Overview

Deborah J. Hirsch

Service learning has arrived. A few short years ago, no one knew what the term meant. Now there is a growing literature of theory and documented program success that is reaching the mainstream higher education community. This issue builds on the Winter 1995 *Metropolitan Universities,* which broadly examined the issue of partnerships between the university and the community. As the articles in that issue demonstrated, metropolitan universities have recently begun to reexamine their missions in light of pressing and seemingly intractable problems facing their surrounding communities. These institutions are talking about, planning for, and embarking on restructuring efforts that fundamentally change the way they do business. Their leaders are being asked to connect the work of the academy to the social, economic, and environmental challenges beyond the campus. Students are demanding relevance in the curriculum to prepare them to enter the increasingly difficult job market they face upon graduation. This, coupled with a rise in the numbers of students interested in community service programs, has resulted in a mushrooming of service programs and concern about how they might be institutionalized in relationship to the academic curriculum and to the work of the faculty.

The current articles trace that evolution and raise questions about the second generation problems, such as standards of excellence, methods of documentation and evaluation, and incentives and rewards that campuses must resolve before they can institutionalize approaches to community outreach. My co-guest editors, James Price and John Martello, echo these sentiments in their article, which lays out a taxonomy of experiential education (including service learning) and discusses a number of these second generation concerns that have emerged from a lack of clarity of practice.

When campus service first appeared on the horizon, it was enough just to have campus-sponsored community service opportunities for students. Programs varied on a number of dimensions—some had a reflection component, others didn't, faculty were rarely involved, connections to what students were learning in the classroom were haphazard at best, evaluation was virtually nonexistent. Goodwin Liu here analyzes the development and evolution of the service movement in higher education in his article, "Reflections on a Movement." in which he describes the founding of a movement by a new

generation of students that is based on idealism, opposition to the apathy and disengagement of a prior generation of young people, and a compulsion to make a difference in a personal way in the lives of others. The student movement generated an institutional response, and campuses and organizations formed administrative infrastructures to support programmatic forays into the community. Now, a little over a decade after the establishment of Campus Compact and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League, and with an influx of money from government and foundations, those who see themselves as a part of this service movement are calling for standards of quality, connections to the core academic program, institutionalization of programs, and accountability for their impact.

The proponents of a service-learning agenda have linked themselves to those calling for reform in the way that the academy defines what it means to be a scholar, what defines the elements of scholarly work, and how such work is rewarded. Earlier calls for a broader conception of scholarship and a more balanced system of faculty incentives and rewards received a major boost by the late Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered.* In this widely read report, Boyer urged that we use the term "scholarship" to capture the full scope of academic work. According to Boyer, scholarship—of which basic research is one form—is characterized by a "...stepping back from one's investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one's knowledge effectively to students" (p.16).

Service learning has been touted as one of the ways to make these connections creating a strong link between the service experience and classroom work. This requires substantial cooperation by the faculty. Adam Yarmolinsky and John Martello argue that through linkage faculty involvement is the critical determinant of the viability of the enterprise. They invoke the models of the professional schools and their clinical components and the ease with which the social sciences can incorporate service learning to amplify, enrich, and apply the theoretical constructs of differing traditions. There remains the challenge of incorporating service into the humanities, to create what Lee Shulman (1991) has called the missing clinical component of the liberal arts and sciences. Typically, the role for faculty has been one of sponsorship of student service initiatives and, possibly, integrators of that service with the classroom experience. Only recently has there been any appreciable discussion of the value of having members of the faculty themselves directly involved as active participants in the service or external outreach. Yarmolinsky

and Martello describe the difficulties of reorganizing the academy around problems instead of disciplines and of rewarding the activity that will be necessary if we are to fully enlist faculty in the service-learning effort.

Leder and McGuinness take on this challenge in their article, "Making the Paradigm Shift." They suggest a number of innovative ways that an institution can organize itself in order to place service at the top of the institutional agenda. Arguing that service learning requires a special pedagogy, one that most faculty have little experience with, they use Loyola College as a case study to show how a campus might develop a comprehensive strategy to integrate service within and across the curriculum and support faculty development of the pedagogical skills necessary to integrate rather than add on a service component to their classes.

Ira Harkavy takes the reorganization of the campus for service one step further in his article calling for campuses to go beyond service learning to "strategic academically-based community service." In doing so, campuses must think strategically and institutionally about how they are going to marshal their resources—both faculty and student—to bring about structural and sustained solutions to community problems. Harkavy cites John Hopkins, Columbia, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania as historical examples of institutions that exemplify the strategic problem-driven, problem-solving academically-based community service linking institutional resources with rapidly changing and complex societal needs. Lest one believe the great models exist only in the past, Harkavy offers the modern example of an undergraduate anthropology course at the University of Pennsylvania as a case in which theory and practice, research and teaching, become interwoven and indistinguishable as students and faculty work to meet community needs.

Sandra Enos and Marie Troppe of the Campus Compact provide numerous examples of how campuses have incorporated service into the curriculum. Their article demonstrates that there are a number of ways and models for incorporating service into the curriculum, variations that allow for differences in institutional setting, disciplinary traditions, and pedagogical styles of individual faculty. They stress that although service can enhance the content of almost any course in a given discipline, and can increase student interest and comprehension of most course material, it may not be appropriate for every course or every faculty member. However, a variety of options and models will make service learning a viable option for every departmental

discipline, and move service from the margins to the mainstream.

