

A VOLUME IN **ADVANCES IN SERVICE-LEARNING RESEARCH**

Service-Learning *to* Advance Access *and* Success

Bridging Institutional and Community Capacity



edited by

Travis T. York
Alan S. Tinkler
Barri E. Tinkler

Service-Learning to Advance Access and Success

A volume in
Advances in Service-Learning Research
Virginia M. Jagla, *Series Editor*

This page intentionally left blank.

Service-Learning to Advance Access and Success

**Bridging Institutional
and Community Capacity**

edited by

Travis T. York

*Association of Public
& Land-grant Universities*

Alan S. Tinkler

University of Vermont

Barri E. Tinkler

University of Vermont



INFORMATION AGE PUBLISHING, INC.
Charlotte, NC • www.infoagepub.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress
<http://www.loc.gov>

ISBN: 978-1-64113-474-3 (Paperback)
978-1-64113-475-0 (Hardcover)
978-1-64113-476-7 (ebook)

Copyright © 2019 Information Age Publishing Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Foreword	ix
Introduction.....	xi
Acknowledgments	xvii

SECTION I

COLLABORATION TO BUILD COMMUNITY CAPACITY

1	An Assessment Framework for Embedding Significant and Sustainable Activity-Based, Course-Based, and Program-Based Service-Learning	3
	<i>Rebecca Pearson and Naomi Jeffery Petersen</i>	
2	Building Community Capacity Through University–City Collaborations: A Case Study of the Austin City Hall Fellows Program	31
	<i>Chloe Latham Sikes, Tracie Lowe, and Suchitra V. Gururaj</i>	
3	Building Communication Capacities Within Nonprofits Through Service-Learning.....	53
	<i>Dennis McCunney and Giuseppe Getto</i>	

SECTION II

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE CHANGE

4 Transforming Institutional Capacity for Community-Based Learning: Leveraging Engaged Department Initiatives Into a Campus-Wide Community of Practice 75
Danielle Lake, Karyn E. Rabourn, Nicholas O. Scobey, and Gloria Mileva

5 Co-Creating Service-Learning: The Importance of True Partnerships 99
Julianne Gassman, Emily J. Shields, Katie Kleinhesselink, and Elaine K. Ikeda

6 The Community-Based Learning Coordinator Model: Investing in Infrastructure for Community Impact Through Service-Learning 123
Connie Snyder Mick, Annie Cahill Kelly, and Sam Centellas

SECTION III

ADVANCING STUDENT ACCESS AND SUCCESS

7 Addressing the Problem With Service: Community Formation, Democratization, and Community-Based Learning Pedagogy 151
R. Tyler Derreth

8 Learning to Collaborate: Intersections of the Classroom and Community 183
Patricia M. Ryan, Shirley M. Matteson, and Valerie O. Paton

9 Planting Seeds Through Service: A Qualitative Approach to Assessing Student Civic Learning Through Community Partnerships 213
Laura Martin, Albert Nylander, and Lakyre’a Janae Owens

10 Advancing Democracy in Teacher Education: Service-Learning in Third Space Partnerships 241
Michael Kopish

11 Rethinking Teacher Education: Lessons Learned From a Mandatory Community-Based Service-Learning Program 283
Gary Harfitt and Jessie Mei Ling Chow

12	Preservice EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Their Reflected Experiences in a Service-Learning Course	309
	<i>Yasemin Kırkgöz</i>	
	 Summary Epilogue.....	 335
	<i>Alan S. Tinkler</i>	
	About the Editors	337
	About the Contributors.....	339

This page intentionally left blank.

FOREWORD

In recent years, service-learning has taken on renewed urgency among higher education institutions with public service missions. For institutions aiming to enhance their engagement work, one of the first places to turn is naturally the service-learning research. Yet the literature often leaves institutions wanting for research that addresses the real challenges faced in their communities rather than esoteric studies that only advance the knowledge base at the margins. In this 2018 volume, Dr. York and his colleagues have set out for—and achieved—something more ambitious and lasting: A collection of research that addresses real problems facing students, institutions, and their regions as they aim to define what effective and impactful service-learning looks like in our time.

Still, the shared mission to strengthen our institutions and communities makes the task no less difficult. But armed with research identifying evidence-based practices that help broaden access, cultivate talent, and build capacity, institutions are empowered to tackle the type of challenges they encounter in their daily work. This volume, *Service-Learning to Advance Access and Success: Bridging Institutional and Community Capacity*, helps scholars and institutions understand both the complexities and promise of service-learning efforts. As president of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, president emeritus of Michigan State University, and former head of the United States Agency of International Development, I've witnessed firsthand the foundational role universities can play in their communities, countries, and world. In all the challenges we face, knowledge is indispensable not only to understanding the world around us but making it

a better place. By examining the multitudes of service-learning approaches and opportunities, the authors of this volume offer to help bring us closer to that ideal.

—Peter McPherson, President
Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

INTRODUCTION

Let us begin with a clear definition of service-learning for any newcomers to this community. The Serve America Act defines service-learning as a regular for-credit course in which students engage in service to meet the needs of a community and participate in guided reflection to achieve the intended learning goals of the course (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2008). Several models of service-learning have been explored in the literature including a critical model of service-learning advanced by Mitchell (2008) and six service-learning course types advanced by Cone (2001; “pure” service-learning, discipline-based service-learning, problem-based service-learning, capstone service-learning courses, service internships, and undergraduate community-based action research). The genesis of service-learning is most clearly traced to the activism of the 1960s and 1970s; however, a closer look at this pedagogy reveals a movement that stretches much deeper into America’s history and foundation.

