

## From the Margin to the Mainstream: Campus Compact's Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study

Keith Morton  
Marie Troppe

**ABSTRACT.** This article offers an introduction to service learning and a brief review of the research on the effects of service learning on academic and values development. It outlines in detail the history of Campus Compact, an organization of 517 college and university presidents founded in 1985, and its Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study. Lessons learned about institutionalizing service learning and information about resources for doing so are also summarized. The findings are based on a three-year, national project supported by the Ford Foundation and an anonymous donor, and two service-learning case studies.

### Service-learning

Service learning is a form of experiential education, deeply rooted in cognitive and developmental psychology, pragmatic philosophy and democratic theory. It shares a common intellectual history with organizational development and participatory action research. Service learning is rooted, as well, in the formal and informal systems humans have developed to care for one another over time, ranging from individual spiritual practices such as charity, to voluntary associations meeting community needs, to human services institutions and welfare systems.

This is all by way of saying that service learning has no singular or simple definition, and that it is informed by a range of intellectual traditions and values systems, many of which seem to contradict or compete with one another. Sociologists using service learning as a vehicle to reinforce lessons about the relationship between personal income and quality of health care, for example, might find that they have little in common with philosophers who use service learning to teach about the meaning and limits of "charity". Or, these two teachers might find that they share a common framework of distributive justice and have independently selected a chapter on membership, community and distribution of social wealth from Michael Walzer's *Spheres of Justice*.

While no singular definition can be offered, it can be helpful to approach service learning as a pedagogy that works from a set of common assumptions about how people learn. David Kolb, in his groundbreaking study *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, argues that "Learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (Kolb, 1984, p. 38). More to the point for business faculty, Kolb traces the shared lineage of experiential education and organizational development. Both emphasize subjective experience. For Kolb, the values of inquiry, choice and authenticity linked experiential education, organizational development and modern participative management philosophies.

In short, service learning theory begins with the assumption that experience is the foundation for learning; and various forms of community service are employed as the experiential basis

---

Keith Morton is assistant professor of American Studies and the Associate Director of the Feinstein Institute for Public and Community Service at Providence College in Providence, Rhode Island. He was Project Director of Campus Compact's Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study from 1992-1994.

Marie Troppe is the Project Associate for the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study at Campus Compact in Providence, Rhode Island.

for learning. These ideas are not new, and can be traced back at least to John Dewey and Jane Addams, who advocated for similar ideas beginning in the 1890s. Dewey recognized that people often learn best in teams, when they build upon what they already know, when they understand the purpose of what they are learning, when what they are learning clarifies their values, and through experimentation. In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1941) argued as well that education was the engine of democracy, and that locally based democracy was a political, cultural and social environment in which both individual and community could flourish.

Addams, in her turn, helped to transform the basic assumptions underlying the delivery of human services. What made her work revolutionary was the linking of two practices: systematically surveying the neighborhood surrounding Hull House (Addams' settlement house in Chicago) and insisting that, in the words of biographer Ellen Lagemann, "it was not for her to choose what services Hull House would offer. Hull House had to be ready to meet whatever needs its neighbors presented" (Lagemann, 1985, p. 25). The surveys were conducted jointly with social science faculty of the University of Chicago. Addams demonstrated the potential of working from an empirical, rather than a moral, definition of societal problems (Addams, 1910). In addition, Addams engaged current and recently graduated college students in service to the communities around her settlement houses.

### **Research findings on the effects of service-learning on academic and values development**

Three recent studies suggest that service learning is an effective pedagogy for teaching both course content (academic concepts) and values. Markus *et al.* (1993) conducted a comparative course section study of a large undergraduate political science course at the University of Michigan. They compared students in service-learning sections of the course to students in the more traditional discussion sections of the course. The results suggest that service-learning can enhance

students' intellectual development. In addition to having an effect on their personal values and orientations toward their community, the researchers "also found that students' academic learning was significantly enhanced by participation in course-relevant community service" (Markus *et al.*, 1993, p. 416).

