suggesting significant benefits, other studies indicated service-learning had not been thoroughly integrated into the curriculum at most colleges and universities (Abes et al., 2002; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Holland, 1997). This study was unique in that of the 500 faculty respondents answering the survey, approximately half of those examined did not use service-learning.

Literature on deterrents to faculty use of service-learning has mainly examined possible barriers recognized by practitioners of the pedagogy rather than deterrents for faculty members choosing not to utilize this educational practice. The researchers developed an expert panel reviewed survey questionnaire to obtain data from faculty members from various institutions in Ohio about factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning (Abes et al., 2002). Previous research identified potential deterrents surmised by practitioners of service-learning and found that lack of institutional recognition of the pedagogy as a scholarly activity and lack of recognition in

27

the faculty reward structure were significant disincentives to participating in the innovative teaching programs (Gray, Ondaatje, & Zacaras, 1999; Hammond, 1994; Morton & Troppe, 1996; Stanton, 1994, Ward, 1998).

Inadequate funding for creating new curriculum and finding appropriate community partners for the engagement piece of the curriculum were also found to sometimes prevented faculty members from using service-learning in prior studies (Levine, 1994; Stanton, 1994; Driscoll, Holland Gellman, & Kerrigan, 1996; Ward, 1996). Logistical difficulties, perceived time constraints, and large course loads were also found to possibly deter faculty from participating in service-learning in earlier research (UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project, 1999). Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) found that lack of logistical support, lack of evidence that service-learning improves academic outcomes, and lack of instruction in how to effectively use service-learning were often referenced as essential factors that prevent faculty from using the pedagogy. The latter finding supports earlier research in showing the association between lack of faculty development for the pedagogy and resistance to implementing the practice (Hammond, 1994).

Four main strategic imperatives to better meet institutional needs ultimately emerged from the study. First, involving community members and students in identifying and recruiting service-learning faculty utilizing numbers of students and outreach potential. Second, identifying, organizing and making transparent service-learning faculty and create opportunities for these faculty to encourage service-learning. The third strategic imperative identified by the researchers was the assessment of academic learning outcomes for service-learning courses and dissemination of results within

28

academic departments and disciplines. The fourth and last policy implication identified in the study was the call to develop and institutionalize a centralized service-learning office to recruit potential community partners with the university, establish stable sources of funding and develop incentives to utilize innovative pedagogies, help faculty with logistical concerns, and make available professional development and instruction to possible service-learning faculty. (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002). All four of these policy imperatives could be implemented at colleges and universities seeking increased community engagement.

Abes et al. (2002) concluded that overcoming barriers to participating in service-learning and transitioning institutional advocacy from tacit approval to insistence on comprehensive integration throughout institutions of higher education everywhere is an essential step to realizing a scholarship of engagement. "Service-learning's many benefits to the students, community, and institution serve to encourage development and implementation of effective strategies to increase the number of faculty and academic disciplines responsibly using service-learning. Indeed, thorough integration of service-learning into the curriculum must be an institutional priority in order to help colleges and universities realize the vision of becoming engaged and socially responsible citizens" (p. 16). The barriers to potential implementation of service-learning pedagogy can be overcome by shifting institutional priorities to advocate for increased campus community collaboration and working to integrate a service-learning component across departments and disciplines. Faculty stand to benefit from a scholarship of engagement that can successfully integrate a service component into a broader effort to connect campuses with local communities to address pressing needs with collaborative action.

29

Roles of Service among Faculty

Service is frequently perceived as outside the intended work of scholars (Ward, 2003). Integrating teaching, research, and service as distinct and legitimate representations of scholarship may significantly improve faculty work environments. Ward's research implied that faculty members utilizing service activities as part of their curriculum stand to benefit significantly as participating in service-learning pedagogy "can unify their professional lives, bringing together their teaching, research, and service in a synergistic way, to the benefit of each aspect of their work and the benefit of those with whom they work" (para. 9). An early study of the academic work environment examined the tensions between teaching and research and "identified service as an 'afterthought' as reflected in the literature. The service function of faculty has been referred to as the 'short leg of the three-legged stool'" (para. 10). To make faculty service a more accepted use of resources is to approach outreach and service activities as scholarly activities as research and teaching have been historically treated. "When faculty and administrators finally embrace a scholarship of engagement and acknowledge the important role of service in both the internal and external functioning and health of the campus, then faculty can begin to experience integrated academic lives" (para. 9).

Challenges faculty face when adopting the pedagogy. The time commitment and additional planning required to incorporate a service-learning component into a course curriculum is significant and has been found to deter participation by some faculty members (Abes et al., 2002). The researchers found that "the potential deterrents included factors related to time, logistics, and funding; student and community outcomes; reward structure; and comfort with ability to effectively use service-learning" (p. 10). The

authors conclude that while the actual barriers faculty face when implementing the innovative service-learning pedagogy may deviate from the perceived barriers surmised by non-participating faculty shifting overcoming obstacles is possible and potentially beneficial for students and faculty alike. Shifting institutional priorities to advocate for increased campus community collaboration and working to integrate a service-learning component across departments and disciplines will address actual barriers and begin to break down and dispel perceived barriers based on fear or lack of understanding. Hou (2009) studied faculty experience and, like earlier studies, confirmed that time commitment, logistics, and additional planning required appeared to be challenges for faculty implementing the pedagogy. Hou's research was aimed at furthering a "dialogue on benefits, challenges, and strategies from both student' and instructors' perspectives" with the understanding that the potential advantage of incorporating service-learning appears to outweigh possible disadvantages and "The infusion of service-learning opportunities in teaching project-based course[s] is effective and demonstrates profound impact on student learning" (p. 297). The potential for service-learning is clear. The barriers to implementing engaged opportunities can and should be overcome to actualize the benefits of student-centered learning.

Factors that motivate faculty to engage in service-learning. Hammond (1994) studied faculty members utilizing service-learning and sought to better understand motivations, experiences, and curricular choices. Rather than looking for reasons why faculty were not utilizing or were deterred from using the pedagogy, the researcher hoped to explore faculty motivations to better understand the circumstances under which faculty may alter their teaching to include a service component. Hammond studied the

motivations of 130 faculty at 23 institutions who chose to implement a service-learning component into their teaching. Findings suggest that the most significant factors were linked to student course-based learning, including relevance to course materials, self-direction and enriched student fulfilment with the educational experience. The course related factors appeared to be more influential than individual factors such as empirical involvement with community service and appreciation working with students in interdisciplinary contexts or student factors linked to civic participation or moral development. Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) confirmed Hammond's findings that curricular concerns motivate faculty utilization of service-learning and that faculty are compelled by evidence of verifiable student outcomes. Abes et al.'s study reiterated results of earlier studies finding that student-learning outcomes provided the most significant motivation for service-learning faculty.

Summary of Literature Review

The literature detailing positive outcomes of service-learning in higher education has persuaded policy makers, practitioners and scholars that service-learning and the scholarship of engagement are educational practices worth pursuing. The faculty component of implementing service-learning pedagogy has been less elucidated in the literature. Two major gaps in the research that my project intended to fill were the absence of studies on faculty experiences in colleges and universities without an established institutionally supported service-learning program and a lack of research on factors related to best practices for cultivating and sustaining effective community partnerships in this context. The bulk of studies have historically focused on institutions with centrally established and supported service-learning programs. The experiences of

faculty establishing and maintaining service-learning pedagogy in a context without a centralized mechanism for collaboration, administration, organization, information sharing were decidedly different and worth exploring further.

While significant and informative studies have been conducted on faculty experiences implementing engaged programs, additional research designed with the goal to better understand faculty motivations for using service-learning in this specific context may be useful for faculty and administration considering institutional implementation of such engaged pedagogies. To achieve this goal, my research focused on five research questions. Those five questions were:

1. What motivates faculty to initiate service-learning in course curriculum?

2. How do faculty members perceive the role of community partners in their service-learning pedagogy?

3. How do faculty members describe the structural components of service-learning?

4. What role does engaging the community have in fulfilling course goals and objectives?

5. What are potential perceived barriers to incorporation of a service-learning component in curriculum?

In order to further explore faculty motivations and perspectives I developed a multiple case study using mediated grounded theory rooted in practitioners of service-learning pedagogy described in the following chapter on research methodology.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore faculty members' theories about engaged scholarship in seven service-learning courses. In this chapter, I explicate the rationale, design, research philosophy, methodological procedures and data analysis techniques selected to address this purpose. My study had five research questions. The first asked what motivated faculty to initiate service-learning in course curriculum. Second, faculty member's perceptions around the role of community partners in their service-learning pedagogy was explored. Third, faculty members were asked to describe the structural components of service-learning. Fourth, the role of community engagement has in fulfilling course goals and objectives was investigated. Finally, the potential perceived barriers to incorporation of a service-learning component curriculum was reviewed.

Rationale

Qualitative methods have historically helped evaluate educational policies and programs identifying best practices, exploring possible complications, and helping to understand interactions between various stakeholders. I initiated a qualitative approach to both examine the perceptions of key stakeholders in the engaged scholarship of service-learning and compare faculty perspectives across disciplines and programs. An increasing number of researchers are investigating service-learning outcomes involving experimental and quasi-experimental designs. Scholars in the field have been calling for better qualitative work that evaluates student and faculty understandings of what they are doing and how they perceive all aspects of service- learning (Battistoni, 2006).

Qualitative research might better shed light on how service-learning yields impacts on learning, social justice and citizenship outcomes than quantitative analysis. Battistoni (2006) pointed out how qualitative techniques are not diametrically opposed to experimental or quasi-experimental design in that "survey research has a place, but can be supplemented with more qualitative approaches" (p. 14).

Service-learning research based on experimental designs and solely premised on identifying and quantifying learning outcomes often ignores the teaching and learning processes from a faculty perspective. In depth analysis of potential problems that may arise during development and implementation of service-learning curriculum requires active dialogue with practitioners of the pedagogy. Qualitative studies offer opportunities to explore dimensions of social phenomena not decipherable through quantitative analysis. In exploratory research, these phenomena are investigated with minimal a priori expectations to develop explanations of these phenomena (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thus, I chose qualitative methods to explore the perspectives and experiences of faculty utilizing the collaborative, interactive, and reciprocal service-learning pedagogy. Qualitative research "…does not start with a hypotheses or preconceived notions. Instead, in accordance with its inductive nature, it involves the researcher's attempts to discover, understand, and interpret what is happening in the research context" (Bowen, 2006, p. 3). Better understanding faculty motivations and perspectives can be best achieved with a qualitative study.

Design

This qualitative investigation was an exploratory, multiple faculty member case study involving descriptive qualitative methods rooted in faculty perspectives utilizing

constant comparative analysis and coding in the tradition of grounded theory. My exploratory, multiple perspective design was rooted in faculty theories of service-learning pedagogy as the unit of analysis (Yin, 2003). The interplay between data collection and analysis identified patterns in faculty perceptions and informed common themes explicating faculty theories of engaged scholarship during the research process. Generally, service-learning is a method of teaching that involves faculty and students in engaged learning through ongoing reflection in the classroom. Reflective observation and conceptual exploration of experiences through community service relevant to academic content are integral components of service-learning.

Typically, service-learning courses require a certain number of hours in the community service internship to be completed during the academic quarter. Class-based reflection often emphasizes open discussion as well as communal, collaborative and autobiographical narratives. Faculty motivations for requiring community service as part of academic coursework was a construct of interest in this study possibly revealing details helpful to administrators and faculty considering exploration of service-learning pedagogy and curricula. Selection of cases was based on utilization of service-learning methods for teaching and learning across disciplines at one public institution in the Northwest.

I conducted my research at one public institution with over 20,000 students and approximately 2,000 faculty located in the Pacific Northwest. The research site does not have an established institutionalized service-learning program. While many faculty members across several disciplines include a scholarship of engagement component in their courses, participating faculty are acting on their own without coordination with an

institutional component. Faculty participating in service-learning are in several different departments across disciplines. Prominent features of the exploratory elements of this study were building theory on the scholarship of engagement in higher education, articulating best practices in service-learning pedagogy, identifying possible avenues for institutionalization and perpetuation of service-learning programs, and identifying possible areas for proactive policy change and future research.

Case Selection

The multiple case design facilitated broad systemic analysis of faculty perceptions of both the institution and existing or desired levels of perceived institutionalization or administration support and at the same time explicate specific aspects of faculty experiences and transferrable best practices in service-learning pedagogy. Case selection was guided by a desire that the selection offers the opportunity to maximize what can be learned in a limited temporal period (Stake, 1995). Because the construct of interest is expressive voices of faculty successfully engaged in service-learning pedagogy, there is much to be learned about what is working in the pedagogy and what isn't. There is also much to be learned about how perceptions of institutional support or lack of support impacts faculty work.

The boundaries of this case study were clear (Stake, 1995). Faculty teaching courses with a service-learning component and willing to participate in semi-structured hour-long interviews were selected to participate. The level of analysis included faculty members who were teaching or had taught service-learning courses in one Northwest institution across departments and disciplines. Each participated in recruitment and continued communication with community partners as well as classroom discussion or

37

reflection. The unit of analysis was the theories of service-learning pedagogy generated by faculty experience. Developing a clear picture of faculty theories required analysis of course documents, literature used to inform faculty approaches to service-learning pedagogy, and documents related to identifying and maintaining reciprocal mutually beneficial relationships with community partners.

Sampling

As data collected were a compilation of interviews and course syllabi, and documents related to community placement protocols, I chose a plan for selecting cases that incorporated purposive selection and snowballing. While case study research is not sampling research (Yin, 2003; Stake, 1995) selecting cases has much to do with maximizing what can be learned about a construct of interest in a period of time available for study. I selected seven faculty members from five departments to participate in the study because of their potential to exhibit an array of faculty tacit theories about service-learning pedagogy as it relates to faculty teaching and learning strategies. Four women and three men participated in the interviews. Recruitment of participants was premised on their participation in service-learning pedagogy. Participation was identified by looking at available course descriptions and speaking with faculty familiar with service-learning in the institution. The range of departments participating faculty represented demonstrates a variety of theories stemming from different frameworks and backgrounds. Selection of different departments with different service-learning focuses upheld sound theoretical selection criteria utilized in grounded theory approaches to research and broadened the scope of the study (Glaser and Straus, 1967). This multiple-case study followed a replication logic where each faculty member was an individual case and facts

38

were gathered from interviews, course documents, and all available materials related to the service-learning experience (Yin, 2003).