By the 1970s, a growing group of scholars and practitioners who had been experimenting with service-learning approaches argued that this teaching method had the potential to (a) transform educational practice through its application of the educational and philosophic principles of John Dewey, Paulo Freire, and Lev Vygotsky; and (b) address societal issues of inequality, oppression, power, and privilege. Most importantly, service-learning offered a pedagogical approach that allowed institutions to accomplish synergy amongst its historical purposes of teaching, research, and service—of which, service has historically always been overshadowed by research or teaching. Those involved in service-learning today would be wise to remember this

pedagogy provides a radical opportunity to deconstruct the ivory tower associated with American higher education and to restructure institutions as integrated symbiotic networks of talent, resource, and capacity development.

Throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, service-learning research was intensely focused on the student outcomes. That body of research has effectively brought service-learning from the fringes into the mainstream of institutionalized pedagogies. In the past decade service-learning research has experienced an infusion of exploration in three distinct ways: first, a commitment to large-scale quantitative methodologies; second, a proliferation of research that has explored how different subgroups of students experience the pedagogy differently, thusly resulting in variation among outcomes; and third, a focus on the experiences and outcomes associated for communities and community partners engaged in service-learning.

In an effort to support these movements, this volume of the *Advances in Service-Learning Research* series focuses on how service-learning can advance access and success. Not simply access and success of students, but the ways that service-learning can advance access and success for all through bridging institutional and community capacity building. I asked authors to consider the following questions regarding capacity building: Does service-learning provide an opportunity for synergy between the core functions of a university and the community? How might service-learning redistribute power between community and institutional agents? Are there lessons to be learned from successes or failures in service-learning to enable institutions to build community capacity in better ways? I also encouraged authors to consider Fourie's (2003) article, "Beyond the Ivory Tower: Service-Learning for Sustainable Community Development."

The chapters in this volume serve as a testament to the ways in which service-learning research continues to be advanced by thoughtful scholar practitioners. The 12 chapters included in this volume are organized into three sections. The first section focuses on how institutional and community partnerships can be leveraged to build community capacity. The second section focuses on how institutions might build their own capacity to effect change for the good of society. The third and final section focuses on six studies exploring the relationship service-learning pedagogy has with access and success for students. Of the six studies, three are situated within the context of teacher-preparation programs.

SECTION I: COLLABORATION TO BUILD COMMUNITY CAPACITY

In Chapter 1, "An Assessment Framework for Embedding Significant and Sustainable Activity-Based, Course-Based, and Program-Based Service-Learning,"

Rebecca Pearson and Naomi Jeffery Petersen provide examples from multiple disciplines to illustrate how service-learning can be used as a tool to frame pedagogical orientation across courses, programs, disciplines, institutions, and interactions with the community. Pearson and Jeffrey Petersen provide illustrative examples for practitioners on the issues of community coherence and sustainability. That practice-based experience is then wonderfully paired with a framework for service-learning assessment that will serve scholars and practitioners alike.

In Chapter 2, “Building Community Capacity through University-City Collaborations: A Case Study of the Austin City Hall Fellows Program,” Chloe Latham Sikes, Tracie Lowe, and Suchitra Gururaj provide an in-depth case study to examine how service-learning can respond to community and city needs and support place-based, reciprocal partnerships with community members. Latham Sikes, Lowe, and Gururaj situate their study using place-building theory employing a mixed-methods analytic procedure with their single-case study design. Their findings serve to inform how community capacity-building can be assessed and serve as a model for improving university–city–community partnerships.

In Chapter 3, “Building Communication Capacities Within Nonprofits Through Service-Learning,” Dennis McCunney and Guiseppe Getto explore the impact of a service-learning course to develop the communication capacities for nonprofit community partners. In the chapter, McCunney and Getto engage in participatory action research to explore what strategies service-learning instructors can employ to aid nonprofits with digital media and the impact of those strategies.

SECTION II: INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE CHANGE

In Chapter 4, “Transforming Institutional Capacity for Community-Based Learning: Leveraging Engaged Department Initiatives Into a Campus-Wide Community of Practice,”

Danielle Lake, Karyn Rabourn, Nicholas Scobey, and Gloria Mileva investigate an Engaged Department Initiative (EDI) seeking to leverage departmental cultural changes, burgeoning faculty expertise, and systemic action research practices to catalyze change at the institutional level. Utilizing a systemic action research design to highlight programmatic successes and failures, the scholars found that maintaining varied levels of support that also act as mechanisms of accountability may be particularly effective practices for generating and sustaining the capacity for community-based learning across an institution.

In Chapter 5, “Co-Creating Service-Learning: The Importance of True Partnerships,” Julianne Gassman, Emily Shields, Katie Kleinhesselink, and Elaine Ikeda explore the effects of providing dedicated time for co-constructed service-learning course development between community partners and institutional faculty. Utilizing a pre–post survey and case study design, the researchers suggest this practice contributes to solidified partnership, enhanced learning outcomes for students, and increased achievement of community needs.

In Chapter 6, “The Community-Based Learning Coordinator Model: Investing in Infrastructure for Community Impact Through Service-Learning,” Connie Snyder Mick, Annie Cahill Kelly, and Sam Centellas undertake an in-depth qualitative analysis of a program using the community-based learning coordinator model. Drawing on interviews and reflections from six community-based learning coordinators, the researchers suggest essential elements for a successful implementation and replication of the model to increase institutional change for improved community partnerships.

SECTION III: ADVANCING STUDENT ACCESS AND SUCCESS

In Chapter 7, “Addressing the Problem with Service: Community Formation, Democratization, and Community-Based Learning Pedagogy,” Tyler Derreth undertakes an ethnographic examination of a postsecondary sociology course to understand how all participants (students, faculty, and community partners) experience and learn through a critical community-partnered pedagogy—a pedagogy that seeks to intentionally shift conventional power dynamics so that all participants are dialectically teachers and learners. Derreth finds that this pedagogy can produce new definitional boundaries of community for those involved and that a shift in power dynamics within the academic setting fostered democratic processes and outcomes.