The larger implications of their research are an insistence that community service is important in higher education because of its educational benefits and a critique of traditional "top-down" approaches to learning or an "information-assimilation model". In such a model, students learn through abstraction rather than through direct experience. The information-assimilation model can transmit large volumes of information quickly and coherently but doesn't prove especially useful in helping students with long-term retention of information.

Service-learning, in contrast, embraces learning as a "bottom-up" method, in which inductive reasoning is used to formulate general principles from direct personal experience. This approach is not known for its efficiency in transmitting large blocks of information, but it counters the abstractness of much classroom instruction. By engaging the student in real life situations, it motivates lasting learning.

In what is perhaps the most important point in their article, Markus and his colleagues conclude that educational institutions will value community service to the extent that it directly benefits students academically. They advocate for the integration of service learning with traditional classroom instruction and assert, "The kinds of service activities in which students participate should be selected so that they will illustrate, affirm, extend and challenge material presented in readings and lectures" (Markus *et al.*, 1993, p. 417). Reflection and discussion must be a part of class meetings.

A second comparative course section study was done with a large undergraduate mass communication and society course at a research university, also with positive implications for service-learning. Cohen and Kinsey (1994) reported that students and teaching assistants found experiential learning to enhance traditional teaching. They concluded: "Community service

tied directly to academics – service learning – carries the promise of success in its potential to transport the student beyond the limiting cultural bounds of the text/lecture forms of the campus and outward into the larger social context from which, and for which, we construct the institutions of education” (Cohen and Kinsey, 1994, p. 13).

In a third study, Boss (1994) compared students in two sections of an undergraduate ethics course. The only significant difference in the way the sections were taught was community service. Boss assessed both the content learning of the students, and then, with assistance from a developmental psychologist, used James Rest's Defining Issues Test to measure gains in moral reasoning. She found that the group of students engaged in community service had a slightly better grasp of the course content and made significantly greater gains in moral reasoning than their counterparts in the non-service section. “This supports”, writes Boss, “the claims of Kohlberg (1971) and Dewey (1939), as well as Gardner (1991), regarding the importance for moral development of real-life experience in confronting actual moral dilemmas” (Boss, 1994, p. 191).

If, as Markus, Cohen and Boss argue, service learning has the potential to be an effective pedagogy for both intellectual and moral development, why is it relatively uncommon on college campuses? Educators such as Jane Addams and John Dewey advocated for experiential, community-based learning as early as 1900. In the 1960s and 1970s, responding to the dramatic increase in urban violence, educators again sought to link service and higher education. Current national service programs gathered under the Corporation on National and Community Service were pre-figured in the University Year for Action, a federally funded program which involved 100 colleges and 10 000 college students in community service between 1971 and 1979.

Service learning is relatively uncommon, we argue, because of the general absence of institutional commitment to service learning by colleges and universities. Service learning is a relationship- and time-intensive pedagogy for both students and faculty. A sociology professor,

in a recent interview, commented that his service learning course was “a peak teaching and learning experience for me and the students that had some positive impact on the community. But”, he continued, “I don't know if I'll do it again soon”. He was hesitant, he said, because service learning took more time than other forms of teaching and it was time away from his personal research and publishing. He felt forced to choose between service learning and formal advancement in his discipline. A meaningful goal in institutionalizing service learning on a college campus is supporting faculty so that they do not feel forced into such Hobbesian choices.

### History of Campus Compact

The genesis and experience of Campus Compact and its Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study suggests some of what it means to institutionalize service learning on a college campus. Founded in 1985 with a membership of 23 schools, Campus Compact is now an organization of 517 college and university presidents committed to supporting community service on their campuses (see Table I). In addition, Campus Compact has 17 state offices and networks for historically black colleges and universities and community colleges. In 1992, 52 percent of the national Compact's members were also members of state Compacts. In 1995, that number stands at 74 percent.

Campus Compact was convened initially by

TABLE I  
Growth in membership

Year	# of Members
1985	23
1986	113
1989	202
1990	235
1991	260
1992	305
1993	380
1994	475
1995	517

Howard Swearer, Donald Kennedy, Timothy Healy and Frank Newman (then presidents of Brown University, Stanford University, Georgetown University and the Education Commission of the States), in response to growing public concern about the moral decline of college students, based largely on the annual student surveys conducted by Alexander Astin. The founding presidents believed that college students would willingly serve their communities if they were given the opportunity, and Campus Compact was founded to support this proposition. Brown University offered logistical, office and staff support to Campus Compact and so its office was established there. In 1994, Campus Compact's membership was: 49 percent private colleges and universities, 28 percent public four year universities and colleges, and 23 percent community colleges (all but 8 of the community colleges are public).