<div align="center">**Research Approach**</div>

Qualitative Description

The study investigated faculty engaged in service-learning and used a multiple case study design involving descriptive qualitative methods rooted in faculty perspectives utilizing constant comparative analysis and coding in the tradition of grounded theory. Qualitative descriptive studies offer a method for providing a comprehensive summary of experiences and events. Qualitative description allows policy makers and practitioners to answer questions about perspectives and experiences that other research approaches may miss. Although qualitative descriptive studies are notably different than grounded theory, ethnographic, phenomenological, or narrative approaches, they may have similar characteristics and utilize representations and analytical techniques from these approaches (Sandelowski, 2000). Qualitative descriptive studies may have grounded theory overtones, for example, as researchers may "employ one or more techniques associated with grounded theory, such as a form of constant comparison, but not produce any theoretical rendering of the target phenomenon" (Sandelowski, 2000, p.337). As such, an explanation of constant comparative analysis and basic approaches to grounded theory methodology is warranted. Grounded theory is a research method that emphasizes constant interaction between data collection and analysis to generate a theory during the research process. I used the grounded theory approach to constant comparative analysis in this multiple case study. A grounded theory is derived during data collection and analysis inductively through examination of themes pertaining to faculty perspectives on

<div align="center">39</div>

campus community collaboration. In this process, patterns, categories of analysis and themes emerged from the data rather than being established and imposed on the process prior to data collection and analysis (Patton, 1980; Straus & Corbin, 1990). Scholars in a wide array of fields have engaged in the grounded theory approach to inform decision makers and practitioners. Student affairs professionals, for example, have embraced grounded theory as a method of research that can increase educators' understanding of the complex interactions between faculty, students, and college environments (Bowen, 2006; Brown, Stevens, Troiano, & Schneider, 2002).

Inductive analysis is the guiding logic of grounded theory. Through systematic collection and analysis of data pertaining to a phenomenon researchers utilizing the approach generate themes. Thematic analysis is comprised of the examination of essential characteristics or common threads that are apparent throughout the data (Bowen, 2006). Through data analysis, the researcher identifies emerging themes in an interview or set of interviews, and other relevant data sources to link portions of the interviews together. The themes are categorized methodically in a way that is expected to produce theory. The theory yielded by analyzing the data can be a pragmatic recommendation of practice that addresses concepts indicated by the data. By increasing understanding of how faculty experience implementation of service-learning pedagogy and identifying themes that link aspects of faculty experiences together, policy makers, administrators, and practitioners can manage change in a proactive and beneficial manner. The inductive nature of grounded theory research and inherent analysis of cultural phenomena from the perspective of one who participates in the culture being studied is well suited for informing educational policy practices and institutional change. Essential to the

development of theory is a purposive movement beyond the words emerging from the interview transcripts and documents so that concepts generate themes and themes produce theory (Bowen, 2006). Faculty perspectives of campus community collaboration in service-learning pedagogy elucidate concepts that give way to theory. Theory, according to Damahidy in 2003, is "powerful because it organizes what professionals pay attention to and how they pay attention. It shapes beliefs that in turn shape action…theories are available to the user as consciously chosen alternative ways to approach understanding settings and developing strategies to address issues. This approach encourages praxis as disciplined reflection engaging theory to enrich practice" (p. 76). If the developing theory might contribute in some way to individual or institutional actualization of best practices, "and positive social change, then a research project has merit and is worth pursuing" (Bowen, 2006, p.8). In this way, theory can be a practical realization that something works well and may be transferable beyond the cases being investigated to positively transform communities and contribute to improving society in some way. In the case of engaged scholarship and campus community collaboration, learning what is working for practitioners and what faculty members perceive as potential barriers to change may yield a rich descriptions that can influence educational professionals and shape constructive action. As is the case with grounded theory in the fields of anthropology, health care, sociology, education and many other contexts, emergent theory and thick descriptions of experiences and perspectives can be a targeted practical understanding of pedagogies or phenomena enabling policy change in a specific context. The qualitative descriptive method can effectively facilitate this greater

understanding of phenomena that can inform meaningful change and research-to-practice recommendations.

Data Collection Procedures

In my study, interview transcripts, course syllabi, and all available documents related to student or community partner expectations and community placement protocols constituted the compilation of collected data. A significant strength of case study data collection is the prospect of using many varied sources of evidence (Yin, 2003). To better understand faculty perspectives of pedagogical and curricular design and maximize construct validity and reliability of data in the context of engaged scholarship as service-learning, I employed the process of triangulation (Yin, 2003). The construct of faculty perspectives on a scholarship of engagement required multiple sources of qualitative data. By looking at multiple sources of data, this study investigated factors motivating the creation and continuance of service-learning pedagogy, core theories participants hold regarding teaching strategies, and possible incentives or deterrents to implementing campus community collaboration in curricular choices. Protocols that are used to increase the likelihood of accurate accounts and alternative explanations are indicative of triangulation (Stake, 1995).

Interviews

A major aspect of data collection in the study was in-depth, face to face interviews with individual faculty members teaching courses having a service-learning component premised on a semi-structured interview protocol. Interviews facilitated examination of faculty motivations to initiate service-learning, perceptions of the role of community partners in the curriculum, faculty understanding of structural components of

service-learning, the role of community engagement in fulfilling course goals and objectives and potential perceived barriers to implementation of service-learning pedagogy. The interviews allowed for faculty members to describe, relate, and evaluate their experiences with course development, community partner selection, interactions with administration and all levels of service-learning implementation. Faculty voices were further heard in supplemental conversations and email communication. Listening to faculty stories thickly detailed with personal perspectives on internal motivations to engage the community as part of course curriculum, best practices in sustaining programs, inherent barriers to developing or expanding the pedagogy, recruiting and maintaining relationships with community partners, and potential avenues to institutionalizing effective practices in engaged scholarship significant concepts emerged that began to link substantial portions of the interviews together. These themes ultimately yield faculty theories (Bowen, 2006).

The interview protocol was developed to allow a flexible format where faculty could reflect on experiences targeted by the research questions and at the same time allow discussion of other topics faculty participants felt were relevant to discuss. Questions covered structural components and course details, curriculum choices, perceptions of community partners, the relationship between community engagement and course objectives and perceived barriers to incorporating service-learning components in curriculum. The semi-structured protocol facilitated conversations that addressed the purpose of the study and enabled introduction of new and valuable perspectives motivated by faculty practitioners of service-learning pedagogy. Follow up questions and discussions occurred as a part of early data analysis. The interviews additionally allowed

flexibility for participants to discuss other possible participants as part of the snowballing

selection process. I conducted interviews face-to-face, and gave hard copies of the

interview protocol to participants. I recruited most interview participants with an initial

email outlining the details of the research and a follow-up email describing interview

procedure and scheduling a time to meet. In some cases, initial contact was face-to-face

with materials presented to participants and an interview scheduled at the end of the

conversation. During the process of data collection, I recorded key details in a notebook

reflected on personal experience with service-learning pedagogy, and participated in peer

and faculty committee debriefs to develop more detailed prompts in later interviews and

draw out details in faculty teaching experiences.

Course Materials

In the initial recruitment letter faculty were told that participants would be asked

to provide available course materials including course syllabi, and all available

documents related to student or community partner expectations, community placement

protocols, and memoranda of understanding. Participants provided the extant data either

during the interview or in email sent after the interview. I analyzed and compared course

materials to interview data in the process of triangulation. Use of multiple sources of

evidence in case studies is especially relevant compared to other research strategies such

as experiments, surveys, or histories (Yin, 2003). Experiments are often constrained by

the measurement or recording of behavior and do not utilize use of survey or rhetorical

information. Surveys put emphasis on verbal information but to the contrary of

experimental approaches do not measure or record behavior. Histories are limited to

archival past events and lack current evidentiary source such as interviews with

informants. Case studies emphasize multiple sources of evidence to allow researchers to assess a more comprehensive range of behavioral, historical, and attitudinal issues. The most significant advantage of using multiple sources of evidence is the creation of intersecting lines of inquiry, a key component of triangulation and trustworthiness of data (Yin, 2003). Any finding or conclusion in a case study is "likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it is based on several different sources of information, following a corroboratory mode" (Yin, 2003, p. 98). By triangulating information from multiple sources aimed at corroborating the same fact or phenomenon the potential for construct validity problems can be mitigated (Yin, 2003). Multiple sources of evidence providing multiple measures of the same phenomenon improves trustworthiness of results and overall quality of the study (Yin, 2003).

Sampling Plan for Faculty Participants

I initially chose a purposive participant selection plan that would include 10 faculty members and utilize snowball procedures based on recommendations from initial contacts and interviews. The sample was reduced as recruiting participants proved to be more challenging than anticipated. Seven faculty members eventually agreed to participate. The initial contact list yielded a number of participants and those initial contacts suggested other possible informants that proved to expand the sample beyond the initial target list. The major selection factor for recruitment was experience teaching a course with a service-learning component. All participants had taught or were currently teaching, service-learning courses. Participants included four women and three men. Six of the participants were non-tenure track including one adjunct instructor and five full-time faculty members. One participant was a Professor Emeritus. Participants represented

the College of Business, Economics, the School of Architecture and Allied Arts and the College of Education. All participants had been involved teaching service-learning courses for more than ten years. The goal of the purposeful sampling strategy was to obtain cases that would yield rich informative narratives for the purposes of studying faculty perspectives of service-learning pedagogy.

Internal Validity

Because exploratory studies are not predicated on extrapolating causal claims "the concern over internal validity, for case study research, may be extended to the broader problem of making inferences…" (Yin, 2003, p. 36). Case studies necessitate inferences in the event that an event is not directly observed. Interviews and other available evidence gathered in a case study allow the investigator to infer that a particular outcome resulted from some earlier manifestation. Research designs that anticipate questions such as "is the inference correct? Have all the rival explanations and possibilities been considered? Is the evidence convergent? Does it appear to be airtight?" has approached the "problem of making inferences and therefore the specific problem of internal validity" (Yin, 2003, p. 36). There are specific strategies that can increase the likelihood of internal validity. One technique for linking data to research questions is pattern matching. Pattern matching is a situation where several pieces of evidence from the same case may be related to some theoretical proposition (Tellis, 1997). I employed pattern matching as a method of linking interview and extant data to my research questions. Pattern matching compares observed patterns with a predicted one. Internal validity is heightened when the patterns correspond (Tellis, 1997). Maximizing the potential that the descriptive aspect of interview data will include enough detail for analysis or

interpretation of inferences necessitates additional questions on the part of the investigator. To ensure that the researcher does not collect "only data that support a preconceived framework…the antidote is to maintain a healthy skepticism toward everything one hears, sees, remembers, records and writes in the course of developing a study. A guiding question: Am I attending as carefully to what is going on as I am attending to what I think is going on?" (Wolcott, 1994, p. 21). To address threats to the interview protocol's construct validity, as mentioned earlier, I reviewed participant responses to guarantee that answers reflected the research questions and purpose. Triangulation of data from multiple sources of information additionally addressed potential validity issues.

Reliability

Reliability can be achieved with various methods in a case study. One of the most important ways to maintain reliability is to develop a case study protocol (Tellis, 1997). The protocol is a major component in affirming the reliability of the case study research (Yin, 2003). The four sections of a protocol should include an overview of the case study, protocol used in the field, questions the investigator must consider during data collection, and a clear format for the case study report (Yin, 2003). I aspired to adhere to this case study protocol in my study. The protocol "is a major way of increasing the reliability of case study research and is intended to guide the investigator in carrying out the data collection…" (Yin, 2003, p. 67). Ultimately, the researcher is interviewing and recording participant responses. In qualitative research this means "issues of instrument validity and reliability ride largely on the skills of the researcher…interviewing, and recording, while modifying the…interviewing, and recording devices from one field trip to the next. Thus

you need to ask…How valid and reliable is this person likely to be as an information gathering instrument?" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 38). The case study protocol keeps research on track and enhances reliability of interview data. Protocols that are implemented to maximize accurate portrayals of data and alternative explanations represents triangulation (Stake, 1995). This need for triangulation is intrinsic to the researcher's obligation to confirm validity and reliability.

Data Analysis

Data analysis universally involves identifying or grouping pieces of evidence and assembling the evidence to make a consistent warranted claim. The data became the warrant from claims established by each property of a category. The arguments established by evidence in each category represent the possibility for theory creation. I used the constant comparative method to analyze data in this study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Making constant comparisons and analyzing pieces of data at all stages of the research process is essential to the ultimate generation of theory. I utilized four stages of constant comparative methodology in my analysis of data in this study. I first compared evidence relevant to each category. Next, I sorted the categories attempting to integrate the arguments supported by the evidence. Approaching analysis much like making an effective argument in debate, I extrapolated a claim from the rhetorical evidence from interviews and extant data and then proceeded to warrant the claim with data from each integrated category. Once the argument established by the evidence is apparent, categories can by synthesized establishing themes for sorting categories with particular properties.

Codes

By synthesizing categories and delimiting the theory, the numbers of categories could be reduced and identifying a theory that portrays an accurate statement of the constructs studied becomes more likely (Glaser and Straus, 1967). The process of coding or identifying themes represents the primary aspect of the constant comparative method of data analysis. Open coding involved identifying and categorizing themes in each faculty member's perspective and comparing those themes to other pieces of evidence generated by the faculty member. Axial coding involved synthesizing the categories generated by the analysis of each faculty member's perspective and making connections while comparing the themes across different faculty perspectives.

I looked to a coding paradigm that could reflect conditions, context, faculty perspectives of actions or relationships, and consequences or outcomes of those actions or relationships (Straus and Corbin, 1990). The condition and context codes may reflect specific characteristics of each faculty member and unique elements of particular course or departmental processes. Faculty perspectives and theories of service-learning pedagogy may generate theories about a scholarship of engagement or perspectives on best practices for campus community collaboration. The relationship codes may focus on aspects of institutionalization or reciprocity with community partners. The selective coding in this analysis allowed additional synthesis of the categories to move closer to a theoretical understanding of faculty theories of service-learning as a scholarship of engagement.

Theory Development

While this study utilized a descriptive qualitative research design, inclusion of constant comparative analysis and coding in the tradition of grounded theory necessitates an overview of basic grounded theory principles. Grounded theory is an approach to research that permits significant concepts to emerge out of the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Glaser and Strauss argue that "an insight, whether borrowed or original, is of no use to the theorist unless he converts it from being simply an anecdote to being an element of theory" (1967, p. 254). A multiple faculty member case study of faculty perceptions of the engaged scholarship of service-learning pedagogy may allow the transformation of anecdote to substantive theory. Kolb (2012) argued that "There are creative and innovative ideas forming and evolving in the minds of educators. I feel the challenges that educators meet are not the lack of great ideas, but the lack of taking the time to listen to the ideas, asking more questions, comparing these thoughts with other ideas, pondering and sorting through these meanings, and then researching and writing these conclusions" (p. 86). Faculty theories of engaged scholarship emerge from the stories of successfully implementing service-learning pedagogy. Narratives of best practices from those faculty members successfully employing innovative engaged scholarship pedagogy may inform other faculty seeking to further develop their teaching and learning strategies.

