

WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproduction of copyrighted materials. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction.

One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If electronic transmissions of reserve materials are used for purposes in excess of what constitutes "fair use", that user may be liable for infringement.

Service-Learning in Higher Education

Concepts and Practices

Barbara Jacoby and Associates

Foreword by Thomas Ehrlich



JOSSEY-BASS
A Wiley Imprint
www.josseybass.com

Copyright © 1996 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved.

Published by Jossey-Bass

A Wiley Imprint

989 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103-1741 www.josseybass.com

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400, fax 978-750-4470, or on the web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, (201) 748-6011, fax (201) 748-6008, e-mail: permcoordinator@wiley.com.

Jossey-Bass books and products are available through most bookstores. To contact Jossey-Bass directly call our Customer Care Department within the U.S. at 800-956-7739, outside the U.S. at 317-572-3986 or fax 317-572-4002.

Jossey-Bass also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Credits are on p. 381.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Service-learning in higher education : concepts and practices /
Barbara Jacoby . . . [et al.]. — 1st ed.

p. cm.—(The Jossey-Bass higher and adult education series)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7879-0291-8 (cloth : acid-free paper)

1. Student service—United States. 2. Student volunteers in
social service—United States. 3. Community and college—United
States. 4. Education, Higher—United States—Curricula.
5. Experiential learning—United States. I. Jacoby, Barbara.

II. Series.

LC220.5.S45 1996

361.37—dc20

96-10047

FIRST EDITION

HB Printing 10 9

The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series

Part One

Foundations and Principles of Service-Learning

Although the concept and practice of service-learning are still relatively new to higher education, considerable foundations and principles exist. Part One examines the theoretical and practical perspectives that serve as a firm base for the development of service-learning in all types of institutions of higher education—large and small, public and private, commuter and residential, two year and four year. The foundations and principles are applicable to the design of service-learning to achieve a wide range of educational and community outcomes.

Part One provides educators with a thorough grounding in the broad issues that underlie successful service-learning, whether it is based in the curriculum or the cocurriculum, so that they can develop programs truly beneficial to students, communities, and institutions. Service-learning is different from many other educational endeavors in that it cannot happen within the confines of a classroom, a discipline, or a campus. By necessity, service-learning involves partnerships between the institution and communities, and affects students in multiple ways. The chapters in Part One establish the foundation for realizing the potentials and understanding the implications of service-learning.

Chapter One

Service-Learning in Today's Higher Education

Barbara Jacoby

Higher education is being called on to renew its historic commitment to service. Its foremost experts are urging colleges and universities to assume a leadership role in addressing society's increasing problems and in meeting growing human needs. Indeed, their calls to action serve as a collective mandate for higher education to become actively engaged in responding to these problems and needs (Bok, 1982, 1986; Boyer, 1990, 1994; Ehrlich, 1995; Hackney, 1994; Kerr, 1963; Newman, 1985; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). Ernest Boyer (1994) urges colleges and universities to "respond to the challenges that confront our children, our schools, and our cities, just as the land-grant colleges responded to the needs of agriculture and industry a century ago" (p. 48). Derek Bok (1982) agrees: "There is no reason for universities to feel uncomfortable in taking account of society's needs; in fact, they have a clear obligation to do so" (p. 301). A renewed commitment to service will go a long way in responding to higher education's critics who bemoan its "fortress mentality" in isolating itself from the encroaching problems of both its local communities and the rest of the nation (Harkavy, 1993, p. 45).

At the same time, higher education is questioning its effectiveness at achieving its most fundamental goal: student learning.

Numerous articles and reports have criticized indifferent undergraduate teaching, overemphasis on esoteric research, failure to promote moral character and civic consciousness, and narrow focus on preparing graduates for the job market (Ehrlich, 1995; Hackney, 1994; Pew Higher Education Roundtable, 1994; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993).

Today's college students, however, feeling compelled to confront society's problems, are participating in community service in record numbers. In Alexander Astin's research on a sample of students who entered college in the fall of 1994, more than 70 percent reported that they had performed volunteer work in high school (Astin, Korn, and Sax, 1994). As more and more elementary and secondary schools are requiring community service, this percentage will only increase.

Indeed, Arthur Levine's (1994, p. 4) 1993 survey of nine thousand undergraduates reveals that 64 percent were involved in volunteer activities. This involvement occurs at all types of institutions of higher education: community colleges (59 percent), four-year colleges (67 percent), and universities (68 percent). Both men (62 percent) and women (66 percent) are involved, as are both older (63 percent) and younger (65 percent) students. The percentages are high for white students (65 percent), as well as for students of color (62 percent). And the trend is established in all regions of the country: the Northeast (61 percent), the Midwest (65 percent), then South (64 percent), and the West (67 percent). Students participate in a wide range of community service activities, working with children, teenagers, people with physical and mental disabilities, people who are elderly, battered women, and people with AIDS. Their work addresses issues of hunger, homelessness, illiteracy, health care, educational disadvantage, the environment, and numerous others. Robert Coles (1993), the well-respected Harvard service-learning educator, points out that in contrast to the young people of the 1960s, "today's students are likely to express their lofty political and social impulses and practical desires to change the world through community service" (p. 40).