Over its ten-year history, Campus Compact's agenda for supporting community service in higher education has undergone two major revisions. When Campus Compact was founded in 1985, the primary emphasis was on increasing opportunities for voluntarism by college students, with a guiding vision of helping students develop as active citizens. Toward this end Campus Compact developed technical support for college campuses, including Campus Partners in Learning, a \$ 1.1 million mentoring initiative funded by the Carnegie Foundation.

The Compact also played a major part in supporting the legislative initiatives that ultimately became the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1990. It was this legislation, growing out of bipartisan efforts initiated in the mid-1980s by legislators such as David Durenberger (R, MN) and Edward Kennedy (D, MA) that established the federal Commission on National and Community Service under President George Bush. This Commission developed a grants program supporting a wide range of youth service initiatives and was the predecessor to the Corporation for National and Community Service created by President Bill Clinton (under the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993) and headed by Eli Segal. It is this Corporation which sponsors AmeriCorps, the

national service program that links community service to higher education benefits, and that made over \$ 10 million in grants available to higher education service programs in 1994.

The first revision to the Compact came in 1989, when Donald Kennedy and David Warren, then presidents of Stanford University and Ohio Wesleyan University and members of Campus Compact's executive committee, commissioned a study of faculty attitudes toward integrating community service into teaching and research. Community service, they reasoned, must be directly linked to the academic mission of higher education if it was to be fully institutionalized. This reasoning was born out by the results of Timothy Stanton's report, *Integrating Public Service with Academic Study: the Faculty Role*.

Stanton's report made three essential points: (1) expand and strengthen faculty participation by finding ways to recognize, reward and provide strong incentives for involvement; (2) define a faculty role in which they link students' public service with academic study; and (3) revise the curriculum with the objective of developing in students a sense of social obligation, an understanding of the values of democratic citizenship and the knowledge and skills necessary for effective citizen participation.

Building on Stanton's report (1990), Campus Compact's Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study was created to build community service into the core educational mission of higher education. (See Table II for a description of Campus Compact's organizational structure.) Over the past four years this project has worked intensively with 60 campuses (running the gamut of urban, rural, private, and public institutions) and consulted with perhaps 100 more. Compact member campuses who wanted to attend the Summer Institutes submitted a proposal outlining the status of service learning on their campuses and potential action steps for further institutionalizing service within the curriculum. A review panel selected those schools that demonstrated an initial commitment to service learning and could benefit most from the Institutes. The Project's objective throughout has been to help these campuses build community service directly into their teaching and research agendas. This has

TABLE II  
Organizational structure

Education Commission of the States		
CAMPUS COMPACT		
Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study*		
Invisible College	Regional Institutes	Technical Assistance

\* The Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study is just one of Campus Compact's projects.

meant developing some sophistication in institutional change, especially in the areas of curriculum, faculty development and strategic planning. Most participating campuses report that the number of service learning courses they offer has doubled, usually from ten to twenty courses, in the last three years.

The Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study (SAS) provides training, advice on strategy and technical assistance to colleges and universities that are working to build community service into their teaching and research. While we provide some resources for individual faculty (such as a database of courses and syllabi), we work primarily with campuses attempting to institutionalize service-based teaching and research. Campuses are typically motivated to integrate service into teaching and research by some mixture of concerns regarding citizenship, diversity or building community. Much of our actual work focuses on integrating service with the curriculum, because we recognize that the curriculum is the core institutional structure around which most campuses are organized.

