

---

**PULLING IT TOGETHER:**  
A METHOD FOR DEVELOPING SERVICE-LEARNING  
AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS BASED  
IN CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

Danika M. Brown  
NATIONAL SERVICE FELLOW

July 15, 2001

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL SERVICE  
NATIONAL SERVICE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

## ABOUT THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

Created in 1993, the Corporation for National Service engages more than 1.5 million Americans annually in improving communities through service. The Corporation supports service at national, state, and local levels through:

- ▶ AmeriCorps, whose members serve with local and national organizations to meet community needs while earning education awards to help finance college or training;
- ▶ Learn and Serve America, which helps link community service and learning objectives for youth from kindergarten through college as well as youth in community-based organizations; and
- ▶ The National Senior Service Corps (Senior Corps), the network of programs that helps Americans age 55 and older use their skills and experience in service opportunities that address the needs of their communities. Senior Corps includes the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), Foster Grandparent Program, and Senior Companion Program.

## ABOUT THE NATIONAL SERVICE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The National Service Fellowship Program, launched by the Corporation for National Service in September 1997, involves a team of individual researchers who develop and promote models of quality service responsive to the needs of communities. The goal of the program is to strengthen national service through continuous learning, new models, strong networks, and professional growth.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Danika Brown is an advanced graduate student in Rhetoric, Composition, and the Teaching of English at The University of Arizona. Ms. Brown has extensive experience in service-learning programs in higher education: over the past decade at Arizona State University, California State University–San Marcos, and most recently at The University of Arizona. She is currently writing her dissertation on service-learning pedagogy.

Contract Number CNSHQ00014

*This material is based upon work supported by the Corporation for National Service under a National Service Fellowship. Opinions and points of view expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Corporation for National Service.*

Upon request, this material will be made available in alternative formats for people with disabilities.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work would not have been remotely possible without the support of many people and institutions. The Corporation for National Service's National Service Fellowship was absolutely instrumental in giving me the funding, support, and backing in order to articulate a project proposal and to follow through the process of working out the methodology as well as piloting it, resulting in this final document. I especially am grateful to Robin Dean, Director of the National Service Fellows Program, for her thoughtful advice, rigorous questioning, and generous "moral" support throughout this process. Additionally, Jeffrey Gale, Patrick Triano, and Deena Johnson made every aspect of working with the Corporation easy, human, and—well, sometimes downright fun. I want to thank my "fellow" fellows for their collaborative spirit, and jokes about Gramsci. Most especially, I would like to thank Emily Miller for being a kindred spirit and offering me friendship in addition to intellectual support for the past year.

But, much of the work I did surrounding this project could not have happened if it were not for my local community and their support. I thank the University of Arizona's Composition Program for allowing me to recruit instructors and make announcements about my project to my fellow composition instructors. I would like to thank Dr. Tom Miller specifically, for his continued unquestioned support in all my endeavors, including this one. I would like to thank the University of Arizona's Southwest Project for supporting this project and providing a valuable communication venue for my work. I would very much like to thank the University of Arizona's LGB Studies Committee for allowing my work to be connected with their innovative collaborations with the community; and my thanks go personally to Dr. Miranda Joseph for being enthusiastic and supportive of my efforts in that arena, and for providing me with many opportunities for valuable dialogue about this project.

Importantly, I want to thank the Tucson community organizers and activists who participated, talked about, and encouraged this project and the methodology that has come out of it. I am endlessly inspired by, indebted to, and humbled by the hard-working, wonderful souls that people Tucson's community activism, and I am thankful that they allow me to work at their shoulders.

I would like most of all, to thank those who participated in the pilot project for their willingness to show up, listen to my meanderings, and for their ability to force me to think through the more difficult issues I have faced in this project. My thanks to Lydia Lester, Paula Arnquist, Cathy Chaput, Valerie Gomes, Jeff Imig, Laura Briggs, Elaine Mariolle, Julia Balen, Penny Waterston, Caren Zimmerman, Kate O'Neil, Jennifer Allen, Stacy Day, Marvin Waterstone, Karin Uhlich, Jim Driscoll, Leith Kahl, Caroline Isaacs, MJ Braun, Kimi Eisele; and very special thanks to Zoe Hammer-Tamizuka, Danielle Mitchell, and Curtis Ferree for not only participating but editing, engaging, questioning, and tolerating the endless barrage of angst and inspiration I have vented throughout this process... . My special thanks to Jesse Ewing for the layout and design of this manual; without Jesse, whatever I may have said would just be plain old text on a page, and I would still be tearing out my hair trying to figure out how to make it look a fraction of how good it looks now. I hope that in this final documentation of our collaboration, my readers are as inspired as I am by their work. It is, after all, their work that is represented in these pages. I can take credit only for taking credit. My thanks to you all.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	Abstract
4	Executive Summary
8	Introduction
10	Part I: Theoretical Background
24	Part II: The Methodology
80	Conclusion
83	Bibliographical Resources

*Pulling it Together: A Method for Developing Service-Learning and Community Partnerships Based in Critical Pedagogy* is a guide to creating service-learning programs and activities that are developed through sustained collaboration between educators, students, and community organizations. The methodology recommends approaches to service-learning to address possible limitations in traditional service-learning activities and move beyond a focus on individual student benefits; that is, the method seeks to expand community access to institutional resources, enhance the benefits and support community organizations receive in such partnerships, and to support or create community coalitions that include educational institutions to address and solve community issues.

The theoretical framework and the detailed methodology in this manual are based on extensive research in service-learning, critical pedagogy, and participatory and action research. Additionally, they are based on the examination and review of current developments in campus-community partnership centers and initiatives. The methodology was further developed in collaboration with both academics and community members through a pilot program in Tucson, Arizona in 2000–2001. The pilot program resulted in the creation of the guidelines in this manual, including worksheets, resource pages, the elements of the process, alternatives, and the analyses of institutional factors and other constraints that practitioners will need to consider as they undertake community-based partnerships for educational activities.

Based on the research I have done and the results of the pilot program, the methodology recommends a theoretical framework of critical pedagogy, grounded in the concepts articulated by Paulo Freire: *Praxis*, *History*, and *Dialogue*. The methodology utilizes these concepts in a process that, ideally, involves multiple instructors or students and community organizations in a series of workshops or meetings to develop activities, to assess those activities according to shared goals, and to create shared resources that extend beyond the individual projects each instructor and organization participate in. By working together to create individual projects and shared resources, the service-learning activities tend to be more responsive to community needs, community members are able to participate in the shaping of the curricula surrounding those projects, and significant relationships tend to develop to extend partnership possibilities beyond a single semester or group of students. Additionally, educators of varying experience-levels with service-learning pedagogy have the opportunity to be mentored, and both educators and community organizers gain access to supporting resources for activities such as assessment.

This manual, then, is primarily directed at educational coordinators for service-learning

activities: directors of service-learning centers or programs, and lead instructors in departmental service-learning projects or working groups. However, the manual has been designed with a good deal of flexibility such that it can also be useful for individual instructors, community organizers seeking to make connections with educators, and students who are interested in creating their own service-learning projects. The worksheets and resources are intended to enhance and guide any approach to service-learning.

For more information or to obtain a copy of the manual, please email the author, Danika Brown, at [danika@u.arizona.edu](mailto:danika@u.arizona.edu) or access the manual online at: <http://www.nationalservice.org>.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September of 2001, I initiated a pilot service-learning program in Tucson, Arizona to develop a model for implementing service-learning and other campus-community partnerships based on the principles of critical pedagogy. I perceived the need for such a methodology based on critiques of traditional service-learning practices as not fully meeting their potential to more integrally address community benefits. The need for further theorizing service-learning partnerships also is grounded in the significant growth of campus-community centers, in the literature and centers devoted to community-based research, and in the study of relationships between “academics” and “communities.” What these trends have revealed is that campus-community relationships are most effective when undertaken collaboratively, when institutional resources are leveraged to address or solve problems on the level of systemic causes, and when educational institutions work in coalition with other organizations in the community in a sustained, mutually accountable fashion. The pilot program I initiated and the methodology that has come out of that program creates an approach to service-learning activities that is consistent with those efforts to create more substantial and productive relationships between educational institutions and other aspects of the community through student placement, and does so from a critical theory framework.

Current practices in service-learning often have instructors placing students in community organizations to perform volunteer service in conjunction with course assignments and reflection. Instructors may look to service-learning coordinators for placement suggestions, curricular ideas, resources, or even advice on creating meaningful service-learning components. Instructors also may work directly with community organizations to create placement opportunities related to coursework. However, for the most part, these projects tend to be constructed in relative isolation. Further, service-learning activities—and assessment of those activities—tend to be primarily concerned with individual student educational outcomes and with creating an “ethic of service” in individual students. The benefits to community are often secondary concerns, and often the relationship with the community organization is maintained almost exclusively by students over the duration of a semester (or two). Additionally, while the service-learning activity may result in a “product” useful for the community—such as a newsletter, article, or brochure—often there is no mutual evaluation strategies worked out between the organization and the instructor, and there is not necessarily a historical record created of progress on the organization’s issue, which causes the possibility for efforts to be simply duplicated in future semesters. Another limitation in current practices is that when service-learning activities are undertaken in relative isolation, there is a tendency to focus on single issues, which may delimit the opportunity for students,

instructors, and community organizers to understand issues within larger systemic contexts.

In order to theorize alternatives to service-learning activities to address these possible limitations, I have turned to critical pedagogy, specifically Paulo Freire, and the concepts of *praxis*, *history*, and *dialogue*. *Praxis*, the enactment of a critical theory concerning social equality and addressing social inequity through practice, depends on both an understanding of *history* and the engagement of genuine *dialogue*. History, according to Freire's theories, involves analyzing multiple layers and contexts to issues, social relations, and individual experience to understand the power relationships and networks of causes for inequities. Dialogue is a situated, open-ended exchange between human agents directed toward an object of knowledge. Dialogue is constitutive of relationships; that is to say, it is the process of dialogue that creates relationships and the relationships recursively shape and respond to the context in which they are created. These concepts construct an understanding of the world and human agency in terms of *hope*. Praxis, history, and dialogue assume that social relations are complex, that they are humanly constructed and humanly alterable products.

These critical concepts are highly suited to service-learning because service-learning pedagogy tends to be based on the same assumptions that change in social conditions is possible through the participation of students. Service-learning pedagogy itself is founded on critique of traditional education practices and on engaging students directly in their communities to improve those communities. Freire's concepts, then, provide an articulated framework by which we might conceptualize and enact service-learning activities. An analysis of service-learning from this theoretical framework leads us to understand the goals of service-learning partnerships as:

- tying research and education to concrete community issues by making curricula and educational activities responsive to community issues and community need;
- examining the characteristics of citizenship or community membership through the principles of history and dialogue, interrogating the systemic and historical contexts of issues and responses to issues;
- contributing to the function of education in discovering causes and long-term responses to social issues by engaging in activities that have impact in communities as defined through dialogue with that community;
- employing academic knowledge in applications to community problem-solving through the concept of praxis and critical dialogue;
- expanding educational institutions' (and the individual representatives of those institutions) participation *in* community, especially in terms of fostering coalitions and creating responsive resources for and with that community.

These principles for service-learning maintain an emphasis on educational opportunities, but create the context for mutual accountability and collaboration with the community in a more critical fashion.

The methodology for enacting these principles that I advocate in this guide, then, is a process of placing community members—educators, students, community organizers, and others—in a sustained dialogue with each other about how to construct educational activities that are mutually beneficial and collectively address social issues. The process itself has five essential elements, all of which are highly adaptable to specific community settings and needs. For each step of the process, I have provided worksheets and resource pages based on the goals of the process.

The first step of the process is **initiating diverse contacts**. In this stage, a coordinator for service-learning, or, alternatively, an individual instructor, community member, or student, identifies potential participants through research and interviews; the coordinator contacts those potential partners, gathering information about the community-issues relevant to those individuals, or their research interests, and their ideas about working in coalition with other community members and educators on those issues. After a list of potential partners has been contacted and connections emerge from the interviews, the coordinator determines a focus for a series of meetings or workshops where specific projects can be collaboratively developed.

The second step of the process is precisely the implementation of those meetings, bringing the group together to **workshop to create curricula and projects, including articulated goals for each party**. The coordinator determines a schedule for these meetings that, ideally, will enable a group of people to come together to brainstorm ideas, identify specific projects, discuss goals and assessment, and see connections between those specific projects and the other projects created by participants in the group. Additionally, these collaborative sessions will include the distribution of and discussion about practical and theoretical material on service-learning, issues in working in campus-community partnerships, and perhaps articles on the community issues themselves. That is, in addition to providing participants the opportunity to create individual service-learning activities, the workshops will also provide access to resources that enable all the participants to approach these activities with analytical tools and will encourage the participants to have a genuine *dialogue* about the potentials and limitations of collaborating in this fashion.

The third element of the process involves sustaining the collaboration established in the initial steps, not only between individual partners (such as an instructor and community organization's course service-learning project), but also between a whole group of instruc-

tors, students, and organizations working on separate projects. By having participants **report back on the partnership progress** to a larger group as well as to each other, the process enables everyone the opportunity to get and give helpful feedback, identify resources, identify connections between individual projects, and to envision possibilities for collaboratively enhancing and supporting each other's work.

Building a collaborative environment and sustaining the connections between participants in this process also enables the fourth step—**collaboratively assessing the projects in terms of articulated goals**. The process provides participants with resources for and discussion about assessment, enabling individuals to determine what type of assessment of the partnership projects is appropriate and to design instruments to meet those needs. Additionally, the group of participants might include assessment “experts,” such as graduate students, faculty, or community organizers who work with educational or community organization assessment and who might make their individual projects focused on actual assessment activities of other partnership projects or the larger group process itself. Incorporating this step into this process helps ensure that the projects are considered in terms of mutual accountability and in terms of each participant's specific goals and needs. Tying the process to assessment contributes to the process' continued responsiveness to the participants' input and goals as well.

The final element of this collaborative process is for the group to consider and **create a resource out of the collaboration** itself. The goal of this fifth element is to create a history and useful resource that connect and sustain the collaborations. Such a resource might be a newsletter detailing the projects and their results; or it might be a group presentation to community officials to share project findings and make recommendations; or the resource might be a compendium of sources collected during the process, such as a handbook of community resources. Whatever the final “product” of the collaborative process might be, it should incorporate the principles of *praxis*, *history*, and *dialogue* that have been honored throughout the other steps, and should contribute to creating a sense of connection between the participants, their organizations, and the issues that individuals addressed.

The methodology itself is not meant to be a lockstep process. It does not depend on size or scale as much as it depends on enacting the principles of collaboration, agency, and coalition building. The ultimate goal of the theory and practices outlined here moves beyond finding more effective ways of educating students. The methodology asks educators and community organizations to engage in a substantial and sustained dialogue about ways to work together to identify and address issues that their communities face and to employ educational activities in that process.

## INTRODUCTION

This method for community partnerships and education has developed out of my commitment to and passion for both education and solving community issues. The method has been informed by my theoretical research regarding social movement theory, education for social change, community-based and participatory research methods, and pedagogical theory. Most importantly, this method has developed out of my collaboration and consultation with many, many other people—educators, community organizers, students—in my own local community and across the nation. This collaboration has come through my teaching, participation on listservs and in conferences, active participation in community activities, and participation with various educational opportunities. The methodology does not pretend to be the final answer to “getting it right,” but does offer a highly situated way to approach community-university partnerships in order to shape those approaches responsibly for benefits to students, instructors, institutions, and importantly, whole communities.

These materials present a suggested methodology for enacting service-learning and other community-based partnerships in education. In what follows, I have attempted to articulate a theoretical and practical framework that facilitates two primary things: academic-community partnerships that enhance educational experiences through connections to community issues, and applications of educational opportunities to issue-based problem-solving and coalition building. I argue the need for such approaches and the benefits of this type of collaboration. I provide a general methodology with specific principles designed to achieve the most effective of these relationships, and suggest various alternative approaches to the method based on possible variant characteristics and needs of communities. I provide resources such as bibliographies, model programs, possible funders, and worksheets for the methodology.

## ORGANIZATION

The first section (Part I) provides a theoretical overview of current practices in service-learning, with an examination of some of the potential limitations in those current practices. Because I believe all practice is implicitly informed by theory but that theory is not often acknowledged, and because I believe best practices are informed by an articulated, critical theory with expressed goals and principles, I review the necessity of engaging in a dialectical process of critique in our educational practices and their relationship to addressing social issues. In this section, I examine some ways that the critical pedagogical theories of Paulo Freire and the principles of *praxis*, *history*, and *dialogue* provide a basis for understanding the role of education as a social practice, and suggest ways to understand service-learning from the perspective of critical pedagogy. My intention with this first theoretical section is to create a foundation for the principles of the methodology I go on to elaborate in the rest of the document. For readers less interested in this theoretical framework, I encourage you to move to the second section which describes the principles and basic guidelines for the methodology.

Part II is an overview for the methodology itself, outlining the assumptions and principles behind the approach I recommend. In brief, I advocate a collaborative approach to individual service-learning projects, an approach that ideally brings multiple educators and multiple community stakeholders to the table in a facilitated process to create partnership projects, share that work with each other, and to establish a larger context for that work. The methodology provides resources to help shape those individual projects, but the method itself is most concerned with creating a process in which service-learning activities can be thought through, collaboratively created and implemented, and collaboratively sustained. In this section, I describe the elements of the methodology which are fundamental to its success, suggest the areas of the method which require the most concentrated effort, and identify the difficulties one might face in enacting this approach to collaboration (both with the community and within an institution of education). I try to provide some groundwork for overcoming those difficulties and supply some guidelines for adapting the method to unique situations. The most important element of the method, I will argue, is that it is highly situated in and adaptable to specific communities, communities defined in terms of geography, issues, institutions, or people. That is to say, the method is adaptable to the specific site in which it is enacted, whether the collaborative aspect is between a group of people sharing the same issues defined by geography, or if the collaboration is defined by several instructors in a specific department, or if it is defined by an individual instructor collaborating with one or more organizations. The method does not depend on specific demographics, but on a specific set of principles of collaboration.

In addition, this section includes “worksheets” for use in facilitating the process defined by the method. The worksheets can be used by coordinators to create a working group of educators and community members, and by those educators and community organizers themselves. The worksheets lead participants of the process through a reflective, generative process that emphasizes the theoretical principles defined in the first part and throughout the methodology itself. While the method assumes that there will be a coordinator for these activities, the worksheets do not *require* such a coordinator. The worksheets have been designed to be utilized by an individual instructor or even a student serving with a community organization, or by a community organizer attempting to initiate partnerships with educators. Included in the worksheets are resource pages that can supplement the particular steps of the process. For example, in the worksheets for “brainstorming” specific service-learning activities or projects there is a list of resources related to service-learning activities. In the assessment phase of the process, there are resources for finding and designing assessment instruments. My intention in this structure is not to over-determine the types of activities that might occur in service-learning partnerships, but to create a process through which appropriate and effective activities can be created that are more mutually beneficial (to the educators, students, and community organizations) than those curricular ideas decontextualized from this process.

In the conclusion, I discuss the methodology in relationship to the future of service-learning and community-based partnerships, the pilot project that I conducted in creating this methodology (which serves as many of the examples throughout the manual), and the necessary question of how to sustain such activities. I briefly identify models and current examples of structures for facilitating these types of approaches to community-campus partnerships. I urge practitioners of these models to continue to reflect on the implications of these activities and to continue to push our understanding of how to tie our resources and activities to the necessary work of achieving social equity and addressing the real problems that face our communities.

## PART I: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### SERVICE-LEARNING

Service-learning is generally defined as the integration of students' service in the community with an educational correlate in a course, tied to active academic reflection on the connections between the experiences. For example, in an English Composition course, a student might be studying literacy—researching issues in literacy and writing analyses of a “literacy problem” for the course. The service-learning component of the course would have that student serving in a community literacy program, integrating the community service experience into her/his research and writing, and reflecting on the connections between the academic work and the experience of serving in the community. Reflections might be part of journals, class discussions, or in the analytical writing itself. Service-learning traditionally works toward a “mutual” or “shared” benefit outcome—benefits for enhancing the student's educational activities as well as her/his civic engagement, and benefits to the community in which the student serves. Another type of service learning might have the student actually doing a “product” such as a newsletter or proposal for the community organization where s/he is placed, rather than simply volunteering and doing a separate class assignment.

In service-learning, the activities might be assigned by the instructor (as with the example above) around a specified activity directly related to the theme of the course, or the community experience might be left a bit more flexible, where the student decides on her/his own placement interest and then ties that in some fashion to the coursework. The relationships between the instructor and the various sites in the community where students are placed might be anywhere from highly structured to informal to nonexistent. The number of hours and the type of service required for the student may vary from course to course, depending on what an instructor feels is useful or necessary for the academic component of the course. In short, there are many variations on service-learning approaches, but what all approaches share is tying course content to community-based activities and reflection.

The rationale behind incorporating service-learning into education is generally twofold. First, the service-learning activity is understood as “experiential learning,” and the basis for including such experiential educational activities draws on pedagogical theory from such thinkers as John Dewey. The second rationale for incorporating service as the experiential activity draws on theories that suggest that a significant part of education should be civic education, and tying community service to education is a form of teaching “civic engagement” and the “ethic of service” to students. It might be useful for some readers to explore these pedagogical theories and their ties to service-learning in a bit more detail.

“Service-learning combines service to the community with student learning in a way that improves both the student and the community.” National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (Learn and Serve America)  
<http://www.nicsl.coled.umn.edu/>

### EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION

Based in the work of psychology and educational theory, experiential education works from the awareness that there are distinguishable types of knowledge. The most important distinction between types of knowledge is that of “abstract” and “concrete” knowledges (cf, Kolb). Abstract knowledge is theory and concepts. This type of knowledge is generally valorized in education: students learn concepts from lectures

and textbooks and are taught to think in abstract terms. Utilizing this framework for understanding the ways individuals have access to certain types of knowledge, David Kolb, among others argues that effective learning takes place in cycles, moving from concrete experience, through reflection, to the development of an abstract concept regarding that experience, and then to the application of the concept to another concrete experience (see, for example, the American Education Network Group's outline of the learning cycle at <http://www.aenc.org/ABOUT/Philosophy-Learning.html>).