As colleges and universities across the country are developing programs to enable their students to serve their communities, the nation, and the world—and at the same time to enrich undergraduate education—it is critical that these programs embrace the

concept of service-learning. This chapter defines service-learning and elucidates the differences between service-learning and traditional community service. It provides a historical overview and a context for understanding the essential linkage of service and learning; it describes the current state of practice; and it highlights the relationship between service-learning and institutional educational goals.

Service-Learning Defined

Robert Sigmon (1994) notes that "many definitions and approaches have been used within the general framework of linking service with learning" (p. 1). In the introduction to *Combining Service and Learning* (1990), Jane Kendall states that she participated in hundreds of debates about the language used in combining service and learning, "debates that will probably rage forever" (p. 18). She adds that she encountered 147 terms in the literature she reviewed; even more are in use today.

For the purposes of this book, service-learning is defined as follows:

Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning.

The hyphen in *service-learning* is critical in that it symbolizes the symbiotic relationship between service and learning (S. Migliore, personal communication, April 1995). The term *community* in the definition of service-learning refers to local neighborhoods, the state, the nation, and the global community. The human and community needs that service-learning addresses are those needs that are *defined by the community*.

Sigmon (1994) proposes a useful service and learning typology with four variations found at colleges and universities: "service-LEARNING," which implies that learning goals are primary and service outcomes secondary; "SERVICE-learning," in which the service agenda is central and the learning secondary; "service learning,"

in which the absence of the hyphen indicates that the two are viewed as completely separate from each other; and "SERVICE-LEARNING," in which service and learning goals are of equal weight and "the hyphen is essential" (p. 2). This last relationship, which Sigmon prefers, is advocated in this book.

This book takes the firm stance that service-learning is both curricular and cocurricular, because all learning does not occur in the classroom. Although some current definitions of service-learning insist that it must be integrated into the curriculum, student learning is indeed structured and facilitated by student affairs professionals, campus ministers, trained student leaders, and community members in addition to faculty. Although the structure afforded by the curriculum (class meetings, syllabi, assignments, grading, and credit) makes it easier to hold students accountable for achieving the desired outcomes of service-learning, skillfully designed and implemented cocurricular experiences can yield rich results. And learning and developmental outcomes are not necessarily related to a discipline or to particular course content. These potential outcomes are discussed in Chapter Three.

Discussion also continues about whether one-time or short-term experiences, such as serving in a soup kitchen or participating in an environmental cleanup project, can be called service-learning. This book posits that they can if they include the fundamental concepts of reflection and reciprocity, which distinguish service-learning from other community service and volunteer programs. Some of these programs include some elements of these concepts, but many do not. The use of the term *service-learning* implies the centrality of reflection and reciprocity to both conception and practice.

Reflection

As a form of experiential education, service-learning is based on the pedagogical principle that learning and development do not necessarily occur as a result of experience itself but as a result of a reflective component explicitly designed to foster learning and development. The work of theorists and researchers on learning—from Jean Piaget to William Perry, from James Coleman to David Kolb, from John Dewey to Donald Schon—indicates that we learn

through combinations of thought and action, reflection and practice, theory and application (Kendall, 1988). Different service-learning programs emphasize different types of learning goals: intellectual, civic, ethical, moral, cross-cultural, career, or personal (Kendall, 1990). Programs also highlight different combinations of these goals.

Service-learning programs are also explicitly structured to promote learning about the larger social issues behind the needs to which their service is responding. This learning includes a deeper understanding of the historical, sociological, cultural, economic, and political contexts of the needs or issues being addressed (Kendall, 1990). Reflection could be designed, for example, to encourage students working in a homeless shelter to ask such questions as Why are there homeless people? What national and state policies affect homelessness? Why do we create homeless shelters rather than identify and solve the root causes of the problem? If homelessness is a global problem, how do other countries deal with it? Reflection can take many forms: individual and group, oral and written, directly related to discipline-based course material or not. Reflection should include opportunities for participants to receive feedback from those persons being served, as well as from peers and program leaders (Porter Honnet and Poulsen, 1989).

Reciprocity

The other essential concept of service-learning is reciprocity between the server and the person or group being served. "All parties in service-learning are learners and help determine what is to be learned. Both the server and those served teach, and both learn" (Kendall, 1990, p. 22). In service-learning, those being served control the service provided. The needs of the community, as determined by its members, define what the service tasks will be. Service-learning avoids placing students into community settings based solely on desired student learning outcomes and providing services that do not meet actual needs or perpetuate a state of need rather than seeking and addressing the causes of need.

Through reciprocity, students develop a greater sense of belonging and responsibility as members of a larger community.