In the most recent revision, Campus Compact's Executive Committee has begun discussing the responsibilities that higher education institutions have to their local communities. Sheldon Hackney, as president of the University of Pennsylvania, set the stage for this concern in his remarks at a 1991 conference on Universities, Community Schools, School-based Health Facilities and Job Training:

We have a long-term self-interest in the wholesomeness and quality of life in the neighborhoods around the University and in the vitality, environment and design of the city of which we are a part.  
... (Hackney, 1991, p. 29)

At a 1993 strategic planning meeting, a group of Campus Compact staff and member presidents began talking about higher education's broader commitment to "rebuild community on and off campus" (Morton, 1993, personal notes). It is likely that new program initiatives will reflect institutional concern with rebuilding community, a term that is generally recognized as covering a spectrum that ranges from, in the words of one president, "expanding neighborliness", to, in the words of another, "helping to rebuild local economies".

We recount this brief history because it reflects, to a large extent, the course of community service in higher education over the last ten years; and this brief history suggests some of the tensions that come into play as community service enters higher education. It is important to note that each iteration of Campus Compact's mission has been an addition to the previous commitments of the organization. Voluntarism is valued as well as academically based service; service of limited community impact is valued as well as institutional commitments to long-term community development.

Yet, voluntarism, while it may have intrinsic worth, does not necessarily teach citizenship, nor does it necessarily have a place as an option or requirement in a college course. Service opportunities designed to enliven or reinforce the content of a particular course do not necessarily lead to an improved quality of life in a community. These iterations represent different, if mutually reinforcing, goals. It is important for campuses to be clear about why they are undertaking a project or partnership.

### Institutionalizing service learning

As this brief history suggests, institutional commitment to service learning is vital over the long run. Eugene Rice, now director of the American Association of Higher Education's project on Faculty Roles and Rewards, has been a seminar leader at three of Campus Compact's national institutes on integrating service with academic study. He argues that, for the integration of service and academic study to be effective, to truly become part of the institutional life of campuses, we must connect service to a "legitimate" and deepening intellectual discourse; and make use of the reward systems currently operating in higher education.

When an academic department or a campus as a whole values service learning, the decision makers will commit funds to ensure its development. They will allocate faculty development funds to introduce faculty to the pedagogy of service learning. They will enable faculty to travel to conferences and workshops to find out how others in the same discipline or on similar types of campuses have implemented service learning. A staff person who can serve as a liaison between faculty and agencies in the community fulfills a critical role for faculty whose time is already stretched thinly.

In order to obtain these resources, a team of faculty and administrators need to serve as a core group committed to service learning and willing

to advocate for it. They need to be "organizationally literate" within their campus climate and, at times, entrepreneurial and opportunistic. The term "organizational literacy", as it is used here, is borrowed from Peter Senge's *The Fifth Discipline* (1990). Organizational literacy means knowing what is going on at your campus: knowing "how to get things done" through or apart from regular channels, understanding who's who, understanding the normative values of student, faculty and staff, and knowing the history and context relevant to the work you are trying to accomplish. While it's not possible to enumerate what the *sufficient* conditions are for institutionalizing service learning, it is possible to outline the *necessary* conditions.

As Table III suggests, an important initial task for the core planning group is demonstrating how service learning aids the campus in achieving its educational mission. Without this link, efforts easily fail. With this link, service learning becomes a vehicle for enhanced teaching and learning, greater student retention, and the creation of a true community of scholarly inquiry. Service learning can then gain greater status in the eyes of influential committees. Usually the most powerful committees on any campus are the Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, and Tenure and Promotion Committee. In these bodies, the faculty make decisions about curriculum content, graduation requirements, what kinds of research and teach-

TABLE III  
Common steps to institutionalizing service learning

- 
- 1) Demonstrate how service learning aids the campus in achieving its mission.
  - 2) Commit funds to ensure development of the service learning initiative.
  - 3) Form core team of faculty and administrators to advocate for service learning. Ideally, some of them would also serve on the Curriculum Committee, Tenure and Promotion Committee and/or Faculty Senate.
  - 4) Prepare the core team to be "organizationally literate" about the campus, aware of the history and context relevant to its work.
  - 5) Hire a staff person to serve as a liaison between faculty and community agencies.
  - 6) Allocate faculty development funds to introduce faculty to service learning pedagogy.
  - 7) Enable faculty to travel to find out how others in their discipline and others on similar types of campuses have implemented service learning.
  - 8) Provide release time for faculty to re-design their courses to incorporate service learning.
-

ing to reward, and how academic departments relate to the rest of the administration.