Contributing to the psychology theory that supports experiential education, this pedagogy can also be traced to pragmatic philosophers such as John Dewey. For example, in Dewey's chapter on "Experience and Thinking" in *Democracy and Education*'s he argues, "doing becomes a trying; an experiment with the world to find out what it is like; the undergoing becomes instruction—discovery of the connection of things" (140). Dewey argues, from an empiricist perspective, that we engage in the world and learn from our engagement with the world when we actively make connections between our experience and the reasons for those experiences. Dewey criticizes educational practices that do not connect theory to experience or which miss the fact that experience is in fact the stimulus for all thinking: "A separation of the active doing phase from the passive undergoing phase destroys the vital meaning of an experience" (151). Dewey's argument in this text and others (see especially *Experience and Education*) supports active learning in educational institutions that is connected directly to experience and practical activity.

Experiential education, especially in terms of its connections to Dewey's thought, often is linked to democratic social and educational reform as a method that contributes to building stronger communities. Dewey's own connections to active participation in the fabric of society in *Democracy and Education* suggests that a student's experiences connected to active educational reflection would lead the student to a more diverse (and democratic) understanding of her/his world. Dewey writes: "These more numerous and more varied points of contact denote a greater diversity of stimuli to which an individual has to respond; they consequently put a premium on variation in his action. They secure a liberation of powers which remain suppressed as long as the incitations to action are partial, as they must be in a group which in its exclusiveness shuts out many interests" (87). This aspect of Dewey's argument can be seen as the second rationale for service learning: tying experiential education to community service as a means of creating a more democratic society through civic engagement.

## CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey writes: "Upon the educational side, we note first that the realization of a form of social life in which interests are mutually interpenetrating, and where progress, or readjustment, is an important consideration, makes a democratic community more interested than other communities have cause to be in deliberate and systematic education" (87). Dewey's main line of argument regarding education is that in a democratic society, pluralism and diversity, as well as experience and participation in social and political activities define the health of the democracy. Consequently, as a public instrument of

### Resources for Experiential Learning Online

National Society for Experiential Education

<http://www.nsee.org>

Association for Experiential Education

<http://www.princeton.edu/~rcurtis/aee.html>

International Consortium for Experiential Learning

<http://www.el.uct.ac.za/icel/>

Bibliography Prepared by Alice Kolb and David Kolb

<http://trgmcbcr.haygroup.com/Products/learning/bibliography.htm>

that society, education should foster, promote, and enact those democratic qualities as much as possible.

In modern American society, there is a general concern about the nation's social fabric and the state of our democracy. Commonly cited evidence for such concern includes a general lack of trust for the political process, a perceived decline in the general public's political and historical knowledge, and, as Sirianni and Friedland write in an article for *Change*,

the crisis of our welfare state manifests itself in no small part as a profound disillusionment with the continued extension of professional dominance, clinical reason, and client dependency. Many civic institutions that formerly played an important role in educating citizens for public work have transformed themselves into narrow service organizations. Newspapers are in decline as key community institutions fostering local public dialogue and associational life, and the media of communication are becoming ever more fragmented as channels of democratic discourse. (14)

As corporatization, privatization, and general business interests tend to take center stage as the focal point for all considerations in American society, it is argued that our institutions tend to move to a "productivity" model that values efficiency over human interaction. Educational institutions are frequently criticized for creating "workers" and emphasizing work-related skills rather than inculcating democratic participation and civic interest.

For example, Campus Compact's "Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University" argues that "Research institutions are subject to the same forces in the society that focus on 'efficiency of means' and neglect continuing discussion about civic purposes and public meanings of our individual and collective work" (Boyte). Along these lines, noted thinkers such as Benjamin Barber have argued that in order for democracy to remain healthy in the midst of globalization and related economic trends, education **must** be focused on the foundations of active citizenship. Barber argues that social justice depends on citizens being informed and active, working in service to collective interests rather than self-interest. Barber's ideas connect directly to approaches to education, specifically service-learning. Barber and Richard Battistoni edited a guide making these connections, *Education for Democracy : Citizenship, Community, Service : A Sourcebook for Students and Teachers*, which connects the role of education to civic participation.

Thomas Ehrlich, a distinguished professor with The California State University and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, connects Barber's and Dewey's work to service-learning in Political Science. In "Civic Education: Lessons Learned," Ehrlich writes about a pilot program in his political science pedagogy that incorporates civic education by means of service-learning. He argues:

Teaching students about democracy by having them study and discuss texts that describe democratic processes and institutions is obviously important. But I believe that academic learning in political science is enhanced when students integrate their study with civic work in a community. This approach is a powerful means both for teaching the strengths

### Resources Regarding Civic Engagement and Education

Association of American Colleges and Universities

<http://www.aacu-edu.org/>

Campus Compact

<http://www.compact.org/>

Civic Education Through Service-Learning, ERIC Digest

[http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC\\_Digests/ed390720.html](http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed390720.html)

The Association of American Colleges and University's "Contemporary Understandings of Liberal Education" <http://www.aacu-edu.org/Publications/understanding.html>

The Saguro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America (John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University)

<http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguro/>

and pitfalls of democracy and for providing students with the foundations of democratic citizenship. A strong citizenry is crucial for the health of democracy, and it is not enough for political science instructors to provide only detached academic discussions of the workings of Congress, lobbyists, federal courts, and the electoral process. When preparing for a lifetime of engaged citizenship, students need to integrate classroom learning with experiential learning in the larger world where practical political decision making and democratic deliberation occur. (Online)

The concern for connecting theory and concrete experience, moving beyond abstractions about democracy to putting democratic ideas into action, and engaging students in experiences that connect their education to community problem-solving is not limited to political science. These motivations for incorporating service-learning can be found in most fields. Various articulations of these contexts for service-learning in specific disciplines are available in the American Association of Higher Education's extensive *Series on Service-Learning in the Disciplines* (edited by Edward Zlotkowski).

Service-learning, then, is a pedagogical innovation based on the assumption that education is most effective when theory is tied to concrete practice, and further, when education is tied to principles of citizenship seeking solutions to the myriad of social inequities within our socio-political system. The basic tenets of service learning can be understood as:

- tying research and education to concrete community issues;
- examining the characteristics of citizenship or community membership;
- engaging in activities that have impact in communities;
- employing academic knowledge in applications to community problem-solving.

These tenets of service-learning pedagogy are achieved through curriculum development, reflection, and community-based classroom projects.

## CRITIQUES OF SERVICE-LEARNING

Service-learning theories and models have the stated intention of involving students in community issues and, through that student involvement, contributing to the achievement of a more just and equitable society. But, service-learning has not been above critique, and that critique comes from many perspectives.

### *The Necessity of Critique*

Critique and dialectic are ways of engaging discourse and social structures. The principle of critique is that something is examined in terms of its purported goals and context. Then the artifact is analyzed for the ideological assumptions that constructed it and that the artifact itself constructs or perpetuates (that is, for the implications of the artifact as it interacts with the world of which it is a part). Finally, critique makes evaluative judgments on that artifact and its implications according to an announced and examined framework in order to suggest alternatives. Critique is based on an articulated and examined perspective, in this case, one which works on the assumption that is oriented toward a goal of social justice.

Dialectic, an essential part of critique, is the constant adjusting of ideological assumptions, the challeng-

ing of both theoretical and practical orientations based on the material and historical realities of humans impacted by the social systems they live in. Dialectic demands that all perspectives be responsive to change. Dialectic suggests that all apparent constants are illusory constructs, and what is most valuable is the flux and moments of change inherent in all social systems. According to this theory, critique is never complete—that is, we critique current historical material conditions and the discourses that construct and reproduce them with the goal of transforming those conditions; once we impact those discourses or cause change, we have a whole new set of historical conditions that require critique yet again. The goal is not some static moment or dogmatic conclusion to a “problem,” but a constant, rigorous engagement with our world in its social relations.

Service-learning itself is based on the enactment of critique. In terms of experiential education, the argument for incorporating concrete learning experiences into the curriculum is based on a critique of pedagogy that functions on what in the twentieth century became termed the “banking model” (cf, Paolo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*). Similarly, the argument that public education has a civic education role is based both on the critique of “the decline of social capital” (Putnam) in modern society and a critique of current educational practices that divorce content from the role of citizenship. Consequently, the initiatives that created service-learning as a theorized approach to pedagogy are based on the articulation of certain goals—specifically, educating for a more active and informed citizenry through the application of ideas to concrete experience—and the analyses of educational practices in relation to those goals. That is, service-learning developed out of dialectical engagement and critique. As service-learning theories become articulated, tested, and assessed, it is essential to engage in further critique, re-examine the goals and methods of achieving those goals, and uncover the implications of current practices in relation to those goals. In what follows, I review some of the more salient critiques, those especially which move from perspectives that share the goals of service-learning as I have outlined them here, and move to incorporate additional theoretical frameworks that informs the methodology outlined in this monograph.

### *Amelioration or Change? Some concerns about the goals of community service*

Perhaps the most significant line of critique aimed at service-learning activities is in terms of what assumptions about social change that underpin those activities. First, the majority of service-learning programs are restrained within course time-frames, generally one semester, occasionally two. Second, the programs are designed around the concept of “volunteerism”—students “serve” in a community, provide a “service” to that community, and connect that service to their academic work. The assumption here seems clear enough—increased volunteerism will lead to impact on community issues. In fact, much of the published service-learning materials, much of the promotional materials, and many of the guides are based on the goal of increasing student volunteerism or creating an “ethic of service.” It is not uncommon to find a statement in the literature promoting or articulating the rationale for service-learning such as, “As America embraces the 21st century, our role as educators is to develop an ethic of service and life-long learning within our youth so that they will be positive, contributing members of society,” (Perkins and Miller).

As John W. Eby points out in his article, “Why Service Learning is Bad”—a provocative and astute essay that in no way dismisses the value of connecting community issues to student engagement—the notion of

volunteerism and student placement is often “simplistic,” hinging on an “anyone can serve” mentality that “trivializes service and demeans service professions” (3). This rather fundamental limitation in the conceptualizing of service has several serious implications.

First, there tends to be implicit in this conception a notion of “privilege” on behalf of those who serve. That is, volunteerism is framed as a sort of *noblesse oblige*—an exercise of charity from a position of privilege, with added educational benefits for the student. Students are given a framework to understand their service in the community as a civic duty to the disadvantaged communities that surround them, and the volunteer service they do is framed as “making a difference” for the community as well as for their own cultural capital in terms of bolstering their resumes. Our complex socio-economic system valorizes institutional educational experience as a sort of “cultural capital.” Higher education is often viewed—from both within and without—as the pursuit of knowledge in a highly specialized fashion. There is always a cultural mystique of privilege surrounding higher education—those who participate in and achieve “higher education” are constructed as a sort of intellectual elite. Additionally, the ranks of higher education (students through faculty and administration) are overwhelmingly made up of an already socio-economically privileged group. Community partnerships, under these constructs, often become the well-intentioned attempt to mobilize that privilege for the benefit of communities that do not share in it, or as providing access to more individuals in order to allow them to participate in those systems of privilege.

This implication tends to work counter to one of the goals of service-learning, that of making universities (or other educational institutions) more responsive and accessible to their communities. The contradiction revolves around an institution “reaching out” to a community while implicitly reproducing the hierarchies that separate that institution. Those who work in the community or are “served” by these students are not oblivious to the often-times patronizing relationships established by well-intentioned, but perhaps not actively examined assumptions.

Additionally, this approach to volunteerism and community service tends to operate on what Eby calls a “false understanding of need,” and a “false understanding of response to need” (3,4). Community “needs” are understood as “deficiencies,” and communities served are understood as “disadvantaged,” or “underprivileged.” In these constructions, often the frame suggests that it is a community’s own fault or inadequacy that has created the need being addressed. And, the response to that need becomes defined in terms of ways to compensate for that deficiency. As Eby explains, “The answer to need as deficiency is an outside person whose service fills the deficiency. This exaggerates the importance of the person who serves, demeans the person served and ignores resources in the community such as peers, families and community leaders. It fails to recognize the political, social and economic factors which create the need” (4). What the focus on volunteerism tends to do, then, is to place the focus on individuals and communities rather than on complex dominant socio-political systems that either create or could possibly alleviate the problems that creates the need for volunteers. Eby claims that “[i]t is tempting to see volunteerism as a viable response to deeply rooted social issues” (4). I would extend that argument a bit to suggest that while volunteerism is absolutely essential in our society and fulfills much need, the implications of an institutionalized volunteerism, framed by a powerful institution in a community such as a university as the way to solve these social issues, actually enables and in many ways perpetuates the very systems that create the problems.

Educational institutions, because of their public missions and roles in the production of knowledge, do not simply have the responsibility to help shape the civic engagement of individuals such as students (and

staff and faculty), but also have the responsibility of identifying the causes and solutions of social issues that have real and devastating impact on communities. It is perhaps counter-productive for educational institutions to frame their response or solution to these problems as the direct service of their students in ways that tend to obscure those causes and more effective solutions.

### *Individual student experience: Some concerns about who gets served*

A related critique of service-learning is that it tends to focus on individual student experience, and assessment of the effectiveness of service-learning is made almost exclusively in terms of impact on the individual student's attitudes or competencies. On the one hand, this is a necessary component of measuring service-learning and in some ways determining the focus of service-learning activities. Since educational institutions' and instructors' first priority is meeting an educational mission and creating environments with primarily educational functions, it certainly seems appropriate that curricular activities emphasize the connection to an outcome of learning. That is clearly the priority in most instructors' approach to service-learning, to most administrators' support of service-learning, and in many researchers' assessment of the success of service-learning. If we look at major assessment projects such as "How Service Learning Affects Students" (Astin, et al.), or at *Combining Service and Learning in Higher Education: Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program* (Gray, et al.), the focus of these assessments is on student or curricular outcomes.

While, again, I do not wish to dismiss the importance of this focus, the issue is not so much about what is in these assessments, but what is missing. While service-learning is indeed an excellent way to enhance learning in the classroom, what differentiates service-learning from other experiential education is that it is based on the goal of addressing community needs and social issues. If framed as if the exclusive goal of these activities is enhanced curriculum, community need becomes secondary, or a fringe benefit, or perhaps is not addressed at all. Some have argued (such as Eby), that service-learning that does not include a thorough and complexified understanding of community need may in fact exacerbate social issues.

When service-learning is constructed around the goal of enhancing educational experience as its primary, if not singular, function, and when service-learning activities and programs are assessed and then further shaped around this primary goal, the results tend to frame communities as a highly innovative textbook or as a means to an end. An example of this kind of construction and implication occurs frequently when instructors become frustrated with service-learning because their students end up "doing filing or other trivial activities" in the placement organizations, rather than the organizations "providing meaningful learning activities." This concern is not uncommon among faculty experimenting with service-learning, especially those who have created a list of possible placements and have sent students out to volunteer. What this type of comment reveals is the implicit focus of service-learning on individual student learning experiences, and an assumption that communities exist in this context to augment learning.

Service-learning purports to provide "mutual benefit" to students *and* communities, but again, if the benefit to communities is trivial or a secondary goal, service-learning's claim of being a high-impact program or to significantly altering educational practices are not genuinely achieved. To achieve those goals, service-learning activities and programs must be shaped to address *both* student learning goals *and* genuine community needs. Assessment needs to measure both outcomes, and programs need to be respon-

sive to both goals. As this becomes more widely understood, assessment models are increasingly incorporating community impact into measurement. For example, in Campus Compact National Center for Community College's publication, *Assessing Internal and External Outcomes of Service-Learning Collaboration*, there is a chapter on measuring community impact, "Community Impact: Defining and Assessing the Intentional Community." More attention needs to be paid to balancing and defining the notion of "benefit" for communities, however. Another potential limitation in current service-learning practices that relates to this issue is that the focus on individual student outcomes that have shaped many service-learning activities has also shaped the nature of collaboration in developing these activities.

### *Collaboration?: Some concerns about serving **with** communities*

In addition to the implications I have suggested above, the way service-learning is often understood, as student volunteerism connected to academic outcomes for individual student experiences impacts the way "collaboration" with communities is understood and enacted. Eby reminds us that, "Often service-learning is organized to respond to the needs of an academic institution which sponsors it, the needs of the students, the needs of an instructor, or the needs of a course. The needs of the agency and the community often come last" (2). Again, while the focus on educational experience is a necessary element of activities undertaken for coursework, if service-learning projects and programs are going to claim a genuine "mutual benefit," it is essential that community needs take a somewhat equal precedence in the activities.

Often in service-learning projects, collaboration with the community amounts to providing contact information for agencies and project ideas, and the actual collaboration with the organization is left almost entirely to the students themselves. Students often have many competing priorities and often are more concerned with accountability to the instructor than to the community organizations in which they do their service. As writers such as Nora Bacon ("Community Service Writing: Problems, Challenges, Questions") have discovered, such collaboration environments often place students in the precarious position of having to negotiate disparate, if not competing advice from their instructors and the organization: "In evaluation failure stories, student writers get very different assessments of their work—and different suggestions for revision—from the teacher and the community agency" (49). Students are often not experienced in collaboration, or do not have a sophisticated sense of balancing resources and assessing "need." As a result, this form of collaboration puts a great deal of the onus on the community organization to mentor and work with the student, work for which the organization gains little recognition and perhaps is not fully prepared for. While these limitations may be compensated for, the fact remains that "collaboration" in these frameworks is not an institutional collaboration so much as an individual student's responsibility. A limitation of such collaboration also includes the fact that the community organizations have not had any input or impact on the curriculum that the instructor is using for the course. The community issues that have been incorporated into the course have been incorporated either peripherally, or through the instructor's (or student's) personal negotiation of contexts. Moreover, the significant relationships that develop out of these types of collaborations are limited to a semester (although many programs extend those relationships to two semesters to address this limitation). The organization is faced with a "turn-over" in the relationship at the end of the student project, and often there is no substantial historical record created of what progress was made in that relationship to guide any future service students might do.

Other service-learning collaborations may include the instructor collaborating either loosely or rather closely with an organization to establish placement relationships, specific projects, and mutual evaluation strategies. In these situations, instructors may develop evaluation strategies with the organization in order to address some of the issues of students handling collaboration activities and the instructor will undoubtedly have a better sense of community “need” in these instances. Depending on the level of collaboration with organizations, the community issues and the organizations themselves may have a more significant impact on actually shaping the curriculum for the course. That is, the instructor and community representative(s) may brainstorm and collaborate on the design of the course; thus the course may be more responsive to integrating specific community issues as well as integrating perspectives from the community organizers themselves. These types of collaborations tend to develop longer, more substantial relationships for the community organizations, and the instructors tend to have a better sense of “progress” or development in the organizations’ needs. But, such relationships are time consuming. Additionally, I would suggest that the collaborations that occur here still tend to be isolated between an individual instructor and a limited number of organizations. While productive, these collaborations might be understood in a broader, more supported context with some attention to the method by which service-learning activities are undertaken.

Collaboration with community organizations is tricky at best. As Randy Stoecker (“Are Academics Irrelevant?”) points out, there are many roles academics (researchers, students, instructors facilitating connections) may play in community organizing, and each role is dependent *on the community*. There is no “one-size-fits-all” model to the level of participation or the type of collaboration that a specific community or organization in a community needs. Community organizations are not monolithic institutions, and to collaborate effectively with organizations around issues requires that academics have a good deal of knowledge and input from the community as they structure those relationships.

### *Final Comments on Limitations*

Current service-learning practices, which tend to be based primarily on educational benefits, individual student experience, and volunteer placement experience applied to separate course content, tend to underestimate the implications of these approaches, miss the opportunity to work in a more substantive way with organizations, and direct student placements to large, established nonprofit organizations that have more infrastructure to take individuals or groups of students. Therefore, service-learning projects and programs often do not connect with grassroots or alternative organizations.

Additionally, methods and programs for service-learning which address these limitations through alternative assessment strategies that include measuring community impact, or through more sustained individual collaborations with the community tend to have two other limitations that I would like to address. First, the collaborations are focused on individual instructors’ relationships with individual organizations. These collaborations might be highly effective and serve as models for other instructors or researchers to incorporate, but they remain somewhat decontextualized from a larger community. If handled a bit differently, these collaborations could significantly contribute to coalition building and to creating larger contexts for addressing community issues. Second, the collaborations tend to be isolated in that they do not necessarily sustain anything beyond the experience for the course and the specific need of

the community. That is, there is generally no historical record or organic resource developed from the service that is done in a community to contribute to a larger picture of the community issues and the work being done on those issues.

What these specific limitations bring us back to is an examination of the goals of service-learning and the theoretical frameworks we might employ to guide us in creating approaches to service-learning and other campus-community collaborations. I would like to briefly examine a possible theoretical framework here and from that framework, rearticulate some goals for service learning that will inform the methodological principles and method I develop in the second section.

## PRAXIS, HISTORY, DIALOGUE: CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND SERVICE LEARNING

The assumptions underpinning service-learning are that there are problems in society which require attention and that education is a viable site in which to turn students' attention and energy toward solving those issues. Service-learning, then, is concerned with the role of education in social relations and socio-political structures. Service-learning is, we might say, a *pedagogy of hope* in that those who practice service-learning believe that such service will make a difference, that the issues communities face are not "natural" or simply "the way things are." The theorist most often associated with a pedagogy of hope is, of course, Paulo Freire, and theories of service-learning have drawn explicitly on him when articulating goals of service-learning.

