Western Libraries Faculty and Staff Publications   Western Libraries and the Learning Commons

Fall 2005

Communities for Growth: Cultivating and Sustaining Service-Learning Teaching and Scholarship in a Faculty Fellows Program

Carmen Werder
Western Washington University, carmen.werder@wwu.edu

Angela M. Harwood
Western Washington University, angela.harwood@wwu.edu

Leslie Ochs
Western Washington University, leslie.ochs@wwu.edu

Deborah Currier
Western Washington University, deborah.currier@wwu.edu

Shearlean Duke
Western Washington University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://cedar.wwu.edu/library_facpubs

Part of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons

Authors

Carmen Werder, Angela M. Harwood, Leslie Ochs, Deborah Currier, Shearlean Duke, Joyce D. Hammond, Lisa Moulds, and Karen Stout

Communities for Growth: Cultivating and Sustaining Service-Learning Teaching and Scholarship in a Faculty Fellows Program

Angela M. Harwood, Leslie Ochs, Deborah Currier, Shearlean Duke,
Joyce Hammond, Lisa Moulds, Karen Stout, and **Carmen Werder**
Western Washington University

We analyze a two-year Faculty Fellows Program designed to enhance the service-learning pedagogy and scholarship at a regional comprehensive university. The impact of the program was analyzed using initial questionnaires, meeting notes, final reports, and faculty reflective essays. Participation in a faculty fellows cohort program provided a sense of campus community, led to professional and personal development, and improved community and student outcomes. Findings indicated the supportive culture created through the program was central to its powerful impact; other positive outcomes were grounded in the sense of community that developed.

Given the current debates about higher education's role in promoting citizenship, advancing the scholarship of teaching and learning, and enhancing faculty development — expanding research about the faculty role in service-learning and analyses of service-learning faculty development are timely and appropriate. We provide context for considering faculty development by examining the shifting role of contemporary universities and their faculty. Addressing the recognized need for further scholarship on the faculty role in service-learning (Driscoll, 2000; Jones, 2001; McKay & Rozee, 2004), we follow the stated context with an analysis of a two-year Faculty Fellows Program designed to enhance service-learning pedagogy and scholarship at a regional comprehensive university.

Two current debates in higher education provide a helpful framework for considering service-learning faculty development: the role of universities in promoting civic engagement, and the changing definition of faculty roles and responsibilities. The continued call for universities to examine their role in students' civic education (Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Simpher, 2004; Erlich, 2000; Kezar & Rhoads, 2001; Ramaley, 2000) is important for those working in the service-learning field. Ramaley (2000) argues that becoming an engaged university requires institutions to reexamine their expectations for themselves as scholars and administrators, aspirations for students, and relationships with communities. Doing so, she maintained, requires recognition that community-based scholarship and collaborative discovery, as well as learning approaches linking educational goals with the challenges of life, can be achieved through community-university alliances. This shift has been framed as a return to higher education's historical

roots (Mauresse, 2001), and is promoted as a means to reenvision and reinvigorate higher education. A report from the recent Wingspread Conference (Brukhardt et al., 2004) stated that working toward a reinvigorated focus on civic engagement requires integrating it into mission statements, teaching and learning, forging partnerships to enable engagement, and creating radical institutional change. A concomitant outgrowth of this first shift in higher education is the second topic we consider — the "catalytic" (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999) impact of Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered* and the efforts to further refine his definition of the scholarship of teaching and learning (see, for example Cambridge, 1999; Diamond, 2002; Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Kreber, 2001a; Richlin, 2001; Smith, 2001; Zahorski, 2002). Faculty who engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning synthesize their knowledge about how to best facilitate student learning with their knowledge about the interaction between the learning process and the content of their discipline (Paulsen, 2001).

These two shifts are closely connected — to fulfill the mission of civic engagement requires a radical change in the approach to teaching at the university level. Engaging faculty in the scholarship of teaching and learning necessitates attention to faculty development issues such as professional growth, career development, and faculty vitality. Criteria for assessing such scholarship includes shared public accounts of teaching, emphasis on learning outcomes and relevant teaching practices, discipline and pedagogical knowledge, and innovation (Theall & Centra, 2001). Suggestions to foster the scholarship of teaching and learning include establishing departmental reading circles on learning, facilitating collaborative action

research, providing workshops and seminars on educational theory and research, and allowing faculty to contract for and focus on their scholarship of teaching and learning (Kreber, 2001b). This sharpened focus on revised faculty roles has provided a springboard for considering how universities should foster faculty development in general (Gillespie, 2002; Mintz; 1999; Sorcinelli, 2000).