Based on the experiences of the five-person teams from 44 campuses that attended Campus Compact's 1991, 1992, and 1993 Summer Institutes on Integrating Service with Academic Study, we have developed a summary list of findings. Each campus was required to send a team of five people, including faculty members, administrators and community service coordinators, if the school employed such a coordinator. Without such a core team, the Project reasoned, chances of success were greatly reduced. These findings are based upon follow-up workshops with participants, written and phone interviews, site visits and progress reports.

- Campuses are generally adopting one of three strategies, with the first strategy being the most common: (1) integrating service into existing academic structure/classes; (2) organizing service-learning as a discipline or area of study (minors or certificates in community service, for example); and (3) affiliating service-learning with a leadership, citizenship or other "center" that is topical and interdisciplinary in nature.
- Campuses with the most success in achieving their plans are those in which the plan is congruent with a broadly understood and accepted mission, and is articulated in the language of the campus. Those leading the most successful initiatives tend to be somewhat opportunistic in finding ways to institutionalize service-learning. This success starts with their own "organizational literacy", the extent to which they know the campus and its competing agendas.
- The least success is achieved where there is not a commonly understood or accepted mission with which to connect, where the plan is inconsistent with the mission, or where the plan is viewed as too "new" or "different". Nearly half of the team leaders remarked that "change is incremental".
- Successful campus service-learning initiatives are those in which administrators, faculty and staff recognize the importance of long-term planning for resource devel-

opment, including space, staffing, and financial resources.

- It is very important that implementation of the plan be perceived as faculty driven. Where implementation is viewed as part of an administration's agenda, resistance is greatly increased and the plan is stalled. This is especially true on campuses in the midst of or just finished with curriculum review processes.
- Presidential and executive level support is a critical, if paradoxical, factor in the success of plans, with these people playing the two key roles of fund-raiser and protector. Often, presidents, vice presidents or deans make critical decisions about the allocation of short-term, soft funds that make or a break an initiative. Yet, executive leadership can be counterproductive if faculty and/or students perceive it as too strong or too directive. The ideal situation seems to be that of executive leadership support of faculty initiatives.
- Campuses view faculty course development grants and/or release time as the most important means for motivating faculty to re-work their syllabi.
- Start-up initiatives are very dependent upon the continuity of staff, faculty and/or administrative support. At least one-third of the campuses reported turnover among team leaders, presidents and provosts, and other significant changes in leadership since attending the Summer Institute. Such turnover suggests the need to develop and document institutional memory of the progress of service-learning initiatives.
- Those campuses with regular and rich communication among team members following the Summer Institute appear to be having the greatest success. Those with such open communication can most flexibly respond to the changing opportunities and challenges on their campus. Typically, the barriers to communication are the same barriers that stall implementation.
- Typically, campuses refine their rationale for integrating service and academic study as they work through the political and struc-

tural problems of implementation. The most common rationale is the relationship of service to citizenship.

- At least one-third of the campuses have doubled the number of courses having a service component since sending a team to the Summer Institute. An average of 20 courses with service components are offered on each campus.

We were also curious to know how other issues endemic to higher education affected efforts to integrate service and academic study. While we have yet to draw significant conclusions from the data, we anticipated that turnovers in leadership, fiscal crises or other external factors could influence success. As Table IV suggests, we found that the campuses participating in the summer institutes did experience significant changes in leadership. Addressing these changes often required teams to rethink their plans and expend extra energy, but leadership changes do not seem to have derailed what were otherwise solid plans. We also noted that nearly two-thirds of participating campuses elected to house service learning in academic, rather than student, affairs. This decision was of symbolic, as well as practical, importance.

We also found that since their teams attended the summer institute, 64 percent of campuses responding to the survey have written support for service learning into the ongoing campus budget, at an average amount of \$ 82 100 per year. A full 59 percent have committed additional staff or faculty time to integrating service with academic study. The campuses had offered an average of 11 courses that included service *prior* to the institute. Campuses reported having added a service component to an average of 10 more courses *since* attending the summer institute.

