Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning *Fall 1995, pp. 112-122*

A Service-Learning Curriculum for Faculty

Robert G. Bringle and **Julie A. Hatcher**
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

The development of service-learning courses is contingent upon faculty. Institutions of higher education which are interested in service-learning can engage in faculty development activities in order to (a) develop a common understanding on campus concerning the nature of service- learning, (b) establish and maintain the academic integrity of service-learning, (c) increase the confidence of faculty as they implement a new pedagogy, and (d) increase the likelihood that service-learning is institutionalized in higher education. This article describes a curriculum for a series of faculty workshops: Introduction to Service-Learning, Reflection, Building Community Partnerships, Student Supervision and Assessment, and Course Assessment and Research. Each module provides a synopsis of topics and suggested readings for participants.

Institutions of higher education are exploring ways of incorporating service to extend their mission, enhance student achievement and persistence, and engage students in their communities as part of their academic curriculum (e.g., Boyer, 1994; Ehrlich, 1995). As institutions search for ways in which to do this, they often recognize service- learning as an important strategy. We consider service-learning to be a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. This is in contrast to co- curricular and extracurricular service, from which learning may occur, but for which there is no formal evaluation and documentation of academic learning.

Implementing service-learning in the academic curriculum of colleges and universities is strengthened by strategically planned change. Bringle and Hatcher (in press) have described a Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL) that identifies four important constituencies that need to be considered for effective implementation of service-learning programs: institution, faculty, students, and community. For each of these constituencies, CAPSL identifies the following sequence of activities to guide the implementation of service-learning: planning, increasing awareness, developing a prototype service-learning course, acquiring resources, programmatic expansion, recognition, monitoring, evaluation, research, and institutionalization. The resulting 40-cell matrix[1] provides a means to develop a strategic plan to implement service-learning and to assess progress towards its institutionalization.

Because the implementation of service-learning represents a revision of courses in the curriculum or an addition to the curriculum, it falls under the purview of faculty. Thus, as important as each of the four constituencies is, the development of service-learning within higher education is primarily the work of faculty. Thus, this article will focus on the expansion of service-learning through faculty development activities directed at curriculum revision.

There are many ways in which the implementation of service-learning can occur. Faculty can discover service-learning through their involvement in the community, personal advocacy for an issue, political engagement and activism, or experience in related pedagogies. We speculate that this would be more likely to occur in disciplines for which there is a predisposition toward an ethic and practice of service (e.g., social work) than in other disciplines (e.g., engineering). Faculty may also discover service-learning through a colleague, a professional journal, a student, or community agency personnel. In addition to being a slow and capricious process, such accidental discovery would likely yield uneven results across the

university's curriculum.

Although self-discovery and learning from others is beneficial, we believe a more deliberate, organized, and centralized approach to faculty development will yield more tangible results more quickly. We assume that planned faculty development is important to the implementation and institutionalization of service-learning courses for at least four reasons:

1. *Common Vocabulary*. Structured faculty development provides a means for establishing, within the institution, a common definition for service-learning. Although faculty may assume that they understand the nature of service-learning, our experience is that some faculty have misconceptions. For example, faculty sometimes confuse service-learning with volunteerism or with other types of experiential learning (e.g., internships, practica, coperative education, pre-service training). Faculty development provides a means for establishing a common vocabulary and understanding about the pedagogy of service-learning.

2. *Academic Integrity*. Service-learning can be conducted in ways that are rewarding to all constituencies: faculty find their teaching is more enjoyable, students discover their learning is enhanced, communities benefit from the resource of students and faculty, and institutions develop additional ways to fulfill their mission. On the other hand, service-learning courses that are poorly designed and inadequately managed can result in counterproductive results for all. If faculty receive adequate education in the pedagogy, then it increases the likelihood that the promise of service-learning will be realized. Effective faculty development introduces a form of quality control at the beginning of curriculum revision and increases the likelihood that the academic integrity of service-learning will be maintained. These academic successes, in turn, may attract other faculty to service-learning.