Strengthening Service-Learning Faculty

How are faculty best prepared to meet the changing demands of their reenvisioned role as scholars of teaching, and helped to fulfill institutional missions for civic engagement? And what motivates faculty to implement service-learning, and what might deter their decisions to do so? The literature on service-learning faculty answers some of these questions and raises others.

Earlier writings about assisting faculty in their service-learning course development focused on establishing the essential elements of such programs and describing emerging faculty development efforts. Rather than having faculty "accidentally" discover service-learning, Bringle and Hatcher (1995) outlined "a more deliberate, organized, and centralized approach to faculty development that would yield more tangible results more quickly" (p. 113). Other authors built on this work by describing programs designed to enhance faculty understanding of service-learning (Jones, 2001; Rice & Stacey, 1997). Faculty development is viewed as an intervention designed to sustain and improve curricular reform. It is intended to help faculty grow in scholarship associated with the pedagogy, leadership for other faculty, and service-learning advocacy (Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997).

Although research on the impacts of faculty development programs is scant, it is emerging. Stanton (1994) reported that a week-long Campus Compact faculty seminar resulted in successful development of service-learning courses, with varying levels of implementation. In addition, McKay & Rozee (2004) identified the opportunity to share and exchange ideas with others as a direct benefit of participating in course development workshops.

Understanding the characteristics of faculty who implement service-learning and the barriers they face further helps understand how to support them. The most frequently cited barrier is lack of time (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Hammond, 1994; Stanton, 1994); institutional context (McKay & Rozee, 2004; Stanton); logistics, funding, student and community outcomes, or pedagogical concerns, (Abes et al.; Hammond; McKay & Rozee); and university reward structures (Abes et al.). Motivating factors for faculty who engage in service-learning include having specific goals and understanding relevant learning theory and models (Stanton), institutional support (Abes et al.; Hammond; Stanton), personal experience doing service (Hammond); community-centered factors (Abes et al.; McKay & Rozee) and improved student outcomes (Abes et al.; Hammond; Hesser, 1995; McKay & Rozee).

Given that faculty are the key to building long-term capacity for universities to engage in service-learning (Kendall, 1990), there is still much to learn about effectively supporting them in their efforts (Driscoll, 2000). To expand the existing knowledge base about service-learning faculty, in this study we sought answers to the following questions: (a) What barriers do faculty perceive to adopting service-learning pedagogy? (b) What issues present challenges as they implement service-learning courses? (c) How might participation in a structured program designed to help faculty examine their pedagogy and scholarship contribute to faculty development? To address these questions, we used data drawn from initial and exit faculty questionnaires, reflective essays, and an analysis of meeting minutes.

Method

Participants

Sixteen faculty members (13 females and 3 males) from a range of disciplines and at varying stages in their academic careers are participating in the Faculty Fellows Program. The sample includes tenured ($n = 6$), tenure-track ($n = 7$), and limited-term ($n = 3$) faculty from 13 different departments and programs: Sociology, Theatre Arts, Journalism, Art, Anthropology, Women's Studies, Community Health, Communication, Biology, English, Sociology, Secondary Education and Business Management. Of the 16 participants, 10 had previous experience teaching service-learning courses and 6 had none. Of the experienced service-learning faculty, seven had worked previously with the University Center for Service-Learning staff to create and implement courses.

Program description

Faculty Fellows engaged in a structured two-year program co-facilitated by the Center for Service-Learning Director and the Distinguished Faculty Fellow. The Distinguished Faculty Fellow was chosen because she has eight years of experience integrating service-learning, developed a seminar in service-learning pedagogy for the Woodring College of Education, and had published research- and practice-based articles. As recipient of the University's Excellence in Teaching Award, she possesses the credibility the service-learning literature suggests for

leaders to help institutionalize practice (Hudson & Trudeau, 1995; Prentice, 2002).

Under the guidance of the faculty mentor and center director, the two-year pilot program began in fall 2003. The program builds sequentially and provides background readings and skill-building activities designed to help faculty create sound course syllabi. They develop their service-learning rationale, articulate measurable learning outcomes connected with course concepts, identify authentic assessment and reflection strategies, and build the community partnerships necessary for successful service-learning courses. First-year *Teaching Fellows* concentrate on these essential service-learning pedagogical concepts. All fellows attend monthly cohort meetings with four to six participants, during which they discuss one major pedagogical topic, and "pressing issues" they face while planning or implementing service-learning approaches. Second-year *Scholarship Fellows* build on the sense of community established the first year to engage in supportive discussions of advanced practice and participate in both individual and collective scholarship.