In addition to the above campus-based lessons, we have also outlined three general lessons for the service-learning field as a whole. First, we found that most campuses see evidence of the increasing legitimacy of service-learning on their campuses although service-learning is still not widely seen as a "serious" pedagogy in tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty believe that a profession-sanctioned forum for faculty presen-

TABLE IV  
Summer institute follow-up survey results

Since attending the Summer Institute:

a. our team leader(s) has/have

no answer	changed once	changed more than once	been the same person
4%	23%	9%	64%

b. our campus president/provost

has changed	has been the same person	will change soon
18%	73%	9%

c. our campus has experienced other significant changes in leadership

Yes	No
36%	64%

d. our campus has experienced other problems significantly affecting its priorities (i.e., state funding cutbacks, lawsuits. . .)

Yes	No
41%	59%

e. our service learning initiative is housed in

academic affairs	student affairs	both	no answer
64%	9%	23%	4%

Note: At the time of publication, 22 out of 44 campuses had responded to this survey.

tations and articles, as well as a national organization of faculty who teach service-learning courses, would increase service-learning's legitimacy. Faculty want discipline-based case studies and service-learning conferences to support their



efforts in incorporating service-learning into their courses.

Second, nearly all respondents expressed strong interest in evaluating the impact of integrating service and academic study. Such evaluation would ideally examine impact on grasp of course content, moral development, perceived relationship of student to larger community, and vocational decisions. Less universal, but of some interest, is assessing impact on communities in which service takes place.

Third, campuses are interested in addressing more vigorously the issues and processes of campus/community collaboration. As campuses become more sophisticated about relationship building in their surrounding community, they focus their partnership commitments more selectively, working with fewer agencies in a deeper way.

### Success and failure: Two case studies

It's easiest to imagine the implications of certain practices of institutionalizing service learning when placed in the context of actual cases. The following paragraphs outline two case studies, one an example of a campus successful at integrating service with academic study and one an example of an unsuccessful case.

*University A.* A large, public institution, had a small volunteer center. It was used mainly by fraternities and sororities whose members sponsored frequent one-time events such as fundraisers for non-profit agencies in the community. Most other students, 50% of whom commuted, rarely used the volunteer center as a resource. The university had a small group of faculty who had experimented with service learning in their courses, but who had not identified each other as engaging in similar efforts. Due to the size of the institution, faculty never had an opportunity to meet others outside their department; there was no annual faculty convocation or orientation for new faculty. The provost, concerned with the community's perception of the institution as "a research machine" that didn't focus on undergraduate teaching or service to the community,

appointed eight faculty members to a Task Force on Excellence in Teaching.

The task force identified service learning as one of several approaches that could improve undergraduate teaching on the campus. It enlisted the help of the Director of Faculty Development in creating a series of workshops and brown bag discussions for faculty interested in using service learning in their courses. The small group of faculty who had been engaging in isolated efforts at service learning found each other and formed a core team to promote service learning. The provost named one of them the Faculty Director of Service Learning. As such she was given release time to work with the volunteer center and other faculty members to re-design a set of existing courses to include service learning. She capitalized on the Greek organizations' interest in service by targeting the three or four majors most often selected by sorority and fraternity members. One such major was business; students who had previously worked on one-time fundraisers for community agencies now had the opportunity to engage in semester-long marketing and accounting projects for those agencies.

University A started out with few resources for institutionalizing service learning but developed them well by facilitating collaboration. A small volunteer center, a small group of interested faculty, and existing activities of student organizations provided a foundation on which institutional support for service learning was built. A visionary task force leveraged existing faculty development funds to help faculty members re-tool their courses. Knowing that faculty listen to their peers, the provost named a faculty member to direct service learning initiatives but didn't ignore the contributions that the volunteer center had made and could continue to make. University A was well on the road to institutionalizing service learning.

*College B.* A small, religious-affiliated liberal arts college, had a thriving volunteer center. Service to others was an important and acknowledged part of the campus mission. A high percentage of students, faculty and staff made individual commitments to volunteer in their community

but viewed these activities as separate from their work and life at the college.