Community members being served learn how to take responsibility for their own needs and become empowered to develop mechanisms and relationships to address them. Thus, reciprocity creates “a sense of mutual responsibility and respect between individuals in the service-learning exchange” (Kendall, 1990, p. 22). Service-learning thus stands in contrast to the traditional, paternalistic, one-way approach to service, where one person or group has resources that they share with a person or group that they assume lacks resources. Reciprocity also eschews the traditional concept of volunteerism, which is based on the idea that a more competent person comes to the aid of a less competent person. In the old paradigm, volunteers often attempt to solve other people’s problems before fully understanding the situation or its causes. Service-learning encourages students to do things *with* others rather than *for* them. Everyone should expect to change in the process (Karasik, 1993).

Some authors have legitimately challenged the use of the word *service* in service-learning (Cruz, 1994; Kendall, 1990; Seidel, 1994). They point out that it suggests inequality among the participants in service-learning, with an individual or group doing something to another individual or group. It goes against the “parity of esteem,” as Howard Berry (1988, p. 3) terms the mutuality of the service-learning exchange. For many African Americans and other people who have experienced oppression, *service* still connotes involuntary servitude. *Service* is also used in a self-righteous sense to mean well-endowed persons “doing things” for those who are less fortunate than themselves. Nevertheless, I agree with Kendall (1990) and Berry (1994) that although the word *service* is problematic, it is the most common and accessible word to use.

Service-Learning as Program, Philosophy, and Pedagogy

In this book, and in numerous other contexts, service-learning is often referred to as a program. Although it is convenient to speak of service-learning programs in higher education, it is important to note here that service-learning is also a philosophy and a pedagogy; unfortunately, it is sometimes construed as a political stance. As a program, service-learning emphasizes the accomplishment of tasks to meet human and community needs in combination with

“intentional learning goals and with conscious reflection and critical analysis” (Kendall, 1990, p. 20). Tasks in which participants engage are often direct services, such as tutoring, work in soup kitchens and homeless shelters, assistance in hospitals and other health settings, environmental cleanups, and renovation and construction of homes and community facilities. Tasks also include advocacy and policy-level work on such issues as housing, economic development, the environment, education, and human services. Service-learning programs have different goals and different approaches. For example, curricular programs can view service-learning as discipline-based or as part of general education. Cocurricular programs can have goals of leadership, citizenship, or spiritual development. Reflection components are thus designed to focus on different learning outcomes and to use a wide range of methodologies. As a program type, service-learning encompasses evaluation of its effects on students, as well as on individuals and communities served.

Service-learning is also a philosophy of “human growth and purpose, a social vision, an approach to community, and a way of knowing” (Kendall, 1990, p. 23). It is the element of reciprocity that elevates it to the level of philosophy, “an expression of values—service to others, community development and empowerment, reciprocal learning—which determines the purpose, nature and process of *social and educational exchange* between learners (students) and the people they serve” (Stanton, 1990, p. 67). Service-learning is therefore a philosophy of reciprocity, which implies a concerted effort to move from charity to justice, from service to the elimination of need.

As a pedagogy, service-learning is education that is grounded in experience as a basis for learning and on the centrality and intentionality of reflection designed to enable learning to occur. Based on the work of Dewey, Piaget, and Kurt Lewin, Kolb’s concept of the experiential learning cycle (1984) is useful in elucidating the role of service-learning as pedagogy. His model outlines the learning experience as a constantly revisited four-step cycle: concrete experience, reflection on the experience, synthesis and abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation—that is, testing the concepts in new situations. Although one may enter the cycle at any point, a person engaged in service-learning often

begins with concrete service experience and then embarks on a period of reflection on that experience, analyzing what actually occurred and what implications arise from those observations. In the next step, reflection stimulates the learner to integrate observations and implications with existing knowledge and to formulate concepts and questions to deepen the learner's understanding of the world and the root causes of the need for service. In the fourth step of the model, the learner tests these concepts in different situations. This experimentation leads the learner to begin the cycle again and again. Chapter Three elaborates on Kolb's model and its relevance to service-learning.

Recent discussions in which I have been involved have focused on service-learning as a political stance. With its commitment to social justice, service-learning is clearly not value free. Nevertheless, I believe firmly that proponents and practitioners of service-learning must strenuously avoid directly or indirectly influencing participants toward specific political parties or toward their personally held political views. This type of influence is inappropriate and exclusionary and can adversely affect an institution's willingness to integrate service-learning into its mission and practices.

Higher Education's Tradition of Service

It is important to ground today's concept and practice of service-learning in higher education's long tradition of service. In his pre-eminent history of higher education, Frederick Rudolph (1962) reminds us: "From the beginning, the American college was cloaked with a public purpose, with a responsibility to the past and the present and the future" (p. 177). Since the founding of Harvard College in 1636, the goals of American higher education have included the preparation of citizens for active involvement in community life (Smith, 1994, p. 55).

Following the Revolutionary War, the purposes of higher education slowly began to shift from the focus on individual students to the building of a new nation (Boyer, 1994). Rudolph (1962) notes that the founding of institutions such as Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1824 responded to the need for builders of railroads, bridges, and other physical and social structures.