In Chapter 8, “Learning to Collaborate: Intersections of the Classroom and Community,” Patricia Ryan, Shirley Matteson, and Valerie Paton explore the experiences of doctoral students, faculty-mentors, and community college partners in a semester-long applied research experience. The researchers utilize a case study approach to exploration and provide an example of an embedded engaged scholarship experience for graduate training. Challenges and best practices are identified and examined.

In Chapter 9, “Planting Seeds Through Service: A Qualitative Approach to Assessing Student Civic Learning Through Community Partnerships,” Laura Martin, Albert Nylander, and Lakyre’a Janae Owens utilize an ethnographic sensibility approach to assesses students’ civic learning outcomes while serving in a year-long, cocurricular, service-learning experience.

Exploring student reflections on a partnership with a rural community in the impoverished Mississippi Delta, findings suggest four key college student civic learning outcomes and offer considerations as to how civic learning can be harnessed to enhance the integrity of community–university partnerships.

In Chapter 10, “Advancing Democracy in Teacher Education: Service-Learning in Third Space Partnerships,” Michael Kopish uses a multiple case study to examine an innovative approach to teacher education aimed at supporting teacher candidates’ development as citizens and as new professionals via the engagement of third space partnerships for service-learning. Kopish demonstrates the efficacy of third space partnerships for service-learning as transformative experiences in the development of teacher candidates provides a critical appraisal of these partnerships for future consideration and adoption in the field.

In Chapter 11, “Rethinking Teacher Education: Lessons Learned From a Mandatory Community-Based Service-Learning Program,” Gary Harfitt and Jessie Mei Ling Chow describe an innovative approach to teacher preparation at the postgraduate level through the establishment of a compulsory service-learning block across subject disciplines at a leading Asian university. Harfitt and Mei Ling Chow detail the process of curricular change to implement and institutionalize the program and explore the personal and professional outcomes related to participation for novice teachers.

In Chapter 12, “Preservice EFL Teachers’ Perceptions and Their Reflected Experiences in a Service-Learning Course,” Yasemin Kırkgöz employs a multiple case-study to explore teacher candidates’ experiences and outcomes with participation in a Turkish preservice English as a foreign language (EFL) course. Kırkgöz suggests that service-learning can be an effective pedagogical tool to promote teacher candidates’ empowerment, increase their awareness of community issues, and improve their confidence in meeting community needs.

—**Travis T. York**
Editor

REFERENCE

- Fourie, M. (2003). Beyond the ivory tower: Service-learning for sustainable community development. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17(1), 31–38.

This page intentionally left blank.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The editors gratefully acknowledge the following reviewers for providing thoughtful feedback and reviews to strengthen all submissions to the volume and for ensuring the rigor and quality of this volume.

2018 Editorial Review Board for *Advances in Service-Learning Research* series:

Samantha Alvis
Jessica C. Bennett
Kathy Bussert-Webb
Jenna Dell
Tyler Derreth
Antonio Estudillo
C. Lynne Hannah
Meghan Hartline
Virginia Jagla

Eileen Merritt
Tania Mitchell
Debbie Paine
Meaghan Pifer
Mark Rivera
Bob Spires
Glenn Sterner
Tommy Van Cleave
Christian Winterbottom

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION I

COLLABORATION TO BUILD COMMUNITY CAPACITY

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 1

AN ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR EMBEDDING SIGNIFICANT AND SUSTAINABLE ACTIVITY-BASED, COURSE- BASED, AND PROGRAM- BASED SERVICE-LEARNING

Rebecca Pearson and Naomi Jeffery Petersen

ABSTRACT

Service-learning is a powerful support for academic success in undergraduate preprofessional programs as well as for communities, but it is challenging to plan and implement, and the paths to success are not always clearly marked. Newer faculty in particular should be encouraged, but also aided, to find and follow an approach that will allow well-integrated, useful, and sustainable projects in their courses. In this chapter, two faculty—one in public health and one in education—discuss complex, multi-component projects undertaken individually in major-specific classes and as a cross-disciplinary teaching team. We share context and rationale, successes, challenges, lessons learned,

and teaching tools to bridge gaps for faculty and communities wishing to move from project idea to learning and capacity-building reality. Finally, an assessment framework is proposed which facilitates the significant and sustainable embedment of service-learning.

SERVICE-LEARNING AS A TOOL TO FRAME PEDAGOGICAL ORIENTATION

Service-learning projects are useful mechanisms to bridge academic and community capacity, an ongoing, and growing, imperative for universities as public serving institutions. Ishisaka, Sohng, Farwell, and Uehara (2004) noted that “universities and communities, working together, can have a profound impact on improving the lives of people while at the same time moving the university to a larger sense of its own mission and purpose” (p. 321). As this book’s aims make apparent, too, service-learning projects can be impactful in distributing, or redistributing, power. Across a university, entities such as campus dining and wellness venues, museums, libraries, theaters, gardens, observatories, and, potentially, others, can become sites in which students, faculty, and local partners including schools, hospitals, senior centers, and other organizations can bridge noticeable (and less noticeable) “town and gown” divides. Faculty who include substantive service-learning components in their courses, and who fully engage such community organizations and agencies as true partners, can have even more impact. Whether by aiding community partners in assessing their own status, potential, and value—or helping build on, or build new ways to do, what they do—when we take seriously our role as public and local intellectuals, we establish the conditions that support community-driven change. Such a transformation is an ideal commonly extolled in the theoretical literature but unfortunately rarely documented. It is therefore helpful to outline the potential value of service-learning to its various beneficiaries and then to proceed to our examination of different models of service-learning serving different purposes.