A new president came in and announced that he wanted to make the college into a model known for its service learning focus. He courted the Curriculum Committee and, after a year, managed to push the passage of a service learning graduation requirement. The rest of the faculty resented what they perceived as an administration-driven decision that added to their workload without providing any incentives or support. The volunteer center, which had previously been reasonably successful, was overwhelmed with the increase in students' requests for placement assistance. Nor did the volunteer center have enough staff to train faculty in working with community agencies or to aid students in reflection on their service experiences. Without guidance from faculty or staff, students often settled for placements inappropriate to the college's requirement. Students perceived the service learning requirement as an "easy" block of credits, as hours that had to be completed without the hassle of writing a paper or reporting back in any academically rigorous way.

College B had some of the necessary ingredients for institutionalizing service learning but failed to use them effectively. It had a volunteer center, a mission that emphasized service, and a supportive president. But it did nothing to cultivate a broad base of support among faculty; instead the administration, albeit through a select group of faculty, mandated a service learning requirement. Faculty and staff were not even given the institutional support needed to implement the requirement successfully. In the face of these mistakes, faculty and student attitudes turned sour in relation to service learning.

Although characteristics of each case above are based on composites of real experiences of particular types of campuses, many of the points made are transferable across institution types. The first and most important decision remains: Will your campus ground service in the faculty and the academic experience or not?

### Other significant resources

In late 1995, Campus Compact published three case studies of institutions that participated in its Summer Institutes on Integrating Service with Academic Study. The publication documents obstacles to and effective strategies for institutionalizing service learning in various campus climates. We hope that many campuses will benefit from the experiences of campuses already on the road to institutionalizing service learning. In addition to the expertise of various campus teams, several national initiatives can provide important resources for interested faculty: Regional Institutes on Integrating Service with Academic Study, the Invisible College, national organizations and networks, a new service learning journal and a service learning discussion group on the Internet.

First, Regional Institutes on Integrating Service with Academic Study are offered at seven sites each summer to teams of faculty and administrators. The week-long seminars help teams develop concrete, workable strategic plans for institutionalizing service learning in the particular climate of their campuses. Contact Campus Compact at Box 1975, c/o Brown University, Providence, RI 02912 or call 401-863-1119 for details.

Second, the Invisible College is an expanding circle of educators who envision and model teaching linked to service and create sustained support for those who share this vision. The Invisible College grows out of the recognized need for an organized faculty voice in the development of higher education's community service agenda. Convened annually by the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study, the Invisible College is a nucleus for faculty voice and leadership that promotes the integration of service and learning in higher education. The Invisible College grew from 20 participants in 1994, its first year, to 60 members in 1996.

The educators are invited to participate in the Invisible College by attending an annual spring meeting at the Highlander Research and Education Center in Tennessee. Highlander was selected as the meeting place because of its long history with community organizing and social

change. More importantly, Highlander's philosophy is one of "educating to organize". Highlander encourages people to reflect on their own experiences and develop an action agenda from this reflection. This seems congruent with the "action/reflection" cycle of service learning. At the annual meeting the Invisible College participants discuss the personal and institutional issues they face in integrating service with learning. Based upon these discussions, they develop an action agenda that is intended to expand institutional support for integrating service and learning.

Twenty faculty selected by a planning committee gathered for the first annual meeting of the Invisible College at Highlander, May 10-12, 1994. Identifying their basic mission as faculty development leading to institutional change, the participants committed to three action items: (1) convene groups of faculty from their own campuses to create a dialogue supporting service learning; (2) act as convener of a national higher education gathering on service and learning (held in May 1995 in Providence, RI) with faculty and other educators as its main audience; and (3) develop and seek funding for a faculty development plan. Call Campus Compact at 401-863-1119 to find out more about the Invisible College. To learn more about the Highlander Research and Education Center, call 615-933-3443.