In 1862 the passage of the Land-Grant Act inextricably linked higher education and the concept of service, specifically related to agriculture and industry. This linkage led Woodrow Wilson, who would become president of Princeton University in 1902, to state: "It is not learning but the spirit of service that will give a college a place in the annals of the nation" (cited by Boyer, 1994, p. 48). In 1903 David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University, declared that "the entire university movement, in this country was progressing towards 'reality' and 'practicality'" (cited by Boyer, 1994, p. 48).

In "Creating the New American College," Boyer (1994) contends that this vision of service has been reaffirmed over and over again. When the economy collapsed, causing the Great Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt recruited outstanding scholars to serve as his consultants. During World War II research universities joined with the government to create solutions to new problems. Two important government-higher education partnerships were founded in the war's wake: the National Science Foundation and the GI Bill. Once the Soviet Union launched *Sputnik* in 1957, higher education joined yet another partnership with government, seeking to improve education in primary and secondary schools. And as Boyer (1994) points out, "the very title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 clearly linked higher education to the security of our country" (p. 48).

The Emergence of Service-Learning

College student community service has a long history that includes the YMCA, 4-H, the Scouting movement, Greek-letter organizations, and many campus ministry initiatives. It grew dramatically in both numbers and in public attention in the 1960s, inspired by President John F. Kennedy's launching of the Peace Corps in 1961. Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) followed in 1965, engaging young people, mostly college students or recent graduates, to tackle problems within the United States. The civil rights movement of the 1960s challenged both institutions of higher education and students to participate in the burgeoning demand for social justice.

As a form of experiential education, service-learning has its roots in Dewey's theory of experience, which "has become the philosophical touchstone of the experiential movement" (Smythe, 1990, p. 296). Along with internships, cooperative education, and other forms of experiential learning, service-learning established itself and flourished on many college campuses in the late 1960s and the 1970s.

The term *service-learning* first emerged in the work of Sigmon and William Ramsey at the Southern Regional Education Board in 1967 (Giles and Eyler, 1994). In 1969 the Office of Economic Opportunity established the National Student Volunteer Program, which shortly became the National Center for Service-Learning. Two years later, this program, along with VISTA and the Peace Corps, combined to form the federal agency ACTION. As a national center for student service, ACTION published a magazine, *Synergist*; developed a network; and distributed seed money. One of its projects, the University Year for ACTION, involved more than ten thousand students from over one hundred colleges and universities in the 1970s. Many campus-based service programs were started during this period. Some have vanished, but others still exist. In addition, regional and consortium programs emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, such as the Southern Regional Education Board's resource development internships, the Philadelphia Urban Semester (Great Lakes Colleges of the Midwest), Chicago Urban Semester (Associated Colleges of the Midwest), and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Urban Studies Term and City Arts (Higher Education Consortium for Urban Affairs, HECUA).

Although the National Center for Service-Learning was relatively short-lived, colleges and universities interested in service-learning continued to network through organizations that developed outside the federal agency. In 1978 the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSIEE; as of 1994, the National Society for Experiential Education, NSEE) was formed by fusing separate groups for field experience education and service internships. NSIEE became the repository and distributor for the considerable written resources on service-learning of the National Center for Service-Learning. Along a parallel track, the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning did much work to lay

the foundation for the acceptance of experiential education in colleges and universities (G. Hesser, personal communication, 1995).

Lessons Learned from the 1960s and 1970s

The service-learning movement that had acquired a foothold on college campuses in the 1960s and 1970s did not last. Kendall identifies three pitfalls that brought about the demise of many programs that involved college students in service:

1. Most of the programs were not integrated into the central mission and goals of the schools and agencies where they were based. . . .
2. Those in the community service movement learned several important programmatic lessons about the balance of power and the pitfalls of "helping others" or "doing good." . . . Paternalism, unequal relationships between the parties involved, and a tendency to focus only on charity—"doing for" or "helping" others—rather than on supporting others to meet their own needs all become gaping pitfalls for program after well-intentioned program. . . .
3. We learned that while it sounds great to help young people learn through service experiences in the community, the service experience does not ensure that either significant learning or effective service will occur [1990, pp. 8–10].

Kendall (1990) reports that a number of educators, community leaders, and students who believed in the potential of service-learning continued through the "me generation" of the late 1970s and the 1980s to identify the elements that need to be incorporated into successful, sustainable programs. Their work has served to encourage the recent great surge of interest in service-learning by institutions of higher education, students, communities, and the federal government.

Service-Learning Today

In 1985 college student community service gained new momentum. The Education Commission of the States began Campus

Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service. Campus Compact, an organization of college and university presidents who have pledged to encourage and support academically based community service at their institutions, now has over five hundred members. While the presidents were establishing Campus Compact, a group of recent college graduates formed the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) to encourage students to serve their communities. As a result, many student-initiated service projects were born, and COOL has an ever-expanding national network. COOL works with approximately one thousand colleges and universities, and more than two thousand students attend COOL's annual conferences. COOL's Critical Elements of Thoughtful Community Service have served as guides for the development of hundreds of high-quality community service projects (Campus Outreach Opportunity League, 1993).