3. *Increase Support and Confidence*. As Kendall, Duley, Little, Permaul, and Rubin (1990, p. 143) note, service- learning is a new pedagogy for many faculty. As such, they are not familiar with the theory and knowledge that support the pedagogy, the nuts-and-bolts of how to do it, and alternative techniques for assessing experiential learning that occurs outside the classroom. Occasions for faculty development provide forums in which faculty can explore, listen, consider, imagine, and talk about the nature of a new pedagogy. And, perhaps most important, they can learn from the experiences of colleagues, learn about university resources that support curriculum reform and professional development, garner the motivation and skills to initiate service-learning in a course, and develop new interdisciplinary professional relationships.

4. *Institutionalization*. CAPSL identifies a planned sequence of activities that support the implementation of service-learning programs (Bringle & Hatcher, in press). In doing so, the model recognizes the importance of four constituencies. However, faculty are crucial to the success of institutionalizing service-learning. Richard Wood (1990) goes to the heart of the matter when he observes, "Educational programs...need champions. Those champions must be found in the faculty if an innovation is to be profound and long-lasting" (p. 53). Faculty will not be coerced into pedagogical change; they must develop the motivation to do it through a reasonable portrayal of its benefits relative to the investments. Effective faculty development will support this process of self-discovery and self-persuasion by faculty. And, as faculty adopt service-learning, the educational culture and climate of the institution will be altered.

Theoretical Underpinnings

Kolb's (1984) model of the experiential learning process has been widely used as a theoretical basis for analyzing and designing experiential educational programs for students. His model identifies four steps that are cardinal points on a cycle of learning: abstract conceptualization (i.e., theories and conceptual schemata that organize experiences), active experimentation (i.e., innovations based on the organized interpretation of one's past experiences), concrete experience (i.e., direct, immediate experiences), and reflective observation (i.e., thoughtful interpretation and comparison of experiences).

This model for learning can also be applied to

faculty development. That is, it can be assumed that instructors will benefit from faculty development that promotes learning about service-learning through the four modalities. Abstract conceptualization would include intellectual presentations that describe the theoretical underpinnings of the pedagogy, how to design and implement a service-learning course, and research that supports the value of service-learning. Active experimentation would include the translation of this information into the instructor's own discipline and, more specifically, determining how the pedagogy could be applied to the instructor's specific course. Concrete experience would be obtained by instructors implementing a service-learning course.

And, reflective observation would occur as the instructor formally and informally evaluates a service-learning class through student evaluations, assessments of student achievement, feedback from agency personnel, conducting research on service-learning, and discussions with colleagues. As the cycle continues, the instructor would, at an abstract level, evaluate the meaning of the information (abstract conceptualization). A spectrum of adjustments to the service-learning course would be considered (active experimentation), the revised course would be offered (concrete experience), and the results would once again be evaluated (reflective observation).

Abstract Conceptualization

Our assumption is that a frequent and effective means to implement service-learning is to begin with presentations to faculty at the cognitive, intellectual level (i.e., abstract conceptualization). This assumption is based, in part, on the belief that the training and work of faculty predisposes them toward abstract, theoretical analyses. To the extent that this is the case, presentations based on abstract conceptualizations make sense as an initial faculty development strategy. Through one-on-one presentations, workshops, formal meetings (e.g., presentations at faculty meetings), and written information (e.g., articles, brochures, newsletters), faculty can learn about the nature of service-learning. Although many campuses have found that faculty development workshops provide a means for accomplishing the goal of increasing knowledge among faculty, there are few curricular guides for how to conduct these workshops. The remainder of this article will focus on a curriculum for faculty development workshops on service-learning.

The workshops we describe constitute a curriculum for faculty that could be presented during an academic year, a semester, during an intensive week of study, or as a summer seminar. We have found it beneficial to distribute readings to participants prior to each workshop. This provides a framework for the presentation, a basis for discussion and questions, and resources that can be used and shared with other faculty and agency personnel. The format of the presentations can be tailored to the preferences of the presenters. At our workshops, the number of presenters has ranged from one person to a panel of five.

I. Introduction to Service-Learning

A general workshop on service-learning serves as a good means to introduce faculty to the pedagogy. This workshop would probably be offered at the beginning of the academic year, prior to any of the specialty workshops, and prior to other faculty development opportunities (e.g., faculty course development stipends, mini-grants). In this way, faculty will be in a better position to consider service-learning course development and to write successful grant applications for funds to support course development.