Concurrently, an increasing emphasis in higher education surrounds building the visibility of student success and community engagement initiatives. Service-learning projects, whether pursued completely within a course or housed fully or partially elsewhere on campus, are recognized as valuable for improving student retention and persistence and supporting local agencies and organizations working to better community outcomes. A wide range of project types, goals, and levels of effort (whether that of faculty, institutional partner, students, or community partner) can be categorized as involving service-learning.

Service-learning may be intuitively viewed as simply a pedagogical tool, most relevant for teaching-focused institutions, and most easily supportable by other faculty when the campus climate overtly values innovative teaching (Furco, 2001). However, service-learning projects and experiences can enhance a researcher's ability to explore social issues and solutions, and Enos and Troppe (1996) argue that research should be seen as integral to service-learning projects, especially when the "intent of such research is to change a system while studying it" (p. 79). Thus, as Furco (2001) noted, it is "as appropriate for faculty at research universities as it is for faculty at other types of higher education institutions" (p. 68). Using Boyer's model of scholarship (Boyer, 1990) and remembering, especially, the need for engaged scholarship to be viewed as, and truly be, assessable scholarship (Glassick, 2000), we can see that service-learning provides opportunities for the scholarship of teaching and of application no matter the field of study. As part of this chapter, we discuss the variation of faculty roles of scholarship and service involved in service learning in addition to its function as a teaching method. We begin, however, with the larger context of our campus orientation toward service-learning and the support mechanisms in place.

BRIDGING WITHIN AND ACROSS THE INSTITUTION AND COMMUNITIES

The complex integration practices that make significant service-learning so useful also make it unwieldy to analyze. This collection of ideals and high impact practices cannot easily be studied for their separate outcomes and contributions to student success, for they are found to be far more effective in combination (Kilgo, Sheets, & Pascarella, 2015) and the variables confound each other. For this reason, our discussion includes the practical problem of collecting information that can assess, and thus document, those outcomes and contributions in a meaningful way, particularly when the service-learning is course-based. Thus, we address assessment methods, fully embracing an outcomes-oriented perspective, regarding high impact methods as the interventions to achieve liberal arts goals.

Considering the use of service-learning to bridge institutional and community capacity, and the identified gaps between university context and community change, challenges us to see, as Winter, Wiseman, and Muirhead (2006) do, the extent to which community-engaged service-learning projects are bringing a "focus on the local, the community, and the applied" (p. 226) and can function as a critical response to individualism and market-based ideas of higher education. As colleagues in our rurally situated, predominantly commuter institution, we have also noted—again, similarly to Winter et al.—a largely depoliticized student population. Service-learning

projects that are intentionally structured with local partners to help address disparate community conditions may help to bring involved students a sense of usable outrage, in a way, enabling them to see their own potential as future actors in their chosen communities.

As a parallel, students in service-learning oriented classes have opportunities, often unplanned, to witness their faculty members “walking the talk.” For example, in addition to lecturing on the difficulties public health professionals face in working with community organizations—a critical aspect of our roles—challenging conversations literally can be brought into (or sometimes simply happen in) the classroom when the community or campus partner visits class to engage in planning, troubleshooting, or debriefing. Students in our classrooms see us, as part of the trajectory of movement during project work, engaging in professional behaviors that make improved community outcomes more likely. Such behaviors (effective communication, organization, follow-through, problem solving, and the like) are not just recognized officially as competencies or otherwise critical components in our respective fields of teacher education and public health, but reflect learnable skills and malleable dispositional traits that students preparing for almost any career setting will need.

Grounded in experiences with our students, we would argue also that the idea of the sociological imagination is translatable to both teacher education and public health, and in fact is basic to understandings of our professional preparation-focused disciplines. Students preparing to be K–12 educators, as well as those planning careers in governmental or other community public health settings, are tasked with understanding, or at least noticing, people’s social, economic, and life contexts as impactful on their capacity to have the academic, health, and other outcomes they want (Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill, 2007). Both teachers and public health practitioners can, as a central focus of their work, help improve that capacity at a variety of levels, but only if they are trained and supported to view themselves as change agents with responsibility, and *ability*, regarding confronting social inequity.

Although the moral virtue of serving the greater good may be touted, especially in our fields, most major-required courses must also provide a practical value adding to a student’s marketability for future employment. Undergraduate content, by design, is of course the reason students pursue higher education, and—particularly in a teaching-first institution such as ours—must be a faculty member’s overriding focus. Fortunately, we find service-learning projects to be not just valuable but invaluable as substantial components of educating our students for our fields, and helping students to move from *thinking* like a student or amateur to thinking like a teacher or like a public or community health professional. Such shift in thinking is often discussed under the rubric of dispositions, and especially those related to professionalism

within a specific field. In both teacher education and public health, we have mandates to train students to serve diverse aspects of the public as well as to meet accountabilities to government at various levels, and our students must leave our programs ready for those responsibilities. In 2014, Peterson, Wardwell, Will, and Campana reported findings that confirm the value of opportunities for students “to practice their nascent knowledge, skills, and abilities” in helping them to feel ready for first jobs (p. 354).

AN INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Our regional comprehensive university intentionally embraces liberal arts ideals as described in a model by King, Kendall Brown, Lindsay, and Van-Hecke (2007), for example, (a) integration of learning, (b) inclination to inquire and lifelong learning, (c) effective reasoning and problem solving, (d) moral character, (e) intercultural effectiveness, (f) leadership, and (g) well-being. In addition, our institution’s goals include the use of “high impact practices” as named by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU, 2015): (a) first-year seminars and experiences, (b) common intellectual experiences, (c) learning communities, (d) writing-intensive courses, (e) collaborative assignments and projects, (f) undergraduate research, (g) diversity/global learning, (h) service-learning and community-based learning, (i) internships, and (j) capstone courses and projects. Such high impact practices are perhaps most important in helping ensure graduates are ready to “contribute with integrity to their workplaces and to their communities, large and small” (p. 1). Importantly, career readiness is a justification and quality measure not just for the specified practices, of course, but for academic programs themselves.

