5-1-2006

Editors' Introduction

Steve Meisel

Carole Elliott

Editors' Introduction

Erratum
The correct spelling of the section coeditor's name is Carole Elliott.

Editors' Introduction

Almost twenty years ago, the Porter and McKibben report commented that "any move by business schools toward broadening the academic experience of their students beyond the technical and functional will find enthusiastic endorsement by many employers." Since that time, many instructors have implemented service-learning components into their teaching with a wide variety of effects. There is no one way to do this but, as in all forms of experiential learning, many ways to have it fail to work as we might hope.

Two examples of how to get service-learning right are part of the current Teaching & Learning section. In *Academic Service-Learning in Management Education: Lessons Learned*, Susan R. Madsen describes the various ways service-learning can succeed or fail even with the best of intentions. In this article, we learn the background of the service-learning movement as well as some ideas about the value of this in creating whole-system awareness in business students. How does this happen? Madsen reveals that it is in the design, the experience, and the student reflection of their learning. This seems like a summary of how all transformational learning takes place and a good way to make the Teaching & Learning connections this Section is all about.

Ted Peters and Jeffrey Yanagi, authors of *A Strategic Management Learning Laboratory: Integrating the College Classroom and the College Human Resource Management Environment*, describe their experience in using their college's Human Resource department as a project location for undergraduate HR students. This process moved the learning out of the classroom and into a problem-solving environment with real-time benefits to the college. Along the way, some valuable lessons are learned (by faculty as well as students) and we get to see how this model could be replicated in other places by faculty members willing to take some chances in partnering with senior administrators.

Our third article, *Student Self-assessment: A Tool for Engaging Management Students in their Learning* by Andy Dungan and Leigh Mundhenk, presents the authors' informed reflections on the challenges and opportunities they faced when developing methods to encourage students to be self-directed in their learning. Many readers engage in a pedagogic approach in sympathy to theirs, recognizing the benefits a more participative approach can bring to students' learning experience. In discussing the findings from their evaluation of the SSA methods they adopted, they alert us to the need to be sensitive to the motivations and needs of students in different learning environments, and that a 'one-size-fits-all' approach to SSA is not appropriate. Their study indicates students responded positively to the SSA process – irrespective of the particular method of SSA used. As they point out, until further research work is completed, they can only speculate as to why this might be the case. Is it because the mere act of using SSA leads to higher student engagement than assessment methods that rely solely on tutors' judgments? They continue their work in this area, and we're sure would be appreciative to hear of reader's experiences as well.

Steve Meisel and Carole Elliot
Co-Editors, Teaching & Learning