Workshop Topics

One objective of this workshop is to create a common understanding of service-learning by offering a definition. The issue of definition should be dealt with in a manner that fits the institutional context. For example, some may wish to draw a distinction between service-learning and other forms of experiential learning (e.g., practica, internships, cooperative education). Unlike these, the experiential activity in a service-learning course is not necessarily skill-based within the context of preparation for a profession. Also, internships and practica may be well established in academic units, whereas service-learning courses may be developed through the support of a campus office. For other institutions, all experiential and practice-based education is centralized within the same office. In this case, discussing service-learning alongside internships, practica, and cooperative education may make sense. Also, at some institutions, service-learning has grown out of a successful volunteer program; a discussion of the distinction between service-learning and volunteerism would then be

appropriate. In any case, the workshop should clarify the local understanding of the term "service-learning", and related pedagogies, so that a common vocabulary is established.

This workshop can also provide a general introduction for how to design and implement a service-learning course. The discussion can include the essential elements and basic recommendations for a service-learning course (e.g., the Wingspread Principles of Good Practice that Combine Service and Learning). Practical concerns about establishing good relationships with community agencies, structuring reflection, and supervising and evaluating students can also be introduced. Presentations by a faculty member, student, and community agency representative from a prototype service-learning course is very useful to provide concrete examples of issues and concerns. Other topics that can be addressed include a presentation of rates of volunteer participation for high school and college (Astin, 1990), factors influencing which types of institutions emphasize service (Astin, 1990), legal issues related to service-learning (Goldstein, 1990; Seidman & Tremper, 1994), and motives and obstacles reported by faculty involved in service-learning (Hammond, 1994). In addition, the expected outcomes from service-learning courses can be summarized.

Suggested Readings

Rubin (1990) provides a discussion of the institutional context and presents the Wingspread Principles of Good Practice that Combine Service and Learning. This can be supplemented with Howard's (1993) Principles of Good Practice in Community Service Learning Pedagogy, which target faculty and academic issues. Both of these readings will provide background for defining and discussing service-learning within the local context.

Gish (1990) establishes a theoretical basis for service-learning as a pedagogy by presenting Kolb's theory and how learning styles differ. Conrad and Hedin (1990b), after opening with a poignant example establishing the need for reflection, discuss from a practical point-of-view some mechanisms for implementing reflection in a service-learning class. The study by Markus, Howard, and King (1993) is an exemplary piece of research on service-learning and provides evidence for nonacademic outcomes, course evaluation outcomes, and academic achievement outcomes.

Ramsay (1990a) and Cotton and Stanton (1990) both deal with community relationships and are excellent at challenging the instructor to consider the complexity of these relationships and the responsibilities of students, faculty, and agency personnel. The articles also discuss the importance of reciprocity as an essential element of service-learning.

II. Reflection

Reflection is viewed as an essential, defining element of service-learning. The presumption is that the educational benefits embedded in community service are best realized through reflection activities that link the service experience to learning objectives. Establishing the key role of reflection as well as discussing specific reflection techniques is important to successfully implementing service-learning.

Workshop Topics

The workshop on reflection can discuss (a) what reflection is, (b) why reflection is critical to service-learning, and (c) how to effectively select and integrate reflection activities into a service-learning course. Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory identifies "reflective observation" as the means by which a student can learn from an experience. In addition, learning theorists note that reflection is a recursive process that promotes not only reflective judgment but also reflective action (Mezirow, 1991; Schon, 1982; Sheckley, Allen, & Keeton, 1993). We define reflection as the intentional consideration of the service experience in light of particular learning objectives (Hatcher & Bringle, 1995). Reflection can support student learning through a developmental process, so that both cognitive and affective outcomes are realized (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990).

Civic responsibility is frequently cited as an intended outcome of service-learning. However, unless reflection activities are designed to meet this objective, it is likely that students will not relate their service participation to civic participation and lessons of civic responsibility (Lisman, 1994; Smith, 1994). Ethical case studies (Lisman, 1994), directed readings, and focus groups are good ways to foster the clarification of values that can lead to civic responsibility.