Decision makers at the institutional level may also take note of faculty utilization of innovative ideas for campus community collaboration as leaders in higher education increasingly emphasize the potentialities of community engagement. The multiple case design of this study provides insight into how faculty utilizing service-learning pedagogy

across disciplines and departments actualize a scholarship of engagement. Case studies have empirically been used effectively to showcase best practices in educational settings. "Case studies have been increasingly used in education…the technique is being applied in a variety of instructional situations…in the implementation of case based learning or *active learning*…The students…begin to think in terms of wider problems and solutions" (Tellis, 1997, p. 5). Faculty members implementing service-learning scholarship recognize the impact active learning has on students. A case study focusing on faculty understanding of the potential for engaged scholarship to positively transform teaching and learning in higher education is a unique opportunity to develop tacit faculty theories for campus community collaboration.

Generalizability

This multiple case study based on principles of descriptive qualitative methodology was designed to balance depth and breadth and permit reasonable extrapolation (Patton, 1990). Participant selection was planned with researcher and stakeholders' desire for extrapolation in mind (Patton, 1990). The lessons learned from the faculty narratives may have value to policy makers and practitioners investigating innovative transformative pedagogies in higher education. "Unlike the usual meaning of the term generalization, an extrapolation clearly connotes that one has gone beyond the narrow confines of the data to think about other applications of the findings…Extrapolations are logical, thoughtful, case derived, and problem oriented rather than statistical and probabilistic" (Patton, 1990, p. 584). My study may help develop a better understanding of how faculty design and implement effective service-learning curriculum. For practitioners and policy makers at the institution being studied

51

insight of faculty successfully practicing the powerful service-learning pedagogy may offer opportunity to alter policies to increase beneficial outcomes for the students, faculty, administration, and community at large. Listening to voices of selected faculty members from one institution participating in service-learning pedagogy may enrich practitioner and policy maker understanding of how to better institutionalize and actualize benefit from a scholarship of engagement.

This chapter explained the methodological approach selected to study faculty perspectives of service-learning pedagogy. The study was designed so that the results might inform educational professionals interested in implementing innovative pedagogies in higher education. It may be possible to extrapolate findings of this study to accentuate important lessons learned and potential applications to future endeavors. Chapter IV will detail the findings of this study and articulate faculty perspectives of engaged scholarship.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Five a priori essential themes were discussed with each faculty participant as part of my research questions. The findings from these discussions are provided here. The five themes included motivations to utilize service-learning, perception of and expectations for community partners, perception of service-learning structure and composition, association between community engagement and course objectives, and perceived barriers to effective and sustained implementation of service-learning pedagogy. This study explored issues relevant to faculty choosing to integrate community-based scholarship in post-secondary education. While explicating perspectives on broad themes faculty tacit theories of campus community collaboration in service-learning partnerships emerged. Understanding faculty attitudes and perceptions of service-learning pedagogy as engaged scholarship may ultimately inform and shape implementation and integration of campus community collaboration (Schaubelt & Stratham 2007). This research was designed to improve understanding of faculty experiences implementing innovative engaged scholarship. Major categories of faculty perceptions are outlined in Table 1 and identify significant themes and associated concepts emerging from faculty narratives. The emerging themes contributed to a better understanding of faculty attitudes and perceptions of service-learning pedagogy.

Motivations to Utilize Service-Learning

Question One asked participants what motivated them to initiate service-learning in their course curriculum. Earlier research has shown that faculty members engage in service-learning for a variety of reasons (Hou, 2009; Schaubelt & Stratham, 2007;

Table 1. Major Categories of Faculty Perceptions

Major Categories	Associated Concepts
Motivations	• Theoretical Foundations • Student Outcomes • Colleague Support/Encouragement • Connecting with Communities • Social Justice • Personal Reward • Previous Experience
Community Partners	• Defining Need • Teaching Students • Reciprocity/Learning and Teaching • Communication of Expectations • Written Proposals • Verbal Agreements • MOUs • Partner Fade
Structure of Course	• Applied • Experiential • Framework for Community Service • Real World • Reflection • Reciprocity
Course Objectives and Community Engagement	• Hands-on Experience • Benefit to Community Partner • Learning by Doing • Experience not Possible in Classroom • Identified Need
Perceived Barriers	• Time Commitments • Workload • Institutional Support • High Level Administrative Figure • Collaborative Hub • Central Portal • Clearinghouse • General Education

McKay & Rozee, 2004; Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Hammond, 1994). An array of
factors motivate faculty to engage in the community in their teaching practices. These
studies affirmed that previous experience with service-learning in graduate programs or
at other institutions emerged as one major influence to become involved with the engaged

pedagogy. Additional influences included experience working with non-profit organizations, possessing strong internal commitments to civic engagement, connecting students with communities, addressing real-world problems, and fundamental commitment to the theoretical foundations of service-learning pedagogy. Included in the variety of reasons identified in past studies were inclusion of clear identifiable goals rooted in theory as well as existence of institutional understanding, recognition, and support (Cooper, 2014; Abes et al., 2002; Hammond, 1994; Stanton, 1994). Hammond (1994) pointed to factors of personal experience with service and perception of improved student outcomes as relevant motivations to implement service-learning. Collaboration with and mentoring from faculty members was additionally found to be relevant to faculty as was encouragement from students (Abes et al, 2002). Faculty in my study similarly identified a range of motivations for becoming involved in this scholarship of engagement. Findings support results from previous studies. Individual faculty members often identify more than one motivating factor.

Faculty participating in this study identified their awareness of service-learning pedagogy and the theoretical framework undergirding the innovative teaching strategy. Faculty members expressed knowledge of theoretical foundations, proven effective outcomes, and colleague respect for implementing engaged scholarship:

> From a pedagogical perspective this is what we have landed on and we are pretty institutionalized at this point and we think it is a pretty effective model and based on what we are getting from discussions with our colleagues at other institutions at national conferences they also think it is an effective model.

Faculty encouragement, inclusion of identifiable goals rooted in theory, a desire to connect students with communities, and positive student learning outcomes were evident motivations for implementing engaged methodology in one participant's perspective:

> I came on staff as well as another person who actually had a degree in teaching taught high school and so with his expertise we began to think about how we embellish the educational elements of this so it isn't just about a course that is doing projects but how do we really begin to focus on the educational aspect of this and of the approach to this? And also the outcomes in terms of what people were getting out of it and we got a lot of refinements to the program at that point and not only that we started building the program into what it is now and that's including things like having opportunity for reflection ensuring that the projects had well rounded methodologies and tried to touch on different aspects of what we are doing in the classroom so that data collection statistical analysis community outreach and interacting with the public is a really big thing…and then opportunities to engage with professionals and our clients are also professionals in the field and we think a lot of learning can go on in that process**.**

A clear understanding of the theoretical foundations of service-learning methodologies was apparent in the narratives of faculty participating in this study. Jacoby (2003) articulated the underlying assumptions of service-learning pedagogy in her observation that at its core "service-learning is a philosophy of reciprocity, which implies a concerted effort to move from charity to justice, from service to the elimination of need" (p. 4). The adherence to addressing genuine problems defined by the community was repeatedly articulated as a motivation for faculty in this study. Several participants expressed a commitment to engaging community defined needs. One faculty summarized the value of engaged scholarship very clearly:

> It has to be an identified community need. One thing I've learned…is if you have ideas and you just kind of shot gun it you are not very successful you need to have a good program and match it with something and the way to have a good program is to have that idea come

up from the community. So we aren't going into communities and saying you should do this. It is more of us saying what do you need? And I'll send out solicitations as part of my economic administration grant saying districts do you need help on any projects if yes fill out this form and we'll try to match resources with you and so through a long period of time we have developed a reputation as a group that can get that work done and trained a next generation of leaders in this state and I think the value proposition is pretty clear to most of our clients.

Faculty members additionally expressed an awareness of the intrinsic value of campus community collaboration consistent with one participant who observed that "we think of ourselves like policy extension we are…working out in communities doing things on behalf of the institution for communities and I think there is a lot of value to that." Recognition of the value for the institution, community, and students was an additional common theme articulated by faculty participants. The perception that student learning outcomes are comparatively better in the context of community engaged scholarship was expressed by several faculty members consistent with one participant's description of receiving student feedback:

If you do this once you realize wow the students are more engaged in this than they used to be when I taught it the old way which is … only in the classroom. I always get comments back from students afterward that say that was great it was challenging but I learned so much more because we worked with a real client … the students get it in the end … this is more work than I expected … all that is more work for students but in the end they say it was worth it.

Faculty implementing community engaged learning strategies in this study repeatedly referenced positive feedback and recognition that student outcomes were a motivation to teach service-learning courses:

When you get their feedback at the end of the term we have had students say this is the best class that I've taken this is my senior year and my last class that I am ever going to take at the university it has created a trajectory for where I really want to go and it has really allowed me to see a vision for what I can do in the future so those are the reasons we teach…because we get feedback like that and we feel that what we are offering is something beneficial.

Another participant expressed the common sentiment that witnessing positive student outcomes was personally rewarding:

Well, I only teach part time I have a full time job so for me to take time out and to teach at the university level it has to be something I feel I either have expertise that I can share or there is something I personally benefit from so service-learning classes fit the bill for both of those. I have a large background in gardening but I really get a lot out of seeing the connections that are made in the garden whether it is university students or reentry clients or parents with kids it is personally rewarding and then it is also personally rewarding to see the connections that happen and the learning that takes place in students.

Personal adherence to applied learning methodology and rewarding personal professional experience were cited by several participants as contributing to choosing to implement service-learning pedagogy:

Applied learning just from a personal standpoint really appealed to me…before I even knew anything about the fact that learning by doing or teaching ended up being the most effective ways to really integrate things into your professional experience into your education so that got me really excited.

Embracing a scholarship of engagement and acknowledging the role of service has been shown in the literature to contribute to faculty experiencing integrated academic lives (Ward, 2003).

Previous experience with service-learning as graduate students was referenced by several participants as a motivating factor for including community engagement in their curriculum:

> I became exposed to off campus engagement as a graduate student…I got exposed as a graduate student…I was steeped in community engagement and I just saw that this is the only way to go when applicable to help students connect with real world problems real world solutions the extra challenge of working with clients the opportunities of that come with learning and working with teams all the great thing that come with community engagement so whenever I've had a class that I've taught I've always looked for ways to make that engagement happen…I have other classes where I think about and struggle with making that happen…logistical things make including community engagement difficult.

Other experiences with service-learning outside of post-secondary environments and adherence to intrinsic values of social justice were additionally referenced by participants in this study as a contributor to implementing engaged scholarship in higher education:

> There is the whole social justice piece…the effort to…look at problems critically…be really mindful of power and privilege in that relationship especially coming from a university perspective…I used to do service-learning with K-8 kids but that gives a whole other institutional power dynamic to everything…so being really mindful of that and being really mindful of really trying to look at where the systems cause problems and not just go out and distribute food or distribute needles and not just go out and plant a tree but really think about why do we need to do this and can we put ourselves out of business…that would be awesome**.**

Participants expressed knowledge of characteristics of service-learning compared to other forms of experiential learning. Faculty members exhibited awareness of characteristics that distinguish service-learning from other forms of community engagement:

> I think the most important things that would differentiate a service-learning course from say an internship experience is the focus on meaningful service so actually having an impact as

opposed to going to get job experience for myself…I always tell my students I wouldn't

encourage you to do this just to put it on your resume…but you are going to do this it will

be awesome and you can put it on your resume…because you know I live in the real world

and also the other really important piece is…to discern service-learning from a volunteer

experience you do on your own which…is the existence of…course material…they both

enrich each other…the course enriches your experience and your experience enriches what

you are doing in the course.

The concept of meaningful service that directly addressed needs of the community and at

the same time provided an enriching educational experience was firmly embraced as a

motivating factor for faculty participants in this study. Jacoby (2003) explains this

reciprocal relationship by pointing to how "The hyphen in service-learning symbolizes

the symbiotic relationship between service and learning…the human and community

needs that service-learning addresses are those needs that are defined by the community"

(p. 4). The experiences students have in the community and the classroom profoundly

impacted several faculty members. Knowledge that students were being transformed by

the real-world experiences in the community and reflection on those experiences in the

classroom solidified faculty support for the pedagogy:

> I think for a lot of students it is important to talk about it and see it with your own eyes at
>
> the same time you know especially students that are in positions of relative power or
>
> whatever…I think they can talk about it all they want or they can go out and volunteer all
>
> they want but there is something that happens when they are out doing their volunteer work
>
> and they come in and say this is what I saw and then we have readings that…encourage
>
> them to look at those things and then for a lot of students there is this…it is not an ah ha
>
> moment it is more of a oh my god moment that I am part of this and you can go and
>
> volunteer at an after school program and think kids are cute and everything and you can
>
> take an education class and learn…the system is imperfect but when you are doing them
>
> both at once it is much more impactful.

While student learning was a clear motivating factor for implementing service-learning projects, benefit to community partners was equally relevant to faculty respondents.

Perception of Community Partners

Question Two questioned faculty perception about the role of community partners in their service-learning pedagogy. Community partners are an essential element to any service-learning course. Previous findings indicate that maintaining quality community partnerships is integral to positive service-learning experiences and outcomes. Faculty in this study confirmed the importance of maintaining reciprocal mutually beneficial relationships with community partners and identified methods to cultivate effective partners and maintain partnerships. Findings of this study show that communication up front including a possible presentation of written proposal or MOU, and extensive discussion of expectations are techniques that faculty have developed to establish and maintain community partnerships. In one interview, a faculty member identified developing and sustaining relationships with community partners as something to work on improving as an institution:

> Community partners are extremely important…as both…teachers of our students focused on the ins and outs of what goes on out there but also by asking us or rather telling us what needs to be done. But it is really hard especially with…the massive institutional power and privilege issues of the university…it is really hard. But that is something I would like to work on as an institution…as a team. To really work on doing that better because we all have our own relationships… so we are doing well with our partnerships and there are other entities on campus that have great relationships with different partners but I think we could have a bigger impact if we looked at it as a united front kind of…actually the Carnegie folks when they gave out the Carnegie classifications…that is one of the biggest problems that they identified that even the best institutions have a hard time maintaining community partnerships.

The suggestion that more collaboration amongst those working with community partners might help maintain lasting relationships is a new finding in this study. Faculty elaborate on aspirations for a collaborative hub or clearinghouse in more detail in their discussions of perceived barriers. One interview participant touched on the perceived benefit of expanding community engaged scholarship for the students, the community, and the institution simultaneously:

> I don't know about ideal but I would describe it as democratic or equal partnership with a lot more input from community on the teaching side as well as the what needs done side…they are teaching the students in some ways and I think the closer we work with community partners the more opportunities they can give students and the more impact students and the institution as a whole can have in the community.