Carol W. Kinsley ("Community Service Learning as Pedagogy") states that, "The CSL development process evolved by combining the theories of Freire, Tyler, and Taba." Stephanie Kurtzman ("Collapsing the Ivory Tower: Service-Learning in Higher Education") identifies the theories of Freire in terms of collaboration, and she says, "Although Freire's (1970) liberationist pedagogy appears only sporadically in service-learning literature, it lends itself well to the formulation of service-learning philosophies." Freire's pedagogy and theory do lend themselves well to understanding service-learning theoretically. But, it is important that we understand what Freire's theories are in more detail in order to fully appreciate their implications for service-learning.

Freire's pedagogy must be understood as "critical pedagogy." Critical pedagogy is an approach to teaching and learning that strives to create and achieve:

the self-empowering pedagogical conditions within which both teachers and students can better make sense of the world and their interactions therein—to engage and thus interact as *participants* (shapers) of history, rather than simply *objects* (passive recipients) to be acted upon, manipulated, and controlled. Emphasizing the need for political awareness, critical work is enormously important for developing a theoretical framework that historically and socially situates the deeply embedded roots of racism, discrimination, violence, and disempowerment in this country. Instead of perpetuating the assumption that such realities are inevitable, the theories presented in critical pedagogy invite the reader to further explore the relationship between the larger historic, economic, and social constructs and

"To think of history as possibility is to recognize that if education cannot do everything, it can achieve some things. Its strength, as I usually say, resides in its weakness. One of our challenges as educators is to discover what historically is possible in the sense of contributing toward the transformation of the world, giving rise to a world that is rounder, less angular, more humane..."  
Paulo Freire ("A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race" 222)

their inextricable connection to ideology and power. (Leistyna and Woodrum 6)

Freire considers these issues to be paramount in all educational endeavors. He frequently reasserts his concern for contextualizing his theories in terms of social processes and critique to uncover and address systems and structures that created unjust conditions. Freire argues that education, knowing, and action were all embedded in social processes and should never be understood as individual or isolated processes: “I engage in dialogue because I recognize the social and not merely the individualistic character of the process of knowing” (“A Dialogue” 202).

Freire writes consistently of the role of the educator as being one informed by hope: “One of the most important tasks of critical educational practice is to make possible the conditions in which the learners, in their interaction with one another and with their teachers, engage in the experience of assuming themselves as social, historical, thinking, communicating, transformative, creative persons; dreamers of possible utopias, capable of being angry because of the capacity to love” (*Pedagogy of Freedom* 45). But this “hopefulness” is intimately connected to the function of and necessity of critique for Freire, and he is critical of educational projects that do not include that element of critique. He asserts that, “The kind of education that does not recognize the right to express appropriate anger against injustice, against disloyalty, against the negation of love, against exploitation, and against violence fails to see the educational role implicit in the expression of these feelings” (45). He says,

If we are cultural beings with the capacity to learn and to opt, to discover knowledge, then we create because we discover, since, for human beings, to discover is to create. If all of this is true, the education of human beings should never be restricted to a true intellectual training that limits itself to merely exposing students to what [Gerald] Graff calls a pedagogy of conflict—as if all existed on an equal basis—without creating conditions that will enable students to understand the nature of the ideologies that created the conflicts in the first place. (“A Dialogue” 214)

In other words, for Freire (and other critical pedagogy theorists), it is not enough to teach students to *care* and to seek change, but to enable them to see the systems that produce the need for change and to enable them to participate in finding ways of changing those systems, to work toward a more just world of their making as a *social process*. Achieving this practice, Freire believes, requires *praxis*, *history*, and *dialogue*.

## *Praxis*

*Praxis* (in its most simplified terms) is the enactment of theory in practice. The concept of praxis is tied intricately to the notion of “critique” in that it suggests rigorous analysis (of systems, relations, manifestations of those relations) according to a philosophical (or, more simply, an articulated) framework and a direct, concrete application of that theoretical knowledge in a *process*. Praxis is much more than coming up with an abstract hypothesis or theory and performing an experiment to test the validity of the theory. Praxis

### Resources on Critical Pedagogy

Leistyna, Pepi, Arlie Woodrum, and Stephen A. Sherblom, Eds. *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review, 1999.

Kanpol, Barry. *Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction*. 2nd Edition. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey, 1999.

*Possibilities: The Critical Pedagogy Website*  
<http://www.vms.utexas.edu/~possible/index.html>

*The Journal of Critical Pedagogy*. An online journal,  
<http://www.wmc.edu/academics/library/pub/jcp/jcp.html>

is hinged to the study of human, social issues and is a recursive process in which analysis and application constantly inform each other toward the goal of achieving substantive change.

The concept of praxis is clearly suited toward experiential education as it integrates abstract learning with concrete experience and application. However, within the rubric of praxis, the experience and application must be informed by a critical theory that examines systemic issues, larger contexts, and implications, *and* which remains tied to the recursive notion of a dialectical process. That is, no response is the final response, no action the sufficient action—all responses and actions inform theory and create new situations, new needs, new responses.

Service-learning activities may be understood as praxis in as much as they tie a concrete experience to concepts in the classroom. However, they can only be understood genuinely as praxis (in the critical sense) if those concrete experiences are tied to analyses of contexts and systemic causes for the individual experiences and if those experiences are tied back to broadening the theoretical understanding of power and change. Such a critical framework takes place only within *historicized* approaches.

## *History*

Critical education depends on historical contextualizing. That is, the goal of critical pedagogies and, I would argue, service-learning, is *change*. But change requires a sense of history, “that people place themselves in history, the assumption being that we are never independent of the social and historical forces that surround us” (Leistyna, et al. 199). Freire himself argues (repeatedly) that “As historical beings, our actions are not merely historical, but also are historically conditioned” (“A Dialogue” 221). This notion of history extends most clearly to the objects of study that we undertake as educators and students.

To take the example of service-learning curricula, the issues that students engage with in this type of study are embedded within a history; the students’ (and the instructor’s) responses to those issues are embedded within and shaped by a history; the causes of and the attempts to address or solve those issues are also embedded within a history; and the experiences or products of the students’ engagement with those issues impact and create new histories. Those historical contexts are essential to a broader understanding of the issues and of the responses to the issues, not simply for the immediate experience of the student, but for those who follow.

In order for the service-learning activity to be critical, this notion of history—our ability to conceive of history as well as to intervene in history through that broader understanding—must inform the *praxis* of the activities. Such a relationship allows us to understand our agency at the same time as it reveals the larger systems that frame problems we seek to change. Additionally, this notion of praxis and history contributes to and is created by a collective project to understand and affect the world. Such a collective project is the product of *dialogue*.

## *Dialogue*

Perhaps most central to Freire’s theories is the notion of *dialogue*. Dialogue (in Freireian terms) is not to be understood as a simplistic exchange or a structured framework where the conversation is controlled to reach a predetermined end. It is also not to be understood as “conversation,” or limited to the immediate

parties engaging in verbal exchange. Dialogue is a situated, open-ended exchange directed at an object of knowledge in which contexts and perspectives are recursively presented and shaped. A major concern for Freire was that his notion of “dialogue” was often reduced to a “methodology” or “technique.” In a dialogue with Donaldo Macedo (Freire often wrote in dialogue with others in a sort of demonstration of his own theoretical understanding of dialectical dialogue—see for example his dialogues with Myles Horton, M. Escobar & G. Guevara Niebla, Peter McLaren, Ira Shor, and J. Fraser), Freire says:

In order to begin to understand the meaning of a dialogical practice, we have to put aside the simplistic understanding of dialogue as a mere technique. Dialogue does not represent a somewhat false path that I attempt to elaborate on and realize in the sense of involving the ingenuity of the other. On the contrary, dialogue characterizes an epistemological relationship. Thus, in this sense, dialogue is a way of knowing and should never be viewed as a mere tactic to involve students in a particular task. We have to make this point very clear. I engage in dialogue not necessarily because I like the other person. I engage in dialogue because I recognize the social and not merely the individualistic character of the process of knowing. (“A Dialogue” 202)

For Freire, genuine dialogue is always the definition of genuine education and is always the appropriate approach to defining and engaging knowledge. Dialogue recognizes the agency and worth of individuals.

In relation to service-learning, however, this principle of dialogue has relevance beyond the relationship of the instructor to the student; it is in fact central to the relationship between educators and the communities and organizations working on community issues. That is, this understanding of dialogue has everything to do with an understanding of collaboration necessary to form and guide partnerships with the community.

In situations where collaborations with the community are not undertaken through dialogue with the community, not simply introductions and brief exchanges, but dialogue in a Freirean sense, the danger is that the relationship becomes what Freire characterizes above as a “mere tactic,” where the community is enlisted as a follower down an already determined path. The “other”—in this case the community partner—tends to be presented with a script, or is treated as having a separate script rather than being engaged in a genuine dialogue as a way of knowing. What dialogue in the critical sense would mean in these situations is that all participants in the object of knowledge would participate in a significant way in the dialogue about the object, co-constructing analyses and responses and connecting experiences toward the goals of the collaboration.

What becomes clear in the analysis of these concepts—Praxis, History, Dialogue—is that they provide a framework by which to articulate an approach to service-learning and other partnerships across institutions

**Resources for Participatory Research and other forms of Campus-Community Partnerships based in Critical Theory**

Randy Stoecker.

“Community-Based Research: The Next New Thing.”

<http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/drafts/cbrreportb.htm>

Comm-Org: The Online Conference on Community Organizing and Development

<http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/>

Institute for Community Research

<http://www.incommunityresearch.org/>

Community Research Network

<http://www.mapcruzin.com/community-research/index.html>

The Loka Institute

<http://www.loka.org/>

TerraKnowledge Network

<http://www.terraknowledge.com/>

Loka's Community Research Network

<http://www.loka.org/crn/index.htm>

Applied Research Center

<http://www.arc.org/>

Policy Action Research Group

<http://www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag/>

(see Community Research, Participatory Research models and resources). How might the goals of service-learning look if we re-articulate them based on this theoretical framework?

## RESTATING THE PRINCIPLES OF SERVICE-LEARNING

Above, I suggested that service-learning utilized the following principles:

- tying research and education to concrete community issues;
- examining the characteristics of citizenship or community membership;
- engaging in activities that have impact in communities;
- employing academic knowledge in applications to community problem-solving.

I would like to revisit those principles here and suggest some expansion and modification of them within the theoretical guidelines that I have been discussing.

In order to reframe these principles, I would argue that service-learning partnerships should strive to

- tie research and education to concrete community issues by making curricula and educational activities responsive to community issues and community need;
- examine the characteristics of citizenship or community membership through the principles of history and dialogue, interrogating the systemic and historical contexts of issues and responses to issues;
- contribute to the function of education in discovering causes and long-term responses to social issues by engaging in activities that have impact in communities as defined through dialogue with that community;
- employ academic knowledge in applications to community problem-solving through the concept of praxis and critical dialogue;
- expand educational institutions' (and the individual representatives of those institutions) participation *in* community, especially in terms of fostering coalitions and creating responsive resources for and with that community.

In restating the principles of service-learning in this fashion, I believe we maintain an emphasis on educational experience for individuals, but infuse into service-learning a broader concept of collaboration and benefit.

Many models of service-learning programs do incorporate these elements. In what follows here, I draw on the strengths of those models as well as make suggestions for developing approaches to service-learning that also incorporate expanded opportunities for coalition building and the development of organic resources that contribute to historical contextualizing of the actions and products of service-learning partnerships. In the next section, I outline the principles of a method for developing service-learning partnerships according to the theoretical goals I have suggested here, provide alternative approaches, outline some considerations for assessment of such partnerships, and draw on examples from my own pilot project as well as other projects that I hope will demonstrate the flexibility and potential for such approaches.

## PART II: THE METHODOLOGY

The history of service-learning practices has been built on the innovations, experimentations, and “good ideas” of individuals—students, instructors, community members alike. As service-learning has gained support from administrative bodies and has gained credibility through assessment, programs and more coordinated efforts have developed to support the use of service-learning according to more formalized sets of goals. For service-learning to have long-term and wide-ranging benefits, as is the case with any institutionalized pedagogical approach, it is essential that its implementation is linked to theory and that the methods of its implementation are based on principles extrapolated and analyzed according to those theories.

The first section of this document attempted to lay out a foundation for theoretical approaches to service-learning. Those theoretical principles, then, might be restated here in a slightly different way: The function of education is not simply instrumental or individual, but is a social process with the potential of placing its participants in roles of agency for social change. For that potential to be achieved, a critical, historical, and dialogic approach is required.

How does this theoretical framework translate into how we might approach articulating some principles for enacting service learning. To recognize the educational imperatives of service-learning, and to recognize the various needs that might be addressed in service-learning (those of the student, the educational institution, the “community”), I would posit the following principles:

- Service-learning can be valuable in teaching students to be agents of or participants in social change by working to bring them to consciousness of the social, historical, and material systems that produce specific conditions for people.
- Service-learning can enhance educational content in the context of education’s relationship to creating such agents of change through demonstrating the integral connections between the content of education and the social relations of community.
- Service-learning can mobilize and provide expanded access to resources for communities seeking to address issues, both directly and in terms of more comprehensive, broad change.
- Service-learning can create collaborations, and dialogue, within a broader context than isolated or individual classroom experiences.

If service-learning *can* do all these things, what are the ways of achieving that potential?

What I would like to suggest here is that in order for service-learning or any partnerships that involve the community to be successful at achieving the above potentials, some traditional approaches to education need to be complicated and everyone involved has to be willing to acknowledge that the most significant source of *expertise* on the community-based element of the work has to be the community (that is, those who are working directly on an issue from a position outside of the classroom) rather than the educational institution. Additionally, in order for the partnerships to have broader, sustained, collaborative impact, the community should be involved in the process of the partnership in a different capacity than educators (those who work within a formal institution) might be used to. However, this is a delicate balance. This claim is not to suggest that instructors are not experts on instruction, nor that they should in any way abandon that role. It is also not to suggest that community organizers have all the time in the world to attend meetings

and work intensively on shaping curricula or course content.

With those qualifications in mind, however, there are ways to approach constructing service-learning partnerships that are effective and are not onerous drains on anyone's energy or time, and that create opportunities for relationships that extend beyond individual instructors and organizers.

## WHAT "THE COMMUNITY" OFFERS

Nonprofit organizations, community associations, and grassroots community organizing groups work intensively and extensively with the issues they respond to on a daily basis. The people who work in these organizations are intimately aware of the history of particular issues and the strategies by which to address those issues. Additionally, they have (increasingly so) experience with creating or working in coalition with other organizations to secure support for and make more comprehensive responses to the challenges the communities they serve face. Often, their volunteers are extensively trained in the appropriate skills and knowledge for understanding the people they serve and the context of the issues being addressed. Those who work in these capacities in the community have considerable expertise in their areas.

Educators are aware of this expertise. In fact, that is why service-learning is a viable educational tool. However, this expertise tends to get isolated and separated from the course in which service-learning is utilized for several reasons. First, educators often do not recognize the ways in which that expertise might inform curricular development and course content. Educators may assume that community expertise to be expertise disconnected from the classroom rather than directly relevant to it. Second, students often mistake the classroom instructor for the expert rather than the community organization. That is, students often respond to the theory/practice split by assuming the instructor has the theoretical expertise while the community organizers are more or less practitioners. The results of this dichotomy are that the community organizations with whom the student is serving have a limited understanding of the educational goals of the students' service. Additionally, students will often naively present their research findings, proposals, or projects to the organization as if the students are (after a semester of research and writing) the experts on the issues organizations face. These projects may be high quality academic work, and they may be products or information that the organization can use, but often those products reproduce efforts or materials that already exist, or provide the organization with information they already have. The instructor often is unaware of this reception of the students' work.

A way to address these situations, however, is to address the notion of "expertise" and collaboration in these relationships differently. As educators designing courses around community-based issues, we might start with the following assumptions:

- ▶ Community organizers can provide valuable input into educational curricula components, especially regarding community issues;
- ▶ Instructors and researchers could design more effective issue-based course content in consultation with the community;
- ▶ Meaningful relationships—beyond a semester of student service—can develop if instructors and researchers work directly with community organizers.

Again, many individual and programmatic approaches to service learning incorporate these assumptions. What I would like to do here is lay out a process that works from these assumptions and, ideally, adds a

layer of coalition collaboration and organic resource development.

The steps to creating the types of project partnerships that value the goals of service learning and assumptions about community knowledge described above are relatively simple:

- **Initiate diverse contacts and connections, and begin implementing the process**
- **Workshop together to create curricula and projects, including articulated goals for each party**
- **Report back on the partnership progress**
- **Collaboratively assess the projects in terms of the articulated goals**
- **Create a resource out of the collaboration**

These steps may appear either obvious or onerous (depending on your perspective), but if we examine them a bit closer, we will see that they are not necessarily obvious, and can be conducted in a fashion which makes them less than onerous.

The ideal methodology I am explicating here assumes that there will be a group of people working together at least a semester ahead of the initial actual curricular activities in a series of meetings. I am also assuming that there is a coordinator facilitating placements or partnerships. Out of the initial group's meetings, individual instructors and organizations will establish specific projects to collaborate on, and will continue to meet in and with the larger group to share those projects and to build sustainability of the process, projects, and relationships initiated in this program. The methodology, then, is ideally based on a "program" model with individual projects carried out within the program. Ideally, the first step for successful service-learning activities in any educational institution (or division thereof) includes the support of someone serving in a coordinator capacity. I attempt to address the reasons for this as I articulate the rationale and importance of each one of the steps below. However, within each step, I discuss some "alternative" approaches to the methodology if no such coordinator or working group exists.

The first step for successful service-learning activities in any educational institution (or division thereof) includes the support of someone serving in a coordinator capacity.

## STEP I: INITIATING CONTACTS AND IMPLEMENTING THE PROCESS

*Identifying and contacting potential participants*

*Collecting and gathering information*

*Determining focus of project*

*Scheduling workshops/meetings for project*

The first step to connecting course activities to community issues is to get to know the community. The way to know what is going on in a community includes being in dialogue with the members of that community. Educators, of course, are always/already members of “the community” in which they live and work. However, there is much written on the institutional isolation of educators and of the separation of educational institutions (especially universities) from their communities (see sidebars). Teaching itself can be an isolating experience, and one of the benefits of service-learning or community-based instructional activities is the opportunity it presents to address that isolation and institutional barriers.

Establishing contacts and relationships between community organizers and instructors (or researchers) is an ongoing, continuous, and recursive process. However, **the initial contacts between these groups should occur at least one full semester, if not a full year, before the partnerships themselves begin.** There are several approaches to identifying community issues and making related contacts for those issues. The first approach might be identifying the issue through its connection to course content or educators’ interests and then establishing contacts based on those intersections. The second approach might bring educators into conversation with a group of community organizers to determine issues that connect with the course content. A facilitator of these partnerships (the coordinator) needs to determine and be prepared for both of these alternatives.

Assuming there is such a coordinator for a service-learning program, the most productive approach to this step is for the coordinator to speak with the instructors who are interested in (or to suggest to instructors why they might be interested in) incorporating community-based activities into their course content. Simultaneously, the coordinator should be contacting various organizations to determine the organizations’ focus, and the organizations’ needs. Additionally, while meeting with community organization leaders, the coordinator can discuss ways those organizations might find connections with instructors useful. The coordinator should be able to provide specific examples of course activities or partnerships, but should also allow the community organization contacts some creative flexibility to be able to envision what would be useful for them. At the end of the section are worksheets for “Contact Interest Inventorying” that provide heuristic questions for both instructors and community organizers that will enable the coordinator to identify

### **On teacher isolation:**

Corcoran, R., L.J. Walker, & J. L. White. *Working in Urban Schools*. Washington, DC: The Institute for Educational Leadership. (ED 299 356), 1988.

Farber, B. *Crisis in Education: Stress and Burnout in the American Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Lieberman, Ann, and Lynne Miller. *Teachers, Their World, and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ED 250 285), 1984.

### **On the divide between community and universities:**

Bok, Derek. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities for the Modern University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 1982.

Axel-Lute, Miriam. “Town & Gown: Making Research Serve Communities’ Needs.”

<http://www.loka.org/town&gown.htm>

Stoecker, Randy. “Are Academics Irrelevant?” Presented at the American Sociological Society Annual Meetings, 1997. Online at: <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/papers98/pr.htm>

common interests, areas where course content and community needs intersect, and the possibilities for partnerships. The coordinator, as s/he sees those connections present themselves, might share those possibilities with both the instructors and community organizers in order to enable them to imagine the possibilities and build on them.

If an instructor is working on this type of activity without the support of a coordinator, the instructor can use the inventory sheets to discuss possibilities with contacts from the community. Another option for the instructor is to approach other instructors and create a “working group” to establish contacts and begin a dialogue with each other and community organizers about possible contacts. On the other hand, if a community organizer is the one initiating the contacts (and this is certainly a possibility that I would encourage for community organizations and groups), s/he might also use the inventory sheets, brainstorming the community organizations’ interests and needs, presenting those to the instructor or other contacts in the educational institution, and utilizing the instructor inventory to determine ways to connect to each others’ needs. In another approach, students interested in doing a project with community members might use these worksheets to coordinate their own placements.

This process of contact-making serves several essential functions for creating the foundation for a strong service-learning program or activity. First, the conversations that occur during these “interviews” are heuristic for everyone involved. Instructors are encouraged to see the possible connections between course content and community issues. While instructors may have instinctually assumed those connections, the act of articulating these relationships makes those possibilities more concrete for the instructor. Likewise, community organizers have the opportunity to articulate the work they do in a context that they perhaps do not generally consider. The worksheet asks the organizers to consider what kind of educational activities they could envision supporting their work. This enables community organizers to see potential connections, as well as to generate creative concepts for educators to consider. If students are utilizing the worksheets, these conversations enable the student to gain a fuller picture of the organization, and to co-construct the connections between their coursework and community placement with the organization.