There are a number of considerations that guide

the design and selection of reflection activities (e.g., learning objectives of the course, structure of the course, number of service-learning students, competencies of students, teaching style). The following guidelines provide faculty a set of criteria from which reflection activities in a particular course can be designed and evaluated (Hatcher & Bringle, 1995)

1. Effective reflection activities link experience to learning.
2. Effective reflection activities are guided.
3. Effective reflection activities occur regularly.
4. Effective reflection activities allow feedback and assessment.
5. Effective reflection activities foster the exploration and clarification of values.

Suggested Readings

Hatcher and Bringle (1995) provide a general discussion of the theory and practice of reflection, and elaborate the set of guidelines for effective reflection. Svinicki and Dixon (1987) provide a clear overview of Kolb's theory and identify a sequence of activities that support learning through the four aspects of Kolb's cycle. Sample instructional sequences are illustrated from six disciplines, demonstrating a variety of activities that can be adapted to foster reflection in a service-learning course.

Menlo (1993) has identified four skills and competencies (reflective listening, seeking feedback, acuity in observation, mindfulness in thinking) that are important for students to have in order to extract meaning from a community service experience. These skills can enhance reflection, particularly if journals or reflective papers are used. This reading describes ways in which these skills can be taught and practiced in a service-learning class.

During the workshop, a variety of reflection activities can be described and reviewed in terms of their effectiveness in meeting certain learning objectives (Henry, 1995; Silcox, 1993). One of the most commonly used is a reflective journal. Conrad and Hedin (1990b) describe a variety of ways to structure a journal. Particularly helpful to students is a list of open-ended questions that serve as prompts for students as they write a journal entry.

III. Community Partnerships

Building community partnerships is a developmental process analogous to the development of students, faculty, and institutions (Bringle & Hatcher, in press). As faculty extend the classroom into the community through service-learning, community partnerships are a fundamental aspect of the success of a service-learning course. This workshop should include community representatives who are familiar with community resources and needs, and who can provide faculty with a range of service opportunities that exist in the community. It is helpful to have a volunteer coordinator from an agency familiar with service-learning discuss roles, responsibilities, and what constitutes a successful experience from the agency's point-of-view. Faculty need to hear from community representatives in order to understand the perspectives of those who are dedicated to providing services and involving volunteers.

Workshop Topics

Community development and empowerment are not only abstract concepts, but are also real challenges faced by agency personnel with varying degrees of success. Listening to the expertise and experience of agency personnel is an important aspect of this workshop. In addition, two-way communication is an essential ingredient to effective and long-lasting community partnerships.

When designing a service-learning course, faculty need to develop with agency personnel the means through which effective communication will occur. Holding the workshop at a community location can strengthen these messages.

Part of the success of service-learning is generating an understanding among agency personnel concerning the nature of service-learning. Even agencies who have extensive experience with volunteers will benefit from understanding the difference between supervising volunteers and supporting service-learning students. For example, in the case of service-learning, agency needs must be coordinated with the educational needs of the student and nature of the course. What is an important volunteer activity from the agency's point-of-view may not be appropriate for a service-learning course. Furthermore, the

activity that is appropriate for students in one course may not be appropriate for another course. Finally, agency personnel must understand their responsibilities in supervising and evaluating students. This workshop will help faculty to clarify these issues as they work with agency personnel on the design, implementation, and evaluation of a service-learning course.

Suggested Readings

Cotton and Stanton (1990) provide an excellent framework for discussing roles and responsibilities. In addition, Kendall (1990a), Mecham (1990), and Ramsay (1990b) provide important information about expectations for agency personnel. Not only should these be read by faculty, but it can also be suggested that faculty share them with personnel at prospective service sites to assist them in understanding service-learning. Levine's (1990) interview of Robert Coles presents a worthwhile discussion of community issues and the value of faculty involvement in community service.

In addition to these readings, there are local materials produced by community organizations (e.g., the United Way) that can be distributed as part of the workshop. These materials will vary across locations, but they generally provide information about needs assessments and volunteer opportunities in the region.