The role of community partners as educator accentuated the importance of establishing and maintaining quality community partnerships. While the goal for faculty choosing community partners is to build relationships that maximize benefits for students and community participants reciprocally, faculty expressed that even less than optimal partnerships can yield benefits:

> I will always attempt to continue to work with them…sometimes it is just a problem of them not having a volunteer coordinator…or know what to do or…handle a volunteer…if they are willing to sort of hash it out and share ideas I would totally be willing to do that. But they are a strapped non-profit they don't have time to talk for hours with me about how to prepare for my students so they are more likely to not take a volunteer than I am to not send them…I think it is just so important to have them both side by side even a not ideal or kind of disappointing volunteer opportunity is better than none…Send them over to…clean bird crap for a couple of hours…you aren't always going to waltz into a place and be organizing the next Dr. King day event…update the data base and learn something…or clean the poop and learn something…I can't imagine doing it without a community partner what would that look like?

The notion that disappointing community placements were better than no placement was expressed by some participants. While several faculty had protocols in place to communicate expectations for the community partner and insulate against disappointing experiences some faculty participants, shared the perception that the community partner might not have the time to prepare and took it upon themselves to work with the student to make the best of the experience despite less than optimal opportunities:

> You know you always hear these stories and this still happens that a student will say hey I heard about such and such organization I want to volunteer there so they go volunteer they are in the class and the people don't know what to do with them they are standing around…and the organization…wants a volunteer and then they don't really know what to do so we have to help the volunteers get the most out of it.

The perception that the community partner did not have the time to talk about expectations was not a commonly held perspective amongst participants. Most participating faculty emphasized a desire to communicate with the community partner before the student placement to make sure that the partner was committed to the project. The willingness to spend time up front to discuss project mission and expectations was perceived as an indication that the partner would dedicate needed time and energy to the student in the community placement. Working with community partners before the placement to ensure that they were committed to the students' education was a sentiment held by many faculty participants in this study. Faculty members designed protocols to identify partners and clearly communicated expectations prior to a students' community placement:

> Our clients tend to be local government entities…non-profit organizations and occasionally private sector…so with the projects we bring to the classroom there is always an identified client. What we mean by that is there is an individual a person on the other end that is

invested in the students' education so we are very clear about our mission with the sponsors that you are getting service but you are also investing into an educational program and with that comes the obligation to do some education and the obligation to accept that students may not be as polished as professional consultants…that have decades of experience for example.

The clear communication of mission with partners was a priority for many faculty participants in this study. The approach to communicating expectations and developing a commitment from community participants varied and took several forms from verbal agreements, to several drafts of written proposals to formal memorandum of understanding. A written proposal presented to possible community partners was one desired approach of communicating expectations:

A lot of them find me. A lot of them are repeats. There are times I send out feeler notes. I look for clients that understand these are students. I look for willingness to be open about implementation issues they must want to hear student perspectives a lot of times project doesn't go 8 weeks…they have to be available to be here for the presentation they have to commit to be the data gatherers within the company….so my proposal will say what we need to have …tech labs is a perfect example…they thought we could use their database… they have to want to work with them…if they are not responsive to me they are off the list. That's about it I don't ask much more the time that is most productive is the time up front…the first proposal draft is important…if they start talking about the process they are in if they are not an active participant they rarely get into the mix…I have had people who play nicely but when project starts they become duds. There is always a way if client doesn't deliver what is plan b or c contingency plan is important.

The written proposal draft functioned as a type of screening process for this faculty member. Contingency plans were in place for this participant if a partner did not deliver. Another method developed by participating faculty as a response to encountering lack of

64

adequate engagement on the part of community partners is the memorandum of

understanding:

> I just use the shot gun approach in that I advertise as widely as I can….what I have learned
> over the years is that the discussion the set up needs to be more thoughtful and more
> involved that it used to be…I used to basically say oh you're interested ok we'll do it for
> you and that's what leads to a lot of groups learning through the process…this isn't what I
> thought…it was oh we are not as engaged as we should be…we are not ready for this so
> that has led to drop off over the years so what I have learned through this is that there needs
> to be a lot more education up front there needs to be more discussion about
> expectations…and both ways. What can the students expect from you and what can you
> expect from the students…and what it has led to this past year is the first time I actually
> have the organization sign a memorandum of understanding that gets them on the hook that
> says here is what you are expected to do here is what the students are expected to
> do…Again to set the hook that we have these expectations of you and you are going to take
> this seriously.

For others the expectations are communicated verbally in a series of meetings or

conversations:

> The learners are involved in what they learn and the way we address that is that students
> come up with learning goals that both fit within the structure of the project so I'd say that's
> one of the more challenging elements…directly to the principles of service-learning in our
> programs…One of the things we will do typically with a new client when we first meet
> with them is say you need to understand our educational mission here and what we are
> trying to accomplish through this and then talk about ways that they might engage in that
> educational mission and universally they are supportive of it and a lot of professionals
> really enjoy working with students because they are different they are young and have got
> good ideas some have lots of good ideas. Maybe a little unrealistic but sometimes having a
> fresh perspective can be very useful. In what we typically do and have for the last several
> years do exit surveys with our client to talk about how the project went and how we might
> improve our service delivery.

When asked about written proposals or other protocols shared with community partners to express expectations, this faculty member showed interest but indicated "No we haven't done that. It has always been just a conversation. I think that is an interesting suggestion I will take up at one of our faculty meetings to see how people feel about it." Despite the lack of written protocols for this faculty participant, a desire for clearly articulated goals and a process to follow up with community partners to articulate expectations is essential to the process of community engagement:

> At the foundational level it is an interesting working with students I can't fire them if they don't perform. For us failure is really not an option. And if something goes wrong I am the one who gets to take the blame for it. The most foundational level of their expectation is the things we said we would do in the work program are the things that will get done. So those expectations end up being I think pretty articulate and in some instances we will structure work programs so there are interim steps where we meet with a client to make sure we are preceding in the right direction.

Articulating expectation and taking steps to make certain that community partners were meeting expectations was common practice communicated by most interviewees. While communicating expectations before implementing the community placement was a goal of most practitioners of service-learning pedagogy in this study, it was clear that faculty members were generally aware that projects and expectations would vary and adaption to produce desired outcomes was desirable and recognized as inevitable:

> From the community's perspective in a democratic society it is sometimes hard to control for those expectations and I think for many people they understand we are working with students but…when we go work with a public committee we don't go in and say well here are our educational objectives it is more of an implicit strategy that we take and it is intentional in part because we want those lessons to be organic in the sense that they occur in the cycle of the project. Rather than saying you should do this sometimes we will meet

66

with our clients and I say we'd like you to do this as part of the education of the students so it can be wildly varying in terms of what the expectations are but typically there is a project and the project has deliverables.

While recognizing the inherent difficulty controlling for expectations with community partners, this faculty participant embraced the organic nature of each community placement as part of the educational lessons that occurred during projects.

Regardless of the chosen method, carefully selecting community partners, communicating expectations ahead of time, and preparing alternative strategies for community partners who may fade away were identified as essential steps to maintaining effective and meaningful community placements for students. The chance that community partners might lose interest or fade away was acknowledged by most of the faculty participants in this study. The recognition that not all community partners retain a solid commitment to the project once it had started was clear in this faculty member's perspective:

> Yes, the non-profit sometimes they just fade away or they don't respond quickly to the students' request and you know ten weeks goes by just like that so if the student has to wait two weeks for a response to a question sometimes nothing moves forward for two weeks because the client hasn't got back to them with the data they need or whatever the answer is.

Another faculty member acknowledged willingness to let community partners drop to avoid harm to students' educational experience emphasizing that putting in a significant amount of time up front makes a failed partnership less likely:

> Along that time people will probably drop out because they'll be like I can't support this time I can't do this. Because my proposals are very clear on my expectations…a firm that will not be named we went through and had 3 proposals they were all gung ho and all of a sudden they went AWOL and stopped returning phone calls. So I wrote back and said not

interested if you can't return my phone calls and my emails you are not going to return the students'. So that's great that they are falling off and they don't end up screwing up the students so I would say on every single project I probably spend four hours to five hours trying to set it up plus and that includes doing the briefing getting the briefing material loaded in and the blackboard set up and stuff so its 40 to 60 hours but I have been doing this so long I can knock out a proposal in an hour and a half.

The preparation phase of campus community collaboration was identified by several faculty members as one way to insulate against community partners fading away over time:

I spend the summer interviewing and advertising…so I reach out to local non-profits and say here is this opportunity to have a student team build a strategic plan for you then I interview every non-profit and talk with the Executive Director and go to a board meeting to make sure they are on board because one of the challenges around any kind of off campus engagement where you require some kind of engagement with somebody else is that they have to take it as seriously as you do so you as a faculty member and the students you are taking this seriously you're doing real work students expect a grade faculty member expects some type of a product out of this so they can grade the students and over the years I have occasionally had a group that kind of fades away over time. Because from their perspective this is free so you know at some level they feel you get what you pay for.

Another interviewee articulated a strategy for adapting to a failed partnership in the middle of a quarter by shifting partners but maintaining project focus:

Well, I would say we had one partner that just kind of faded and so if your partner at some point loses interest in your project without fully engaging in where that's going it makes it pretty challenging and if that is your sole mission for the class then it is pretty hard…[so you need a] change of focus there was a time when the federal reentry clients just got fewer and fewer either there is not enough push from the top to actually come to the garden or what we learned they actually have a lot of demands on their time and for them to actually be out in the garden when what they need to be doing is either going to school themselves…they weren't getting credit for our class. They were busy trying to get a job or

housing or reconnect with family or friends. So it really became an extracurricular activity for them at some point there were just fewer and fewer of them in the garden so our partnership of growing food with them faded so we just kind of changed games. We decided that we would focus more on at risk youth and we started working with some folks at [a juvenile detention] center and then worked with…a charter school and just found that we had a very similar mission of growing food for people in need that we could find a different partner to achieve that goal.

Ultimately, most faculty participants in this study identified conversations with potential community partners before initiating a project as an essential practice to increase chances for successful and positive service-learning experiences. Choosing a meaningful community placement and initiating several conversations with the partner about time commitment, student-centered educational objectives, and trajectory for the project over time was articulated by several participating faculty as best practices in service-learning pedagogy:

So, I advertise to non-profits about this idea of engaging in strategic planning there are varying levels of understanding about what that really means every organization has to think where they will be in a few years… What's coming up over the horizon…students will reach out to experts…whatever is appropriate for that group…so students reach out and ask strengths weaknesses opportunities and threats. I explain this to the non-profit…students are doing most of the work…the student's job is to develop that roadmap…so I've learned it takes more and more discussions in the set up phase…to lead to a higher level of success during the process.

My study identified faculty perspectives on maintaining relationships with community partners and findings suggest that communication using a variety of methods before entering into the reciprocal relationship makes successful, sustaining, and mutually beneficial partnerships more likely. Faculty have discovered ways to change their practices to adapt to problems that arise. Identification of best practices, potential

69

problems, and viable solutions in campus community collaboration may be useful for policy makers and practitioners implementing service-learning pedagogy. Faculty perspectives on community partners suggest that there is a universal understanding that community placement is an integral component to service-learning and without development and maintenance of committed community partners perpetuating a scholarship of engagement would not be possible.

Description of Service-Learning Structure and Composition

Question Three solicited faculty description of the structural components of service-learning. A better understanding of the impact of engaged scholarship on faculty illuminated the potentialities of service-learning as a strategy for generating and sustaining conditions that facilitate faculty growth and learning. Faculty perspectives in this study shed light on how rethinking traditional pedagogical approaches contributed to both faculty and student educational outcomes. Faculty perceived the teaching and learning strategies they were implementing to be innovative and effective. One participant described the process of picking community partners as a way to provide unique opportunities for students to participate in true community service:

> I like to pick projects that will stretch the students and will make the students feel a little uncomfortable but where I do believe that they may not know it but I know that opportunities they have had in the school have given them foundational work that they can apply so I don't see it as community service in terms of a volunteer…kind of thing the way I would normally think of my service sitting on a board or those kind of things I do hope the opportunity though lets students understand that they have been given a gift of an education and a framework…and tools and they have talents and they can apply those both within a company they may go to but they hopefully open their eyes at 22, 23, 24, 25 that they have value they can bring to an organization so maybe even jumpstart some of their what …I will call true community service activities.

70

The perspective that faculty members are providing a framework for innovative experiential opportunities to students was commonly expressed by participants in this study:

> A lot of what I am looking for is students given an opportunity where they can apply the frameworks that they are learning in the classroom…In a real world kind of setting…and the service to me is experiential learning to the extent that it crosses over to service-learning being that's where I think my definition of service is where you not only can provide assistance but potentially have an impact and the trick for that conversion for me is picking the clients and picking the projects so there are lots of opportunities where a company say they want to be involved with students I think there is a smaller subset of picking and filtering out those that the students can do and I don't mean that they can with a slam dunk.

Challenging students and providing a community forum in which they can apply frameworks from the classroom was the goal expressed by numerous faculty members participating in this study. The reciprocal nature of the relationship between students and community partners was identified by all participating faculty in a fashion similar to this respondent:

> It is a course that's offered that allows university students to engage with the community …and it is a reciprocal process where students are learning from the community group and the community group is learning from the students. That is the basis…you are able to take university students in, take information that they have gained in the classroom or from other classes…actually implement that work out in the community and in real projects…and the community group benefits from the knowledge that they have…whatever expertise that might be or energy or hours or…physical strength any of those things can contribute to what the community group is in need of.

Faculty expressed awareness that they were designing intentional experiences that may be perceived as pushing students into situations that that make them feel uncomfortable or stifle their creativity. All participating faculty exhibited confidence that the decisions

71

made about placement and project would benefit students and were comparatively better than other educational experiences.

> One of the things people might say looking from the outside…is you are really ratcheting down on the creativity students have…because you are coming in with a work program, an identified client and a specific product. And my response to that would be yes but…these are complicated and involved projects and there is plenty of opportunity with the scope of that work for creativity and thinking hard about a lot of different things and for students to direct the course of that research so we are operating at a different level…and is it better? Yes I would like to think it is better.

Several faculty participants compared typical classroom experiences to the dynamic application of a community placement experience available in their courses. The experiential aspects of engaging the community as part of course curriculum were perceived to be advantageous for students and community participants. One faculty member explained the reciprocal mutually beneficial relationship with a local elementary school:

> Well, it is much more applied is the key thing…where the projects that you do have a really obvious result there is an obvious goal and you can physically and emotionally see what happens through that process. It is not just reading and writing papers and doing research. Things like that that you actually get a response…you know we see the response through the kids…and that those kids actually engage and want to come and be a part of the project that we are doing…and the university students…it is a fabulous matching for them because they are just now at a point they can look back and if they have younger siblings or nieces or nephews they are actually able to reconnect with kids at that age at the elementary age…because they have gone through a little process of separating from family and little kids and all of a sudden they find little kids really interesting and engaging…the best quote that we have is one little girl kept coming up to us at recess and saying when do the teenagers arrive they didn't care much about the instructors but they just thought the college students/teenagers were the most awesome thing they'd had on campus it is really cool.