Service itself is an industry within the university that allows it to address those ideals associated with its academic commitment as well as the priority of attracting and retaining students until they complete their degrees. It is no secret that the stability of tuitions is a high priority in fostering the stability of scholarship. The institution has supported and promoted service-learning. On our campus, the dean of student success oversees a vast assortment of focused activities and entities, including the Center for Leadership and Community Engagement (CLCE).

ACTIVITY-BASED SERVICE-LEARNING

CLCE sponsors an agenda of programs both on- and off-campus, some of which are categorized as service-learning and/or place-based learning. These involve community partnerships that are the venues for the activities

typically tied to nationally observed recognition periods. For instance, in association with Earth Week, students are recruited to work on civic projects in Ellensburg, at Olmstead State Park and along the Yakima River. For Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, a candlelight vigil, a film screening and activities with local elementary school children are organized on campus. Other offerings include workshops developing leadership skills and “community building” experiences for small groups. CLCE also administers a scholarship for students with a record of civic engagement and hosts an annual appreciation: “Members of the CWU community who contribute in extraordinary, though oftentimes quiet, ways for the betterment of our campus are recognized at this semi-formal event” (CLCE, n.d.a).

One of CLCE’s innovations is the Leadership Transcript system: “Similar to an academic transcript, the Leadership Transcript officially lists all your activities outside the classroom—Leadership positions, club/organization membership, athletics, community service, sport clubs/intramural sports, honors and awards received, and professional development” (CLCE, n.d.). This cataloging is promoted as adding value to employment, graduate school, and scholarship applications. Unstated is its role of collecting data that can show the university’s campus-wide commitment to engaging students in service of various kinds and emphases. However, data is not systematically collected from this system nor as part of the above-mentioned civic engagement activities, workshops, or awards events that could be used to quantify any of the outcomes mentioned above. The frequency counts of participation may be interpreted in summary reports according to the stated purpose of the venue, not to any measures of outcomes.

Given the value placed on service-learning as part of campus environments that promote student persistence and success, institutions often establish supportive campus entities to help students and faculty find and pursue service-learning projects and other opportunities, and our campus, with the CLCE, is no exception. Such entities can be helpful, and ours is, especially for newer faculty or those without experience developing and implementing service-learning course projects, and for encouraging engagement in discrete projects with short-term, concretely defined outcomes (such as a River Clean-Up Day). However, inadequate monetary support and fluctuations in campus climate and administrative format, as well as personnel changes, can limit the usefulness of such a center.

Additionally, a center by its very nature poses something of an organizational barrier for faculty wishing to implement course projects that integrate community partners as consultants or co-developers. The center approach is necessarily simplistic and micromanaging, and thus may be counterproductive: Faculty with ideas surrounding more creative and community-engaging initiatives may rightly view their instructional goals and project structuring as beyond what such an ostensibly supportive entity can,

in actuality, support. Such projects typically are less bounded and sometimes present “moving target” objectives that a Center’s system—probably designed to establish user-friendly project descriptions and supports such as electronic sign-up sheets for tracking volunteer numbers, tasks, and time-lines—is not equipped to handle.

COURSE-BASED SERVICE-LEARNING

Another support, and one more useful for faculty perhaps, especially those new to service-learning as a teaching tool, is our institution’s Academic Service-Learning Faculty Fellows structure. CWU’s academic service-learning webpage, maintained largely by this group of stipended faculty, describes academic service-learning as

a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. (Central Washington University [CWU], n.d.b)

Developing and disseminating that definition is actually identified as one of the accomplishments of the group, along with providing resources to promote its implementation.

The university’s academic service-learning report identifies courses containing a service-learning element, highlighting the community engagement activity (Walker, 2017). This information is also included in the academic service-learning website. Only three departments were represented in 2015–2016, although service-learning opportunities are known to be a part of many others. In four art courses listed, emblems, posters, and program covers were designed for events, allowing students to apply the principles of design. All other listed projects occurred in Education and Public Health courses, some of which were courses studying community: EDEC Parent Involvement and HED (now PUBH) 351 Community Building Strategies for Health include field experience as a required element.

As part of the academic service-learning site’s resources for faculty wishing to integrate ASL into their teaching, a template is provided for UNIV 109/309/509, a shell available to faculty in any department. Essential components are identified as awareness, engagement, practice, reflection, and integration. Students are expected to spend a combined time in class and in the field of about 30 hours per credit implementing the project. The template includes an example Academic Service-Learning Journal outline that, in 13 graded prompts, addresses aspects of a project’s anticipated

development, planning, execution, and intended impact, as well as posing questions that help students reflect on their own progress and change as learners, including changes in attitude and readiness for future careers and “role as a citizen” (CWU, n.d.c).

The provided template, journal outline, and other resources are valuable, and interested faculty should find them useful in helping to frame meaningful course aspects and assignments. However, our university’s academic service-learning site itself has vast and likely unexplored potential to become a clearinghouse for best practices-related tools and opportunities. For example, although the student is asked, as part of the journal outline, to discuss who will benefit from the project, a way to gauge how a community host views the contribution of the student is not provided. Additionally, the template appears to assume an independent student investigation with no instruction, although collaboration and mentoring and other high impact practices might be factored in, as they are in the more formal internships to be discussed below. As with the simpler participatory events described above, these instructor resources also lack a way to measure perceived benefit from the civic venue’s perspective or the academic content knowledge gained. These gaps could be addressed simply by, in the first case, providing an electronically available survey instrument and invitation templates a faculty member could use to solicit input from community partners, and, in the second, by providing faculty with an efficient tool such as the Student Assessment of their Learning Gains (SALG). Free to use, adaptable and, in our experiences quite well received by students, the SALG “focuses exclusively on the degree to which a course has enabled student learning” (“About SALG,” n.d., para. 3).