IV. Student Supervision And Assessment

Faculty can benefit from guidance on practical aspects of supervising students in service-learning courses. These include (a) orienting and training students at the beginning of the course, (b) supervising students during the course, and (c) assessing student performance at the end of the course. Local conditions will determine how and to what degree these duties are distributed across faculty, students, community agency personnel, and a centralized office on campus. We are aware of a full spectrum of circumstances ranging from, at one extreme, programs in which a centralized office arranges placements, places students, reads student journals weekly, and monitors the students, to the other extreme in which the centralized office leaves all of these tasks to the faculty member and agency personnel. Those conducting the workshop will need to clarify these issues and responsibilities for their own institution and faculty.

Workshop Topics

When orienting students to service-learning, the instructor should emphasize the importance of having (a) reliable volunteers, (b) mutual expectations that are established and understood (e.g., number of hours, scheduling flexibility, student skills), and (c) service and learning objectives that are clearly articulated (National Center for Service-Learning, ACTION, 1990). The discussion of student orientation might also include the variety in students' expectations and motives for service. Littlefield (1994, p. A 7-8) presents a questionnaire that could be used with students at the beginning of the course.

An additional set of management issues includes ensuring that both the student and instructor have contingency plans ("What happens if this or that occurs?"), a discussion of liability and legal issues (Goldstein, 1990; Seidman & Tremper, 1994), ethical issues that a student might encounter, issues of confidentiality including what to do if information about personal problems is disclosed (e.g., physical abuse, substance use, suicidal statements, threats), and how to deal with interpersonal and professional problems at the placement site. Monitoring students during the semester includes providing a means for keeping in touch with the student and knowing what they have been doing. This can be accomplished by brief weekly log sheets collected either at the agency or by the instructor. These log sheets provide an opportunity for the instructor to monitor the student's reliability and an opportunity for the student to indicate what occurred each week (e.g., number of hours, nature of service activities, specific problems).

As has been stressed in most discussions of service-learning (e.g., Howard, 1993), grades should be based on learning, not service. Therefore, instructors will need to implement a means for assessing learning which may include, or even be limited to, traditional measures of mastery of the course content. There may also be supplementary forms of evaluation through reflection activities (e.g., papers, directed writings, class presentations). Littlefield (1994, p. 35) provides a good example of an essay question that requires students to write about the relationship between the service-learning experience and the course content. What is noteworthy about her example is how she details the criteria for answers.

Assessment at the end of the course should include a means for conducting a course evaluation. This might be targeted at the traditional issues of student satisfaction or more specific issues associated with a service-learning course. Instructors should also collect information from the agency on each student (e.g., Were they reliable? Were they engaged? Were they effective?).

There are many ways to conduct the supervision and assessment of students in service-learning courses. Experienced service-learning instructors can present various ways they have dealt with these issues to illustrate the choices for those planning courses.

Suggested Readings

Mecham (1990) and Kendall (1990b) provide an excellent summary of practical issues for faculty to consider. Conrad and Hedin (1990a) provide faculty with some advice on monitoring students. Hedin and Conrad (1990) suggest ideas for student recruitment into service-learning classes as well as other practical issues.

V. Course Assessment and Research

This workshop is particularly important for establishing links between service and both teaching and research. The workshop can focus to varying degrees on two different themes: (a) assessment and documentation by the faculty member of the service-learning course as part of professional development, and (b) an introduction to some design and measurement issues that are needed to conduct adequate research on service-learning courses. Engaging in both of these activities helps a faculty member better monitor the course during the semester and at its conclusion. In addition, this documentation provides important evidence for administrative review. This information can demonstrate how the course revision represents an important and unique contribution to the curriculum and one's professional development. Furthermore, research on service-learning can help fulfill scholarship expectations.

Workshop Topics

Faculty can benefit from having a means to monitor and assess what is happening, both good and bad, in the course during the semester, particularly when they have made changes such as adding service-learning. The Classroom Assessment Techniques developed by Angelo and Cross (1993) provide excellent examples of a variety of techniques for assessing student reactions and learning. Faculty can also include traditional measures of student satisfaction or measures designed specifically for a service-learning class.