From 1983 to 1989 consultants trained by NSEE, with support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, worked with more than five hundred colleges and universities to develop and strengthen experiential education. The consultations were based on the premises that service-learning (and all other experiential education) must be firmly rooted in the mission of the institution, involve faculty, be integrated into the curriculum, and be grounded in sound theory and pedagogical practice (Kendall, 1990).

In response to the burgeoning growth of community service and service-learning programs and the increasing awareness that effective service and learning do not necessarily happen automatically, NSEE began a process of articulating and refining a set of principles of good practice in 1987 (Kendall, 1990). The intense and thorough process culminated in a 1989 Wingspread conference hosted by the Johnson Foundation at which the *Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning* (Porter Honnet and Poulsen, 1989) were hammered out. Although there are numerous definitions of service-learning in wide use today recorded in articles, books, laws, and scholarly and institutional documents, all recent definitions are based on the key statement in the preamble to the Wingspread principles: "Service, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both" (Porter Honnet and Poulsen, 1989).

On the heels of the Wingspread principles, Kendall and associates published the seminal three-volume set, *Combining Service and Learning*, in 1990, under the auspices of NSEE, in collaboration with ninety-one national and regional associations. It brought together a wide range of resources on service-learning in K-12 settings, as well as higher education, including many previously published and new historical, theoretical, policy-related, practical, and programmatic pieces, plus an annotated bibliography of the service-learning literature. In the same year, Jossey-Bass became the first mainstream educational publisher to produce a volume on service-learning, *Community Service as Values Education*, edited by Cecilia I. Delve, Suzanné D. Mintz, and Greig M. Stewart.

The 1990s have seen a veritable explosion of literature and conferences on service-learning. In 1991 NSEE sponsored another Wingspread conference, which spawned the *Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s* (Giles, Porter Honnet, and Migliore, 1991). With the support of the Kellogg Foundation, the Office of Community Service Learning at the University of Michigan brought out *Praxis I: A Faculty Casebook on Community Service* (Howard, 1993); *Praxis II: Service Learning Resources for University Students, Staff, and Faculty* (Galura and others, 1994); and *Praxis III: Voices in Dialogue* (Galura and others, 1995). These volumes focus on curricular service-learning and are valuable for faculty in designing service-learning courses. In response to the call for published research on the effects of service-learning, the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* was launched in fall 1994. In the same year, NSEE published the *Service-Learning Reader: Reflections and Perspectives on Service* (Albert, 1994), a textbook designed to facilitate students' thoughtful reflection on their service experiences. Campus Compact continues to produce important resources, such as *Rethinking Tradition: Integrating Service with Academic Study* (Kupiec, 1993), *Redesigning Curricula: Models of Service Learning Syllabi* (Jackson, 1994), *Service Matters: A Sourcebook for Community Service in Higher Education* (Cha and Rothman, 1994), and *Service Counts: Lessons from the Field of Service and Higher Education* (Smith, 1995).

The national conferences and regular publications of many higher education associations whose primary focus is not service-learning or experiential education have featured large numbers of

speakers and articles on service-learning. Among these organizations are the American Association of Higher Education, the Council of Independent Colleges, the United Negro College Fund, the American Association of Community Colleges, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the American College Personnel Association, the National Association of Student Employment Administrators, the National Association of Campus Activities, and the Association of College Unions—International.

The federal government's interest in and support of service-learning increased substantially in the 1990s with the passage of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1990. This act represented the culmination of George Bush's 1988 presidential campaign recognition of "a thousand points of light," which inspired the creation of the first White House Office of National Service and the Points of Light Foundation. After the excitement created by Bill Clinton's presidential campaign for a large-scale national service program, a long and heated congressional debate finally culminated in the passage of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. As a result, the Commission on National and Community Service, ACTION, and the newly established National Civilian Community Corps merged to form the Corporation for National and Community Service, generally referred to as the Corporation for National Service.

In its first year, the corporation funded the creation of twenty thousand positions in the AmeriCorps national service program, as well as service-learning programs in both K-12 and higher education settings through Learn and Serve America. The corporation's programs have given tremendous impetus to service-learning in colleges and universities. Many institutions of higher education have entered into partnerships with community agencies and schools to engage college students in addressing a wide range of needs. AmeriCorps participants receive living subsidies plus a substantial postservice educational stipend to be used to pay off acquired educational debts or to finance future education and training. In addition, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 regarding student financial aid stipulated that beginning in July 1994, 5 percent of the federal work-study program funds allocated to each institution must be used to compensate students engaged in community service.

On September 8, 1994, President Clinton wrote a letter to all college and university presidents—the first time any president has ever done so for any reason—asking for their help in "inspiring an ethic of service across our nation." In response to the president's call to service, the American Association of Higher Education and Campus Compact convened the Colloquium on National and Community Service in January 1995. The colloquium has already spawned many additional meetings, workshops, and materials that deal with service-learning in higher education.

Institutional Traditions, Approaches, and Models

Different types of institutions have distinctly different missions, traditions, and approaches regarding service and service-learning. Some embrace service-learning as a philosophy and have developed programs that encompass the critical elements of reflection and reciprocity. Others support student involvement in community service to varying extents and may or may not include the fundamental concepts of service-learning.