PROGRAM-BASED SERVICE-LEARNING

Unlike activity-based service-learning, which is discrete and with no specific connection to academic outcomes, and unlike isolated course-based service-learning which may be connected to academic outcomes, program-based service-learning is directly linked to academic and professional outcomes. As faculty teaching in the seemingly disparate areas of teacher education and public health, we share a focus on students planning to enter fields where they will be serving others and directly involved with improving individual and community outcomes. The terms we use (teacher candidate, preprofessional), our sites and partners (K–12 schools, other community entities), and our assessment and documentation methods (primarily state-mandated and specialized, primarily faculty-designed and setting-specific) differ, but we find commonalities in approach and goals.

As part of degree requirements, our students engage in extensive practice in public-serving settings: Public health students are required to complete 400 hours as interns housed in community organizations or governmental agencies, and teacher candidates engage in 450 hours of classroom-based experience under the designations of field experience, practicum, and internship. Prior to these capstones, undergraduates in our two programs typically have at least a few service-learning experiences, often as part of our own courses. In this chapter, we focus on complex, community partner-engaging projects, often spanning an academic term or longer. These relatively intense projects may provide commensurately more value, both with respect to capacity building among community entities and improving students' professional readiness and development. Again, a survey of the community entities' perception of value added by the presence of students is rarely focused on in the immediate service-learning activity. The community building is regarded as a long-term investment in cultivating highly qualified future employees for the enhancement of the profession.

SERVICE-LEARNING AND TEACHER PREPARATION

The National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), selected *service-learning* as the preferred generic term for hands-on experiences (e.g., practicums, internships, clinics, labs, fieldwork). However, its replacement, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) does not use the term at all. Instead, Standard 2 for teacher preparation institutions requires “the provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P–12 students’ learning and development.”

The components emphasize candidate preparation and performance, and the contribution to the community is not recognized as immediately beneficial. Instead, host schools see that developing a more competent and committed professional is an investment for the future. CAEP details three aspects of this mandated hands-on learning: partnerships for clinical preparation, clinical educators, and clinical experiences. Considering merely the numbers of tasks required to establish and maintain the practice aspect of teacher education illustrates the complex nature of service-learning relevant teacher candidate preparation components. Our teacher preparation program aligns with these guidelines as well as their emphasis on monitoring career readiness. The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) codified these competencies in 10 standards that echo the AACU’s liberal arts ideals as well as research on high impact

practices (Kendall, 2011). The students are assessed using a state-mandated Teaching Performance Assessment (edTPA) which incorporates many of the ideals of service-learning. They must certainly have mastered academic content, they must be aware of the diversity and equity issues of the community, they must demonstrate considerable rapport and communication with students and families, and they must use evidence based methods.

SERVICE-LEARNING AND PUBLIC HEALTH PREPARATION

Given the depth and breadth of public health practice and the variety of potential employment settings, new community health professionals develop and hone skills for some aspects of their field, reasonably, only when they are actually in the field. However, those emerging from baccalaureate programs are expected to have been exposed to, if not yet be skilled at, concepts and practices related to the Centers for Disease Control's three Core Functions of Public Health (assessment, policy development, and assurance). Organized under this umbrella are the 10 Essential Services: (a) monitor; (b) diagnose and investigate; (c) inform, educate, and empower; (d) mobilize partnerships; (e) develop policies and plans; (f) enforce laws and regulations; (g) link people to services; (h) assure a competent public health and personal health care workforce; (i) evaluate effectiveness, accessibility, and quality; and (j) research for new insights and innovative solutions (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011; Laufman, Duquette, & Trepanier, 2012). Even setting aside the necessary further delineation of the essential services into the array of strategies and activities public and community health professionals must be ready to undertake in their daily working lives, these concepts and practices are recognizably abstract, meaning that, as noted above, active learning experiences are critical. In addition to needing other competencies, new public health professionals enter workplaces and settings that demand they have skills in communication, as well as the ability to develop and maintain relationships with community partners. Such new professionals should be ready to navigate and manage their places in sensitive and long-term organizational and community conversations, or at least be aware that the context of community health improvement will entail such conversations.

Anecdotally, public health and teacher education faculty tend to share the perception that, no matter our efforts as instructors to bring in the "real worlds" of public health work and K–12 education, students routinely enter others of our courses having *not* internalized certain understandings we believe we've emphasized and even overemphasized. Those perceptions are echoed, it seems to us, in hallways and faculty offices across campus, and probably across the globe. Educational trends, such as active learning

or problem-based learning, come and go; however, even without the substantial body of literature making the case for us, most university educators would recognize the value of such strategies in reinforcing concepts, and particularly abstract or more distal concepts that play an important role in future success but are not necessarily a focus of major coursework at the undergraduate level. As we have noted, beyond the opportunities present in other teaching strategies, service-learning provides supervision and support for students to use conceptual understanding in professionally relevant practice, often in actual professional settings, and thus actively improve, for themselves, that understanding.

Given the content-heavy nature of both teacher education and undergraduate public health education, embedding community-engaged practice opportunities for students is a challenge if only from the course time perspective; however, doing so is essential and can help our disciplines both claim ownership of this type of training and potentially gain institutional support for doing so. This chapter's examples and arguments arise from the authors' disciplinary contexts, but it should be noted, as alluded to above, that many disciplines will find reasons for, and opportunities allowing, embedded community-engaged service-learning projects in appropriate courses. Furthermore, in an institution embracing liberal arts ideals, every course can be expected to embed the core components of service-learning: academic achievement, citizenship, professional practice, community cohesion, and collective insight.