72

The impact innovative teaching practices has on students and community partner was frequently referenced by participants as a result of a more applied learning environment rooted in a strong theoretical framework and supported by literature:

> We have several programs here but our mission has been to engage students in applied work service hence the name community service generally…in educational processes. So service-learning in our view is a process of engaging students in a controlled environment in doing work that is directly related to their educational goals and we go down and we spend quite a bit of time looking through the literature on this and there is a pretty substantial body of literature.

Core principals of service-learning were cited frequently as key to course implementation:

> But we try the extent possible to implement the core principals of reflection and reciprocity to have students engaged to the extent that we can in developing their program for what they want to learn in this under faculty guidance…to provide them with the opportunity to in our discipline to interact with both the community through public engagement but also with our clients.

Faculty articulated their role in guidance to provide opportunity for students when explaining course goals and practices. Faculty adherence to and insistence on core principals of service-learning pedagogy are exemplified by this respondent's explanation of reflection in the classroom:

> Both faculty and the students saying here are some things you did really well here are some things we think you could improve and that's proving to be a really effective approach in sort of rapid fire education so we do that we have reflection sessions where we use a bunch of different ways to do those reflection sessions but part of what we do is the literature is really clear on reflection and it is something I wish as a professional I had more time to do because trying to run this program and bring in money and keep myself and everybody else employed doesn't allow me a lot of time to kind of sit back and think about what am I

learning from this and how can I use that to enhance our programs and its interesting because we get pushback from students who say I don't reflect…well that's ok but you are going to reflect in this class whether you want to or not so that's the classroom component and they integrate pretty well…sometimes we'll have our clients come into the class and talk with students either to the entire class or to their specific team.

Rethinking traditional pedagogical approaches challenges faculty to understand the context of service-learning within their discipline, acknowledge their contributions in cultivating conceptual frameworks such as ethical responsibility and leadership, and actualize community partners as both teachers and learners (Pribbenow, 2005).

Association between Community Engagement and Course Objectives

Question Four probed community engagement in relation to fulfilling course goals and objectives. While faculty participants articulated very clearly that the classroom or in some cases garden time allowed for critical reflection, debriefing, and sharing of stories, discussions of the importance of community partners in enabling these course objectives were equally prevalent. The essential characteristics of finding and maintaining community partnerships and sharing experiences with other learners and teachers in facilitated discussions are woven into explanations of experiences throughout the interview transcripts. Recognition that the symbiotic hands-on nature of community placement and classroom reflection positively impacts students was clearly articulated by faculty. Faculty similarly linked themes of collaboration, consultation, and partnership into discussions of course objectives.

The primary purpose of this course is to learn to do hands-on experience with economic research and students develop an appropriate topic and detailed prospectus for an undergraduate honors thesis in economics. Students learn to apply the tools of economic

74

analysis to real-world problems. Students work as part of a team and a community partner. Teams complete the project with lots of help from me and in consultation with their community partner.

The awareness that student placement in the community benefits community partners at the same time it provides unique learning opportunities for students was clear from this faculty member's explanation that "my goal is to find interesting, important, and tractable projects that will provide a significant benefit to the community partner."

Faculty goals for their courses frequently referenced students learning by doing and obtaining real-world experience:

I think it really helps because…we expect students are going to go out and get professional jobs…and this gives them some real world experience so it's not sitting in a classroom reading a theory reading other plans that other people have developed or me telling them war stories of here is something that happened or didn't happen or here is a problem you might encounter. They learn all that by doing and it becomes real for them. And it raises their expectations because they are not just satisfying my needs or my expectations to get a grade…there is this external group where they will be presenting at the end…this raises the bar in a couple of ways one their presenting to strangers and then two these strangers have questions of them and they better be prepared for those questions.

This faculty participant perceived that student expectations were raised by the awareness that they were accountable to the community partner. The course objective of presenting to a community group at the end of the project required students to engage and understand the needs and perspectives of the community partner throughout the process. The placement in the community uniquely allows students to apply knowledge acquired in the classroom. Student experiences while working with community partners cannot be replicated in the classroom as this faculty member posited:

75

> Two years ago I had a grant…two of them…one through EPA and one through the Dept. of environmental quality and one of our communities we were working with was [a rural town nearby] and so we went up to a city council meeting…to tell them what we were doing and the students did their presentation and a gentleman in the audience stood up and basically started attacking the student saying I don't believe that these laws are legitimate why are you here and so on and I stepped in because we try to control the learning environment a little bit. But the point I'm trying to make is that is not an experience that can be replicated in the classroom. And it is an experience for better or for worse that happens more frequently than we would like it to happen in our discipline. So that is a big reason we want people out in communities is that it is our laboratory for lack of a better term.

This reference to the community placement as a laboratory in this discipline highlights the essential nature of community engagement in service-learning pedagogy. Without the study there is no discussion. Some faculty referenced certain topics that could not be taught adequately in a typical classroom:

> Well, it's traditional to our discipline and there are different schools of thought about role of government in the united states obviously…in a democratic environment…and that communities should have a voice in decisions being made that affect them…because the first goal is citizen involvement but we also…create a learning environment that is unique and unpredictable in ways that are really quite robust in terms of teaching and from my looking at other service-learning programs in our discipline around the country most of them are doing things off campus in communities however you define communities some are neighborhoods…some are cities we work statewide we don't tend to do a lot of work outside of [the state]…there's plenty of need out there and we work with communities that actually have some sort of identified need so that engagement is central to what we…do and it is really hard…you can teach strategies for public involvement in the classroom and there is a pretty broad body of literature on how to do public involvement but you can't teach how it works in the community in the classroom.

Engagement is central to what this faculty member perceived to be their discipline's essential purpose. Teaching how public involvement in the community works requires an

applied approach. Course objectives required community engagement for all faculty participants.

The traditional pedagogic model emphasizes an individualistic, teacher-centered, classroom with the primary objective of information dissemination (Pribbinow, 2005). In a service-learning classroom, the responsibility for teaching and learning is shared by instructors and students synergistically. In the service-learning pedagogy the instructor and students redefined the classroom together. Pribbinow (2005) explained "by re-socializing themselves around a new set of roles, relationships, and norms" (p. 26). One faculty member discussed the impact of community placement at a local elementary school:

> And it puts everyone on the same level which is what service-learning is really great at…so the elementary students, university students, parents, teachers, faculty you give one little bit of instruction and everyone is on the same page and you can really kind of can jump in it is a great way to put everyone in one place and then you start learning about people.

Redefinition of roles, relationships, and norms is an essential characteristic of service-learning pedagogy. Perceptions of the role of community engagement as a metaphorical text for the class were represented by one participant:

> We used to say that the community placement was one of the texts for the class but I thought that sounded really…I didn't like it I thought it sounded pompous. I am not that much into academy talk…which is a problem…sometimes…I didn't think students would care…but that is exactly what it means…It is more grist for the mill…so students will most often come in…from their site and reflect on it and it is our job as instructor to say that reminds me of such and such in the reading or how somebody else would jump in and say you are at a different site how does it tie in with what you are doing…I mean it would just be another class if we were not out in the community…we would just be sitting there talking about what other people say… and not making our own stuff to say.

77

While this faculty member did not approve of the lexicon of community placement as a textbook, they observed that the community experience was uniquely relevant to course objectives. Without the community placement, reflection, and the sharing of narratives from teachers and learners a service-learning course would not have the same meaning and "it would be just another class." Establishing connections with people in the community allows students to encounter different cultural frames of reference:

> The interaction with the community with people who come from a different framework and frankly we try to do things in rural communities number one because there is a lot of need and number two you are not in the bubble…[of the city] and it exposes people to different frames of references and different cultures in the community and I think that contributes a lot it fits in with what we think are the university's equity and inclusion goals and we've been doing a lot of work with Latino cultures…but culturally…people say [the state] is a pretty homogenous place so that might mean interacting with people with different political perspectives than you or simply live in a different environment. Rural [state] is a very unique and different place than the campus of the university.

Placement in the community allows faculty to design a more dynamic and topic specific course than they would be able to do without experiential methodology. Student work in the field provided unique opportunities and lessons in this course that transcended the classroom according to the instructor:

> And one of the things I've learned over a period of time is that students get really invested in topics…students get really engaged with the topics but what we tell them is over the course of six months you will probably not become an expert in this. It typically takes longer than that but the vehicle of taking a project that is sponsored from start to finish by typically our faculty usually me will write the…program that we are contractually obligated to do but the students get to think through all of the elements of how do we collect data for this if we are doing a survey what questions do we ask how do we frame the project…how

do we engage the community…how do we engage with our client and those kinds of

things how do we work together in a team without getting at each other's throats? So all of

those things end up being lessons that I think transcend the classroom.

The symbiotic nature of community placement and classroom reflection was identified

consistently by faculty participating in this study. Course objectives universally entailed a

community placement and a classroom component.

Perceived Barriers to Sustained Implementation of Service-Learning

Question Five asked about the potential / perceived barriers to the incorporation

of a service-learning component in curriculum. Previous discussion of research in the

review of literature identified potential barriers perceived by practitioners of service-

learning. Lack of institutional recognition of the pedagogy as a scholarly activity and lack

of recognition in the faculty reward structure were found to be significant disincentives to

participating in the innovative teaching programs (Gray, Ondaatje, & Zacaras, 1999;

Hammond, 1994; Morton & Troppe, 1996; Stanton, 1994, Ward, 1998). Inadequate

funding for developing and implementing new curriculum and identifying appropriate

community partners were also referenced by practitioners as challenges and perceived

barriers (Levine, 1994; Stanton, 1994; Driscoll, Holland, Gellman, & Kerrigan, 1996;

Ward, 1996). Difficulties with implementation and logistics, perceived time

commitments, and already large course loads were also identified in the literature as

possible deterrents to implementing engaged scholarship in the classes they teach (UCLA

Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project, 1999).

Faculty observances in my study were consistent with previous findings shining

light on challenges inherent in incorporation of service-learning into one's teaching,

research, and service. The potential perceived barriers mentioned by participants in this

study included the time required of faculty and students, institutional and colleague support, resources from the department, administration or other sources, and reward structure including discussion of the tenure and promotion process. On the topic of institutionalization, lack of implementation of policies perceived as potentially beneficial was included in the category of perceived barrier or challenges. Faculty pointed to the lack of a general education requirement in service-learning, for example, as a barrier to being able to get an adequate number of students into the class, ultimately threatening the continued viability of the class. Participants also pointed to examples of other institutions that had central collaborative clearinghouses or centralized service-learning offices when asked to describe potential barriers. Additionally, the lack of a high level administrative officer in charge of service-learning pedagogy was cited as a challenging barrier. Embedded in the faculty expositions on potential barriers were inferred position statements and policy advocacy. Ultimately, by clearly identifying potential inherent barriers to implementing and sustaining service-learning pedagogy policy makers and practitioners may be able to address pertinent issues and facilitate successful innovative strategies and solutions.

The results of this study in the area of faculty perception of barriers and potential deterrents to effective and sustained implementation of service-learning are consistent with previous research. Faculty in this study identified more time and more work as two possible impediments to implementing and sustaining service-learning partnerships:

> Well, it takes a lot of time. Service-learning classes by far just take so much more time than just teaching in a regular class room. I mean even if you don't have the component of having to manage a garden which doesn't stand by itself when you leave on break for five weeks so a barrier of time is really challenging because just setting up meeting times with

your partner, organizing meeting with them ahead of time, meeting with them afterwards to see how things worked out so time is a challenge. I would say the only other barriers really that I see are having other faculty or partners acknowledge the process that you go through because it really isn't a normal or at least it is not now a normal thing maybe in the future it will be more normal I see more of it happening but recognizing that leaving campus or having elementary kids come out to the garden so I think just getting out of the norm for everybody presents different challenges so people have to recognize that you are not always just sitting there presenting information and then people go away and do homework and come back. Whether that is fifth graders or university students.

Faculty implementing service-learning courses are investing more time than many of their colleagues. This participant expressed an aspiration to be acknowledged by others for the time spent developing innovative teaching strategies. A typical assessment of workload for a service-learning course emphasized the amount of work required before course, including finding and preparing community partners:

We get it we are very applied so faculty get it and realize it is beneficial to the students but it takes more work I don't know if anybody puts as much time and effort into prepping as I do so the class I described…I had 7 teams and I did 25 off campus meetings over the summer to prep for that again that is me learning over time that it takes more prep and thankfully it is a fall term class summer is a bit lighter so I've got the time to go meet people off campus if it were some other term it would be a lot tougher. It would be hard in other fields [to say] here is something to do but it will take more work.

The perceived deterrent of prohibitive time commitment is consistent with previous research. This participant surmises that some fields may have a tougher time implementing service-learning pedagogy. Workload was perceived as a potential barrier to expanding service-learning curriculum across disciplines.

Despite barriers that exist for campus community collaboration across disciplines, faculty members perceive their programs and others on campus to have value to students, themselves, community partners, and the university:

> To do the community engagement piece really well and really democratically working with community partners is to decide what we should do and to have community partner have a voice in teaching. Because right now we ask them to teach students without having any overall mechanism for community feedback I guess so we have all these great programs and we have all these great community and government relations folks [others] do a great job with their part and we do a great job with our part but it is just little pockets of awesome.

Lack of collaboration amongst those faculty embracing engaged scholarship was described by this participant as isolated pockets of excellence. They indicated that the institution lacked any mechanism for community feedback. Several participants suggest possible mechanisms to improve on the problem of lack of communication and collaboration across and between successful programs.

> Yes, all the good ones do [have institutionalized service-learning] I think it would be great the question is how to do that without taking agency away from the folks that are already doing that great work…because they don't want to be told what to do…they are doing great …so how do you acknowledge that and figure out how to have some sort of central clearinghouse, not for centralized control but just for coordination and collaboration

The suggestion of a centralized clearinghouse to coordinate and collaborate with programs participating in service-learning pedagogy was mentioned by many participants. The potential problem of encroaching on autonomy or taking away agency was additionally discussed by faculty members.

Faculty members articulated the concept of institutionalization in terms of resource allocation and central support.

Well, money if we had money we would have more teachers and have more stuff like art supplies for the after school program all that stuff we would be able to put on meetings for community partners which would involve feeding them which…would be nice and get more people to come. I think the central coordinating infrastructure would really help get it out into different departments like chemistry human physiology all these. I know there is a service-learning class happening in the English department. I think it would be so great if we could collaborate together on time, money, and had central support… I think institutionally we have problems…if we could get our act together here then we could have better community partnerships I think.