Portfolios provide an important means for a faculty member to reflect on course and professional development. Portfolios should at least be a compilation of course materials, including the syllabus, reading lists, materials developed for the course, methods of evaluation, and other course materials. In addition, these materials about the "what" and the "how" of the course need to be supplemented with explanations and annotations about the "why." For example, the course design is abstracted in the syllabus. However, in the portfolio, a reflective statement should be appended to the syllabus that explains why certain decisions were made in the course design, why students were asked to do certain activities, and what the theory is that integrates elements of the course. The portfolio can establish several important facets about the service-learning course. First, it can document the instructor's professional development and growth. Second, it can focus on student learning as well as teaching. Third, it can demonstrate how the course changed the climate of teaching and learning at the institution.

The discussion of research should, first of all, establish the difficulty of answering the questions being addressed. Assessing, monitoring, and evaluating a course all focus on process or formative evaluation questions (e.g., Is service-learning being properly implemented?) and the outcome or summative evaluation questions (e.g., What is the status of students who have completed the course?). In contrast, research questions focus on establishing at least two additional issues: (a) How can we be confident that those outcomes occurred as a result of the service-learning course (i.e., causality)? (b) Why did those outcomes occur (i.e., theory)?

In order to establish causality, adequate research designs are needed. A basic introduction to Campbell and Stanley's (1966) discussion of pre-experimental and experimental designs is important. For example, the limitations of single group designs, both pre-test only and pre-, post-test designs, should be summarized.

In contrast, stronger alternative designs should be presented. For example, analysis of covari-

ance controls for initial differences in pre-existing groups. As such, it represents an improvement over the typical procedure of generating difference scores between pre- and post-tests (see Campbell & Cook, 1979).

Another alternative is a delayed treatment design. This occurs when a service-learning course is required of a group of students, but only some of them can take the course in a given semester. The students who are enrolled become the treated group, whereas the students who will be enrolled during a subsequent semester serve as the control group. Once the second group is enrolled, they become the treated group, and the next wave who are not taking the course become the control group. This design has the advantage that the control group students are from the same pool of students as the treated group.

The most powerful design involves random assignment to treated and control groups. With random assignment, systematic initial differences between the two groups become unlikely. Implementing random assignment is sometimes practically impossible but, when it is possible, it provides the greatest confidence in making causal inferences.

An alternative procedure is to randomly assign service-learning students to different levels of an intervention. For example, the reflection activity could be varied with some service-learning students doing journals, while others do journals plus small group discussions. For this type of research, random assignment to condition is more easily implemented.

There are additional concerns for conducting research on service-learning that can be discussed. These include the following: (a) Implementation of the independent variable (Was service-learning adequately and appropriately implemented? Are there any manipulation checks to establish quality control?). Research requires a stable implementation of the independent variable. For this reason, it may not be wise to conduct research on a new service-learning course. It might be better to fine tune the course, stabilize the pedagogy, and then conduct research. (b) Moderator variables are variables that qualify in some way the outcomes. For example, under what conditions, and for what types of students, does service-learning have what effect? Are older students affected the same as younger students? If not, then age is a moderator variable of the effects. (c) Mediating variables are intervening variables that are assumed to explain why the intervention (service-learning) has a particular outcome. Mediating variables get at the heart of testing theory. For example, we might conjecture that service-learning students do better than control students on the final examination because, as a result of their service-learning experience, they are better problem solvers. A research design which demonstrates that the service-learning experience caused improvements in higher order cognitive skills, and that these caused better examination performance, demonstrates how research becomes an important tool for elaborating the theoretical and empirical bases for service-learning.

The discussion of experimental design focuses on one's ability to make valid causal inferences. A second, though conceptually distinct, concern is the adequacy of the outcome measures. A section of the workshop should focus on measurement. Measures selected for research should not be chosen for convenience; the measures need to be sensitive to the expected effects of the intervention (e.g., academic self-esteem rather than global self-esteem), specific to the intervention (e.g., consistent with the educational objectives of the course), and meaningful (i.e., reliable and valid). In addition, the choice between qualitative and quantitative measures deserves discussion. There is an inappropriate temptation to choose qualitative measures. In part, this occurs because qualitative data are available in service-learning classes (e.g., journals) and it appears that they can be analyzed easily. However, developing reliable and valid scoring protocols prior to data collection is deceptively time intensive and difficult (there are boxes and boxes of journals from service-learning courses waiting to be analyzed!). Quantitative measures have many advantages for research projects.