At church-related colleges and universities like Notre Dame, Azusa Pacific, Messiah College, and Loyola College in Maryland, service-learning is firmly grounded in the institution's spiritual mission and in the quest for social justice. Other institutions, such as Rutgers, Baylor, and Providence College, have chosen to found their programs primarily on the relationship of service to citizenship, civic responsibility, and participatory democracy. At both private institutions like Stanford, Brown, and Bentley and public ones like Portland State, University of Washington, and Brevard Community College, a center for service-learning links service to academic study. The University of Richmond uses the connection of service and leadership as the basis of its program. The University of Minnesota, the University of Pennsylvania, Miami-Dade Community College, and Gettysburg College, as well as many historically black institutions (Clark Atlanta University, Chicago State University, and Southern University and A&M College), ground their service-learning programs in community partnerships and public problem solving. Some institutions whose service-learning programs are based on community collaboration are members of consortiums with other colleges and universities, including the

Shriver Center Consortium in Baltimore, the Urban Community Service Program in California, and the Regional Action Team in Colorado.

More and more institutions, among them Franklin and Marshall, Portland State, Alverno College, Waynesburg College, and Chandler-Gilbert Community College, have integrated service-learning into the core undergraduate curriculum. Many others envision service-learning as a way to achieve greater depth in a particular field of knowledge. Programs based in student affairs generally emphasize psychosocial, moral, leadership, and citizenship development, together with honing practical skills and deepening students' appreciation of individual differences and commonalities.

Service-learning programs exist at a wide range of levels of institutional commitment. At institutions where service-learning is central, it is a prominent and highlighted aspect of the mission; institutional funding is secure; policies explicitly support service; student, faculty, and staff involvement in service-learning is recognized and rewarded; and a strong commitment to service-learning is shared among all constituents. At the other end of the continuum are many colleges and universities where those who promote and attempt to coordinate service-learning remain on the periphery of their institutions' policies and practices, where funding is scarce and constantly in question, and where those who engage in service-learning feel isolated from the institutional mainstream.

Community service and service-learning programs are housed in various locations on campus. Student organizations were among the first coordinators of service programs, and many continue to be the institution's focal point for service. According to Campus Compact's 1994 survey of its members, offices such as student affairs and student activities are the most common home (45 percent) for service programs (Cha and Rothman, 1994). Religious institutions often house their service programs within the campus ministry, and many programs originated with campus ministers in public institutions as well. While some programs are based in career centers and internship offices, an increasing number each year are under the purview of an academic department or dean. And at some colleges and universities, service-learning

reports jointly to academic and student affairs, while at others, it reports directly to the president's office (Cha and Rothman, 1994).

Programs primarily associated with academic affairs tend to reflect a high institutional commitment; result in a more centralized, coordinated program; and risk overemphasizing learning and underemphasizing service. Programs housed in student affairs tend to be more flexible in responding to student needs and more open to student initiatives; respond more effectively to community needs; risk overemphasizing service and underemphasizing learning; are often of a lower priority to the institution and less stable financially; and are linked with only one academic department, if any (National Center for Service-Learning, 1980). Regardless of where service-learning is administratively located, it is the premise of this book that if service-learning is to be central rather than marginal, it must be integrated into both academic and cocurricular practice.

Moving from Community Service to Service-Learning

Observers of higher education and contemporary society strongly believe that higher education has a rich array of resources and tremendous potential to make a significant positive difference in meeting growing human needs and in addressing increasingly complex social and economic problems. However, although the public, together with many federal and state officials, may believe that colleges and universities are blessed with underworked faculty, fat operating budgets, and abundant staff, the reality is to the contrary. In what is actually a time of reduced public support, soaring costs, decaying infrastructures, and ever-diversifying student bodies with greater needs for services, institutions of higher education are thinking strategically about what they can and cannot do. More and more are harkening back to their fundamental missions and focusing more sharply on their primary purposes.

This is why this book is about service-learning rather than student volunteer or community service. If higher education is to sustain its historical commitment to service in this time of great societal needs and increased competition among its own priorities, it is essential that developing opportunities for students to engage in service-learning must also enable colleges and universities

to meet their own educational goals for students. Although community service has generally been perceived as a good thing, all good things cannot be the province of higher education. Service-learning, with its intentional goals for student learning and development, fits far more clearly into higher education's mission and priorities than volunteer or community service programs, which lack its reflection component and intentional learning goals.