Third, the inaugural issue of the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (MJCSL) was published in September 1994. The inaugural issue was funded by a venture grant from the Michigan Campus Compact (with funds received from the Corporation on National and Community Service), and is seen as the next step in developing a publications arm for service learning through the Michigan Compact (following up on the already published *Praxis I*, *Praxis II* and *Praxis III*). MJCSL was the first service learning journal to be published. The journal is edited by Jeffrey Howard, Director of the Office of Community Service Learning at the University of Michigan. His intention is that the journal "enhance the perceived scholarliness of service learning as a field". The first issue includes research, pedagogy, and thoughtful

explorations of important, controversial and ongoing issues related to service learning. Write to the Office of Community Service Learning (OCSL) Press, University of Michigan, 2205 Michigan Union, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 or call 313-763-3548 for more information.

Fourth, Communications for a Sustainable Future and the Peace Studies Association at the University of Colorado at Boulder have established a service learning discussion group and database that can be accessed through Internet. Faculty, staff, students and administrators can use it to compare course syllabi and program models, discuss implementation strategies and express their views on critical issues in the field. To subscribe, send the message:

"sub sl (your full name)"  
to: listproc@csf.colorado.edu

Fifth, numerous organizations can serve as resources. Organizations like the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) and Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) have been active in the service learning movement for years. The former targets the broadest audience and tends most often to attract practitioners in the service learning field. The latter is a national organization of students. In the last year, several other important higher education organizations have started service learning initiatives, ranging from special projects, grant programs, and conferences to workshops, committees and publications. The Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), and the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities (ACCU) are examples of such organizations.

## Conclusion

Clearly, we believe a strong case can be made regarding the educational value of service learning and the need for institutional support. The primary message we wish to convey is that service learning's primary value to higher edu-

cation is that it improves educational outcomes. If service learning is to gain broader acceptance, further work is needed, however, in “deepening the intellectual discourse” connected with service learning and in researching the impacts of service learning on all the primary stakeholders: students, community and faculty. Service learning would benefit from the ideas percolating in other disciplines, such as the discussion of “caring” taking place in social philosophy and feminist studies, or the implications of chaos theory for social welfare delivery systems. Service learning would benefit, as well, from the practical experiences of educators primarily concerned with teaching values and ethics.

There is also a need for continued study of the impacts of service learning. While the three studies cited suggest that service learning is an effective pedagogy, they are isolated examples of such research. We are aware of no longitudinal studies at all that explore the impact of service learning on, say, later vocational choices, political participation or charitable giving. Much of the research available is “borrowed” from other fields, and energy is needed for developing more comprehensive “meta-analyses” of the field. It is a historic artifact of federal funding patterns, as well, that many valid research methodologies were developed in the 1970s and shelved by funding cuts before they could be applied. In short, service learning offers scholars from all disciplines rich opportunities for contributing their ideas, teaching and research.

### Acknowledgements

Funding for the Work of the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study described in this article has been provided by the Ford Foundation and an anonymous donor.

### References

- Addams, Jane: 1910, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (The Macmillan Co., New York).
- Boss, Judith: 1994, ‘The Effect of Community Service Work on the Moral Development of College Ethics Students’, *Journal of Moral Education* 23(2), 183–197.
- Cohen, Jeremy and Dennis Kinsey: 1994, ‘“Doing Good” and Scholarship: A Service Learning Study’, *Journalism Educator* 48(4), 4–14.
- Dewey, John: 1941, *Democracy and Education* (The Macmillan Co., New York).
- Hackney, Sheldon: 1991, ‘Papers from the Conference on Universities, Community Schools and School-based health Facilities and Job Training’, *Universities and Community Schools* 2(1–2), 28–29.
- Kolb, David: 1984, *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development* (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).
- Lagemann, Ellen: 1985, *Jane Addams on Education* (Teachers College Press, New York).
- Markus, Gregory, Jeffrey P. F. Howard, and David C. King: 1993, ‘Integrating Community Service and Classroom Instruction Enhances Learning: Results from an Experiment’, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 15(4), 410–419.
- Senge, Peter: 1990, *The Fifth Discipline* (Doubleday/Currency, New York).
- Stanton, Timothy K.: 1990, *Integrating Public Service with Academic Study: The Faculty Role* (Campus Compact, Providence, Rhode Island).

Feinstein Institute,  
Providence College,  
Providence, RI,  
02918-0001,  
U.S.A.

Email: kmorton@providence.edu