Finally, the workshop can mention potential outlets for research on service-learning. These can include journals specific to service-learning (e.g., *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*), discipline-specific journals (e.g., *Teaching of Psychology*), general education journals, and monograph series.

Suggested Readings

Giles, Honnet, and Migliore (1991) present an overview of research issues for service-learning. They outline research questions, methodological issues, strategies for encouraging and supporting research, and disseminating research findings.

Giles and Eyler (1994) provide an example of a pre-, post-test design. Their article also illustrates how to measure outcomes in service-learning and it provides a discussion of some of the limitations of the design. Bringle and Kremer (1993) provide an example of a static groups, pre-, post-test design that employs analysis of covariance to statistically control for initial differences. Markus et al. (1993) kept students blind as to which sections of a political science course were to be service-learning and which would have alternative assignments. Although this study did use strict random assignment, it is very close. For that reason, it is a very strong design for making the causal inference that it was the difference in instruction that resulted in the difference on the outcome variables.

Conclusion

Generally, faculty workshops focus on one particular style of instruction and learning in Kolb's model (abstract conceptualization). We acknowledge that the other three styles can be the basis for other forms of faculty development. Active experimentation can occur as faculty (a) redesign courses, (b) develop integrated sequences of service-learning courses, and (c) write grant proposals for service-learning. Involving faculty in research projects that examine innovative and creative ways to improve service-learning as a pedagogy and the theoretical understanding of it also represent active experimentation.

In addition, it is possible to engage faculty in direct service experiences (concrete experience). We have had faculty participate in a service project and reflect on the experience to identify additional ways that service at the agency can be integrated into academic study. Community service fellowships and community-based sabbaticals are more intense examples of this same strategy. Faculty can also be paired with a faculty mentor and learn about service-learning through the assistance and one-on-one support of a colleague.

Finally, reflective observation can also be used as a faculty development strategy. Involving faculty in presentations and workshops locally and at professional conferences provides an opportunity for them to reflect on and share their teaching experiences. Writing is an important tool of reflection. Involving faculty in writing articles for newsletters and manuscripts for professional journals enhances not only their professional development but also their recognition. Faculty can prepare annual reports and documents for administrative review. Providing a basis for effectively documenting the implementation of service-learning courses as a teaching, research, and/or service activity also becomes a reflective exercise.

Thus, faculty development workshops are only one facet of the process of expanding the use of service-learning among faculty. In addition, expansion among the faculty is only one aspect of implementing and institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. The CAPSL model (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995) details additional activities to be targeted for faculty, as well as the other three constituencies (i.e., institution, students, community).

As more faculty develop service-learning courses, they will begin to affect the character of the curriculum, and, eventually, they will become the "champions" of service-learning that will make it an enduring feature of higher education.

Note

[1] Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL).

	Institution	Faculty	Students	Community
Planning				
Awareness				
Prototype				
Resources				
Expansion				
Recognition				
Monitoring				
Evaluation				
Research				
Institution-alization				

References

Angelo, T.A., & Cross, K.P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1990, December). *Student involvement in community service: Institutional commitment and the Campus Compact.* Paper presented at the meeting of the California Campus Compact, Los Angeles.

Boyer, E. (1994). Creating the new American college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 9, A48.

Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (in press). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education.*

Bringle, R.G., & Kremer, J.F. (1993). An evaluation of an intergenerational service-learning project for undergraduates. *Educational Gerontologist*, 19, 407-416.

Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1990a). Evaluation of youth programs and individual performance. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 285-291). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1990b). Learning from service. Experience is the best teacher—Or is it? In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. I* (pp. 87-98). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field studies*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cotton, D., & Stanton, T.K. (1990). Joining campus and community through service learning. In C. Delve, S.D. Mintz, & G.M. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service as values education* (pp. 101-110). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delve, D., Mintz, S.D., & Stewart, G.M. (Eds.) (1990). *Community service as values education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ehrlich, T. (1995). Taking service seriously. *AAHE Bulletin*, 47(7), 8-10.