Richard Battistani presents compelling evidence, through excerpted student journals, of the power of such courses in the preparation of students as active and involved citizens. Despite arguments presented earlier on the potential of using service learning as a vehicle for realigning the academy with community needs and as an important pedagogical tool for faculty, the power of such learning, Battistani explains, is in educating our students to be responsible members of a democratic society.

Marie Kennedy and Molly Mead's article on the servers and Edward Zlotkowski's article on community remind us that when we talk about students and community we need to be careful in making assumptions about what those terms mean and who they encompass. As these authors point out, in some instances those doing the service might not be different from those who are being served. Their experience indicates that no matter who the students are, they all require careful preparation before entering the community on a service project. And Zlotkowski calls into question some of the assumptions we typically have about community. He reminds us that we are all members of multiple communities—on campus, where we grew up, where we reside, and larger areas such as regions or countries, and that each of these communities can benefit from our service in one way or another. In fact, he argues, we should not forget the need to work on problems that plague our immediate campus communities even as we go off to do good outside the ivy-covered walls.

A common thread that links all of these contributions is the need to connect a campus with its external constituencies, for the benefit of both. We need to move toward developing a conceptual framework for a "connected college or university." Such an institution will be committed to a pervasive engagement of both faculty and students with external constituencies, as envisioned by Ernest Boyer as the "New American College." The focus is on both faculty and student service, how these forms of outreach interact with and reinforce each other, and the impact they have on the institution. The specific issues that need to be addressed in developing such a framework have yet to be answered, but include:

- What would a vision for a connected college or university look like?
- How is this vision related to the role(s) of institutions of higher education in society?

- What structures must be in place to create a connected institution?
- How might these differ among different kinds of institutions?
- How can we create a seamless concept of community outreach that harnesses both student and faculty talent and institutional resources?
- What are the benefits to the institution for reaching out to the community?

We hope that the articles in this edition offers ideas and models for those advocating and implementing programs of community outreach for students and faculty as well as stimulating thought and conversation about the larger concern of restructuring the academy for community connection.

Suggested Readings

Boyer, Ernest L., *Scholarship Reconsidered.* New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Boyer, Ernest L., "The New American College," *Chronicle of Higher Education.* April, 1994.

Schön, Donald A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action.* New York: Basic Books, 1987.

Donald A. Schön. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Shulman, Lee. "Professing the Liberal Arts." Presentation at the 1991 Campus Compact Institute on Integrating Service with Academic Study. July, 1991.

Publisher's Advice to Contributors . . .

Our Editor is pleased to provide a detailed guide to the style and preparation of *MU* articles. This condensation is based on his *Guidelines for Contributors.*

Content. *MU* articles should be provocative and challenging, but above all useful. Readers – mostly university administrators and faculty – want to know what works, so they can apply it at their institutions. *MU* is a forum for discussion, not a place to publish original research. Be rigorous but engaging. Write in the first person and include personal experiences and anecdotes. Footnotes are discouraged; if you need to cite references, do so in the text. Please include a short bio and list of readings.

Stylistics. Manuscripts should be about 4,000 words, typed double-spaced on 8.5 x 11 paper, flush left and unjustified, with no hyphenation. Two copies of the manuscript should be submitted with a diskette using WordPerfect 5.0 or higher for IBM PCs. (Please see *Call for Contributions* on p. 4.)

We are guided by *The Chicago Manual of Style*, but flexible. Our goal is readability and consistency, but copy editing is light. If you use British spellings, for instance, we'll leave them that way. Some authors may sprinkle commas more liberally than others. So be it. However, if you can observe the following conventions, it will greatly reduce the number of changes we have to make to set your article in type.

- Place the author's name first, with no "by." Place the title second, followed by subtitle, if any. We cannot handle long main titles, so use a subtitle if you need to.
- Always use upper and lower case titles, not all caps. Use intital caps for key words in each title.
- Center main subheads ("A-Heads"), but do not underscore them, bold them, or italicize them. Just center them. Our program takes care of the rest.
- Place secondary subheads ("B-Heads") flush left on a line by themselves. Again, don't underscore, bold, italicize, or use all caps – just initial caps for key words.
- Don't leave a space between paragraphs. Use the tab key to indent new paragraphs. Never use the space bar to indent paragraphs.
- It's difficult to italicize text in WordPerfect. If you do, thanks, but if you just underscore words to be italicized, we'll take it from there.
- Use the spell-checker before saving copy. Its vocabulary is limited, but it avoids some needless errors.
- Use bullets (like these) when making a list, rather than numbers, dashes, or whatever. If you are not bullet-literate, use asterisks.
- Here, at the Publisher's Office, we do Windows, but not research. If you cite publications but leave pages or dates for us to fill in, we omit them.
- Please have any tables or diagrams set up camera-ready.

A few grammaticisms. We prefer to see a comma before the final "and" in a series, but accept consistent anomalies. Please spell out in full the first use of any person or institution before using acronyms or last names. Don't use Dr. or Ph.D. Read up on the juxtaposition of periods, commas, colons, semi-colons, quotes, parentheses. Also on numbers, arabic and spelled-out; capitalization; gerunds; split infinitives. . . .

Cavils notwithstanding,

We welcome your contribution!