Second, these conversations build a frame for the rest of the process by revealing larger themes, establishing connections across issues and disciplines, and suggesting possible specific resources that might be effective in supporting continued partnerships between the educational institution and community organizations. The facilitator has the opportunity to analyze these elements and determine the most beneficial focus of a program. The conversations enable the facilitator to make some judgements about how much support certain types of partnerships might require, based on expertise, level of possible participation, number of possible connections, and other factors. The facilitator can make choices based on the amount of support available to such a program, the desired goal of the program, and the contacts most likely to be active in a program in order to delimit the focus of the current opportunity in the most productive fashion.

Third, the information generated from the contact phase can create a resource list itself for future projects or programs, even if the contacts are not followed up on in the immediate program. That is, if whomever collects the information from the worksheets transfers that into a contact sheet with descriptions and summary of the information collected, there will be available a resource list of possible future projects and partnerships. I have provided an example of such a sheet from a pilot project focused on community activism. In the next step of the process, this contact sheet is distributed to all of the participants in order to provide exactly that type of resource for the group involved in the rest of the process. Again, this opportu-

nity allows each participant to make their own connections and to follow-up on areas of possible partnership.

Finally, gathering this information enables the coordinator (or individuals) to proceed through the rest of the process. To complete this step, after participation and program focus has been determined, a series of “workshops” or meetings should be scheduled to facilitate the rest of the steps. The workshop content should not be overly determined ahead of time, as the individual workshop sessions and the projects undertaken in the process will determine much of what happens in those sessions. However, there should be sessions scheduled and facilitated that provide the participants with support materials to encourage theoretical and practical success of the individual projects, and the sessions should correspond with the steps and goals of the process. The program, then, is the series of sessions where the contacts and potential partners design individual relationships and projects, work as a larger group to identify and address common issues, especially in terms of assessment and expectations, and create a shared resource to connect the work that occurs in the individual projects.

The final worksheet and the example “Workshop Overview” in this section are designed to provide the coordinator of this process with guides to creating this series of sessions. The coordinator will want to consider the needs of the participants on a practical level—time availability, location of the sessions, how much facilitation needs to occur in the workshops. However, it is important to consider those needs as diverse and to address some commonly overlooked assumptions in negotiating campus-community partnerships. For example, where the sessions take place is extremely significant for community involvement. If the sessions take place *on campus*, the community may be reluctant to attend, may have difficulty parking or finding what are for the educational institution’s members very familiar places. Is it possible that a message of “authority” or “ownership” is being sent if the meetings take place on campus? Are there alternative venues that might be beneficial to explore? I recommend that the coordinator ask these questions of the participants and get participant feedback in making these types of logistical decisions.

---

## WORKSHEET #1A:

### SOURCES FOR IDENTIFYING INSTRUCTOR, COMMUNITY, AND OTHER CONTACTS

As you establish these contacts, remember that you are looking for maximal input into the rest of the process, seeking advice on how to frame the collaborative projects, and assuring all participants that the process will not be a huge drain on nor a waste of their time. The goal in making these contacts is not to plug people into certain roles, but to generate unexpected information and connections, and to coordinate a larger context that develops organically out of the group process.

#### *Instructor Contacts*

General query on:

- Departmental listservs;
- Special project mailing lists;
- Newsletters or departmental info-memos.

#### *Example message:*

Dear Colleagues:

As instructors teaching a variety of courses and attempting to integrate a variety of learning experiences, we often discuss how difficult it can be to make contacts with other teachers and community leaders, contacts we know could benefit from and inform our pedagogical frameworks, as well as our students' work. If you are interested in discussing the potentials for expanding these conversations in particular ways, please contact me to set up a brief, informal meeting.

#### Identifying individual instructors:

Utilize departmental listings, project membership pages, Curriculum Vitae, and word of mouth to locate

- instructors on service-learning committees or who currently utilize community-based learning in their courses.
- instructors with research interests that coincide with current community issues or relate directly to community.
- instructors with records of attendance at pedagogy workshops.
- instructors who are members of community organizations.

Contact these instructors with a brief message about what kinds of activities you are exploring and request to discuss possibilities further and to get their feedback on other possible contacts or approaches.

---

### ***Community Contacts***

In order to identify possible participants in the community,

- ▶ obtain a list of local community organizations through the local volunteer services and information referral services.
- ▶ refer to published lists of campus organizations (students, staff, faculty).
- ▶ generate a list of community issues that are prevalent in local media and identify the community organizations that work on those issues.
- ▶ attend community meetings and introduce yourself as working on establishing partnership projects for education and community organizations.
- ▶ post general queries to community bulletin boards.
- ▶ ask initial contacts for suggestions about other people to contact and for advice in terms of the best way to contact those people.

*Example message of introduction to a community contact:*

Dear [community organizer]:

I attended the meeting the other night where community leaders, including you, had gathered to discuss the bill currently being voted on in the legislature that would impact the way homeless persons could obtain healthcare. I noted that your organization appears to do a significant amount of work on this and related issues, and I wanted to discuss with you the possibilities of connecting your work and knowledge about these issues with educational activities at the university. I am currently coordinating some discussions about such possible partnerships and would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to get your feedback and possible participation.

### ***Other Possible Contacts to Consider***

While instructors and community organizations are the primary people we think of in terms of service-learning partnerships, it is valuable to consider other types of people to ask to participate in this process as the function of the process is to create a high-level of collaboration—a sort of coalition—and resources to support activities focusing on community issues.

#### *Public officials*

Consider talking with public officials from city offices, legislative assistants, community relations staff, community project leaders, etc. These officials have a good sense of high priority community issues, the players in those issues, resources that have been created and needs for resources, and can be valuable in thinking through connections of issues.

---

*Graduate Students*

Graduate students are often forming research projects or looking for ways to connect their academic experience with communities. Identify graduate students who might benefit from contacts in the community for their research through faculty, listservs, and research groups.

**A Note on Diversity**

The purpose of this approach to creating service-learning opportunities is to expand and support possible coalitions, create expanded collaborations and access to resources for both educators/researchers and community organizers, and to create resources for addressing community issues. Therefore, the process is most effective when there is a significant level of diversity during the collaboration. Such diversity might include:

- the academic disciplines represented;
- the level of expertise in utilizing these approaches to instruction;
- the types of community approaches to issues;
- the issues represented;
- the ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status represented.

Refer to worksheet 1C for further information on the significance of this issue. If reaching a specific level of diversity is part of your particular program/project goal, it is wise to keep these factors in mind as you are making initial contacts.

---

## WORKSHEET #1B

### INVENTORYING CONTACTS AND CONNECTIONS

#### Questions for Instructors:

- What courses do you teach?
- Do you “theme” your courses? If so, why and how?
- Do those themes connect to issues that you are familiar with in the community? How?
- What type of assignments do you use in your courses?
- What types of “texts” do you use in your courses?
- What are the limitations of those assignments and texts?
- Have you considered ways to enhance those assignments while still achieving the desired educational outcomes of the course?
- Could you imagine someone from the community contributing to the instructional materials to enhance the course content in some fashion?
- If you are a coordinator or community organizer, can you at this point imagine any contributions from an organizer in this regard? Can you imagine any assignment connections? Provide an example of such activities, even if it is from another discipline or course to suggest ways that this instructor might think about these possibilities. See for example, 101 Ideas for Combining Service & Learning, available at: <http://www.fiu.edu/~time4chg/Library/ideas.html>.
- Would you be willing to participate in a series of conversations to workshop possible partnership projects between instructors, researchers, and community organizations?

At the end of the interviews, in order to create reference notes for planning, you might:

- List keywords for course content and possible community issue connections.
- List possible contacts for instructor to collaborate with.

#### Questions for Community Organizers:

- What is the main focus of your organization’s work?
- What are the issues you identify as needing attention in the community?
- What are the assets of the community you work with?
- Have you had experience with students volunteering in your organization as part of their educational requirements (coursework, etc.)? If so, what went especially well? What didn’t work so well? What would you have liked to have done differently?
- If the organizer has had no such experience, offer an example of how service-learning might be relevant to this organization.

- 
- Can you imagine resources from an educational institution that would contribute to your organization's ability to do its work?
  - Do you work in coalition with other organizations?
  - Would it be helpful to work in collaboration with a group of people (educators, researchers, and other community organizers) to find connections between issues and to get a better sense of what other organizations are doing?
  - What type of collaborative resource from such a group might be useful to your organization (or to the community in general)?
  - Would you be willing to participate in a series of conversations to workshop possible partnership projects between instructors, researchers, and other organizations?

To continue your reference notes, you might:

- List keywords for community issues and possible research or course content connections.
- List possible contacts for organizer to collaborate with.

---

**WORKSHEET #1C**  
**DETERMINING PARTICIPATION AND FOCUS**

Once you have established contacts, gained an overview of possible connections and themes, and determined the willingness of various contacts to participate in this process, you are in a position to better determine the size and scope of the main project. Your goal is to create a collaborative space for specific projects to take place and to tie those specific projects together in such a way that the participants can support and offer feedback on each others' projects as well as create a larger context to see the issues being addressed. Ultimately, this process can facilitate coalition-building, and can itself create a shared resource.

However, you will want to determine the size and scope of the project based on your own institutional priorities, climate, support, and goals. This worksheet is designed for you to work through those factors so that you can determine how to proceed to the next steps of the process.

**List all contacts and keywords for those contacts, possible connections, and availability/willingness of the contact to participate:**

Contact Info	Descriptors (issues, courses, goals)	Possible Partners	Willing to Participate?

**How much time does the coordinator/facilitator have to devote to this project?**

Your answer to this question will help you realistically determine how big this project might be (for instance, it will take considerably more time to facilitate a project with twenty possible partnerships than it will to do ten). However, it may also help you to determine alternative ways that you might structure the methodology. The basic methodology assumes a series of workshop sessions facilitated by a single coordinator (who would also maintain contacts between the workshop sessions). That coordinator then would also facilitate the development of the resources discussed in Step 5 of the process. If this model is not feasible—there is no administrative support for that level of facilitation—other options might include small groups with self-appointed coordinators, or a form of self-facilitation through a listserv.

---

**What are the goals of this project?**

- ▶ Is the goal to create a large infrastructure for long-term, sustained community partnerships? Is the goal to introduce as many instructors as possible to service-learning?
- ▶ Is the goal to create a grassroots-type of structure that can organically develop with sustained participation?
- ▶ Is the goal to “pilot” this approach and determine its feasibility for a larger implementation after the first experience and assessment?

The answers to these questions will depend on the current institutional structures in place to support campus-community partnerships and the institutional priorities for those structures. Any of these goals would suggest a different size and focus for the rest of the process.

**What is the focus?**

Once you have determined the size of the project, it will be essential to determine other ways of focusing the project. For example, if you have chosen a small pilot project, you may want to focus that project (or the contact conversations may have suggested a possible focus) around a specific issue, or several clearly connected issues. Or you may want to focus specifically on some apparently not-connected issues so that part of the process will include teasing out the larger contexts and systems that do connect those issues. While this focus should not necessarily delimit the individual project partnerships that occur between instructors and community organizations, it will be helpful in terms of creating the larger collaborative effort and in determining the type of resource such a project may begin to create.

**Who is represented?**

Whatever you determine the size and focus of the program to be, an important element to consider is the diversity of the participants. Consider what types of diversity would be most beneficial to the participants of such a program. For example, having instructors who are rather experienced at utilizing community-based activities along with instructors who have limited experience in that area creates possibilities for informal mentoring to occur. Having several disciplines represented during the process enables opportunities for productive interdisciplinary connections to be made. Having graduate students involved in the process enables those students to collaborate with instructors or community members they may not otherwise have the opportunity to. Perhaps most importantly, having a variety of community organizations (diverse in size and approach) enables community organizations the opportunity to network and increase contacts, possibly leading to shared resources and coalition building. It is, in any case, essential to have as much diversity of possible in terms of ethnicity, class, gender, and sexual orientation for the possibility of a more complex dialogue regarding the issues and approaches to issues to take place.

---

**Describe the final program in terms of participants, initial goals, and overview of the process.**

After you have thought through these questions, determined the answers, and come up with a general concept and overview for the rest of the process, write a description of that program so that you will be able to represent it to others as you begin to collaborate with them in implementing and further shaping the process.

---

## WORKSHEET #1D

### SCHEDULING SESSIONS

As you create the workshop series, you will want to take into account the characteristics and needs of your participants on all aspects of the sessions, from time, location, content, and level of facilitation. Utilize the questions on this worksheet to generate a guideline for a flexible series of sessions to facilitate the service-learning program with your contacts.

**Have any of the potential participants suggested a good location for the workshops?**

**Generate a list of potential locations for the sessions.**

**Are there any time considerations you need to take into account in scheduling these sessions?**

**What is the timing for this program? When do you anticipate individual projects to begin (next semester, next year)? Do you and the participants think it would be most useful to hold some of the sessions concurrently with the projects (works best if assessment of the projects and program is to occur in the sessions)?**

**How much time between sessions would be useful for the participants? (This may be a question that is answered in the first session, or the schedule may have to remain flexible enough to alter the dates if necessary).**

**What will be the focus of each session? (The example provided loosely matches the workshop sessions with the steps in the suggested process: contacts; workshopping projects; reporting back; assessment; creation of shared resource. However, specific contexts might find another structure more helpful.)**

**Write up the dates, times, location, and short description of each session. Consider distributing this sheet as a draft to your participants to get suggestions for revisions or to discuss issues you may have overlooked.**

## EXAMPLE PARTICIPANT CONTACT LIST RESOURCE

The following is an edited list of participants from the Tucson pilot project with the kind of information that might be included for establishing the first step of this process.

---

## CONNECTING COMMUNITY AND ACADEMIC ACTIVISM A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

### List of Participants

The participants in this workshop series represent a variety of interests and approaches to issues of local concern. For the purposes of managing this pilot project, I have had to limit the direct participation to the following individuals, but as project needs develop, there are certainly no ends to possible connections to other groups and individuals in this community. With this list of participants, we have among us a rich resource for contacts and connections to related issues. As you read these summaries of interests, be aware of possible connections and consider ways you might directly partner with one or more of the people on this list to achieve your goals—whether those goals are in terms of university research, student placement, resources to bring to your classroom, contacts at the university for research or resource support, or more informal network possibilities.

LYDIA LESTER (llester@u.arizona.edu)

#### **Students Against Sweatshops, Southern Arizona Alliance for Economic Justice**

Lydia works with **Students Against Sweatshops**, a student organization that organizes around human rights issues in labor and the university's role in such practices. For the past couple of years, the group has been highly engaged in protesting the university's relationship with manufacturers of products sold or endorsed on campus that utilize sweatshops (Nike, etc) and have been working with the administration to get the university to participate in a Workers Rights Consortium. Currently, the projects they are actively pursuing include:

“First, we've proposed that the university work with community activists and experts in human rights and labor issues to rethink the way it chooses its licensees. Specifically we are thinking of trying to incorporate worker cooperatives and other more 'economically just' factories that need contracts to survive. We have done a lot of work on this and has found some community people that are willing to talk to the university about this. So far, it looks like some kind of committee may be formed to work on this.

“Second, we've proposed that the university give some money to students (graduate and undergraduate) to study issues relating to sweatshops. Hopefully there will be a meeting with SAS, the Admin. and the Task Force to talk about this soon.

“Third, we've asked the university to take a more proactive role in the WRC. The university has spent lots of resources on the FLA, but until now, it has not put the same kind of effort into the WRC. The recent visit of Rich Appelbaum from the WRC was helpful because he gave some ideas of ways that UA can help get the WRC off the ground. One of the obvious things that UA can do is give money. The WRC

would like to run pilot projects that will (hopefully) form a foundation for working in the future on the sort of projects the WRC hope to develop. The WRC itself is not sure yet how these pilot projects will take shape, but UA could help by heading up one of these projects.”

Additionally, Lydia works with the **Southern Arizona Alliance for Economic Justice**, a coalition of activists working on local issues for social justice. And, Lydia works with the **Poverty Law Center**, which will be undertaking a project on tenants’ rights in the near future.

KATE O’NEIL (koneil@u.arizona.edu)

**Sociology Grad Student and Instructor; Coalition to Organize Graduate Students**

Kate says of herself: “I am currently a Ph.D. student in the department of sociology at Arizona. I completed my M.A. work at the University of Washington. My research interests include the study of organizations, especially nonprofit organizations and religious organizations. I currently work as a teaching assistant in a course that includes a service learning component. I am also designing a course on contemporary social issues, which I will teach in the summer of 2001. Prior to graduate school, I served as an Americorp\*VISTA volunteer working in the area of adult literacy. Before I was in VISTA, I worked as the volunteer coordinator of a breakfast soup kitchen. I am an active member and organizer in the Coalition to Organize Graduate Students, and I volunteer with Pima County Adult Education in the literacy program. My previous activism and volunteerism has centered around issues of poverty and hunger and feminist issues. Originally from Maine, I ended up in Tucson by way of Baltimore and Seattle.”

LONNI PEARCE (lonni@u.arizona.edu)

**UA English Instructor (Business and Technical Writing)**

Lonni is an instructor and graduate student in the Department of English. Lonni will be teaching a course on Business and Technical writing in the spring while concurrently working on an online version of the course that ties students to local community partners analyzing technology in professional communication. She would like to make contacts with local activist and nonprofit organizations in order to facilitate connections for students and to get input into the professional writing curriculum for the online course.

CURTIS FERREE (cpferree@visto.com)

**PCC/UA English Instructor (Composition)**

Curtis is an English Composition instructor at Pima Community College and the University of Arizona. He is developing his courses around either mining or border issues and would like to work with local activists to tie his course materials to immediate and historical issues in the community.

PAULA ARNQUIST (afscaz@azstarnet.com)

**Workers Rights Board, Southern Arizona Alliance for Economic Justice, American Friends Service Committee**

Paula works with the **Workers Rights Board** and the **Southern Arizona Alliance for Economic Justice**. She seeks assistance with immigrant labor issues and day labor concerns. She always is seeking volunteers for the Workers Rights Board hotline, especially law students. Paula has information on trends in local workers’ rights issues and organizing efforts.

MIRANDA JOSEPH (mirandaj@u.arizona.edu)

**UA Women's Studies/LGB Studies Faculty**

Miranda is a University of Arizona Women's Studies faculty and director of the LGB studies committee. She is currently developing a course on Prisons and seeks activists and experts to advise on her curricula and perhaps participate as guest speakers in her classes.

Additionally, Miranda is the director of a Rockefeller funded project-a committee of activists from the community and university working on "Sex, Race, and Globalization" issues. The committee seeks ways to connect issues of sexuality, gender, race, and class around globalization trends, thus connecting disparate issues and mobilizing various forms of activism in unison. One significant project of the committee will be a **Spring Symposium: Collective Action: Working for Sexual, Racial, and Economic Justice.** (March 9 and 10, 2000.) The symposium will have four plenary speakers of scholars and activists, will include a screening of the film, *Out at Work: The Gay and Lesbian Movement Goes to Market*, and will include a series of facilitated workshops around specific action oriented issues (such as, Money, Media, etc). Miranda seeks support from the local activist community in terms of co-sponsors. Co-sponsoring would involve endorsing the symposium and assisting with advertising by providing mailing lists and distribution of advertising materials.

CATHY CHAPUT (chaput@u.arizona.edu)

**UA English Instructor (Business and Technical Writing)**

Cathy is an instructor and graduate student in the Department of English and is currently teaching a course on Business Writing that has focused on the local Brush-Wellman controversy. Her students have been working in the community researching the issue and creating documents and projects around and in response to the issue. Next semester, she will be teaching a Technical Writing course and seeks similar projects to link her curricula and students into. She would like to work with local activists on defining issues and as contacts for her students and her class.

VALERIE GOMES (lbarskygom@aol.com)

**Tucson Health Workers SoundOff**

Valerie works in local healthcare as a Registered Nurse. She and some of her colleagues developed and implemented a newsletter for healthcare workers called "Tucson SoundOff" that deals with workplace issues and serves as a venue to connect local workers together. Her ultimate goal with this publication is that it serve to mobilize workers to eventually develop a collective bargaining strategy.

Valerie is interested in working with higher education and the community on getting workplace issues into professional education programs, specifically in the College of Nursing. She is also seeking research and technical assistance on moving her newsletter forward as an organizing tool. Valerie is also able to advise on local healthcare issues, especially in terms of the labor practices and implications for healthcare workers.

LAURA BRIGGS (lbriggs@u.arizona.edu)

**UA Women's Studies Faculty**

Laura is a Women's Studies faculty member and serves on the Executive Committee for LGB Studies.

She works closely with graduate students who are interested in activist issues and is involved in activism on the university campus as well as in the community. Laura is teaching a course on “Women and Activism since the 30’s” and is looking to develop an activist component for her students. She would like to broaden the definition of activism for women and would like to establish a stronger base of connections in order to advise her students.

**ELAINE MARIOLLE** ([mariolle@u.arizona.edu](mailto:mariolle@u.arizona.edu))

**UA Geography Doctoral Student, Community Learning Project Developer, Southwest**

**Project instructor**

Elaine is a doctoral candidate in the Geography program with an area of specialization in Cultural/Historical/Social Geography. Her dissertation explores Route 66 as a cultural icon. For the past 2.5 years she has worked with the Community Learning Project (grant for the CLP concluded 12/2000) developing a suite of projects at Fort Lowell and Lawrence Intermediate schools which explore issues of local history and land use. Projects include an oral history video at Fort Lowell school, sense of place workshops coordinated with the Arizona Sonora Desert Museum, a photographic exploration of place facilitated with Kimi Eisele of Voices, and a borderlands/missions/Fiesta de Tumacacori project developed in partnership with the National Park Service, the Arizona State Museum and Lawrence school. Projects are place-based and emphasize critical thinking around issues of local resources, history, land use and decision making.