Awareness that successful service-learning was occurring on campus but collaboration was lacking was a new finding in this study. The absence of a perceived central support system appeared to be associated with a lack of collaboration and information sharing. Instituting service-learning more broadly was identified as feasible on the campus despite the possible perception that autonomy may be eroded:

I think it would I think there are some inconsistencies when I started we didn't know a thing about it we just started digging in. we are like we're doing service-learning. I wonder what the literature says about this. 25 years ago there was an enormous body of research and it keeps growing. Conferences on it there are some foundational principles of how this service-learning works that can be instituted and I think can be instituted more broadly across the curriculum than it is right now. The key issue is how do you do that without making a bunch of faculty mad that you are dictating how they teach.

The lack of information sharing might impede implementation of service-learning more broadly across disciplines according to this participant's perspective. At the same time faculty perceived service-learning to be embedded in every level of the institution:

There was a period in the 1990s there were a number of faculty in this department that were outright hostile to what we were doing. Because they didn't believe there was value in service-learning and the role of an academic institution was to be dealing with lofty ideas

not teaching skills…so as it turns out over the last 25 years that I have been here…service-learning is embedded in just about every element of the institution. So it feels like it has come full circle but we certainly don't have as much institutional support as in other places.

Instituting service-learning more broadly across the curriculum will take a significant increase in institutional support. The mechanisms are in place and effective practices are being implemented across several disciplines. The perceived lack of optimal institutional support is a barrier to effective and sustained implementation of service-learning pedagogy.

The idea that the university has problems with community trust was introduced by faculty participants. Perceptions that the institution might benefit from working to build relationships with communities external to campus were expressed by participants. Faculty suggested that nurturing relationships in the community may help rebuild community trust of the institution:

> You know our default is that we want to teach our students so when we talk about assessment…almost always talking about what our students learned. And very rarely about what did our students actually accomplish so really [participating department] is another great example they have relationships with folks. Folks that host and teach their students basically…they have a community advisory board that is very active they just manage that relationship really, really well and when it comes down to it count up the number of hours and multiply it by the dollar amount from the bureau of labor and statistics and say that is our impact so that is what I am trying to sell to the dean or the college dean and to dean of undergraduate studies is that that is what we should be doing and we could do it so well I think we really need to as an institution…we have issues, internal, that if you read the newspaper, and the comments section in the [local paper] and such it is not good so here is what I am going to say to [administration]…There is a difference between rebranding and having a big PR thing and actually having relationships with the people that you work with.

Like put up all the banners that you want…put a new font in your website…or whatever you need to do but that's not going to solve the problem that people don't trust you and people think that you are out for yourself and your football team and whatever.

Making engagement a priority was perceived as a potential solution to lack of community trust. Campus community collaboration was perceived as a way to improve the image of the institution. Embracing a scholarship of engagement may have potential to change community perceptions. While faculty felt understood and valued by departments and the administration the lack of desired levels of support was evident:

It doesn't translate into dollars the way we would desire it to. They clearly do and we work with community relations, government relations, media relations, the provost who will talk about what we're doing so when the president makes the annual trip out to Pendleton for the roundup we always give him a list of who we got out in that region through our…program what projects we've done so they can go out and talk about what the [institution] is doing for the rest of the state so yes they do see some value in it. It hasn't always been this way. If the institution isn't invested…it is a really tough row to hoe**.**

While faculty feel valued and supported at certain levels, the institution is perceived as less supportive than other institutions:

We had a contingent of folks from University of Idaho come out a couple years ago and they were talking about their University and how they did it and he said our University has a requirement we have an office of service-learning that has a vice president and at the administrative level and it is required in every program across this institution and my initial thought was wow that's really neat I wish we had that here. Because it would be beneficial. But the administration has been quite supportive of us and they understand what we are doing.

The idea of having administrative level support for and institutional investment in service-learning was mentioned frequently by faculty members:

I'd like to see the university make some investments in service-learning and I feel like we are a long way off. You stay at one of these places long enough you get to see the seamy underbelly of academia. And so I think our budget model might have been a step in the right direction. The research enterprise is making investments in certain types of research projects but for programs… for ours…it is like pulling teeth getting institutional investments in these things. Part of it is the culture of this organization do more with less perpetually and what we suffer with in our unit is we have done a lot for nothing and the expectation is that we can continue to do that indefinitely. I think…some investments in it that would be nice…if it came out at the provost level. It would be really beneficial if they came as a contact for service-learning. They hired a VP for something recently but it wasn't service-learning.

Without optimal central support it is difficult for faculty to make changes that they see as potentially beneficial. Having an administrative level decision maker in charge of coordinating service-learning endeavors was suggested as a possible approach:

some of my observation of other programs is they may not institutionalize service-learning principals as strongly as they might and we have conversations with other programs about those issues and where I got to was I don't have any leverage nobody is going to listen to me so I am not going to invest any time on it and so if you really want to do that it has to be elevated up to the provost level and…there may be some unevenness across the disciplines social science disciplines and the disciplines in our school have seen it a bunch of times it just doesn't work very well then you have people who are tenured and on a tear they are investing all of their effort into that. They coordinate a bunch of classes. How that boils down and how the service-learning gets in it making it more than just a project is an interesting set of questions.

The unevenness described by faculty across disciplines was described as an obstacle for implementing and perpetuating a scholarship of engagement. A perception that support from upper level administrators was integral to sustaining service-learning was evident:

86

we're really not trying to fit in to the institution but we are trying to make them notice that we fit in…in the meantime what we try to do is appeal more to different types of students like doing outreach to social science students…and their advisors…ethnic studies students and their advisors. The undeclared people they should be totally exploring this just as a getting to know yourself exercise. So mostly we are about the outreach and trying to lure students in to our web not so much trying to conform to…we don't have to conform that much to the larger institution. What we are trying to do is work with the dean of undergraduate studies to try to figure out what our next steps should be for making it more accessible and more …I mean it is available to everybody right now but it is not accessible because people don't know that it's here…those are the obstacles right now that we are having.

The perception that support from administration may help collaboration across disciplines was explained in one example as a possible provost sponsored forum:

I think there are some opportunities in other disciplines to do that. There are opportunities for me to collaborate with other disciplines but it is hard to find time…the person who started it was a tenured professor I am not tenured I have to work…not doing what a director should do getting out telling our story as much as would be optimal so those kinds of investments and maybe just having more consistency across campus…even sponsoring a forum on service-learning…if the forum that was happening were sponsored at the provost level it might have gotten more traction. Don't know how much interest they might generate.

Suggestions for ways to share information about service-learning pedagogy included forums at the provost level. Other suggestions included finding ways to link courses to degree programs to increase enrollment and departmental diversity:

It would really be great to see students from other disciplines…part of it is our class is not a required class for anybody and then because it is kind of a new experimental class the number that the class falls under doesn't necessarily fall under a category for a certain requirement to fulfil a niche for a student so it would be really great if we had other

87

departments that would acknowledge the class and allow it to fulfil a requirement for certain degree programs. I think that is one of our bigger challenges actually it is why we don't have a more diverse student population.

Faculty perceived the innovative experimental nature of service-learning to be a possible barrier to increasing enrollment. Suggestions for requiring service-learning as a general education requirement emphasized benefits for students and community:

> I think the administration could require service-learning classes for an undergraduate degree. A general education requirement would be fabulous. Part of it is you are in (City) and as an undergraduate student you may never leave campus when people get past four blocks from campus they are like where is this. Engaging the community that you are actually in but part of that is just personal growth for students. Recognizing that you are going to be a member of a community. Numbers are down for community engagement. These are all reasons for service-learning classes. Give them a reason to engage in their community and give them an opportunity to feel good about it. Students never walk away from this class and say gosh I hate this class I should have never done it. They feel good about the class and then they are far more likely to go out and volunteer or engage in a process once they graduate. It is just the bottom line.

Recognition that campus community collaboration could be increased by changing general education policies was prevalent amongst faculty participants in this study:

> it seems like it would be kind of an upper course level but we have I would be very supportive of having a requirement for undergraduates been talking…about a wide requirement how you stand that up and make it work. That is an interesting challenge in the face of limited resources…maybe other people have found ways to be more efficient at this than we have I would say we are on the high end in terms of the amount of investment we put into it our programs…I think a way to institutionalize that and figure out how everybody who comes into the institution certainly at the undergraduate level ends up being engaged in service-learning that is discipline specific would be hugely beneficial…I think there are ways to introduce the principles of service-learning into any discipline and when

you think about the basic sciences…it is a quest for truth and things that improve society overall so there must be a way that all disciplines can engage in service activities somehow or another.

Institutionalization has been shown in the literature to be a major motivating factor for sustaining service-learning pedagogy. Cooper (2014) identified the role that senior level administrators play in supporting and maintaining effective service-learning courses. Cooper's study supports previous findings that institutional level support from "chief academic officers, along with the support from colleagues within a faculty member's unit, was perceived as very important to most participants especially when support from the academic dean may have been nominal" (p. 419). Faculty responses in my study support these previous findings.

A lack of desired levels of institutionalization was identified repeatedly by faculty participants:

Yes, I think so it affects us in a number of different ways. From a pedagogical perspective I would say not really. From a programmatic perspective I think part of the implications are a lot of people at least in our disciplines from the outside look at the institution and with the notion that they must have something to offer us how can the university help. And because we don't have that then there is no central portal for people…that engagement to occur and as a result I don't think that the university does a very good job of messaging it externally…I don't think the university is doing a very good job of messaging how it…and there has been a lot of progress…how it is having broader economic impacts throughout the state…beyond we turn out graduates and they go work places. And so I think from an operational standpoint we face challenges around unrestricted funding to pay for our administrative staff and you know things like that some of those things could probably be better coordinated. At the same time you give up something with that [central portal]. And so the nice way about how we have operated is we have an enormous amount of autonomy.

Faculty expressed awareness that while the administration may recognize the value of programs engaging the community, optimal levels of support have yet to be actualized. One interviewee theorized that "maybe they get that it is important but not important enough to bankrupt the College…a sort of central collaborative hub would be awesome…The dean of undergraduate studies is really interested in this so I am now putting together…a list of ideas." This collaborative center might inform and facilitate policy alterations including changes to general education requirements.

The idea that a central portal, clearinghouse, or hub might help facilitate successful implementation and maintenance of service-learning pedagogy is a significant finding of this study. The discussion about institutionalized or centrally supported service-learning might compromise agency of effective programs was addressed by participants with the common conclusion that while it may not be possible to implement without upper administrative support, a manifestation of a service-learning office or center would have significant and unique value for perpetuation and growth of service-learning pedagogy:

> Oh yes absolutely one thing it could do…my perception which is perhaps incorrect the extent to which faculty is implementing service-learning principals is uneven across some of the programs and we are not in a position to tell people how to run their classes I'm not sure anybody is. The nature of an institution but I think that could be good. I think they would have the ability to think about linkages that exist across departments we've done that but we have been careful about how we do it because frankly not all academics want to be engaged in what we do and some of them aren't very good at it and that's not a knock on them it's just that if you are doing basic research that's basic research and that's different than service-learning…I could see an office of service-learning whatever it ended up being called having that kind of influence and benefit I think from an external's standpoint. Marketing the institution to students I think it would have some positive benefits because

my perception is that students are increasingly demanding that they get so I could see a manner that could work and still maintain autonomy in groups. You know at some level I think trying to bring all these programs in that are doing something is maybe an impossible task now that the genie is out of the bottle. Nor is it necessary but I guess I could also see I would like to see the institution make some investments in external service beyond the town and gown stuff you know there is different definitions of this we have a specific definition of the kind of service think about service to clients we have a very narrow scope of what we do…I think if the institution had a broader agenda that it was talking about externally then it would raise the value proposition and the profile of the organization and the entire institution for the state which I think would have ultimate value to the institution but also to the people who work here and being educated here. We are engaging students in a material way…they're not making copies for us they are doing the research and writing the reports. We think that is significant and unique.

Infusing service-learning into general education and making cross-disciplinary connections was shown in previous research (Cooper, 2014) to be relevant to developing and maintaining effective service-learning pedagogy. My study supports previous findings in this area and identifies specific institutional advocacy to address perceived barriers.

Results Summary

Findings across all five research questions in my study support previous studies identifying faculty theories of campus community collaboration in service-learning partnerships. Explicating faculty perceptions of motivations to include service-learning in their course curriculum, expectations for community partners, viewpoints on structure, composition, and best practices for engaged scholarship, descriptions of community engagement and course objectives, and perceived barriers to service-learning including possible policy solutions adds dimension to the discussion of the underreported area of

91

faculty experiences implementing and sustaining service-learning pedagogy. The issues important to faculty in the area of motivations support previous research and indicate that faculty become involved in service-learning for a variety of reasons. A new finding reported here was the perceived role that institutionally supported outreach to the community could play in restoring public trust, exhibiting genuine awareness of and action to address community need, and benefitting the overall credibility of the institutional mission. Another new finding was reported here identifying faculty tacit theories of why community partners fade away during the student placement and perceived best practices for addressing the problem. Faculty perceptions of community partners for effective service-learning confirmed previous research and reported new findings that if expectations and explanations of course purpose and objectives are not clear before entering into a service-learning experience with a community partner the likelihood of maintaining a mutually beneficial partnership for the duration of the course is diminished. Faculty adaptation to the problem included establishing meeting protocols, drafting proposal documents, signing a memoranda of understanding, and spending significant time preparing for the student placement in the community. Faculty explanations of service-learning structure and composition supported previous research that practitioners of service-learning pedagogy perceive the potentiality of service-learning as a strategy for generating and sustaining conditions that facilitate faculty growth and professional development (Pribbenow, 2005). Innovative approaches to teaching, challenged faculty to understand the context of engaged scholarship within their disciplines, solidified awareness that students benefit from community experiences, and made it clear that community partners are both teachers and learners in the reciprocal

symbiotic relationship. Faculty descriptions of community engagement and course objectives confirmed adherence to the criteria of community defined need and community partner benefit in selecting the service-learning partnership. Faculty viewed community placement as essential to the service-learning experience and perceived the student role in the community as similar to the student role in a laboratory. Faculty expositions of perceived barriers to implementing and sustaining service-learning pedagogy supported previous findings and suggested a new finding that while excellence in pedagogical practices existed within the institution, lack of a centrally supported mechanism for collaboration, may have thwarted growth of innovative and beneficial strategies. Faculty perceived possible solutions to be increasing institutionalization of service-learning, establishing a centrally supported office to support collaboration in engaged scholarship, and altering the general education requirements to expand service-learning across disciplines and increase opportunities for students to benefit from the scholarship of engagement.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In my study, I explored perspectives and theories of faculty implementing service-learning pedagogy in higher education. While the benefits of service-learning to students have been well established in the literature fewer studies have probed how implementing service-learning pedagogy was perceived by faculty participants. The dearth of research in the area of faculty experiences with service-learning has been documented in my earlier chapters and by leading researchers in service-learning (Pribbenow, 2005; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997, Zlotkowski, 1998). The implications of engaged scholarship for faculty have been underreported in the literature. My study investigated faculty perspectives on motivations for involvement in service-learning, the methods faculty have developed and implemented to cultivate and maintain relationships with community partners, perspectives on structure, composition, and objectives for service-learning, and perceived barriers to implementing and sustaining service-learning practices in higher education.