We have each integrated complex and relatively long-term service-learning projects in our courses. In this chapter, we provide examples, offer guidance for establishing and maintaining the projects, and discuss challenges and opportunities. As instructors of project-focused, community-engaged courses, we take different approaches and our fields have different emphases, but several common challenges, and opportunities, arise. The overall challenge is to improve student success.

STUDENT SUCCESS AND SERVICE-LEARNING

Improving student success is complex. This complexity becomes particularly visible in conjunction with community engagement projects and even more in campus-based efforts that aim to build capacity in underserved or less well recognized, but potentially impactful, community groups. Even with this intricacy, a center-style approach can be valuable, particularly for new faculty wishing simply to award credit in a given course based on student service-learning hours and written products. Again, though, certain faculty and their community partners will predictably benefit from a flexible and reflective approach. Faculty may be able to help students attain

stronger success with respect to learning outcomes and field readiness (Kilgo et al., 2015) if they integrate other high impact practices in their projects. Also, reasonably, with such an integrated approach, those faculty committed to the scholarship of teaching and learning will likely be able to contribute more to the evidence base. However, faculty engaged in these more involved and multi-faceted service-learning strategies may need to create their own paths to success.

The study by Kilgo and colleagues (2015), mentioned above, is of considerable scope and rigor, and worthy of further discussion here, while considering campus contexts surrounding service-learning. In 2015, these authors discussed findings from the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNS), which examines longitudinally the effects of high impact practices in 17 four-year institutions representing the range of types, control, size, selectivity, location, and patterns of student residence found in American colleges, including three research institutions and three regional comprehensives. Over half (53.12%) of the students remaining in the study sample at follow-up had participated in service-learning and even more (69.76%) in internships. The authors noted that an “internship was a significant, positive predictor for inclination to inquire and lifelong learning as measured by the Need for Cognition Scale (NCS) and socially responsible leadership” (p. 521), although service-learning did not have as stable an influence. This apparent discrepancy may speak to the differences between service-learning and internships, the primary ones being (often) whether participation is compulsory or voluntary and whether the planned experience is of short or longer duration.

Another WNS finding was surprising: “Service-learning was a weak, significant, negative predictor for inclination to inquire and lifelong learning as measured by NCS” (Kilgo et al., 2015, p. 522). The NCS is an 18-item scale measuring students’ “tendency to engage in and enjoy effortful cognitive activity” (Cacioppo, Petty, Feinstein, & Jarvis, 1996, p. 197). The authors interpreted this finding as indicating a need to study variations in the way service-learning experiences are administered, and suggest that a key aspect of that administration concerns the assessment of the experience, that is, whether the liberal arts ideals are explicitly articulated as goals for the experience, whether those ideals are measured as academic outcomes, whether students are afforded opportunities to reflect on their experience, and whether there are explicit connections between the service-learning experience and future careers. Meanwhile, it is worth noting that the authors recognized the study’s limitations in not measuring the variation of students’ experiences within each practice, and recommended that institutions should proceed with caution before promoting or discarding a particular practice.

The Wabash study (Kilgo et al., 2015), concurring with many others, found that “active and collaborative learning and undergraduate research were consistently significant, positive predictors for nearly all of the liberal arts educational outcomes” (p. 521), which speaks to the role of service-learning and internships as pedagogical models to achieve the remaining ideals. The effectiveness is apparently cumulative, with multiple dimensions of best practice explaining the dynamic. Although considering ways to address such multiple dimensions may daunt an instructor new to incorporating projects such as ours, a translatable example is found within our Public Health program, in a senior course, PUBH 470, Population Health Assessment and Research. PUBH 470 is the first in a sequence of three courses that each incorporate undergraduate research, active and collaborative learning, and service-learning. The entire class works together to design a needs assessment tool for a particular real world entity (such as a workplace or the campus itself), uses their instrument to collect data, and then (in the second course in the series, PUBH 471, Program Planning) designs an intervention based on their analysis of the data. In the final course, PUBH 472, Program Implementation and Evaluation, students conduct their intervention and evaluate its impact. The service-learning in this case is not in any way an internship, but a pedagogical model for engaging students in meaningful application of the courses’ content while also generating a contribution of indisputable value to the local entity.

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND SERVICE-LEARNING: A BRIDGE FOR STUDENTS

We, the authors, come from two fields which are professionally defined as service oriented. In any university, some academic programs are by nature already attuned to certain ideals and practices. Career-oriented programs such as ours—Professional Educator Preparation (PEP) and Public Health (PH)—often deliberately identify as outcomes those competencies necessary for employment, making them a fairly obvious fit for service-learning. Additionally, nearly all professional studies are multidisciplinary, incorporating a knowledge base including arts, humanities, business, and sciences both natural and social; this breadth of content also helps to encourage the use of service-learning strategies, as projects and partnerships can arise, then, from a wide range of foci, increasing both the quantity and diversity of opportunities for students and community.

Perhaps just as critical as opportunities to develop profession-relevant habits and skills are opportunities to gauge the fit of an intended field—*before* one engages in further, and perhaps expensive, training or, even more importantly, before taking a first job in the given field. Field experiences, whether

short- or longer-term, can be “reality checks” for students, especially those in preprofessional programs such as ours. Boyns and DeCesare (as cited in Perry & Jones, 2006) surveyed graduating sociology seniors and found important relationships among students’ service-learning orientations, their participation in community-based internships, and their commitment to civic engagement. They found that, although the internships promoted an orientation toward civic engagement, they also appeared to alert students to the difficulties inherent in civic engagement activities. Those students who had *no* internship experience reported significantly *higher* interest in studying people and in working in a sociology-related field.