Additionally, she has worked with the University of Arizona’s Southwest Project making local cultural materials available to instructors for curricular use. Working under the leadership of Stuart Glogoff (Distributed Learning at Univ of AZ) she recently helped develop the “Cowboy Songs and Singers” materials on the university’s library web exhibits that gathers historical and cultural materials to make them readily available for incorporation into course materials.

Elaine is currently working with Chris Lamar, Director of Telecommunications and Production Services at Pima Community College on a community education program which will focus on issues related to Rio Nuevo (physical, cultural, historical, economic...). This project is in the formative stages and Elaine is currently in the process of identifying and incorporating community groups and instructors who would like to partner in the Rio Nuevo community education project.

**JULIA BALEN** ([jbalen@deimos.email.arizona.edu](mailto:jbalen@deimos.email.arizona.edu))

**UA Women’s Studies Director of Academic Internships**

Julia is the director of academic internships in Women’s Studies at the University of Arizona. She works closely with students identifying internships that can be structured around academic credit. She would like to develop further contacts with the activist organizations in the community, especially because Women’s Studies is a historically activist discipline and thrives on connections to local issues.

**PENNY WATERSTONE** ([pennyw@theriver.com](mailto:pennyw@theriver.com))

**Local Histories Projects; UA Women’s Studies affiliate**

Penny works both in the community on oral history projects and is associated with the University Women’s Studies program. Penny develops projects that involve radical local histories and incorporate humanities’ approaches to understanding community. She has been involved with many local projects and is

able to identify potential funding possibilities for innovative approaches to local history. Penny could partner with university instructors and researchers working on historical, labor, and local activism issues from both an academic and community oriented approach, incorporating—among other things—oral history, sense of place, and story telling.

**JEFF IMIG** (jeffi@u.arizona.edu)

**Pan Left Productions, alternative media**

Jeff works with the alternative media group, Pan Left Productions. Pan Left produces videos about local issues as well as documents local activism. Current projects underway with Pan Left are: *Poisoned*, about the BrushWellman's toxic materials practices and implications for employees as well as the broader community; *Heridas Abiertas: Sonoran Copper Miners Struggle to Survive*, which explores globalization's impacts on local mine workers and the strikes associated with them; *Sex Work*, a diary/documentary about women working in the sex industry. Also underway is a video about from the Florence Immigration Project, *Know Your Rights*, designed to help immigrants understand and protect their own civil rights. There are many ways students can work on these projects.

Additionally, Jeff works on ballot initiatives concerning local health care and would welcome participation and assistance with those initiatives.

**STACY DAY** (sday@email.arizona.edu)

**UA English Instructor (Composition)**

Stacy is an instructor and graduate student in the Department of English and is developing a composition course that utilizes Truman Capote's novel: *In Cold Blood*. Stacy would like to work with community groups on developing connections to local issues and possible community projects for this course.

**JENNIFER ALLEN** (prohoods@azstarnet.com)

**ProNeighborhoods, Southwest Alliance to Resist Militarization (SWARM)**

Jen works with ProNeighborhoods, an organization that works directly with neighborhood communities on asset based development. ProNeighborhoods provides small grants as well as technical assistance to communities to develop their own programs utilizing their community members' strengths and building outward to create constructive relationships with the institutions in and around that community (like the University, for example). Jennifer sees possible connections between this program and the university on a variety of levels: the organization itself would welcome assessment assistance and support from members of the university; Jennifer would also be able to connect students into relevant neighborhood projects where they might be able to offer assistance or learn first-hand how communities organize themselves.

Additionally, Jennifer is part of the Southwest Alliance to Resist Militarization of the Border. This group watches and acts against the increased military presence and actions on the US/Mexico border. This group is in an organizational development phase, but has ongoing projects for which university partnerships would be welcome.

**MARV WATERSTONE** (marvinw@u.arizona.edu)

**UA Geography/CCLS Faculty**

Marv is a faculty member in the Department of Geography and will be teaching a course on cultural geography that investigates and critiques resource management and decision-making policies. Students from the course will conduct intensive research projects on regional and local issues. Projects for these students might include community activism issues and students might partner with a local group to investigate local environmental issues. Students may be able to provide valuable resources to the community from completing these projects.

Additionally, Marv works with the Arizona Green Party and is working on voter reform initiatives, and may serve as a resource for an instructor to consider electoral processes in a course.

**KARIN UHLICH** (karin@primavera.org)

**Primavera Foundation, Day Labor, Workers Rights Board**

Karin is the Executive Director of the Primavera Foundation. Currently, projects that she is working on that would benefit from partnerships with higher education include day labor worker education/organizing and legislative advocacy; ongoing monitoring and engagement with Mayor/Council policies/proposals; local activism tied to some national groups' agendas (on homelessness, welfare policy, federal budgets, labor issues/policy, housing policy, etc.). Karin's organization targets homelessness and associated labor issues and strives to be proactive in addressing systemic issues that cause and perpetuate homelessness in communities. The Primavera Foundation has developed a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional approach to dealing with social issues and can provide valuable information regarding coalition building and collective action in the community.

**JIM DRISCOLL** (jdriscoll@azcitizen.org)

**Arizona Citizens Action**

Jim works with a statewide coalition, Arizona Citizen Action. The group's web page ([www.azcitizen.org](http://www.azcitizen.org)) describes Arizona Citizen Action as: "the biggest public interest watchdog group in the state and the Arizona affiliate of USAction. We fight for campaign finance reform; quality health care for all; clean air, food and water; affordable, reliable telephone and electric service; decent jobs; quality public education and civil rights for all. We research, educate, lobby, demonstrate and elect candidates. Over 11,000 families have joined since our founding in 1990." Arizona Citizen Action works with student groups and students to mobilize on public issues.

**LEITH KAHL** (leith@u.arizona.edu)

**Teamsters, Asarco Mines**

Leith is a member of the Teamsters as well as Students Against Sweatshops. Leith has contacts with Teamsters working in the Asarco mines who are currently facing major labor issues related to the historical struggles of that industry and exacerbated by the rapid expansion of corporate power and globalization. Leith can put interested instructors and students in touch with a contact to work on this current issue.

ZOE HAMMER-TAMIZUKA (zhammert@u.arizona.edu)

**UA Cultural Studies; prison research/dissertation**

Zoe is a Doctoral candidate in Comparative Cultural and Literary Studies at the University of Arizona. Her dissertation research is a critique of the prison-industrial complex and she is analyzing the relationship of prison issues to larger trends in globalization and labor. She seeks to incorporate local prison research and activism into her work. She will also be collaborating with Miranda Joseph on developing course curricula dealing with prison issues.

CAROLINE ISAACS

**American Friends Service Committee; Prisons Concerns Committee**

Caroline works with American Friends Service Committee, a national activist organization dedicated to issues of social justice. Locally, AFSC has several ongoing social justice projects. The Global Economy Program has ongoing projects including: Maquila Organizing Project; Anti-Sweatshop Campaign; Economic Literacy Workshops; and Jubilee 2000. The Creative Response to Conflict Subcommittee has projects developing “Alternatives to Violence” and “Help Increase the Peace, directed and created especially for youth. The Prisons Concerns Subcommittee has projects to address changing the criminal justice system in Arizona including: Death Penalty Abolition; Outmates; Prisoners are People Day; and Restorative Justice. American Friends would welcome the opportunity to provide information and resources to instructors teaching courses involving these issues and would welcome student projects that involve understanding these issues further.

MJ BRAUN (mjbraun@u.arizona.edu)

**UA Department of English Instructor, Grad Student, Students Against Sweatshops**

MJ is an instructor and graduate student in the Department of English and an active member of Students Against Sweatshops. MJ develops course curricula and her own activism in connection to local issues and recently worked with Professional Communication students on developing projects around the BrushWellman toxic materials controversy. MJ is looking forward to continuing developing joint projects with the university and community activism and can provide technical assistance and contacts as project partnerships develop.

DANIELLE MITCHELL (mitcheld@u.arizona.edu)

**English Department Grad Student and Instructor; Writing Center, Grantwriter**

Danielle is a grad student at the University of Arizona who teaches a range of courses (introductory composition to business writing) and also co-coordinates the Writing Center. Her primary academic interests are in queer theory and oppositional teaching practices, which she attempts to combine in order to create academic sites dedicated to achieving social justice, not only by considering issues of heteronormativity but also how they are related to class, race, and gender. She also has experience working as a grant writer, seeking funding for non-profit social agencies from corporate, private, and public sources. Danielle hopes to increase her community activism and to find ways to incorporate her research interest and skills into specific activist sites.

CAREN ZIMMERMAN (racaz@earthlink.net)

**Jobs with Justice, LGB Studies**

Caren is a graduate student in Comparative Cultural and Literary Studies and researches community activism and organizing. She is a Research Assistant with LGB Studies and is assisting with the coordination of the Spring Symposium. Additionally, Caren is active with Jobs With Justice, a national organization that works toward collective action in labor and justice issues. The local chapter works in coalition with local labor unions and community activist organizations on a variety of projects.

KIMI EISELE (eisele@dakotacom.net)

**Program Coordinator, Voices Inc.**

Kimi received an MA in geography from the UA in 1999. A writer, she has worked on history, geography, and writing projects with children on both sides of the border. Voices: Community Stories Past and Present, Inc. is a local nonprofit organization that works with teenagers to preserve and document stories about everyday lives in Tucson. Kimi heads up the current Voices project working with 20 teenagers afterschool to produce a new youth magazine that will present stories, both historical and present-day, about Tucson neighborhoods and the people who live there. The theme of this year's pilot issue is stereotypes and discrimination. Voices would benefit greatly from collaboration with UA faculty and students as we always welcome the expertise of people who study journalism, history, geography, sociology, linguistics, writing, photography, fine arts, popular culture, etc.

DANIKA BROWN (danika@u.arizona.edu)

**UA Department of English Instructor, Grad Student, National Service Fellow**

Danika is a grad student in the Department of English and her research interest is the University's role in community issues, specifically in terms of pedagogies that involve technology and service learning. She is working on critiques of service learning and university-community collaborations in an effort to find meaningful ways for individuals in the university to consider themselves activists in their communities. Additionally, she will be teaching Business Writing in an online format for the Spring semester and is seeking ways to incorporate student analyses of technology in professional communication into the goals of local nonprofit and grassroots organizations. She would welcome the opportunity to partner students with community organizations to conduct useful analyses that might assist community organizations in their goals.

## CONNECTING COMMUNITY AND ACADEMIC ACTIVISM

### A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

#### Overview and Schedule

(Locations of workshops to be announced. Please send suggestions and feedback to [danika@u.arizona.edu](mailto:danika@u.arizona.edu))

In an effort to create meaningful connections between higher education and community activism, I am facilitating a series of workshops for university instructors and researchers to meet with community activists. At these workshops, everyone will have the opportunity to talk about the work they are doing, projects that need support, and sources of information and action that exist in the community, including the university. As the workshops continue, meaningful partnerships will be established between activists and educators that might include collaborative research projects, student placement opportunities, and community leaders contributing to course content in various ways.

► The first session will be held on **November 29th from 5-8pm**. This session will be an opportunity to gather and share information. Those instructors and community members participating in the whole series of workshops, as well as additional invited activists from the community, will present brief overviews of the work they are doing and suggest ways that others might be involved or support that work. I will present some example resources that might connect educational activities with community work, as well as provide examples of ideas for some projects that might emerge as a result of these collaborative endeavors. We will generate a contact list and set goals and outcomes for the rest of the sessions of the workshop. Everyone will be invited to continue attending the workshops.

► The second session will be held on **December 13th, from 5-8pm**. At this session, participants will spend the first hour identifying the collaborative projects they will be working on and provide brief synopses of what they expect to be doing and their goals in the projects. If anyone has been unable to identify a project, we will work as a group to make suggestions and establish preliminary contacts for pursuing those ideas. Additionally, we will determine if anyone needs further assistance in establishing contacts. We will work to identify local resources (technical, cultural, advisory, etc.) to facilitate specific projects. The rest of the session will be devoted to discussing issues of university-community partnerships, including the role of the university researcher and issues of students working in the community. There are implications to service-learning and university research participation with the community, especially in terms of activist agendas, and we will discuss the limitations and possible implications of such work. At the end of the session, I will ask everyone to think about the guidelines they will implement for participating in this collaboration, and will provide resources and models for your consideration. I would like to develop a “Best Practices” guideline for my final methodology and would ask you all to provide input in this area.

- ▶ The third session will be held on **February 7th, from 5-7pm**. This session will consider questions of outcomes and assessment. Participants will talk about expectations and how the projects will be measured according to those expectations. Instructors may think in terms of specific course goals and additional ways to facilitate student involvement with the community. Community activists may think in terms of educating students on community issues and getting support for activist projects. The goal of the session will be to foster a clear sense of what participants expect from these collaborations and if those expectations can be achieved.
  
- ▶ The fourth session will be held on **February 28th, from 5-7pm**. This session will be an opportunity for everyone to talk about how the work is going and to generate additional ideas for future collaboration, or to revise the process by which this initial collaboration was undertaken.
  
- ▶ The fifth session will be held on **April 18th, from 5-7pm**. This session will generate ideas of sustaining the collaborations that have been initiated by this process. Is it possible for us to consider structures that might facilitate this work? We will also focus on assessing the process in terms of expectations and outcomes. We will uncover any unexpected limitations, negative implications, or other obstacles to this process. We will identify and collaborate on determining or designing appropriate formal assessment instruments for the projects.
  
- ▶ The final session will be held on **May 9th, from 5-7pm**. At this session, I will provide an overview of this particular process with the various collaborative projects, discuss options for sustaining the process, and discuss the resource pages we have created collaboratively on linking community issues to academic work. We will determine where those resources might be most effectively maintained and disseminated. Interested participants will also look to the next round of this process, which might involve co-constructing future curricular or research projects to be pursued in the summer and fall.

These sessions are flexible and we will alter them as necessary to meet our particular goals or circumstances. Please feel free to suggest alternatives at any time.

## STEP 2: WORKSHOP TOGETHER TO CREATE CURRICULA AND PROJECTS, INCLUDING ARTICULATED GOALS FOR EACH PARTY

*Facilitating the first session: Introductions, Resources, Ideas*

*Launching individual projects in collaboration*

*Considering issues in partnerships*

Whatever the focus of the program process is determined to be, the first session ideally will be devoted to introductions, providing resources, and encouraging participants to come up with possible collaborative projects. If at all possible, creating a resource notebook for each participant is a useful strategy for disseminating materials and giving the participants tangible resources and a place to collect their ideas and materials generated during the process. For the first session, the materials that you might want to offer in the notebook might include a well-selected and relevant article as well as a bibliography or list of resources on service-learning. I have provided such a resource list in this section. The article should be chosen based on the focus of and participants in the program. If a resource page and/or pertinent article can be provided for each session, the notebook itself becomes a developing resource for the participants as well as for others.

Before the first meeting, the coordinator might want to distribute the list of participants and summary descriptions of their interest in the program. At the first session, each participant should be given time to describe their work, why they are interested in making connections with others, and what types of ideas they have regarding possible partnerships. The participants might be provided with a “contact worksheet” (included in this section, 2B) that encourages them to take notes and contact information during the introductions and ensuing conversations.

This element, like the previous step, of the process should initiate a *praxis of dialogue*. Again, the assumptions of the process are that dialogue about community issues and work will lead to a shared understanding of history and response to issues. Participants should be encouraged to provide contextual and historical information around issues and explicitly talk about goals and concerns. Participants should also be encouraged to make available as many resources or sources of further information about issues for each other. This initial session is perhaps the most productive session that will occur. At this point, participants are enthusiastic and meeting new people with similar concerns and interests. A surprising number of connections, formal and informal, can be generated in this session, and a surprising level of sharing of resources also occurs at this stage in the process.

After everyone has introduced themselves and begun thinking about and discussing potential partnerships, they can utilize the next worksheet (2C, Project Partnership Possibilities) to brainstorm those ideas further. The purpose of that worksheet is to have both instructors (or students if they are initiating this work on their own) and community organizations further consider ways to work together, to articulate ideas, and to be prepared to work *with* each other to finalize and initiate those projects. The worksheet also asks the participants to consider goals they have in these projects. Having both the educational goals and community goals articulated before finalizing projects will enable the projects to be designed with both interests taken into account. The worksheet may also offer a basis for the second workshop session. In the example workshop sessions’ overview from the previous step, the second session was devoted to giving participants the time and space, as well as the facilitation help if it was required, to work out specific

projects. Participants had contact information for each other or utilized the coordinator to contact each other prior to the workshop, and came to the second session prepared to make concrete project plans.

Additionally, the second session was designed around “issues” that come up while we do this sort of work. In the first chapter, I discussed some of those issues with service-learning. Because this methodology specifically attempts to address those issues, primarily through collaborative dialogue and theoretically informed practice, those issues are appropriate topics of a workshop session. The participants are able to talk through expectations and concerns, negotiate assumptions, and come up with collaborative ways to address those implications. Worksheet 2D (Issues in Partnership) asks participants to engage with those issues in terms of their own projects. What is useful and, I would argue, necessary about this part of the process is that it helps all participants—from educators to community members to students—understand the possible implications of this work and enables, again, clearer goals and expectations to be collaboratively established for service-learning activities. For example, the worksheet asks instructors (or alternatively, students) to consider if they will be completing a “product” for the community organization and follows that question up with related questions regarding the community organization’s expectations and issues in evaluating those products. Embedded in those questions are alternative ways to structure a service-learning project if the issues for certain types of projects appear to create counter-productive implications.

Throughout the collaborative process between an instructor/researcher and community organizer(s) of designing a service-learning activity, what will become clear is that service-learning is a highly flexible concept and community-based projects can be defined in varying ways depending on the needs of the instructors, students, and community organizers. For example, in one partnership in a recent pilot project I coordinated, the community organization and the instructor determined a slightly reversed service-learning focus. The community organization had determined that an extremely important part of their mission was public outreach and education. The organization understood students as representing part of the “public” that they wanted to reach and educate. The instructor understood the work and information available from the organization as providing a highly effective component for the materials he was teaching. That partnership project worked out a collaboration where the representative from the community organization presented to the class while they were involved in related research from various sources on the issue they were studying. The instructor then had the students compile their research and perception of the organization’s mission, needs, and activities in an analytical essay. The instructor was able to provide those materials to the community organizer as a “feedback mechanism.” This project was valuable for the organization for several reasons. First, the organizer had a sense of how the issue he worked on was framed in a classroom and was given access to diverse resources related to the issue. Second, the organizer had some input into the development of that curriculum and was able to offer the instructor additional resources. Third, the organizer had the opportunity to bring his organization’s work and outreach to a group of students, providing education (part of the organization’s mission) and possibly recruitment of volunteers. Finally, the organizer got direct analytical feedback on the issue and his own organization from that “public’s” perception. The instructor gained the opportunity to think about his curriculum with a group of other instructors *and* community members directly impacted by the issues he was teaching, was able to add a useful component of a guest presentation

For further discussion of these issues, see “On Trying to Get It Right: Reflections on Some Ethical Issues in Community-Academic Partnerships,” an article written for the pilot project by Danika Brown. Online at: <http://www.u.arizona.edu/~danika/issueframing.htm>

in his classroom, and was able to connect course-related issues to concrete situations beyond the course with the presence of the community organizer and the materials he provided.

Other partnerships were more service-oriented. In partnership with a community organizer who was working on a current community issue, several instructors collaborated to create a curriculum that had students working with that organization to create actual “products” (newsletters, letters, flyers, multimedia presentations) to address the issue for the organization to utilize in its campaign. In this instance again, the organization member came and presented the issue to the class, the class conducted individual direct research and met with the organizer outside of class, and the projects were evaluated by the instructors based on the criteria developed in relation to the organizations’ needs. In another partnership, the instructor and a person from the community who represented several projects in the community worked together to direct groups of his students on projects for various community organizations or issues. In this case, the instructor focused on a theoretical subject and allowed the students to collaborate closely with the community coordinator to design projects that met both the instructional and community needs.

Another alternative model from the program was that of an individual student (a graduate student in this instance) identifying an ideal partner-organization for her research project. She designed a partnership with a member of that organization in which she was given access to concrete experience with the particular issue she was researching, and in turn was able to provide access to and applications of her research for the goals of the organization. Additionally, the graduate student was able to connect the organization with various resources from the university that enabled the organization to hold an event greatly enhanced by those resources.

What the process emphasized was the need for the instructor or student and “community” to collaborate, but to leave that collaboration and the individual projects flexible enough to meet the specific needs of the parties involved. All of the participants had a shared understanding of what “service-learning” meant and what their individual goals in the process were, and from that understanding were better able to collaboratively determine mutually beneficial approaches to incorporating community-based activities into students’ activities.

And while all of this in itself is a successful articulation of a service-learning program, the method and program should not stop at this point. In addition to creating opportunities for placement and partnership, this methodology seeks to provide ways to incorporate assessment and mutual accountability into the process, to generate larger coalition building and support, and to create shared resources that extend beyond individual course or student experience. The next steps in the methodology are essential to following through on these three components of the process.