The higher education community has turned much attention to the need to strengthen the quality of undergraduate education (Association of American Colleges, 1988; Boyer, 1988; Chickering and Gamson, 1987; Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, 1984; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). There are concerns about fragmented and incoherent curricula, lack of clarity about purposes and goals, absence of values, the need to integrate out-of-class experiences with education, and the need to prepare students better for the world of work. The Wingspread Group on Higher Education (1993) identifies at least three fundamental issues common to all U.S. colleges and universities: "taking values seriously; putting student learning first; and creating a nation of learners" (p. 7). As a means of addressing these issues, the group recommends that colleges and universities organize and sustain community service programs for large numbers of students and "wholeheartedly commit themselves to providing students with opportunities to experience and reflect on the world beyond the campus" (p. 10). Boyer proposes judging the quality of a college education by asking if "students see the connection between what they learn and how they live, looking for the deeper significance, for the moral dilemmas and the ethical responses" (1988, p. 296). He goes on to say that "the college succeeds as its graduates are inspired by a larger vision, using the knowledge they have acquired to form values and advance the common good" (p. 296). Chickering and Gamson (1987, p. 1) articulate seven principles for the improvement of undergraduate education, which point clearly toward service-learning:

Good practice in undergraduate education:

1. Encourages student-faculty contact.
2. Encourages cooperation among students.

3. Encourages active learning.
4. Gives prompt feedback.
5. Emphasizes time on task.
6. Communicates high expectations.
7. Respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

Another goal that service-learning effectively addresses is citizenship education and preparation for participation in a democracy. According to Frank Newman (1985), "If there is a crisis in education in the United States today, it is less that test scores have declined than it is that we have failed to provide the education for citizenship that is still the most significant responsibility of the nation's schools and colleges" (p. 31). It is virtually impossible to "teach" students what it means to be a citizen or to participate in democracy (Barber, 1993; Astin, 1994). "People cannot be told how to be responsible, knowledgeable, or caring citizens. They must be involved in the process" (Cirone, 1989, p. 5). Astin (1994) cites service-learning as the most effective means of accomplishing higher education's "stated mission: to produce educated citizens who understand and appreciate not only how democracy is supposed to work but also their own responsibility to become active and informed participants in it" (p. 24).

Besides preparing students for citizenship and democratic participation, higher education's goals include preparing them for the world of work (Boyer, 1988; Pew Higher Education Roundtable, 1994). Academic knowledge cannot be successfully applied without well-developed cognitive and social skills. In addition, students must acquire a set of transferable skills rather than prepare for a single lifelong career. Service-learning affords students opportunities to develop such skills as the ability to synthesize information, creative problem solving, constructive teamwork, effective communication, well-reasoned decision making, and negotiation and compromise. Other qualities that can be developed through service-learning include initiative, flexibility and adaptability, openness, and empathy. Service-learning in professional education leads to an increased sense of social responsibility on the part of physicians, lawyers, business leaders, government officials, and other key practitioners and decision makers.

Another shared goal among institutions of higher education is to develop students' appreciation of human differences and commonalities and to teach individuals to live peacefully and productively in communities that value persons of different races, genders, physical and mental abilities, religions, class backgrounds, and sexual orientations. Service-learning, which has as basic tenets reciprocity among those who are servers and those who are served and a reflective component with intentional learning goals, helps participants develop a deeper understanding of these issues, as well as how values and norms are socially constructed and the causes of social injustice.

It is unwise and inexpedient to propose a blueprint or model for institutional programs that involve college students in service to the local, national, and global communities. However, it is clearly in the best interest of students, communities, and institutions alike if higher education commits itself to service-learning rather than to community service and volunteer programs lacking service-learning's principles, which so clearly enable colleges and universities to meet their already established educational goals.

Conclusion

This chapter began by defining service-learning and clarifying its distinctions from volunteerism and community service. It has discussed higher education's tradition of service, the emergence of service-learning, and an overview of service-learning at today's colleges and universities. This introduction has also affirmed that service-learning is both curricular and cocurricular and can be designed to yield a wide range of outcomes for student learning and development, as well as for community enhancement. Service-learning is in fact a significant means through which higher education can achieve its overarching goals. Service-learning activities, be they course based or not, one-time or intensive, merit such designation if they include the basic elements of structured reflection and reciprocity. The remaining chapters of this book examine how educators can engage in the practice of service-learning to promote student learning, strengthen teaching and research, and bring human and other resources to bear on addressing society's problems and meeting its greatest needs.

References

- Albert, G. (ed.). *Service-Learning Reader: Reflections and Perspectives on Service*. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Experiential Education, 1994.
- Association of American Colleges. *A New Vitality in General Education*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1988.
- Astin, A. W. "Higher Education and the Future of Democracy." Inaugural lecture as Allan Murray Cartter chairholder, University of California, Los Angeles, Oct. 1994.
- Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., and Sax, L. J. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1994*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, 1994.
- Barber, B. R. "A Mandate for Liberty." In S. Sagawa and S. Halperin (eds.), *Visions of Service: The Future of the National and Community Service Act*. Washington, D.C.: National Women's Law Center and American Youth Policy Forum, 1993.
- Berry, H. A. "Service-Learning in International/Intercultural Settings." *Experiential Education*, 1988, 13(3), 3.
- Berry, H. A. "Reexamining Service-Learning in an International Context." Paper presented at the International Experiential Learning Conference, Washington, D.C., Nov. 1994.
- Bok, D. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Bok, D. *Higher Learning*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Boyer, E. L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: HarperCollins, 1988.
- Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Boyer, E. L. "Creating the New American College." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Mar. 9, 1994, p. 48.
- Campus Outreach Opportunity League. *Into the Streets: Organizing Manual, 1993-94 Edition*. St. Paul, Minn.: COOL Press, 1993.
- Cha, S., and Rothman, M. *Service Matters: A Sourcebook for Community Service in Higher Education*. Providence, R.I.: Campus Compact, 1994.
- Chickering, A. W., and Gamson, Z. F. *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*. Racine, Wisc.: Johnson Foundation, 1987.
- Girone, W. J. "Linkages Between Civic Literacy and the State History/Social Science Framework." Address to Constitutional Rights Foundation Area VI, Santa Barbara, Calif., May 1989.
- Coles, R. *The Call of Service: A Witness to Idealism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1993.