Summary of Findings

Before providing limitations or interpretation to my results, I consider it important to review my findings. My study confirmed previous findings that faculty chose to employ service-learning in their courses for a variety of reasons (Abes, et al., 2002). Participating faculty expressed adherence to principals of community defined need, civic responsibility, and social justice as key reasons to include a service-learning component in curriculum. Demographic variables among participants outlined in Chapter III did not appear to have an impact on faculty perspectives in my study. Perceptions of motivations,

community partners, course structure, objectives, and barriers were richly described, supported previous studies, and exhibited a strong sense of adherence to and common understanding of service-learning pedagogy. A strong perception of positive student outcomes, an understanding of and commitment to the theoretical foundations of service-learning, and a desire to connect students with communities to address genuine locally defined needs, were all additional factors motivating faculty to get and stay involved with campus community collaboration in service-learning partnerships.

Findings in the area of perceived barriers to implementing and sustaining service-learning yielded three pertinent faculty theories of possible policy applications in the area of engaged scholarship. Faculty theories of campus community collaboration as a possible public relations strategy with clear advantages for institutional mission and student outcomes were articulated in faculty narratives. Faculty narratives explored the perceived restorative impact on public trust of promoting the reciprocal benefits of engaged scholarship. Additional changes suggested by faculty participants in service-learning were the establishment of a centralized collaborative center designed to encourage and facilitate service-learning partnerships and changes to the general education requirements to expand service-learning across disciplines and increase opportunities for students to benefit from the scholarship of engagement.

Limitations

Before discussing the implications of my findings, it is imperative to acknowledge that there were several limitations to my study. The first is that faculty respondents reflect perspectives from one single institution in the Northwest and one institutional type. While this sample allowed evaluation of perspectives in one particular environment with

95

faculty sharing an institutional framework lacking a central support mechanism for service-learning pedagogy, perspectives from faculty from other institutional types and other regions of the country who had similar institutional environments may have strengthened the study. Additionally, the number of faculty participating in the study was small at seven respondents. While the academic disciplines signified in the study were reasonably diverse, including supplementary disciplines would have bolstered the depth of perspectives.

Another limitation is that while faculty perspectives on community partners were articulated, the perspectives of the community partners themselves were excluded from my study. Faculty perspectives on community partners and best practices for developing and maintaining relationships with placement participants revealed how practitioners might alter their educational practices to address potentially problematic issues. Including community partner perspectives in the study may have added richness and depth of understanding to the assessment of best practices in cultivating and sustaining quality partnerships. The symbiotic reciprocal nature of community partnerships warrants a focus on all aspects and perceptions of the relationship. Exploring community partners' perspectives regarding the motivations and barriers to engaging in service-learning partnerships would potentially inform practices employed by faculty to improve partnerships and simultaneously shed light on a currently missing perspective in the relationship.

An additional limitation was the lack of follow up interviews for all participants. Additional conversations occurred with some of the respondents but did not follow a particular consistent protocol. Adding a second interview that could target particular

concepts with more detail might have drawn out aspects of faculty experience that were not articulated in the single interview. By having an additional interview, it might have been possible to develop a more complete understanding of particular constructs initiated but not fully developed by respondents. Similarly, the semi-structured interview protocol was repetitive and led to duplicate answers, redundancy, and loss of potentially beneficial interview time to explicate constructs with more detail and depth. Including five research questions additionally may have diverted potentially valuable follow up time developing faculty theories on possible policy implications and improvements in the field instead of definitional explanations of structure and composition of the pedagogy.

Implications

My study has implications for those who implement, coordinate, and advocate for innovative community engaged teaching strategies in higher education. Furthermore, faculty perspectives and advocacy may be of interest to policy makers and practitioners looking to support campus community collaboration in service-learning partnerships. Faculty participating in service-learning pedagogy may be able to utilize articulated best practices for recruiting and maintaining community partners as well as strategies for encouraging collaboration across disciplines and departments. Additionally, this study may be of interest to those focusing on encouraging campus community collaboration and improving undergraduate educational opportunities. Another possible implication for this study is associated with faculty development. Results suggest that faculty benefit from participating in service-learning pedagogy. If encouraging more faculty to participate in the pedagogy improves teaching and learning, then the strategy of expanding service-learning institutionally could be conceptualized as a professional

97

development strategy with empirical advantages individually and across campus and communities.

My first research question set out to identify factors that motivated faculty to include a service-learning component in their curriculum. Faculty motivations are vastly underreported in the service-learning research literature. Calls for future research have emphasized the need to more closely examine the relationship between faculty and service-learning, the specific role faculty play with service-learning, and the implications of service-learning on faculty experiences and professional development. A closer look at faculty narratives for what motivates implementation of innovative teaching strategies showed faculty awareness and commitment to the symbiotic relationship between service and learning and the community needs that service-learning addresses. It was additionally important to faculty that the needs addressed in collaborative learning endeavors were defined by the community. As key stakeholders in service-learning partnerships in campus community collaboration, faculty control the curriculum and instructional methods. For this reason, it is clear that "the most important factors to investigate include faculty motivations and outcomes in offering service-learning…understanding what motivates faculty to include this methodology in their curriculum may provide service-learning program coordinators or college administrators with information necessary to increase the participation of faculty" (Garcia & Robinson, 2005, p. 1). A more complete examination of the motivational factors of faculty improves the understanding of academic decision makers by highlighting the reasons why faculty alter their educational practices to include service-learning pedagogy. My study identified personal commitment to social justice, recognition of positive student learning outcomes, desire to address

genuine community needs, and recognition of personal fulfillment and positive professional development outcomes as important motivations for initiating and sustaining campus community collaboration in service-learning partnerships. By emphasizing positive outcomes for students, faculty, and community and pointing to the promising implications for and faculty commitment to social justice, Cooper (2014), called for a dissemination of service-learning's advantages as a possible path to "both increase the number of faculty involved in service-learning and the number of faculty who choose to sustain their work" (p. 426).

My second research question examined faculty perception about the role of community partners their service-learning pedagogy. The essential importance of community partners to service-learning was well understood by faculty. The answers to this question can lead to a better understanding in of how faculty initiates and maintain mutually beneficial community partnerships that may assist policy makers, practitioners and scholars in making decisions to maximize advantages of innovative pedagogies such as service-learning while avoiding possible pitfalls such as loss of community partner commitment. Modeling best practices identified in my study may help avoid the problem of partner fade where community partners do not understand their role or do not remain committed to the pedagogical goals of the partnership. Establishing clear expectations for all stakeholders and establishing written or verbal protocols identifying goals for the student placement in a service-learning partnership enhanced the experience for everyone involved and maximized chances for actualization of positive outcomes at both individual and institutional levels.

The descriptions of structural components of service-learning, answering the third research question, shed light on the potential for service-learning to enhance faculty growth, learning, and professional development while generating similar positive outcomes for students and community partners concurrently. Faculty understanding of the structural and theoretical components of service-learning has practical implications for those seeking to implement and maintain campus community collaboration. Identified best practices may serve as a model for implementation of new opportunities for engaged scholarship. Faculty might also advocate for increasing service-learning courses in curriculum by pointing to potential advantages for all stakeholders involved in the reciprocal relationship.

The results of my fourth research question linked faculty explanations of the role of community engagement in fulfilling course objectives that were connected to themes of collaboration, consultation, community defined needs and reciprocal partnerships into discussions of course objectives. Participants agreed that community partnerships were essential to service-learning and could not be replaced with alternative strategies. For some disciplines, community placements were perceived as the only method for fulfilling particular curricular requirements for the topic area. Faculty perspectives on engaging the community as an essential part of a disciplinary requirement may provide a warrant for arguments to maintain or expand service-learning pedagogy in these targeted disciplines.

Explicating what is working for practitioners and what faculty members perceive as barriers to change may have the potential to influence educational professionals and shape constructive action. My fifth research question in my study addressed these barriers and generated discussion of possible solutions. A targeted practical understanding of

perceived barriers to implementing and maintaining service-learning pedagogy may inform educators' understanding of potential prescriptions for creative solutions enabling policy change in a specific context. Faculty in my study identified potential solutions as institutionalizing service-learning practices with the guidance of upper level administrative representatives, creating a central support office to facilitate collaboration for faculty implementing engaged pedagogies, adopting policies to alter general education requirements to increase participation in service-learning across disciplines, and expanding opportunities for students to experience the advantages of engaged scholarship. While an ideal service-learning model that would suit all institutions and circumstances may be difficult to actualize, findings of this study set forth strategies and best practices that may provide useful information to educational professionals as they seek to implement and sustain service-learning pedagogy.

While the time commitment and additional planning required to incorporate a service-learning component into a course curriculum is significant and has been found to deter participation by some faculty members (Abes et al., 2002), shifting institutional priorities to advocate for increased campus community collaboration and working to integrate a service-learning component across departments and disciplines may effectively address actual barriers and begin to break down and dispel perceived barriers based on fear or lack of understanding. Potential deterrents related to preparation time, logistics, funding, reward structure, student and community outcomes, and comfort with the aptitude to effectively implement service-learning may be addressed by policy changes designed to increase institutional support and collaboration across disciplines. Actual barriers faculty encounter when implementing service-learning pedagogy may

101

differ from perceived barriers presumed by non-participating faculty, and accurately identifying and overcoming potential obstacles may prove beneficial for both students and faculty (Abes et al., 2002). Transcending barriers to participating in service-learning and transitioning institutional advocacy to facilitate integration throughout institutions of higher education is an essential step to realizing a scholarship of engagement. The potential benefits to students, community, and institution should provide a persuasive incentive to increase the number and academic disciplines utilizing service-learning pedagogy. Faculty stand to benefit from a scholarship of engagement that can successfully integrate a service component into a broader effort to connect campuses with local communities to address pressing needs with deliberate collaborative action.

Recommendations

Policy makers and practitioners in higher education should continue to explicate the implications of service-learning for faculty choosing to adopt this innovative educational practice. Identifying possible institutional advocacy for action to encourage and support a broader range of faculty to implement a scholarship of engagement may inform decision makers of viable policy options to improve and expand on service-learning pedagogy. This exploration of possible institutional changes to encourage campus community collaboration has numerous possible advantages. Further exploration of ways to foster collaboration and information sharing among practitioners of service-learning would be beneficial. Institutions lacking a central support mechanism for service-learning may benefit from establishing a collaborative hub, portal, or clearinghouse centered in higher administration that can facilitate institutional support, collaboration, information sharing about community partnerships and other best practices

for implementation. Looking into possible avenues for altering the structure of general education requirements to encourage engaged scholarship is another possible advantageous application of faculty theories developed in this study. Identifying faculty participating with and interest in service-learning and advocating for their involvement through transparent institutional structures may benefit institutional leadership, faculty, and students. Identifying and disseminating ways to impart opportunities for faculty to collaborate and share strategies, information about community partners, and any and all best practices associated with service-learning pedagogy could be a primary role for a collaborative center for engaged scholarship. Academic administrators such as a provost or vice president could effectively support and advocate for development of policies to support service-learning as a general education requirement. The potential role that institutionally supported outreach to the community could play in maintaining or restoring public trust, exhibiting awareness of and action to solve community problems and addressing genuine community needs is a credible warrant for action to expand community engagement as an integral aspect of institutional mission. Institutionalizing and centralizing service-learning appears to have potential for addressing faculty desires to improve communication and collaboration for practitioners of this form of teaching.

Future Research

Future studies and program evaluations of service-learning should investigate faculty perspectives at different institutions of different types. Observing how faculty adapt to different institutional environments may inform a broader array of potential policy makers and practitioners. Future research may additionally examine community partners' perspectives and possible alignment or incongruities with faculty perceptions of

relationships with community organizations. By looking at community partner theories of collaboration future studies may elucidate a better understanding of the reciprocity and collaborative potential of the campus community relationship.

Further studies examining the impact of service-learning practices on faculty also are needed. Particular attention to the area of service-learning as a potential avenue for professional development may prove fruitful. Studies designed to identify factors that would differentiate between establishing service-learning courses or programs versus maintaining previously established programs may also provide useful information for practitioners planning new projects or sustaining existing programs. Additional examination of specific ways in which involvement in service-learning has transformed faculty educational practices may also yield potentially useful results. The role of senior level administration in fostering and maintaining service-learning pedagogy is also a potentially beneficial avenue for future research. Future research should continue to examine all aspects of the relationship between faculty and service-learning. As key stakeholders in service-learning partnerships, faculty experiences have been rarely referenced in the research literature. At the same time studies exploring community partner and student perspectives on engaged scholarship and best practices for maintaining reciprocal relationships would have potential application for policy makers, practitioners, and scholars and contribute a diverse array of perspectives to the study of these symbiotic campus community collaborations.

<div align="center">**Conclusion**</div>

My study has potential implications for those who engage in service-learning currently or would like to develop the professional potential to incorporate a scholarship

of engagement into their educational practices. Faculty currently practicing service-learning pedagogy are motivated by their commitment to social justice, personal awareness and experiences with positive implications for students, and an intrinsic devotion to addressing genuine community needs through educational practice. Institutional decision makers may actualize real advantage from advocating for increased campus community collaboration. By emphasizing clear and beneficial learning outcomes for students and articulating the social justice implications inherent in the pedagogy administrations may find it possible to increase the number of faculty choosing to implement service-learning and at the same time develop and maintain robust relationships with faculty, students, and community stakeholders.

APPENDIX

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

➢ Thanks for taking the time to talk with me today. Did you receive, sign and return the consent form for participating in this interview? As indicated in the consent form I will be recording our discussion. [Begin recording.]

➢ I have already had the opportunity to speak briefly with you and have learned some things about your service-learning course.

➢ I have looked over some of the course materials including syllabi and community placement protocols.

➢ One of the most important components of this dissertation is speaking with you.

➢ In this interview, we will be speaking about your role as a faculty member who teaches a service-learning course. [Optional: I may contact you for a second interview for clarification and elaboration.]

➢ This interview will be approximately 45-60 minutes. Do you have any questions before we get started?

Structural Components

o What is a service-learning course?

o How does a service-learning course differ from other courses?

o What does the structural component of community placement contribute to course curriculum?

Course Details:

o Tell me about the [name of service-learning course/courses you teach.

o Tell be about your role in the development of the course.

- How long have you taught this course? Can you give a brief history of the course?