Giles, D., Jr., & Eyler, J. (in press). The impact of a college community service laboratory on student's personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence.*

Giles, D., Honnet, E.P., Migliore, S. (Eds.) (1991). *Research agenda for combining service and learning in the 1990s*. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Gish, G.L. (1990). The learning cycle. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 198-205). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Goldstein, M. (1990). Legal issues in combining service and learning. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 39-60). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

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

Hatcher, J.A., & Bringle, R.G. (1995). *Reflection: Bridging the gap between service and learning.* Manuscript under review.

Hedin, D., & Conrad, D. (1990). Practical issues for youth programs: Recruitment, liability, transportation. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 100-108). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Henry, R. (1995). *The tackle box: Reflection.* Cocoa, FL: Florida Campus Compact.

Howard, J. (1993). Community service learning in the curriculum. In J. Howard (Ed.), *Praxis I: A faculty casebook on community service learning* (pp. 3-12). Ann Arbor, MI: OCSL Press.

Kendall, J. (1990a). Using students effectively in your organization. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 219-227). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kendall, J. (1990b). The service-learning educator: A guide to program management. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 17-23). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kendall, J., Duley, J., Little, T., Permaul, J., & Rubin, S. (1990). Increasing faculty involvement. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 137-163). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Levine, A. (1990). Learning by doing through public service: For students and faculty alike. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 164-175). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Lisman, D.C. (1994). Ethics and service learning. *Communique*, 6, 3. Meza, AZ: Campus Compact for Community Colleges.

Littlefield, V.M. (1994). *Community service-learning at Augsburg College: A handbook for instructors.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Center for Faculty

Development.

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, 410-419.

Mecham, M. (1990). Orienting, training and supervising students: From the agency's perspective. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 228-241). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Menlo, A. (1993). Preparing students to learn from the experience of community service. In J. Howard (Ed.), *Praxis I: A faculty casebook on community service-learning*. Ann Arbor, MI: OCSL Press.

Mezirow, J. (1991). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Center for Service-Learning, ACTION (1990). The service-learning educator: A guide to program management. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 17-38). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Ramsay, W. (1990a). Establishing agency relationships. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 109-117). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Ramsay, W. (1990b). The role of the agency supervisor. In J. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol. II* (pp. 242-250). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Rubin, S. G. (1990). Transforming the university through service learning. In C. Delve, S.D. Mintz, & G.M. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service as values education* (pp. 111-124). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D.A. (1982). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Sheckley, B.G., Allen, G.J., & Keeton, M.T. (1993). Adult learning as recursive process. *Journal of Cooperative Education*, 28(2), 56-67.

Silcox, H.C. (1993). *A how-to guide to reflection: Adding cognitive learning to community service programs*. Holland, PA: Brighton Press.

Smith, M.W. (1994). Community service-learning: Striking the chord of citizenship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 37-43.

Svinicki, M.D., & Dixon, N.M. (1987). The Kolb model modified for classroom activities. *College Teaching*, 35(4), 141-146.

Seidman, A., & Tremper, C. (1994). *Legal issues for service-learning programs*. Washington, DC: Nonprofit Risk Management Center.

Wood, R.J. (1990). Changing the educational program. In D.W. Steeples (Ed.), *Managing change in higher education* (pp. 51-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Authors

DR. ROBERT G. BRINGLE is Director of the Office of Service Learning and Associate Professor of Psychology at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. As an instructor, he has integrated community service into Introductory Psychology and Psychology of Aging courses. His interests in service-learning include faculty development, identifying ways of generating and assessing campus commitment for service-learning, and student and faculty attitudes toward service-learning. Trained in social psychology, he is recognized for his research on jealousy in close relationships.

JULIE A. HATCHER is Assistant Director of the Office of Service Learning and Associate Instructor in the School of Education at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. As an instructor, she has designed and implemented two service-learning courses in which college students mentor and tutor middle school students. Her interests in service-learning include exploring ways that service-learning can enhance the goals of general education and providing faculty an opportunity to integrate research, teaching, and service.