- Cruz, N. "Reexamining Service-Learning in an International Context." Paper presented at the International Experiential Learning Conference, Washington, D.C., Nov. 1994.
- Delve, C. I., Mintz, S. D., and Stewart, G. M. (eds.). *Community Service as Values Education*. New Directions for Student Services, no. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Ehrlich, T. "Taking Service Seriously." *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin*, 1995, 47(7), 8-10.
- Galura, J., and others. *Praxis II: Service Learning Resources for University Students, Staff, and Faculty*. Ann Arbor: OCSL Press, 1994.
- Galura, J., and others. *Praxis III: Voices in Dialogue*. Ann Arbor: OCSL Press, 1995.
- Giles, D. E., and Eyler, J. "The Theoretical Roots of Service-Learning in John Dewey: Toward a Theory of Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1994, 1(1), 77-85.
- Giles, D., Porter Honnet, E., and Migliore, S. *Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s*. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Experiential Education, 1991.
- Hackney, S. "The Roles and Responsibilities of Urban Universities in Their Communities: Five University Presidents Call for Action." *Universities and Community Schools*, 1994, 1-2, 9-11.
- Harkavy, I. "Community Service and the Transformation of the American University." In S. Sagawa and S. Halperin (eds.), *Visions of Service: The Future of the National and Community Service Act*. Washington, D.C.: National Women's Law Center and American Youth Policy Forum, 1993.
- Howard, J. (ed.). *Praxis I: A Faculty Casebook on Community Service Learning*. Ann Arbor: OCSL Press, 1993.
- Jackson, K. (ed.). *Redesigning Curricula: Models of Service Learning Syllabi*. Providence, R. I.: Campus Compact, 1994.
- Karasik, J. "Not Only Bowls of Delicious Soup: Youth Service Today." In S. Sagawa and S. Halperin (eds.), *Visions of Service: The Future of the National and Community Service Act*. Washington, D.C.: National Women's Law Center and American Youth Policy Forum, 1993.
- Kendall, J. C. "From Youth Service to Service-Learning." In A. C. Lewis, *Facts and Faith: A Status Report on Youth Service*. Washington, D.C.: Youth and America's Future: William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, 1988.
- Kendall, J. C. "Combining Service and Learning: An Introduction." In J. C. Kendall (ed.), *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service*, Vol. 1. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Experiential Education, 1990.

- Kerr, C. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Kolb, D. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1984.
- Kupiec, T. Y. (ed.). *Rethinking Tradition: Integrating Service with Academic Study on College Campuses*. Providence, R.I.: Campus Compact, 1993.
- Levine, A. "Service on Campus." *Change*, July/Aug. 1994, pp. 4-5.
- National Center for Service-Learning. *The Service-Learning Educator: A Guide to Program Management*. No. J302-513. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- Newman, F. *Higher Education and the American Resurgence*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985.
- Pew Higher Education Roundtable. "To Dance with Change." *Policy Perspectives*, 1994, 5(3), 1-12.
- Porter Honnet, E., and Poulsen, S. J. *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning*. Racine, Wis.: Johnson Foundation, 1989.
- Rudolph, F. *The American College and University: A History*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1962.
- Seidel, R. "Reexamining Service-Learning in an International Context." Paper presented at the International Experiential Learning Conference, Washington, D.C., Nov. 1994.
- Sigmon, R. *Linking Service with Learning*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges, 1994.
- Smith, M. *Service Counts: Lessons from the Field of Service and Higher Education*. Providence, R.I.: Campus Compact, 1995.
- Smith, M. W. "Issues in Integrating Service-Learning into the Higher Education Curriculum." In *Effective Learning, Effective Teaching, Effective Service*. Washington, D.C.: Youth Service America, 1994.
- Smythe, O. "Practical Experience and the Liberal Arts: A Philosophical Perspective." In J. C. Kendall (ed.), *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service*, Vol. 1. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Experiential Education, 1990.
- Stanton, T. "Service-Learning: Groping Toward a Definition." In J. C. Kendall (ed.), *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service*, Vol. 1. Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Experiential Education, 1990.
- Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. *Involvement in Learning*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1984.
- Wingspread Group on Higher Education. *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education*. Racine, Wis.: Johnson Foundation, 1993.