---

## WORKSHEET 2A

### GENERAL RESOURCES ON SERVICE LEARNING (A MERE SAMPLING)

#### *Articles and Books*

- Barber, Benjamin R., and Richard M. Battistoni. *Education for Democracy*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1993.
- Belbas, B., K. Gorak, & R. Shumer. "Commonly Used Definitions of Service-Learning: A Discussion Piece." National Clearinghouse of Service Learning. (1993) Online:  
<http://www.nicsl.coled.umn.edu/res/mono/def.htm>
- Bringle, R. G. & J.A. Hatcher. "A Service-Learning Curriculum for Faculty." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2 (1995): 112-122.
- Bucco, Diana, ed. *Building Sustainable Programs: A Guide to Developing and Maintaining Service-Learning at Community Colleges*. Mesa, AZ.: Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges, 1995.
- Campus Compact. *Mapping the Geography of Service on a College Campus: Strategic Questions about the Institution, Stakeholders, Philosophies and Community Relationships*. Providence: Campus Compact, 1994.
- Galura, Joseph. *Service-Learning Resources for University Students, Staff, and Faculty*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Office of Community Service Learning, 1993.
- Jacoby, Barbara, and Associates. *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
- Kendall, Jane C., et al. *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service*. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 1988.
- Kinsley, Carol W. "Community Service Learning as Pedagogy." *Quest International*. Online:  
<http://www.quest.edu/slarticle10.htm>
- Kupiec, Tamar Y., ed. *Rethinking Tradition: Integrating Service with Academic Study on College Campuses*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1993.
- Rhoads, Robert A., and Jeffrey Howard. *Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.
- Zlotkowski, Edward A. *Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Pub. Co., 1998.

#### *Online Resources*

- "101 Ideas for Combining Service & Learning": <http://www.fiu.edu/~time4chg/Library/ideas.html>
- Impact Online. "Matching Volunteers with Projects": <http://www.impactonline.org/>
- National Service Learning Clearinghouse: <http://www.nicsl.coled.umn.edu>
- Quest International on Service Learning: <http://www.quest.edu/servicelearning.htm> (includes articles and summaries as well as other resources)
- "Service Learning Homepage": <http://csf.colorado.edu/sl/>
- Taskforce on Citizen Education (Purdue), Articles about Service-Learning: [http://www.mgmt.purdue.edu/centers/citizen\\_ed/other/articles.htm](http://www.mgmt.purdue.edu/centers/citizen_ed/other/articles.htm)
-



---

**WORKSHEET 2C**  
**PROJECT PARTNERSHIP POSSIBILITIES WORKSHEET**

In order to have a productive second session working with partners, it would be helpful if you thought about some possible project ideas and partners to work with from the first session or from the contact information summary. Please fill out this worksheet if it is helpful, and bring it along to the second session.

**Briefly outline your issues of interests or current projects:**

**List possible partners or connections:**

**List as many ideas for connecting with a community or university member on a project. After the idea, please list a goal or two you'd like to see come out of such a partnership:**

---

## WORKSHEET 2D

### ISSUES IN PARTNERSHIPS WORKSHEET

Now that you have come up with ways to collaborate, there are a whole host of issues that should be addressed in order to make your partnerships most effective. One of the most significant reasons I have put together this project is because there are problems and dangers to how community-education collaborations happen. The first problem is that higher education has institutional constraints that limit actual contacts and connections. We have, to some extent, addressed that obstacle through the first workshop and the contact list, etc. The second problem is that relationships between higher education (instructors, researchers, and students) and community organizations are often fraught with issues of differences in power, differences in goals, assumptions, and a host of other dynamics that create obstacles to continued working relationships. All participants in this workshop might want to have thought through and drafted their own guidelines for addressing the potential problems that could come up as we operationalize our partnerships. This worksheet is designed to begin that process. We will fill this sheet out during and after the second session.

**Briefly describe your project partnership with emphasis on how you will be collaborating. For example, will you be sending students to serve with organizations? Or will you be accepting student volunteers with your organization? How? Will you be doing collaborative research with an organization or with a researcher from the school? Will you be asking a community leader into your classroom as an advisor? Will you be presenting to students? That is, identify the ways you expect to be interacting in this partnership.**

**If you are sending students into the community, is your assumption that the students will be learners or teachers? How will you communicate to students the nature of their relationship to the community?**

---

If you are inviting students or researchers into your community organizations, what are your assumptions about how they can participate? Do you view them as part of the community and participants in the projects, or do you view them as “researchers”—outsiders that must remain somewhat separate from the project? How do you plan to communicate with your partner(s) the nature of that relationship?

If you are creating community assignments for students, or if you are allowing instructors to have students do assignments around your community projects, what will the assignments be? Will they be “products” for the community issue (like a proposal or newsletter article or flyer)? Or will they be associated research more for projects for the course, but shared with the community organization?

If you are having students create a “product” for a community issue, how will these assignments be evaluated by both the community and the instructor? Will you be consulting with the instructor or community leader? Will you create shared criteria?

If you are having students create a product, how might you (both community leader and instructor) deal with a student who writes something oppositional or writes something that they don’t actually believe? Is this an issue that concerns you?

---

If you are dealing with students, what are some of the assumptions that students might have about the issues you are dealing with? What do you think students might assume about community service in general? What do you think students' reactions to "political" instruction might be?

What specifically are your goals in including community participation in your curricula or research? Or, what specifically are your goals in partnering with an educational program?

How do you plan to share the results of your work with your partner? How do you plan to evaluate your experience in this partnership? (We will cover this in the third workshop as well, but this is a question that needs to be considered from the outset.)

What issues have we missed in these discussions and how can we address and include them in the future?

### STEP 3: REPORTING BACK ON THE PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS

*Continuing the dialogue about projects*

*Sharing and responding to ongoing projects*

*Visualizing resources to support continued collaboration*

One of the guiding assumptions behind this methodology is that communities do not face issues in isolation and that achieving a broader sense of connections between specific issues and actions taken on those issues enables us to view larger structures and more comprehensive responses to them. Again, the methodology here works on the theory that such *praxis* requires both history and dialogue to allow members of a community to analyze and *act* on the issues it faces. In the first steps of this process, a diverse group of community members (from inside and outside of the educational institution) were brought together to share their work and find immediate ways to work together. As those partnerships occur, the work itself creates a new history and new opportunities to see connections and develop further potential partnerships.

This third step of the process, then, brings the individual partners back into conversation with each other to share the projects they have initiated or would like to initiate, their goals in doing so, progress or discoveries on their issues, and unexpected experiences in doing this work. The other participants in the program are then offered the opportunity to provide feedback, generate additional ideas based on the conversations, and make connections between their work and everyone else's work. This aspect of sharing work and providing feedback to each other furnishes the basis for long-term relationships to develop, and creates a way for projects to constantly undergo the dialectical process.

Another focus of this third step is to have the participants in the workshop series begin thinking about a common resource that might be generated out of the program, beyond their individual projects, that builds a foundation for those long-term relationships and collectively connects the work that is taking place in the local community. I discuss possibilities for such a resource or resources in the final step of the process, but it is important that it is a goal of the whole process to generate ideas and materials to make that resource possible.

The two worksheets included for this step provide participants the opportunity to engage in activities that will encourage the dialectical process here. Sessions in the workshop series should include these activities; again, it is useful to provide articles or theoretical bibliographies (examples attached) that support this work and contribute to the participant notebook (which in fact may turn out to be the "resource" generated by the process).

**This step in the process, however, is perhaps one of the most difficult steps.** Getting a group of people from diverse institutional contexts together initially is far less difficult than getting them to sustain a collective meeting once their individual projects are established. There is a tendency for people working in institutions to turn their attention back to individual work and to understand their accountability almost exclusively in terms of those institutions. Academics, for example, have to juggle committee work, other components of their instruction, their own (often differently related) research, conferences, and keeping up with research in their fields. Community organizers have the incredible task of juggling the day-to-day service activities, volunteer and funding limitations, crises, information gathering, and sustaining relation-

ships with other stakeholders. Students find themselves in the midst of juggling disparate coursework, exams, extra-curricular activities, travel arrangements to see their families... . While these factors all appear to be simply matters of constraints on time, they are also part and parcel of larger institutional constraints. Our identifications with and accountabilities to various institutions have a great deal to do with how we do our work.

In the academic world, especially, there is a great deal of emphasis placed on working individually; those who have done academic work well for any length of time often come to rely on their own abilities to construct the “bigger picture” for themselves, frequently in isolation. The venues for sharing that work—at least those that are institutionally valued—are publications and conference presentations, or student outcomes. Academics are accustomed to envisioning and enacting projects on their own, with very little direct support. Academics may read the suggestion that they need to attend a workshop in order to do this work as naively implying that they are not able to follow-through on projects on their own. In addition, collaborative work is not generally rewarded in the same way within the institutions that they identify with, a fact that tends to decrease the incentive to devote time to extending collaborations. A result of these factors may be that the instructor/researcher may have actually even dropped out of touch with her/his immediate community contact as well as the larger group, and even though the project is being initiated within the educational institution, the community organizer may not be totally aware of that. The community organizer then is left with the feeling that her/his collaboration did not materialize and her/his presence in further program activities is not all that necessary.

These factors make it all the more essential that “reporting” back and continued dialogue with the larger group does occur. If, in fact, projects have stalled, this regrouping may give everyone involved the added incentive or provide a collective problem-solving approach that can give projects what they need for follow-through. Or, if one or more of the collaborators is unable to continue in a specific project, bringing everyone back to the table may enable other partnerships to develop instead. If the project is going forward but there has been some break-down in communication between the partners, these session activities will provide the mechanism for the partners to remain apprized of each other’s progress and position.

Therefore, the coordinator of the larger program, or however that responsibility is determined (perhaps, for example, the group will determine that a revolving coordinator for each step or session is the most equitable way to facilitate this process), should make significant effort to get the original group back together and in dialogue. Another approach to this effort, one that is slightly less effective and creates a great deal more work for an individual than the actual bringing together of everyone involved, would be for the coordinator to distribute and collect the worksheets in order to get updates from all the participants, and to write up and distribute those updates as a collective resource to everyone involved.

If this step in the process can be enacted effectively, it creates a layer of accountability and collaboration that is extremely productive toward sustaining effective service-learning activities as well as for allowing a shared and collaborative approach for larger community issues. This step should also be understood as a recursive element that is not necessarily separate from the other steps, but occurs throughout the process, enabling the process of assessment, the fourth step, and resource building, the fifth step, to proceed.

---

**WORKSHEET 3A**  
**PROJECT SUMMARY AND PROGRESS**

In order to maintain and further develop the collaborative relationships initiated by this process, it is useful to share how your work is going, identify potential need for additional support or feedback, and to highlight especially effective elements of your project for the other participants in the program. Please take a few minutes to reflect and describe your partnership project. Please share this information with the rest of the participants.

**Identify the group or groups that you are working with:**

**Briefly describe the project:**

**Identify your desired outcomes and goals from this project:**

---

**Have you run into any unexpected difficulties with this project?**

**Describe what is working well in the project:**

**List next steps and identify places where anyone might be able to help you with those steps.**

---

**WORKSHEET #3B**  
**RESPONSES AND IDEAS**

As you read or listen to the reports of others projects, consider ways that you can support those projects: Can you suggest additional resources or contacts? Do you have suggestions for extending a project or addressing an issue the project is facing? Further, identify connections you see between your own work and the projects being described. Finally, as you listen to the work being shared, brainstorm ideas about a collaborative resource that might be produced by and for this collective process. (For example, would a group report or publication be possible? Could these groups participate in some sort of community meeting? Do the issues intersect at some point that might enable a specific group action on a specific issue?)

**As you listen to the summary of the projects, note interesting and useful elements of the projects that relate to your own project or work:**

**Identify any specific ways you can support other projects, or identify specific suggestions you might make about those projects:**

**List some possible “collective resources” this group might create together to support or extend this work:**

---

## WORKSHEET #3C

### RESOURCES

As you develop the “reporting back” step in this process, it may be helpful to provide participants articles that situate the necessity of maintaining these relationships at this point in the process. Listed below are some examples that may be useful.

#### *Articles and Books*

Axel-Lute: Miriam. “Town & Gown: Making Research Serve Communities’ Needs.” Online:

<http://www.loka.org/town&gown.htm>

Beckwith, Dave. “Ten Ways to Work Together: An Organizer’s View.” Dave Beckwith (Special Issue of Sociological Imagination: Sociology and Social Action Part II. Vol. 33 no. 2. Online at:

<http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/si/beckwith.htm>

Erickson, Joseph A., et al. *Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Teacher Education*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education: Published in cooperation with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1997.

Schensul, Jean J. “The Development and Maintenance of Community Research Partnerships.” Online:

<http://www.terraknowledge.com/schensul1.htm>

#### *Online Resources for Additional Ideas*

Comm-Org: The Online Conference on Community Organizing and Development:

<http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/>

LINK Research: <http://linkresearch.org/default.asp>

TerraKnowledge Network: <http://www.terraknowledge.com/>

#### STEP 4: COLLABORATIVELY ASSESS THE PROJECTS IN TERMS OF THE ARTICULATED GOALS

*Considering the role of assessment and evaluation*

*Providing resources and instruments for projects*

*Integrating assessment projects with individual projects*

*Incorporating findings into the process and disseminating results*

Assessment is a significant issue for both educators and community organizations. In a project where the collaboration is between groups that are accountable to different stakeholders and that have significantly disparate missions, issues in assessment are compounded. Measuring outcomes for individual projects from the perspective of an educator may mean focusing on student outcomes related to course goals. Measurements from a community organization's perspective may need to include outcomes in terms of delivery of service and direct impact on the community. But a third level of accountability is added in this program methodology, which might be understood in terms of creating expanded partnerships, enhancing coalition resources, and providing infrastructures for mutually supporting the apparently separate imperatives of each group.

Distinguishing between these levels of assessment and finding ways to support each level, as well as finding ways for each level to inform the others, are difficult tasks. This step in the process requires program participants to work together, analyze and choose instruments and approaches that are applicable to their projects, and work to develop a specific tool that assesses the program according to the specific focus of that program in general.

Both educators and community organizers should be encouraged to conduct assessment of their particular projects. The extent to which each chooses to engage in evaluative activities will, of course, depend on their time and if they see those evaluation activities as necessary and productive. It will also depend on whether they need documentation of their work in this situation to account for their time or commitment of resources. For example, a tenured faculty person may or may not be inclined to run an assessment/evaluation of her/his service-learning activity because s/he perhaps does not see an individual course project as having a huge amount of weight in the way work is measured in the academy. A non-tenured faculty person, however, may wish to conduct a fair amount of assessment, and may want to tie that assessment to elements of her/his research to develop a record for teaching and research activities in the tenure review process. Similarly, an organization that views this particular activity as subsumed under general outreach or as a volunteer recruitment activity may not be concerned with generating a significant amount of assessment on the activity. Another organization may need documented assessment quantifying or qualitatively describing how these activities supported and justified their mission.

Regardless of the individuals' incentive to conduct assessment in this type of program, having participants conduct some specific assessment activities, especially if this can be done in collaboration with their project partners, will provide them the opportunity to revisit their goals and their partner's goals and to see the project direction in perhaps alternative ways. If the program here seeks to create long-term relationships between instructors, researchers, and organizations, this process will contribute to sustaining those relationships by creating further dialogue and a level of mutual accountability. Sharing those assessments

with the other individual members in the process (step 3 again) will be helpful for others to see the strengths of certain projects, and gain insight on how to avoid limitations that might be revealed in the assessments. Additionally, the sharing of assessment provides yet another opportunity for the larger group of participants to offer significant feedback and support for individual projects. For example, if the assessment reveals an unexpected limitation in a specific project, the larger group might help the instructor, student, and/or organization identify strategies to overcome that limitation in the future. Assessment activities, then, can be structured to support the larger project's goal of creating a history, engaging in informed praxis, and facilitating genuine dialogue.

In the supporting documents here, I provide resources for project and program assessment including instruments that have been developed by experts in service-learning. I also provide some evaluation sheets for the sessions and for the individual projects that ask questions to link evaluation to the goals of this methodology. I would like to make some suggestions about utilizing the instruments here and to suggest an element for the program itself that will assist participants with the assessment process.

In terms of implementing the various assessment/evaluation instruments that do exist, in order to make those tools more responsive to the type of activities that this process attempts to foster, I would recommend that the instructor/researcher/student and community organizers involved in particular projects meet to examine the tools and enhance them in ways that emphasize or include the goals that they developed in partnership. This might mean adding questions for the sake of the community organizer's mission and goals, or it might mean rephrasing questions to take into account the focus of the particular project in relation to course goals. For example, Project STAR's "Evaluation Assistance" ([http://www.projectstar.org/star/AmeriCorps/ea\\_home.htm](http://www.projectstar.org/star/AmeriCorps/ea_home.htm)) offers an evaluation worksheet that enables users to create a plan for assessment that is specific to the goals of their projects. If that worksheet is filled out collaboratively between the educational and community organizational partners, the instrument developed can presumably get to a more comprehensive set of mutually determined goals.

But these limited suggestions for working with and modifying assessment instruments should not serve to dismiss the complexity of assessment issues. As the "Service-Learning and Evaluation" article on the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse site indicates, "There are literally volumes of work on almost every conceivable aspect of evaluation. The bad news: There is too much information available for anybody to make much sense of it in just a few pages. There are entire doctoral programs on the study of evaluation, so it is unrealistic for anyone to believe that a person can become really knowledgeable about evaluation through a workshop or a single source of information" (<http://nicsl.jaws.umn.edu/res/bibs/slev.htm#intro>). The list of resources I have provided in this section should, at the very least, indicate a bit of how much information there is out there, and the complexity of that information.

A benefit of approaching service-learning partnerships supported in a programmatic fashion as described in this methodology is that you do have the opportunity to incorporate assessment projects directly into the collaborative group and process itself. One possibility might be to invite an assessment specialist (either from one of the community organizations or from an academic institution) or an advanced graduate student working on assessment to be a participant in the project and to conduct assessment activities, or even run an assessment workshop with the sessions. One or more of the individual service-learning projects can tie into other projects and provide assessment for both the instructional and community impact of specific projects, reporting out valuable "third-voice" feedback on the projects as they are shaped, conducted, and shared in

the program process. This approach honors the process of dialogue, creating shared history, and collaboration on co-determining and assessing the goals of service-learning activities. Additionally, this approach may provide the program itself a constant source of participation from programs in educational evaluation or sociology research methods and other sites where students work with assessment projects.

Finally, the *program* assessment, which is (depending on the number of participants) somewhat separate from the individual project assessment, should incorporate the project assessments but focus on measuring the ways the overall process achieved the theories and goals behind the program process itself. Those goals, we will remember, involve *praxis*, *history*, and *dialogue*, and, again, might be articulated as:

- Expanding access to and sharing resources between education and community organizations;
- Enhancing collective understandings of community issues and ways to act on those issues;
- Supporting and expanding existing coalitions working in communities.

However assessment is handled in the process, the results of the assessment should be subject to active reflection and should contribute to the continual process of making the program responsive to the needs of education and the community issues addressed. Participants should consider and discuss ways to disseminate evaluations where strategies prove effective in terms of meeting educational goals and which impact community-based issues. The evaluations themselves may in fact contribute to the “resource” created by participants in this program.

---

**WORKSHEET 4A**  
**DETERMINING YOUR ASSESSMENT NEEDS**

As you initiate projects in collaboration with your partners, consider what types of assessment would be beneficial for these projects. In making decisions about approaching evaluating your projects, consider the mutual interests involved in the process and consider how those interests can be accounted for in the assessment process.

**Do you currently have an assessment strategy or instrument you utilize for other projects? How would you characterize that strategy or describe the instrument?**

**In reflecting on your goals (and your partner's goals) for this project, do the instruments you usually use for assessment seem to facilitate getting at measurements of those goals? Explain.**

**Brainstorm some ways that you might measure the activities in terms of the goals you have for the project.**

**How important to you is assessment of this project? How would you use the results of such an assessment? Do you need formal assessment data for a specific reason?**

**Do you have contacts with anyone who can help you design an assessment strategy? Are there contacts from this program itself who can work with you on assessment?**

---

**WORKSHEET 4B**

**PROGRAM EVALUATION: THINKING ABOUT YOUR PROJECT IN A LARGER CONTEXT**

In order to understand the individual projects that you are undertaking as contributing to the larger collaborative context of this process, please take a moment to reflect on some questions regarding the process itself.

*Facilitation of your project*

**In what ways has the process enabled you to develop your project(s)?**

**What has been especially useful for you in terms of the process?**

**What could have been more useful?**

**Did anything in the process create a barrier or demand on your time/energy that was not useful for your work?**

---

*Goals of the Process*

**In what ways do you see this process as expanding shared resources between education and community organizations?**

**Could the process have done more to facilitate those shared resources? In what ways?**

**In what ways has the process enhanced your (or others', as you perceive it) ability to see broader connections between community issues?**

**In what ways has this process facilitated specific actions on community issues?**

**Could or should the process do more to facilitate such actions?**

**Has this process supported or created coalition building opportunities? How?**

---

Has this process helped to create a sense of partnership between institutions of education and community organizations beyond the scope of individual projects? How? Or, if not, please explain.

Has the theory behind this process been clear to you throughout?

Have the resources provided in this process contributed to shared understandings of the goals of the process?

*Perpetuating the Process*

What type of resource could you envision or would you like to come from the collective participants of this process?

What are some suggestions you would make to improve, alter, or expand this process in the future?