- How did you get involved teaching with a community engagement component?

- What are the key objectives of the course?

- How has the purpose changed over the [number of years]

Curriculum Choices:

- Why does this course include a community engagement component?

- What, if any, adjustments have been made since you started teaching this course?

- What, if any, literature, scholars, authors do you look to for service-learning information?

- What does community placement uniquely contribute to the curriculum?

- What does the classroom component contribute to the course?

- How do the community and classroom components work together? What are essential characteristics of each? Could you speak to the reasons that community placement is uniquely important for this course? Prompts: Could you clarify what you mean by [interviewee's description of the service-learning components of the course.]

Community Partners

- Could you tell me about the role of community partners in Service-Learning?

- What do you perceive as key components of locating community partners for your course placements?

- How do you choose community partners that are appropriate for the course?

- Could you describe criteria for placement of students with community collaborators?

- o Can you describe the ideal relationship with community partners?

Community Engagement and Course Objectives

- o What does community collaboration contribute to course goals and objectives?

- o Could you describe the role of student and community partners in the service-learning partnership?

    - ▪ Prompts: Clarify your perception of each partner's expectations, goals, and objectives for entering into the partnership.

- o What role does engaging the community play in fulfilling course goals and objectives? Do you see an alternative or possible alternatives to community placements for fulfilling the goals and objectives of this course?

Perceived Barriers

- o Have you experienced any barriers to incorporating service-learning components in curriculum?

- o Have you encountered any problems working with service-learning partnerships?

- o Are there particular disciplines that you perceive as more likely to utilize service-learning partnerships?

- o Do you feel that your Department and Administration understand the campus community collaboration components of your course?

- o Do you feel that you have support you need to successfully maintain service-learning components in your courses?

- o Could you envision ways to improve institutional supports for service-learning?

REFERENCES CITED

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2012). A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Abes, E., Jackson, G., Jones, S. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1), 5-17.

Altbach, P. (1995). Problems and possibilities: The US academic profession. *Studies in Higher Education, 20*, 27-44.

Anderson, J. (1998). Service-learning and teacher education. Retrieved February 20 20015, from ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/files/service2.html

Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A., & Sax, L. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.

Astin, A., Sax, L., & Avalos, J. (1999). The long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(2), 187-202.

Astin, A., Vogelgesang, L., Misa, K., Anderson, J., Denson, N., Jayakumar, U., Yamamura, E. (2006). Understanding the effects of service-learning: A study of students and faculty. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Barber, B. (1992). *An aristocracy of everyone*. New York: Ballantine

Barr, R., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27*(6), 13-25.

Batchelder, T., & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, pro-social cognitive, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 341-355.

Battistoni, R. (2006). Approaching democratic engagement. In K. Casey, G. Davidson, S. Billig & N. Springer (Eds.), *Advancing knowledge in service-learning: Research to transform the field*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Berberet, J. (1999). The professoriate and institutional citizenship toward a scholarship of service. *Liberal Education, 85*(4), 33-39.

109

Billig, S. (2000). Research on K-12 school-based service-learning: The evidence builds. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(9), 658-664.

Billig, S. (2009). Does equality really matter: Testing the new K-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S. Billig (Eds.), *Advances in service-learning research: Vol. 9. Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Boice, R. (2000). Advice for new faculty members: Nihil Himus. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bowen, G. A. (2006). Grounded theory and sensitizing concepts. [Article]. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(3), 1-9.

Bowman, N., Park, J., & Denson, N. (2015). Student involvement in ethnic student organizations: Examining civic outcomes 6 years after graduation. [Article]. *Research in Higher Education, 56*(2), 127-145. doi: 10.1007/s11162-014-9353-8

Boyle-Baise, M., & Kilbane, J. (2000). What really happens? A look inside service-learning for multicultural teacher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7*(1), 54-64.

Bringle, R., Games, R., & Malloy, R. (1999). *College and universities as citizens*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *The Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 43*(2), 112-122.

Brown, S., Stevens, R., Troiano, P., & Schneider, M. (2002). Exploring complex phenomena: Founded theory in student affairs research. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(2), 173-183.

Bulot, J., & Johnson, C. (2006). Rewards and costs of faculty involvement in intergenerational service-learning. *Educational Gerontology, 32*(8), 633.

Butin, D. (2003). Of what use is it? Multiple conceptualizations of service-learning within education. *Teachers College Record, 105*(9), 1674-1692.

Butin, D. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Butin, D. (2015). Dreaming of justice: Critical service-learning and the need to wake up. [Article]. *Theory into Practice, 54*(1), 5-10. doi: 10.1080/00405841.2015.977646

Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 125-147.

Cohen, J., & Kinsey, D. (1993). Doing good and scholarship: A service-learning study. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator, 48*(4), 4-14.

Colvin, J., & Tobler, N. (2013). Culturally relevant pedagogy, experiential learning and a higher education classroom. *Journal of Experiential Education, 36*(3), 233-246.

Conway, J., Amel, E., & Gerwien, D. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service-learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology, 36*, 233-245.

Cooper, J. (2014). Ten years in the trenches: Faculty perspectives on sustaining service-Learning. [Article]. *Journal of Experiential Education, 37*(4), 415-428. doi: 10.1177/1053825913513721

Cooper, S., Cripps, J., & J, R. (2013). Service-learning in deaf studies: Impact on the development of altruistic behaviors and social justice concern. *American annals of the deaf, 157*(5), 413-427.

Curran, J. (1999, January). *College students' attitudes towards mental retardation: A pilot study*. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Damahidy, M. (2003). Using theory to frame community and practice. *Journal of Community Development Society, 34*(1), 75-84.

Deeley, S. (2010). Service-learning: Thinking outside the box. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*(1), 43-53.

Desrochers, C. (2006). Educating pre-service teachers for diversity: Perspectives on the possibilities and limitations of service-learning. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 40*(3), 263-280.

Driscol, A. (2009). Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirming higher education's role in community. In L. Sandmann, C. Thornton & A. Jaeger (Eds.), *New directions for higher education*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley.

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 66-71.

Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. (2008). Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.

Erlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

111

Eyler, J., Giles, D., & Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service-learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 4*(1), 5-15.

Eyler, J., Giles, D., Stenson, C., & Gray, C. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions and communities, 1993-2000*. Washington DC: Learn and Serve America National Service Learning Clearinghouse.

Fair, C., & Delaplane, E. (2015). It is good to spend time with older adults. You can teach them, they can teach you': Second grade students reflect on intergenerational service-learning. [Article]. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 43*(1), 19-26. doi: 10.1007/s10643-014-0634-9

Feal, R. (2006). Academic collective bargaining preface. *Academic Collective Bargaining*.

Finley, A. (2011). Civic learning and democratic engagement: A review of the literature on civic engagement in post-secondary education. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Furco, A. (1996). *Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

Galvan, C., & Parker, M. (1994). Investigating the reciprocal nature of service-learning in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Experiential Education, 34*(1), 55-70.

Gamson, Z. (1997). Higher education and rebuilding civic life. *Change, 29*(1), 10-13.

Garcia, R., & Robinson, G. (2005). Transcending disciplines, reinforcing curricula: Why faculty teach with service-learning *AACC Research Brief*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Garrison, J., & Jaeger, A. (2014, Spring). From serendipity to resolve: Graduate student motivations to teach using service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *20*(2), 41-52.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago Aldine.

Gray, M., Ondaatje, E., & Zakaras, L. (1999). Combining service and learning in higher education: Learn and serve America, higher education. Summary report. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 21-28.

Harrison, L. (2013). Service-learning and the preparation of English teachers. *English Education, 43*(341-368).

Harwood, A., & Rodoff, S. (2009). Reciprocal Benefits of mentoring: Results of a middle school-university collaboration. In B. Moely, S. Billig & B. Holland (Eds.), *Advances in service-learning research: Vol. 9. Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Hatcher, J. A., & Studer, M. L. (2015). Service-learning and philanthropy: Implications for course design. [Article]. *Theory Into Practice, 54*(1), 11-19. doi: 10.1080/00405841.2015.977656

Hébert, A., & Hauf, P. (2015). Student learning through service-learning: Effects on academic development, civic responsibility, interpersonal skills and practical skills. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 16*(1), 37-49. doi: 10.1177/1469787415573357

Hildenbrand, S., & Shultz, S. (2015). Implementing service-learning in pre-service teacher coursework. *Journal of Experiential Education, 38*(3), 262-279.

Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*.

Hou, S. (2009). Service-learning + new master of public health student = challenges for professor. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education 20*(2), 292-297.

Howard. (2003). Service-learning research: Foundational issues. *Studying service-learning: Innovations in educational research methodology*. Malwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: concepts and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Jacoby, B. (2003). *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, J., DuBois, M., & Wigderson, S. (2014). Learning by helping? Undergraduate communication outcomes associated with training or service-learning experiences. [Article]. *Teaching of Psychology, 41*(3), 251-255. doi: 10.1177/0098628314537982

Keeling (Ed.). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: ACPA/NASPA.

Kendall, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kendrick, R. (1996). Outcomes of service-learning in an introductory sociology course. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 72-81.

Kilgo, C., Ezell Sheets, J., & Pascarella, E. (2015). The link between high-impact practices and student learning: some longitudinal evidence. [Article]. *Higher Education, 69*(4), 509-525. doi: 10.1007/s10734-014-9788-z

Kinloch, V., Nemeth, E., & Patterson, A. (2015). Reframing service-learning as learning and participation with urban youth. [Article]. *Theory Into Practice, 54*(1), 39-46. doi: 10.1080/00405841.2015.977660

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, S. (2012). Grounded theory and the constant comparative method: Valid research strategies for educators. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 3*, 83-86.

Kuh, G., Shuh, J., & Whitt, E. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. (1994, July/August). Service on campus. *Change, 26*(4-5).

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

London, S. (2012). Building collaborative communities. In M. Mortensen & J. Nesbitt (Eds.), *On Collaboration*. London: Tate.

Magolda, M. (2003). Identity and learning: Student affairs' role in transforming higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(2), 231-247.

Markus, G., Howard, J., & King, D. (1993). Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15*(4), 410-419.

114

McKay, V., & Rozee, P. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service-learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*(2), 21-33.

Mendel-Reyes, M. (1998). A pedagogy for citizenship: service-learning and democratic education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 73*, 31-38.

Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mobley, C. (2007). Breaking ground: Engaging undergraduates in social change through service-learning. *Teaching Sociology, 35*(23), 125-137.

Morse, S. W. (1998). Developing the skills for citizenship. [Article]. *About Campus, 3*(2), 29.

Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996). From the margin of the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. In M. Troppe (Ed.), *Two cases of institutionalizing service-learning*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Musselin, C. (2007). Transformation of academic work: Facts and analysis. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (pp. 175-190). Kassel, Germany: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge.

Myers-Lipton, S. (1996). Effect of a comprehensive service-learning program on college students' level of modern racism. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*(1), 44-54.

Myers-Lipton, S. (2002). Service-learning and success in sociology. In C. Berheide, J. Chin & D. Rome (Eds.), *Included in sociology: Learning climates that cultivate racial and ethnic diversity* (pp. 197-212). Merrifield, VA: American Association of Higher Education and American Sociological Association.

Nathan, J., & Kielsmeier, J. (1991). Special section on youth service. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*, 739-742.

Novak, J., Markey, V., & Allen, M. (2007). Evaluating cognitive outcomes of service-learning higher education: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports, 24*, 149-157.

O'Grady, C. (1998). Moving off center: Engaging white education students in multicultural field experiences. In R. Cavez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non)engagement in the multicultural education terrain*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

O'Meara. (1997). Rewarding faculty professional service (Working Paper No. 19). Boston: Resource Center for Higher Education.

Partidge, K. (2007). Research universities deepen commitment to engaged scholarship with strategies for community research Retrieved January 17, 2010, from http://www.compact.org/news/press/release/753

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Perry, J., & Katula, M. (2001). Does service affect citizenship. *Administration & Society, 33*(3), 330.

Peterson, J. J., Wardwell, C., Will, K., & Campana, K. L. (2014). Pursuing a purpose: The role of career exploration courses and service-learning Internships in recognizing and developing knowledge, skills, and abilities. *Teaching of Psychology, 41*(4), 354-359. doi: 10.1177/0098628314549712

Pribbenow, D. (2005). The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*(2), 25-38.

Reed, P., & Butler, T. (2015). Flipping the script: When service-learning recipients become service-learning givers. [Article]. *Theory Into Practice, 54*(1), 55-62. doi: 10.1080/00405841.2015.977663

Rhoads, R., & Howard, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Academic service-learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (Vol. 73). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Robins Foundation. (2014). Why Collaboration matters. Retrieved from www.robinsfdn.org website:

Rockenbach, A. B., Hudson, T. D., & Tuchmayer, J. B. (2014). Fostering meaning, purpose, and enduring commitments to community service in college: A multidimensional conceptual model. [Article]. *Journal of Higher Education, 85*(3), 312-338.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health, 23*, 334-340.

Schnaubelt, T., & Statham, A. (2007, fall). Faculty perceptions of service as a mode of scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*(1), 18-31.

Schneider, C. (2000). Educational missions and civic responsibility: Toward the engaged academy. In T. Erlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 98-123). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Schuster, J. (2003). The faculty makeover: What does it mean for students? In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *Exploring the Role of Contingent Instructional Staff in Undergraduate Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. (2006). *The restructuring of academic work and careers: The American faculty*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Seibold, C. (2002). The place of theory and the development of a theoretical framework in a qualitative study. *Qualitative Research Journal, 2*(3), 3-16.

Shevellar, L. (2015). From bearers of problems to bearers of culture: Developing community in the community development classroom. [Article]. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE), 28*(4), 457-475. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2014.916433

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Stanton, T. (1994). The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 7-20.

Stanton, T. (2007). *New times demand new scholarship: Research universities and civic engagement*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tellis, W. (1997, September). Application of a case study methodology. *The Qualitative Report, 3*(3). Retrieved from: http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-3/tellis2.html

UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project. (1999). 1999 service-learning needs assessment. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA.

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Eduction Report, 29*. Retrieved from EricDigests.org website: http://www.ericdigests.org/2004-3/faculty.html

Ward, K. (2005). Rethinking faculty roles and rewards for the public good. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Higher education and the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Webster's. (1989). *The new lexicon: Webster's encyclopedic dictionary of the English language*. New York: Lexicon.

Weinrich, D. (March 2003). Service-learning at the edge of chaos. *Educational Gerontology, 29*(3), 181-195.

Winans-Solis, J. (2014). Reclaiming power and identity: Marginalized students' experiences of service-learning. [Article]. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 47*(4), 604-621. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2014.959267

Wolcott, H. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Third ed.). Thousand Oaks

Zlotkowski, E. (1998). A service-learning approach to faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* (73), 81-89.