Although this finding may be problematic at first read, it points to the importance of internships as orientations not just to community and practice engagement but to professional fields that include public service. Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) posited that a mature service-learning curriculum will cultivate maturity in students through five phases of involvement: *exploration*, *values clarification*, *realization*, or insight into the meaning of service, *activation*, and *internalization*. However, this model does not include a discrete phase we have observed in both public health and teacher education somewhere between realization and activation: the reality check that “this is work!” Inherent to this insight is a redefinition of leadership as a deliberate decision to confront inertia and the absence of vision by patiently and relentlessly pursuing an ideal through concrete efforts and continuous compromise. This stage is a vulnerable point in service-learning as well as service-oriented professions: Students and new professionals are frustrated that their best laid plans require continued problem-solving and resolve, an epiphany which distinguishes this phase from the earlier naiveté. Participation and advocacy are recognized as the eventual byproducts of considerable planning and rehearsal.

In teacher education, there are abundant anecdotes of a candidate investing years completing required academic preparation only to discover, during student teaching, a dispositional incompatibility with the teaching lifestyle. When such mismatches occur, the candidate of course suffers the delay in obtaining a more meaningful and useful degree. Worse, the profession suffers when an ill-suited candidate perseveres, having invested so much time in becoming qualified. Education reforms have included specific measures to screen candidates for basic literacy before commencing teacher preparation programs and for content knowledge and pedagogical proficiency before concluding a program and achieving certification. Nearly all states require a minimum number of clinical hours in direct contact with students, and most programs require applicants to have documented dozens of hours of observation, if not active volunteering, in classroom settings. Such requirements can help students (and host schools) identify issues of unsuitability.

However, other service-learning opportunities, with their emphases on reflection and content integration, can not only help students to identify disconnects but to identify them earlier, which all would agree is beneficial. Even more positive, perhaps, service-learning implies service-learning writing assignments, brief or more intensive. These assignments typically ask students to articulate what, how, and how *well* they are learning—as well as how they are using, or in future might use, course content to impact a community. Completing such assignments obviously can aid students in clarifying a specific reason for an apparent dispositional mismatch. An instructor or engaged community partner may then be able to determine ways to help build the student's content knowledge or understanding of context such that what seemed to be a chasm becomes instead a bridgeable gap.

CITIZENSHIP AND SERVICE-LEARNING: STUDENTS AS BRIDGES

The leadership dimension includes social justice advocacy. In addition to public health and teacher education programs, majors such as sociology, psychology, the various realms often carrying the “studies” label (women's studies, family and consumer studies, environmental studies, and the like), and others emphasize a social justice orientation as a part of students' development (Brumagin & Cam, 2012; Chamanay, 2006; Petray & Halbert, 2013). Faculty scholars from those disciplines tend to recognize the challenges associated with such an emphasis, starting with the unfortunate reality that social justice is likely something of an unfunded mandate: Petray and Halbert (2013) view this reality as sociology educators facing the “same increasing demands for measurable skills and achievements felt across the university sector” (p. 441). However, these authors note that the gap between the institutional context and the foundational idea that education is a “training ground for active citizenship” (p. 441) can be bridged by holding engagement and an activation of “students' sociological imaginations” (p. 442) as parts of an instructor's commitments surrounding course content. In 2006, Ngai discussed a growing, and disheartening, “fundamental disconnection between the real world and academic learning” felt by students, faculty, and administrators, and pointed to service-learning, in contrast, as a “fundamental pedagogical mechanism that [can] bridge this divide” (p. 165).

Our experiences with complex service-learning projects have confirmed, for us, the opportunities they bring to help students become field-ready professionals, and, sometimes, to inspire peers to such self-development. Such opportunities are available specifically because students completing service-learning projects are actively learning about the effects of actions—learning

that is not possible in typical classroom instruction, where concepts and even skills, particularly in our two disciplines, may be abstract. Students may believe they will attain competence via osmosis, but the fallacy becomes apparent when we think about a shared content area such as advocacy. It is highly unlikely that even the most enthused teacher candidates or developing public health professionals can become skilled advocates (or even understand what advocacy entails) without having had an opportunity to engage as an advocate and be observed and coached with respect to their performance of advocacy-related behaviors. Angelique (2001) described internships as a combination of service-learning, empowerment, and transformative learning. This pedagogical practice can be regarded from both perspectives, for the undergraduate student as well as the community entity benefit from greater self-direction and self-regulation (i.e., empowerment). Both too may subsequently change the way they approach complex tasks in the future, in effect experiencing transformative learning.

To echo the idea of the sociological imagination, it is our perspective that abstractions in any undergraduate content area only become effectively imagined, thus understood and usable, through practice. Under the novice to expert paradigm (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000), a novice views the concrete task, but needs the practice setting to recognize its consequences. Contributing too to the theoretical support for service-learning is systems theory: Practice opportunities can be viewed as among the contextual factors that, along with social ideals, influence the competence of teacher candidates and pre-professionals in public health. Service-learning then becomes an essential aspect of our professional preparation programs, as our emerging graduates unquestionably must have such practice before entering their fields. Notably among the academic, and abstract, content in our fields are our professions' respective ethics. Professional preparation for teachers as well as for those planning careers in public health must emphasize ethics and the place of effective government regulation, in both of which a social justice emphasis is inherent, given the vulnerable populations these future professionals will encounter.

Professional practice is easily defined by the knowledge and skills needed for competence, but professional malpractice is almost always defined by a breach of professionalism in terms of disposition or its indicator, ethical practice. In the helping professions, unethical work is embodied in behaviors that have not served the best interests of the population. Effective, ethical professional work involves both cognitive skills and the use of well-exercised executive functions (Chevalier, 2015). In our fields and most others, whether theoretical or applied, errors of omission can be as critical as errors of commission—and both are difficult to simulate in the classroom. In contrast, engaged service-learning projects bring students direct but safe opportunities to identify and discuss with each other, an instructor, and