---

WORKSHEET 4C  
SELECTED RESOURCES ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

*General Assessment in Education*

Eric Clearing House on Assessment and Evaluation: <http://ericae.net/>

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory: Assessment Based on a Vision of Learning:  
[http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/rpl\\_esys/assess.htm](http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/rpl_esys/assess.htm)

Portland State's Center for Academic Excellence: Classroom Assessment Techniques:  
<http://www.fd.pdx.edu/workshops/cat/>

*General Assessment for Community Organizations*

Basic Guide to Program Evaluation, by Carter McNamara (includes free library with planning guides):  
[http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/fnl\\_eval.htm](http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm)

Innonet, Tools for the Nonprofit Community: <http://www.innonet.org/>

Learning Institute for Nonprofit Organizations, Learner Resource Center, Nonprofit Organizational Assessment Tool (includes worksheets that are adaptable for specific programs): <http://www.uwex.edu/li/learner/assessment.htm>

*Assessment Publications and Sites in Service-learning*

Assessment and Evaluation in Service Learning Bibliography (a National Service-Learning Clearing House PDF file from the University of Minnesota): <http://nicsl.jaws.umn.edu/res/bibs/assessment.pdf>

Campus Compact's Evaluation and Assessment in Service Learning: <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/academic/compact/Evaluation/index.html>

Campus Compact's Assessing Internal and External Outcomes of Service-Learning Collaborations:  
<http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/academic/compact/Outcomes/index.html>

National Service Learning Clearing House: Service-Learning and Evaluation: <http://nicsl.jaws.umn.edu/res/bibs/slev.htm>

Project STAR Evaluation Assistance (Corporation for National Service sponsored Technical Assistance):  
[http://www.projectstar.org/star/AmeriCorps/ac\\_index.htm](http://www.projectstar.org/star/AmeriCorps/ac_index.htm)

Service Learning Research and Development Center, UC Berkeley: Publications and Monographs on Assessment in Service-Learning: <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/research/slc/rande/pubs.htm>

UCLA Service Learning Clearing House Project: Assessment of Service Learning in Higher Education:  
<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/slc/assess.html>

*Assessment Instruments for Service-learning*

Compendium of Assessment and Research Tools (CART): <http://cart.rmcdenver.com/>

Service Learning Research and Development Center, UC Berkeley: Instruments and Protocols:  
<http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/research/slc/rande/instrums.htm>

## STEP 5: CREATE A RESOURCE OUT OF THE COLLABORATION

*Identifying a group project*

*Working collaboratively on a product*

*Sustaining and promoting the process*

The fifth step of the larger collaborative process is the creation of a resource or other type of “product” from the program collaboration itself. The individual project partnerships will ideally produce their own specific student projects or research programs, and those projects may be completed in a semester, or may continue for extended lengths of time. However, the program collaboration between those individuals can produce a collective product that works to achieve other goals of this methodology. This resource can serve several functions: It can serve as a shared history and tangible indicator of the collective work done in this process; it can serve as a tool beyond the workshop meetings for educators, students, community organizations, and/or the community itself; it can serve as a form of collective action taken on community issues identified throughout the process.

Ideally, the process of collaborating on community-based activities in a specific community with a specific group of actors will itself reveal the most effective product or resource that might be created. As the group meets and supports each other, there should be an ongoing discussion about what type of resource would support that work. The worksheets I have provided in each section all include questions to generate ideas for such a group resource. The worksheet in this section is entirely focused on that discussion. In order to determine a product that would be most useful and feasible for the group, the participants will need to consider the local context, goals for such a resource, the participants’ ability or desire to contribute to creating the product, as well as the means of disseminating or maintaining the resource itself.

In the pilot program for this methodology, the group determined that a resource that suited the program goals would be a website that identified community issues and the groups that worked on them. The web resource (which was designed to also be available in printed form) was initiated early in the process and continues to develop. From the initial contacts, I (working as the coordinator for the project) developed pages that identified organizations and issues, contacts, and brief histories and goals for each issue or organization. As the larger group worked together and instructors designed courses and identified supporting research materials, I developed each page with their input, including links to other web resources, short bibliographies for the issue, articles that tracked local history of the issues, lists of suggested instructional materials, and links to syllabi from similar courses as well as the current course offerings. For example, one of the participants from the community was the co-director of a local alternative media group that works on documenting local activism in video. An instructor from the pilot program worked with this contact to develop projects with students working with the media organization to create promotional and informational materials about the organization, analyzing its history, accomplishments, and the need for such an organization in the community. However, other ideas for working with this group came up throughout the sessions and the resource page for that group outlines other possible connections of coursework with the goals of the organization. There are links to sample syllabi for courses that analyze media and community activism, lists of texts that would focus a course project in connection with the specific organization, links to similar organizations across the country, and descriptions of the organization’s current projects with ideas for ways to collaborate.

As these pages developed and the larger group worked together on their separate projects, what became clear was that the issues that each partnership was addressing were connected and could be understood in a larger context. Several of the participants in the project saw the potential for the informational resource developing to have an added layer of analysis between the issues and to serve as a growing analytical tool for the issues. One of the members of the project was interested in moving those materials to a home in an academic program that has funding to work on community-based activities where the materials will be designed to organically grow through the contributions of community organizers and academics alike, creating “articles” connecting the various issues and utilizing hypertext links to illustrate those connections. The materials will include specific histories and potentials for action on the issues in connection, the ways in which different groups can support each other’s work as they address their own major issue concerns, and will be tied into a listserv created to keep community members and academics with common interests in contact with one another. This resource product, then, worked with and plugged into other attempts to create collaborations and became a venue for the sustainability of the program and this methodology itself.

Another possible resource product that a program might consider could be the creation of a community-campus activities newsletter that details what partnerships are happening and what their impacts are. This might be a one-time publication highlighting the accomplishments of the students in the project and promoting the work that the instructors, researchers, and community organizers did over the course of the program. Or it might serve as the impetus to organize additional collaborative ventures, to bring other instructors or community organizers working in collaboration into the larger collaborations outlined in this method. In these types of activities, there is the benefit of students from the various projects being able to contribute to the developing materials. In this case, students could provide examples of their projects, contribute short articles, or design “advertisements” for the organizations they serve with.

Perhaps the group might decide that the most fitting result of their work together on community-based issues would be a “community meeting,” where the projects and findings are shared with public officials, residents, other community organizations, and decision-makers in the community. Such a meeting again could draw students who were serving with organizations to present their findings and analyses. The collaborators from the program could collaborate to create a list of recommendations to local officials regarding a specific issue or a set of issues. This activity may increase community support for action on issues, help educate those in the community about specific issues, and may provide the incentive to create “action plans” for these issues.

Another “product” that could come out of the group process might be a collaboratively written editorial or media project that educates or analyzes the connections between issues or the work that is done on specific issues. Such a product would spotlight the collaborations between educators and community leaders and provide access to thoughtfully articulated positions and information for the community.

Another option here might include coordinating group participation with organized community events or planning collaborative activities in a national service event such as “Make a Difference Day” (<http://www.usaweekend.com/diffday/index.html>) or for Martin Luther King, Jr. Day activities (<http://www.mlkday.org>). The benefit of these types of events is that they provide a structure that the group can keep in mind to direct the focus of the “product” and they enable this collaborative work to tie into even larger structures.

Whatever “product” or resource the group determines is appropriate will ideally incorporate the values of the whole collaborative process—praxis, history, and dialogue. It is a good idea to determine ways to collaborate on the work that will not place the burden of the project on a single person. It is also a good idea to use the same principles of mutual benefit and mutual accountability between the participants that have been underscored throughout this process in creating the collaborative product. That is, the product should be envisioned in such a way to cross institutional boundaries and to represent the interests of both educators and community organizers. The product might be understood as promoting this type of work and highlighting the contributions of all participants, as well as of bringing in additional community members (other organizations, students, community leaders) into the shared process. By following through on the process in this fashion, the entire process grows within and beyond itself, and contributes to creating more meaningful partnerships between educators utilizing service-learning and other community-based activities and the communities where that work is done.

---

## WORKSHEET 5A

### IDENTIFYING A GROUP PROJECT

In order to connect the individual projects that you are working on during this process to a larger context, and in order to find ways to promote and increase participation in these activities, we will create a collaborative “product” or resource out of our collaborative process. This worksheet asks you to brainstorm some possible resources or products that might come out of the group sessions.

**Identify some “intersections” between the various individual projects underway.**

**If you are working with students, identify a useful venue for the results of your students’ projects that would be mutually beneficial for the students, the organization, and the instructor.** For example, would a collaborative “newsletter” enable your students to talk about their service in a short article? Is there a community event where students might present the results of the service they have done?

**How might the project you are working on (or completed, or plan to work on) be disseminated to other educators or organizations to be replicated or developed in other ways?** Could the group develop a “best practices” notebook of these projects and strategies for dissemination? Could the group do a panel for a conference or at community organizations’ organizational meetings?

---

**Has the work of all the participants suggested or revealed some community-action plans that might be articulated and shared with appropriate stakeholders? Could a meeting with key local officials, organizations, or residents result in an appropriate audience for the results of these individual projects?**

**How could the resources created for this process be assembled and disseminated in a useful fashion for others to utilize?**

**Are there any community events (for example: “Make a Difference Day,” Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday events, community service initiatives) that this group could coordinate activities for, drawing on the work done throughout this collaborative process?**

**Propose a project (product or resource) that the group might consider doing. Explain how the project would fit the goals of the group collaboration, how the product or resource would benefit educators, students, and community organizations, and what type of commitment such a product would require from participants.**

## SOME PRACTICAL NOTES ON THE METHOD

The danger of laying out a “methodology” for this type of work and of suggesting “steps” in a process is that of reducing the process to a mere method or technique, or of implying a level of rigidity that discourages certain local efforts. I would like to make some observations on the process itself to emphasize its adaptability and variability.

### *Scale*

Throughout the steps, I have indicated that ideally this method brings together a group of educators, researchers, and community organizers who can identify individual partnerships with each other and then come back and share that work with the larger group. The size of that group should completely depend on the resources available to support the large group process, the specific focus of the project, and the ability for scale to be negotiated. If the site for this program includes a center devoted to service-learning and a full-time coordinator for service-learning activities, the larger collaborative group could be fairly large and the coordinator might find having these individuals working together to greatly enhance her/his ability to facilitate multiple activities at once.

However, if the individuals interested in doing this type of project are not supported by a coordinator or office and are working on a more specifically focused activity (for example, on a specific community issue that two or three individuals are interested in tackling in their research or course activities), the group might only include a few instructors and a few organizations. The sessions might be far more informal and each participant may lead a separate part of the process.

Another alternative scale might be a single instructor or researcher and a single community organization trying to work together in the most productive fashion possible. In this case, the “workshop sessions” I have outlined here might simply be working meetings between the instructor and organization and the “resource” they create might be a plan to do further collaboration projects in following semesters, or strategies to promote their activities in a larger community.

**The method here does not *depend* on scale as much as it does the principles of collaboration outlined in the theoretical background and throughout the steps.**

### *Time*

The method I have outlined here appears to be and is a fairly intensive process. As I indicated above with scale, much of that intensity will be determined by the number of participants, the diversity of those participants, the focus and goals of the project, and how the process is supported (whether it has a coordinator or not). Nonetheless, despite the fact that the process appears to require a significant commitment from the participants, in actuality, the time commitment should be put into perspective. Instructors will be working out course plans and syllabi, and will be workshopping those plans with community partners. Many instructors I have worked with have found it valuable to set aside this time to think through their courses with others rather than rushing to do the syllabi as they teach or the night before classes begin. Additionally, instructors benefit from sharing resources rather than doing the researching and reviewing of materials on their own.

The workshop sessions themselves can be structured as monthly meetings of a couple of hours each. If the sessions are planned in a fairly flexible fashion, and the schedule is provided enough in advance with a fairly clear description of what will occur in the sessions, participants can mark their calendars, attend only the sessions or parts of sessions that are most essential for them, or submit written materials to the coordinator or other partners to be presented for them at the sessions. Sessions can be audio- or video-taped for those who are not able to attend to view at their convenience, and/or minutes can be made available to participants. The program might utilize a listserv, webpage, or occasional newsletter to keep people informed and in touch.

What the sessions may appear to cost in terms of time for attendance, they can compensate for in terms of support and collaborative activities for educators and community organizations alike. The sessions and other supporting communication networks can provide instructors, researchers, and community organizers access to time-saving resources and support networks. It is important that the process is organized in such a fashion as to take these factors into consideration and to be responsive to the needs and limitations of the participants.

### *Focus*

One of my motivations in researching, developing, and piloting an actual version of this methodology was to create some guidelines for community-based educational partnerships that addressed the needs of as many approaches as possible. My sense was that many service-learning activities tend to be undertaken by individuals without much support, or supported through student placements that are brokered through larger structures, hence the placements tended to be concentrated in larger nonprofit organizations working on common or mainstream issues. My goal was to enhance the ways that service-learning might be supported by creating a flexible method for large and small community organizations to work directly with educational partners to design projects that incorporated the very specific missions of organizations and specific course content of individual instructors.

Consequently, the principle of the methodology itself is to adapt to the specific needs of any group collaborating with each other. In the pilot project, I worked with a fairly cohesive group of community activist organizations (both on and off campus) that had already established relationships with each other. The focus of the program was around community activism and the terms of “activism” projects were determined by the group itself. Simultaneously, I worked with a campus-based project made up of a completely different group of people seeking to tie campus research and resources to local activities and resources such as art, history, and the local environment. Yet another group I am working with is made up primarily of educators in various institutions (K-12, community college, university) seeking to create a center for service-learning in the community as a resource for both community groups and schools for placements and best practices. The method outlined here has been highly adaptable to each of these venues precisely because the method encourages those working together to co-determine the focus and activities of the program in terms of shared articulated goals.

## *Recursivity*

It is important to note that despite the fact the “steps” I have outlined here occur in a specific order and appear as distinct from each other, they are not bound by that order and should not be understood as disparate moments in the process. The process is, in fact, most beneficial to a greater number of participants if it is not strictly linear and does not have a formal “end.” While the series of workshop sessions or meetings might take place over the course of a semester, many of the projects will not begin or be “wrapped up” within that time. The process itself is to launch and continuously facilitate individual partnerships and ongoing relationships. The more flexibility that you are able to incorporate in that process, the more useful the process will be in supporting those individual partnerships.

For example, let’s imagine a program is initiated with five or six instructors, a graduate student researcher, and eight organizations. The workshop sessions are scheduled to start in September and run through May with monthly meetings. Over the course of those months, perhaps two or three of the instructors will have planned a course project (with the community partners) and actually have implemented that course in the spring semester. At the end of the sessions, they will be wrapping up those specific courses and preparing to either start a new project or to revise the projects they worked on in this process. The other instructors may be planning a year in advance for their courses and may not actually have initiated the projects in the time of the workshop. Other instructors or organizations may have simply not been able to participate in the initial sessions, but would be interested in becoming involved or at least informed of activities as they develop. The graduate researcher may be working on a two year dissertation project with her/his community partner. With the variations possible in the needs of the individual participants, if a program is going to be structured with such a variety of projects, the sessions and collaborative group activities might account for these through flexibility in the “steps.” Perhaps an evaluation/assessment component can be offered at several of the workshops, as just a component of the meeting’s agenda. The “resource” step of the process may in fact shape some partnership projects themselves or be part of a future project for an instructor to include in a course component, and should therefore not necessarily be considered a “final” product to be completed with the end of the sessions.

Again, the steps should be understood more as principles than as a lock-step methodology. The specific context and goals of those involved in the process should be the top priority in shaping the way the process is actually enacted. Any process that is based on *praxis*, *history*, and *dialogue* must be continually responsive to the actors in the process. Above all else this method seeks to enact the principles of collaboratively shaping mutually beneficial partnerships that explore responses to social issues through education and the agency of the participants working together.

## CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF COMMUNITY-BASED PARTNERSHIPS

The early (and continuing) goal of service-learning was to create pedagogical opportunities: to link concrete applications of educational content to service in the community. In order to create and support those opportunities there has been a lot of theoretical work, dissemination of ideas, assessment, curricular development, and program development. But like the tree that grew to shade Horton's home, service-learning's growth continues, becoming part of the larger context of educational institutions' community-based partnerships.

Early in service-learning's development, there was a general assumption that sending students to volunteer in the community would contribute to the health of the community, and would serve as an "outreach" function for educational institutions' achieving their missions as public institutions. However, the theoretical work since that initial growth of service-learning has revealed that having students serve in communities creates mutual accountability issues for both educational institutions and the community institutions where they serve. What is further revealed is that these institutions co-exist *as* the community, and that the sharing of resources in order to address significant issues should extend beyond student volunteers.

Consequently, there has been significant growth in the area of campus-community partnerships and programs which specifically support such activities. Whether the partnerships are focused on research in health, youth and families, labor, or environmental studies, whether the focus of the programs are devoted to community-based research, applied sociology, or urban and regional planning, the programs overwhelmingly recognize the need to work *with* and *in* communities, bringing institutional resources to bear on community issues.

Examples of these kinds of partnerships can be seen in various formations. Some programs are based within the educational institutions and work to bring community organizations into the institution to collaborate on major issues. For example, *The Community Partnership Center* at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (<http://www.ra.utk.edu/cpc/>) works in collaboration with rural communities on addressing the issues of low- and moderate-income residents in the region. There are similar community-partnership programs at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (<http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/>); California State University, San Bernadino (<http://partnerships.csusb.edu/cupinfo.html>); the University of Louisville (<http://www.louisville.edu/home/community.html>); and the University of California, San Francisco (*Center For Health Professions' Community-Campus Partnership for Health*, <http://www.futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph.html>). The University of Oregon's *Labor Education and Resource Center* (LERC) (<http://www.uoregon.edu/~lerc>) works to offer support for regional labor unions through educational opportunities, research, and conferences. *The Labor Center* at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst (<http://www.umass.edu/lrrc/>), *The Centers for Labor Research and Education* at the University of California, Los Angeles (<http://labor.sppsr.ucla.edu/>), the University of California, Berkeley (<http://ist-socrates.berkeley.edu/~iir/clre/clre.html>), and *The Center for Labor Studies*, at the University of Washington (<http://depts.washington.edu/>

Goals are unattainable in the sense that they always grow. My goal for the tree I planted in front of my house is for it to get big enough to shade the house, but that tree is not going to stop growing once it shades my house. It's going to keep on growing bigger regardless of whether I want it to or not. The nature of my visions are to keep on growing beyond my conception. That is why I say it's never completed. I think there always has to be struggle. In any situation there will always be something that's worse, and there will always be something that's better, so you continually strive to make it better. That will always be so, and that's good, because there ought to be growth. You die when you stop growing. (Myles Horton. *The Long Haul: An Autobiography*, 228)

pcls/Center\_for\_labor\_studies.htm) all serve similar roles as academically based resource centers working in collaboration with communities in terms of labor issues.

Some of these partnerships work from the community, bringing university and educational institutional resources into those external sites. An example of such a program is *The Applied Research Center* (<http://www.arc.org>) in Oakland, California, where applied research in areas of racism in the community and schools is analyzed and the contributions to publications include both academic and community-organizer research and analysis. *Community Scholars* (<http://www.communityscholars.org/>), in El Paso, Texas, is a community-based program that recruits students from high schools for a paid summer internship to learn about community leadership and to gain experience in community issues that will impact their continuing education in college. *The Society for Community Research and Action* (<http://www.apa.org/divisions/div27/>) is a collective sponsored by the American Psychological Association that links academics and students and institutional resources to issues that center on wellness and prevention. If programs are flexible and allowed to have goals that grow—that is, remain responsive to the needs of the community and the institutional constraints that may present themselves, they occasionally start in one institution and develop their own independence. *The University Neighborhood Housing Project* (<http://www.unhp.org/>), for example, was created by Fordham University, and developed in collaboration with the Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Foundation. It has since become its own nonprofit organization.

The methodology I have outlined here—if taken and sustained in its entirety—seeks to create possibilities for service-learning to be part of this movement. The ultimate goal of the theory and practices outlined here moves beyond finding more effective ways of educating students. The methodology asks educators and community organizations to engage in a substantial and sustained dialogue about ways to work together to identify and address issues that their communities face and to employ educational activities in that process.

An example of how this method might function as a way to incorporate service-learning as the basis for creating these types of programs occurred in the pilot project I conducted over the 2000-2001 academic year. The program focused on community activism, bringing together a group of self-identified “academic activists” and community activists in workshop sessions to create service-learning activities and collaboration projects to support local activism on a variety of issues. The group collaboratively determined a definition of “activism” as rigorous and complex analysis of systemic causes for social inequity coupled with concrete strategies for addressing those systemic causes through collective, collaborative activities. The group met in the initial phases of the program to share their work, to discuss the issues of bridging academic and community work, and to brainstorm specific projects that would contribute to the collective goals of local activism, enhance educational opportunities for students, and create a sustainable space for supporting each others’ work.

Through the project, several service-learning partnerships developed with specific semester-long projects (some of which I described earlier). The projects were as diverse as the participants themselves, from first-year composition courses incorporating a specific community issue with guest speakers from the community, advanced undergraduate students in professional communication collaborating with students in other courses on creating analyses and projects around a controversial local environmental and labor issue, graduate-level seminars focusing on specific topics through theory and applying that theory in local contexts on specific issues in collaboration with community groups to assemble history and research needs, to an individual graduate student’s dissertation research project developed in collaboration with a local

community organization. Beyond this academic year, participants developed several curricular plans and syllabi to conduct in the summer and the following fall. However, the project did accomplish more than creating a space for these service-learning activities to occur.

In addition, the group collaboration contributed to the success of a national academic-community conference held locally, and resulted in plans to develop web-based resources to support connections of academic research and analyses to direct action in the community. Additionally, several community-campus special projects in local history and community art have been initiated, planned and promoted through participants of the method, working from the theoretical frame we collectively articulated. Further, the analysis of the community and the local institutional contexts has led to the development of a proposal for a community-based center, similar to *The Applied Research Center* in Oakland, to support service-learning placements, community-based research, popular education programs, and a clearinghouse devoted to local community issue histories and resources to promote strategic work on those issues.

The pilot of this methodology indicates that given the opportunity and mechanisms to collaborate, disparate groups find effective ways to share resources and collaborate. However, what makes that work more successful for those various groups is that those opportunities were tied to articulated principles and to the process of actively examining the assumptions and constraints of all those involved.

The process of placing the theoretical work from critical pedagogy, service-learning, and community-based partnerships into conversation and into the form of a praxis-oriented method of conducting this work has led me to analyze relationships between institutions, as well as the systems and constraints that create barriers to this work. This methodology does not, in and of itself, purport to solve those issues or completely realize an idealized collaborative moment for communities and educational institutions. Taken in its entirety, there is nothing simple about this approach to this type of work. The methodology itself places all of us—educators, community organizers, community members—in relationship with, responsible for, and accountable to each other. This is a vulnerable position. It can be messy. But as Horton reminds us, that messiness itself creates the possibility for growth and change.

Our culture tends to function through institutions. We identify with and at the same time individuate ourselves from those institutions. We tend to lose sight of the fact that institutions can be shaped by those who people them; that they are not natural, independent entities, but are created through the processes we bring to them. Working as isolated individuals only gets us so far in responding to the structural issues that we face and desire to change. This methodology recognizes that and hopes to offer a process for bringing the work of individuals and the desire of individuals to see systems change together. More than that, this method seeks to bring those individuals together in such a way that enables and honors a dialectical process created by those participating rather than rigid institutional roles. It is my hope that this in some way contributes to the thoughtful development of community-campus partnerships.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

Selected resources in areas related to this methodology. Please note that there are extensive bibliographies and resources in each of these areas. Items that are primarily resources and provide extensive additional bibliographical listings are indicated with this symbol: **R**

### CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

#### *Books and Articles*

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Negative Dialectics*. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.
- Bigelow, W. "Inside the Classroom: Social Vision and Critical Pedagogy." *Teachers College Record* 91.3 (1990): 427-448.
- Boyce, Mary E. "Teaching Critically as an Act of Praxis and Resistance." *Electronic Journal of Radical Organizational Theory* (summer 1996): <http://newton.uor.edu/FacultyFolder/MBoyce/1CRITPED.HTM>
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Forester, John. *Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Freire, Paulo. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. [1st American] ed. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.
- . *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power, and Liberation*. Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1985.
- . *Politics and Education*. UCLA Latin American studies; v. 83. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1998.
- . *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.
- . *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare Teach*. The edge, critical studies in educational theory. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.
- . *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 30th anniversary ed. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Freire, Paulo, and Antonio Faundez. *Learning to Question: A Pedagogy of Liberation*. New York: Continuum, 1989.
- Freire, Paulo, and Ana Maria Araújo Freire. *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1994.
- , Ana Maria Araújo Freire, and Donaldo P. Macedo. *The Paulo Freire Reader*. New York: Continuum, 1998.
- Freire, Paulo, and Donaldo Macedo. "A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race." *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy*. Pepi Leistyna, Arlie Woodrum, and Stephen A. Sherblom, eds. Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review, 1996.
- Gadotti, Moacir. *Pedagogy of Praxis: A Dialectical Philosophy of Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Giroux, Henry A., and Peter McLaren. *Critical Pedagogy, the State, and Cultural Struggle: Teacher Empowerment and School Reform*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.

- . “Critical Pedagogy, Cultural Politics and the Discourse of Experience.” *Journal of Education* 167.2 (1990): 2-21.
- Harvey, David. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Kanpol, Barry, and Peter McLaren. *Critical Multiculturalism: Uncommon Voices in a Common Struggle*. Critical studies in education and culture series. Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey, 1995.
- (R)—. *Issues and Trends in Critical Pedagogy*. Critical education and ethics. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 1997.
- Lankshear, Colin, and Peter McLaren. *Critical Literacy: Politics, Praxis, and the Postmodern*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Leach, M. “Toward Writing Feminist Scholarship into History of Education.” *Educational Theory* 40.4 (1990): 453-461.
- (R) Leistyna, Pepi, Arlie Woodrum, and Stephen A. Sherblom. *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy*. Harvard educational review. Reprint series ; no. 27. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 1996.
- Livingstone, D. W. *Critical Pedagogy and Cultural Power*. Critical perspectives in education series. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, 1987.
- Macedo, Donald P. *Literacies of Power: What Americans are not Allowed to Know*. Edge, critical studies in educational theory. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994.
- , and Colin Lankshear. *Politics of Liberation: Paths from Freire*. London ; New York: Routledge, 1994.
- , and James M. Giarelli. *Critical Theory and Educational Research*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- (R) —. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 1998.
- Pignatelli, Frank, and Susanna W. Pflaum. *Celebrating Diverse Voices: Progressive Education and Equity*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, 1993.
- Sears, John. “Rethinking Teacher Education: Dare We Work Toward a New Social Order?” *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 6 (1985): 24-79.
- Shapiro, H. Svi, and David E. Purpel. *Critical Social Issues in American Education : Transformation in a Postmodern World*. Sociocultural, political, and historical studies in education. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1998.
- Shor, Ira, and Paulo Freire. *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, 1987.
- . *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- , and Caroline Pari. *Education is Politics: Critical Teaching across Differences, K-12*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 1999.
- Simon, Roger I. *Teaching Against the Grain: Texts for a Pedagogy of Possibility*. Critical studies in education and culture series. New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1992.

## Online Resources

CaMP Coop: The Critical and Multicultural Pedagogy Cooperative for Teaching Resources:

<http://www.scsv.nevada.edu/~neese/campcoop.html>

(R) *Critical Pedagogy*, resource links from Dr. D.J. Chandler at the College of Education, University of San

Francisco: [http://www.coedu.usf.edu/chandler/Critical\\_Pedagogy/critical\\_pedagogy.html](http://www.coedu.usf.edu/chandler/Critical_Pedagogy/critical_pedagogy.html)

*The Journal of Critical Pedagogy*. <http://www.wmc.edu/academics/library/pub/jcp/jcp.html>

Paulo Freire Institute Web Site: <http://www.paulofreire.org/>

(R) *Possibilities: Critical Pedagogy Web Site*: <http://wwwvms.utexas.edu/~possible/index.html>

## SERVICE LEARNING

### Books and Articles

Adler-Kassner, Linda, et al. *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*.

Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education: Published in cooperation with the National Council of Teachers of English, 1997.

American Association for Higher Education. *Connecting Past and Present: Concepts and Models for Service*

*Learning in History*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.

—. *AAHE Series on Service-Learning in the Disciplines*. Edward Zlotkowski, ed. Washington, DC: American

Association for Higher Education, 1996.

Astin, A.W., L.J. Vogelgesang, E.K. Ikeda, and J.A. Yee. *Executive Summary: How Service Learning Affects*

*Students*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, 2000.

Bacon, Nora. "Community Service Writing: Problems, Challenges, Questions." *Writing the Community:*

*Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*. *AAHE Series on Service Learning in the Disciplines*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, 1997.

Bailey, Patricia A., Dona Rinaldi Carpenter, and Patricia A. Harrington. *Integrating Community Service into*

*Nursing Education: A Guide to Service-Learning*. New York: Springer Pub. Co., 1999.

Barber, Benjamin R., and Richard M. Battistoni. *Education for Democracy*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt

Publishing Company, 1993.

Belbas, B., Gorak, K., & Shumer, R. "Commonly Used Definitions of Service-Learning: A

Discussion Piece." National Clearinghouse of Service Learning. (1993).

<http://www.nicsl.coled.umn.edu/res/mono/def.htm>

Boyte, Harry, and Elizabeth Hollander. "Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the

American Research University." Campus Compact. <http://www.compact.org/resources/>

[declaration.html](http://www.compact.org/resources/declaration.html)

Bringle, R. G., & J.A. Hatcher. "A Service-Learning Curriculum for Faculty." *Michigan Journal of*

*Community Service Learning* 2 (1995): 112-122.

Brubaker, David C., and Joel H. Ostroff. *Life, Learning, and Community: Concepts and Models for Service-*

*Learning in Biology*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.

- Bucco, Diana, ed. *Building Sustainable Programs: A Guide to Developing and Maintaining Service-Learning at Community Colleges*. Mesa, AZ: Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges, 1995.
- Campus Compact. *Mapping the Geography of Service on a College Campus: Strategic Questions about the Institution, Stakeholders, Philosophies and Community Relationships*. Providence: Campus Compact, 1994.
- Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges. *Assessing Internal and External Outcomes of Service-Learning Collaboration*. Terry Pickeral and Karen Peters, eds. Mesa, AZ: Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges, 1998.
- Cantor, Jeffrey A., and Association for the Study of Higher Education. *Experiential Learning in Higher Education: Linking Classroom and Community*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7, 1995. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1997.
- Couto, Richard A. *Streams of Idealism and Health Care Innovation: An Assessment of Service-Learning and Community Mobilization*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1982.
- DeVitis, Joseph L., Robert W. Johns, and Douglas J. Simpson. *To Serve and Learn: The Spirit of Community in Liberal Education*. New York: P. Lang, 1998.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- . *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1938.
- Droge, David Allen, et al. *Voices of Strong Democracy: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Communication Studies*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education: Published in cooperation with National Communication Association, 1999.
- Eby, John. "Why Service Learning Is Bad." March 1998. Online: <http://www.messiah.edu/agape/pdf%20files/wrongsvc.pdf>
- Ehrlich, Thomas. "Civic Education: Lessons Learned." American Political Science Association, Online: <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/june99/ehrllich.cfm>
- Erickson, Joseph A., et al. *Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Teacher Education*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education: Published in cooperation with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1997.
- Galura, Joseph. *Service-Learning Resources for University Students, Staff, and Faculty*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Office of Community Service Learning, 1993.
- Gray, Maryann Jacobi, et al. *Combining Service and Learning in Higher Education: Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America Higher Education Program*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Education, 1999.
- Guarasci, Richard, and Grant Hermans Cornwell. *Democratic Education in an Age of Difference: Redefining Citizenship in Higher Education*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.
- Heffernan, Kerrissa, et al. *The Practice of Change: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Women's Studies*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.
- Hellebrandt, Josef, Lucía T. Varona, and American Association for Higher Education. *Construyendo puentes = Building Bridges: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Spanish*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1999.

- Henry, Roger. *A Service Learning Center: A Practitioner's Workbook*. Cocoa, Fla.: Brevard Community College/Florida Campus Compact, 1995.
- Howard, Jeffrey, et al. *A Faculty Casebook on Community Service Learning*. Ann Arbor: OCSL Press University of Michigan Office of Community Service Learning, 1993.
- Jacoby, Barbara and Associates. *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.
- Kendall, Jane C., et al. *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service*. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 1988.
- Kinsley, Carol W. "Community Service Learning as Pedagogy." *Quest International*. Online: <http://www.quest.edu/slarticle10.htm>
- Kolb, D.A. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.
- Kupiec, Tamar Y., ed. *Rethinking Tradition: Integrating Service with Academic Study on College Campuses*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1993.
- Kurtzman, Stephanie. "Collapsing the Ivory Tower: Service-Learning in Higher Education." *The Vermont Connection: The Student Affairs Journal of the University of Vermont*. (1998) Online: <http://www.uvm.edu/~vtconn/journals/1998/kurtzman.html>
- Lisman, C. David, Irene E. Harvey, and American Association for Higher Education. *Beyond the Tower: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Philosophy*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.
- Longres, John F. *Human Behavior in the Social Environment*. 3rd ed. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 2000.
- National Center for Service-Learning (U.S.). *Planning by Objectives: A Manual for Student Community Service Program Coordinators*. Washington, DC: Action's National Center for Service-Learning, 1980.
- Norbeck, Jane S., et al. *Caring and Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Nursing*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1998.
- O'Grady, Carolyn R. *Integrating Service Learning and Multicultural Education in Colleges and Universities*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2000.
- Ostrow, James M., et al. *Cultivating the Sociological Imagination: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Sociology*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education: Published in cooperation with American Sociological Association, 1999.
- Parsons, Michael H., and C. David Lisman. *Promoting Community Renewal Through Civic Literacy and Service Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
- Perkins, Daniel F. and Joyce Miller. "Why Community Service and Service-Learning? Providing Rationale and Research." *Quest International Online*: <http://www.quest.edu/slarticle2.htm>
- Poirrier, Gail P., and National League for Nursing. *Service Learning: Curricular Applications in Nursing*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 2001.
- Putnam, Robert. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6.1 (1995): 65-78.

- Rhoads, Robert A., and Jeffrey Howard. *Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.
- Sirianni, Carmen, and Lewis Friedland. "Civic Innovation and American Democracy." *Change* 29.1 (1997): 14-23.
- Stephens, Lillian S. *The Complete Guide to Learning Through Community Service: Grades K-9*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995.
- University of Michigan. Office of Community Service Learning, and University of Michigan. Center for Learning through Community Service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. Vol. 1. Ann Arbor: OCSL Press University of Michigan, 1994.
- Wade, Rahima Carol, and NetLibrary Inc. *Community Service-Learning: A Guide to Including Service in the Public School Curriculum*. SUNY series, Democracy and Education. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Zlotkowski, Edward A. *Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education*. Boston, MA: Anker Pub. Co., 1998.

### *General Online Resources (all R)*

- American Association for Higher Education's Service-Learning Project: <http://www.aahe.org/service/srv-lrn.htm>
- American Education Network Group: <http://www.aenc.org/>
- The Association of American Colleges and University's "Contemporary Understandings of Liberal Education": <http://www.aacu-edu.org/Publications/understanding.html>
- Association for Experiential Education: <http://www.princeton.edu/~rcurtis/aee.html>
- Bibliography Prepared by Alice Kolb and David Kolb: <http://trgmcbcr.haygroup.com/Products/learning/bibliography.htm>
- Campus Compact: <http://www.compact.org>
- Civic Education Through Service-Learning, ERIC Digest: [http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC\\_Digests/ed390720.html](http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed390720.html)
- Corporation for National Service, Learn and Serve: <http://www.cns.gov/learn/index.html>
- International Consortium for Experiential Learning: <http://www.el.uct.ac.za/icel>
- International Partnership for Service-Learning: <http://www.ipsl.org/>
- National Service Learning Cooperative Clearinghouse: <http://nicsl.jaws.umn.edu/>
- National Society for Experiential Education: <http://www.nsee.org>
- Quest's List of Service-Learning Article links: <http://www.quest.edu/summarysla.htm>
- Rural Clearinghouse for Lifelong Education and Development's Service-Learning Article links: <http://www-personal.ksu.edu/~rcled/publications/sl/sl.html>
- The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America (John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University): <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguaro/>
- Service Learning: The Home of Service Learning on the Web: <http://csf.colorado.edu/sl/index.html>
- Western Region Campus Compact Consortium: <http://www.ac.wvu.edu/~wrccc/>

### *Service-Learning Program Sites Online*

(R) Robin's Guide To: College and University Service-Learning Programs Including Links to Online Course Lists and Syllabi: <http://csf.colorado.edu/sl/academic.html>

Portland State University's Center for Academic Excellence: Community-Based Learning Program: <http://www.oaa.pdx.edu/cae/>

Agape Center for Service and Learning: <http://www.messiah.edu/agape/index.html>

Community Literacy Center (based at Carnegie Mellon): <http://english.cmu.edu/clc/>

INVST (International and National Voluntary Service Training), University of Colorado, Boulder: <http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/INVST/>

University of Michigan's Edward Ginsberg Center for Community Service Learning: <http://www.umich.edu/~mserve/>

### SELECTED RESOURCES ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

#### *General Assessment in Education*

Eric Clearing House on Assessment and Evaluation: <http://ericae.net/>

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory: Assessment Based on a Vision of Learning: [http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/rpl\\_esys/assess.htm](http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/rpl_esys/assess.htm)

Portland State's Center for Academic Excellence: Classroom Assessment Techniques: <http://www.fd.pdx.edu/workshops/cat/>

#### *General Assessment for Community Organizations*

Basic Guide to Program Evaluation, by Carter McNamara (includes free library with planning guides): [http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/fnl\\_eval.htm](http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm)

Innonet, Tools for the Nonprofit Community: <http://www.innonet.org/>

Learning Institute for Nonprofit Organizations, Learner Resource Center, Nonprofit Organizational Assessment Tool (includes worksheets that are adaptable for specific programs): <http://www.uwex.edu/li/learner/assessment.htm>

#### *Assessment Publications and Sites in Service-learning*

Assessment and Evaluation in Service Learning Bibliography (a National Service-Learning Clearing House PDF file from the University of Minnesota): <http://nicsl.jaws.umn.edu/res/bibs/assessment.pdf>

Campus Compact's Evaluation and Assessment in Service Learning: <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/academic/compact/Evaluation/index.html>

Campus Compact's Assessing Internal and External Outcomes of Service-Learning Collaborations: <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/academic/compact/Outcomes/index.html>

National Service Learning Clearing House: Service-Learning and Evaluation: <http://nicl.jaws.umn.edu/res/bibs/slev.htm>

Project STAR Evaluation Assistance (Corporation for National Service sponsored Technical Assistance): [http://www.projectstar.org/AmeriCorps/ac\\_index.htm](http://www.projectstar.org/AmeriCorps/ac_index.htm)

Service Learning Research and Development Center, UC Berkeley: Publications and Monographs on Assessment in Service-Learning: <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/research/slc/rande/pubs.htm>

UCLA Service Learning Clearing House Project: Assessment of Service Learning in Higher Education: <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/slc/assess.html>

### *Assessment Instruments for Service-learning*

Compendium of Assessment and Research Tools (CART): <http://cart.rmcdenver.com/>

Service Learning Research and Development Center, UC Berkeley: Instruments and Protocols: <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/research/slc/rande/instrums.htm>

## COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY RELATIONSHIPS AND RESEARCH

### *Articles and Books*

Angwin, Jenny. *The Essence of Action Research*. Geelong: Deakin Centre for Education and Change, Deakin University, 1998.

Arhar, Joanne, Mary Louise Holly, and Wendy C. Kasten. *Action Research for Teachers: Traveling the Yellow Brick Road*. Upper Saddle River, NJ.: Prentice-Hall, 2000.

Atweh, Bill, Kemmis, Stephen, and Weeks, Patricia, eds. *Action Research in Practice: Partnerships for Social Justice in Education*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Axel-Lute: Miriam. "Town & Gown: Making Research Serve Communities' Needs." Online: <http://www.loka.org/town&gown.htm>

Beckwith, Dave. "Ten Ways to Work Together: An Organizer's View." Dave Beckwith (Special Issue of Sociological Imagination: Sociology and Social Action Part II. Vol. 33 no. 2. Online at: <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/si/beckwith.htm>)

Boog, Ben, Harry Coenen, Lou Keune, and Rob Lammerts, eds. *The Complexity of Relationships in Action Research*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, 1998.

Cherry, Nita. *Action Research: A Pathway to Action, Knowledge and Learning*. Melbourne: RMIT University Press, 1999.

Greenwood, Davydd J., and Levin, Morten. *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage, 1998.

McNair, Ray H., ed. *Research Strategies for Community Practice*. New York: The Haworth Press, 1999.

Schensul, Jean J. "The Development and Maintenance of Community Research Partnerships." Online: <http://www.terraknowledge.com/schensul1.htm>

Stoecker, Randy. "Are Academics Irrelevant?" Presented at the American Sociological Society Annual Meetings, 1997. Online: <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/papers98/pr.htm>

—. "Community-Based Research: The Next New Thing." Online: <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/drafts/cbrreportb.htm>

The Aspen Institute's NonProfit Research Fund, Projects and Findings: <http://www.nonprofitresearch.org/newsletter1531/newsletter.htm>

### *Centers for Community-Based Networks:*

Applied Research Center: <http://www.arc.org/>

Comm-Org: The Online Conference on Community Organizing and Development: <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/>

Community Research Network: <http://www.mapcruzin.com/community-research/index.html>

Institute for Community Research: <http://www.incommunityresearch.org/>

The Loka Institute: <http://www.loka.org/>

Loka's Community Research Network: <http://www.loka.org/crn/index.htm>

Policy Action Research Group: <http://www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag/>

Swearer Center for Public Service: [http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Swearer\\_Center/](http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Swearer_Center/)

TerraKnowledge Network: <http://www.terraknowledge.com/>

### *University Based Centers for Community Partnerships and Community-University Partnership Initiatives*

California State University, San Bernadino, Community University Partnerships (CUP): <http://partnerships.csusb.edu/cupinfo.html>

Center for Labor Research and Education, University of California, Los Angeles: <http://labor.sppsr.ucla.edu/>

Center for Labor Research and Education, University of California, Berkeley: <http://ist-socrates.berkeley.edu/~iir/clre/clre.html>

Center for Labor Research and Education (CLEAR), University of Hawaii: <http://homepages.uhwo.hawaii.edu/clear/default.html>

Center for Labor Studies, University of Washington: [http://depts.washington.edu/pcls/Center\\_for\\_labor\\_studies.htm](http://depts.washington.edu/pcls/Center_for_labor_studies.htm)

Children Youth and Family Consortium, Minneapolis, Minnesota: <http://www.cyfc.umn.edu/>

Comm-Org's links to Community-University Partnership Programs: <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/research.htm#partnerships>

The Labor Center: University of Massachusetts, Amherst: <http://www.umass.edu/lrrc/>

LINK Research: <http://linkresearch.org/default.asp>

Proposal for Center for Popular Education and Participatory Research, University of California, Berkeley: <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/research/pepr/>

San Francisco State University, J. Paul Leonard Library, Labor Archives & Research Center: <http://www.library.sfsu.edu/special/larc.html>

University of California, San Francisco Center For Health Professions' Community-Campus Partnership  
for Health: <http://www.futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph.html>

University of Louisville, Community Partnerships: <http://www.louisville.edu/home/community.html>

University of Oregon, Labor Education and Resource Center (LERC): <http://www.uoregon.edu/~lerc>

UPenn's Center for Community Partnerships: <http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/>

Wayne State University, Labor Studies Center: <http://www.laborstudies.wayne.edu/>

*Programs to Promote and Fund Community-University Partnerships*

FannieMae Foundation's University-Community Partnership Initiative: [http://  
www.fanniemaefoundation.org/ucpi/](http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org/ucpi/)

Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Office of University Partnerships: <http://www.oup.org>

Office of Environmental Compliance Assurance Community-University Partnership Funding:  
<http://es.epa.gov/oeca/oej/grlink2.html> (No Funding Currently Available)

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Community-University Research  
Alliances: A Pilot Program: <http://www.sshrc.ca/english/programinfo/grantsguide/cura.html>