Procedure

Reported data are drawn from initial questionnaires, transcriptions of faculty fellows meetings, final faculty reports, and faculty reflections. In analyzing each set of data, we employed the analytic induction method of analysis (Bogden & Bicklen, 1992). In this approach, themes emerge from the data and are constantly tested and re-tested as additional data are analyzed. Initial faculty questionnaires ($N = 16$) were administered at the beginning of each of the two years of the program. On these questionnaires faculty articulated the design for their service-learning "dream course" and identified their needs and perceived barriers to making it happen. All responses to the question about barriers were recorded and tabulated. Responses were then categorized by content.

At each meeting, faculty raised any questions, concerns, or topics they wanted to discuss as they planned for and engaged in teaching service-learning courses.

Meeting notes and transcriptions of tapes from 17 cohort meetings provided data on challenges faculty faced as they implemented service-learning. Each topic raised during the "pressing issues" discussion segment of each meeting was noted and categorized ($N = 66$).

Data illuminating the impact of participation in the Faculty Fellows Program was provided by faculty from the first year of program operation only, and consists of information contained in their final summary reports ($N = 8$) and reflective essays ($N = 6$). Faculty completed the final reports at the end of the 2003-04 academic year, and were specifically asked to list "outcomes of participation in the Faculty Fellows Program" for faculty, students, community partners, and the university. Faculty impacts listed on the final reports were categorized and tabulated, yielding 21 coded data points.

Finally, to provide triangulation for final report data and explore in more detail the impact of the fellows program, second-year faculty were invited to write reflective essays on the impacts of their participation as fellows. This set of qualitative data was analyzed following a form of analytic induction (Glasser & Strauss, 1999; Patton, 1990) in which the categories emerge from the data. The first round of analysis took place when fellows met and read their essays to one another. As the data were presented, we generated coding categories together. Those categories were then refined and used by two researchers in a first round of open coding. These researchers then met and discussed the coding scheme and data; codes were added, categorized, and combined during that session. The final round of coding was conducted by the lead researcher and an additional coder who had not been involved in previous coding sessions. The final coding yielded 142 coded data points with an inter-rater reliability of 89.5%.

All appropriate means for securing human subjects were approved through the campus Institutional Review board. Faculty granted permission to use data from their questionnaires, reports, and the fellows meetings. Occasionally during fellows meetings faculty requested to go "off record" when discussing politically sensitive or personal issues; those issues were not included in our analysis.

Results

Our findings on barriers perceived by faculty are consistent with those reported by previous researchers. Our central finding is that by establishing a reflective community of supportive colleagues, faculty were able to address the barriers and challenges of service-learning, resulting in scholarly professional development and enhanced personal growth.

Perceived barriers to implementing service-learning

In all, 51 issues were listed as barriers (see Table 1). Time was the most frequently listed barrier ($n = 20$). Faculty were concerned about the shortage of time in the University's quarter system and its impact on students and faculty. One wrote "Huge concerns about how much time this could consume — always feel strapped for time already" and another "intellectual overload — how to think about all of this at once (given all my other duties?)." Others noted that "stu-

Table 1
Potential Barriers Identified by Faculty

Barrier	Number of Instances
Time	20
Student-Related	9
Inadequate Materials & Resources	7
Connecting with Community	5
Attitudes of Others	5
Pedagogical	3
Need for Support Services	2

Note. ($N = 51$)

dents need time to gain experience in scientific studies and to adequately assist local organizations" and concerns related to the curricular impact, including "course format too short" and "already FULL curriculum." The second most frequently mentioned barrier was student issues ($n = 9$), which ranged from concerns about student skills, to "potential for student free-riding," concern for student safety, and "how to prepare students for those problematic situations such as factionalism within an agency, sexual harassment, etc." Faculty also listed inadequate materials and resources ($n = 7$), the difficulty of connecting with community partners ($n = 5$), colleagues' attitudes ($n = 5$), how to handle pedagogical issues ($n = 3$) and the need for support services ($n = 2$) as barriers to their service-learning practice.

Pressing issues raised by faculty implementing service-learning

Once faculty decided to integrate service-learning they still faced many challenges as they led their students through this complex approach. As summarized in Table 2, faculty raised the following as "pressing issues" ($N = 66$): pedagogical challenges, difficulties working with community partners, institutional issues, student issues, and risk management concerns.

Faculty most often raised pedagogical challenges ($n = 22$) during fellows meetings. Topics raised included fundamental issues of service-learning pedagogy ($n = 11$), ranging from the role of volunteerism vs. learning, to identifying and teaching to stated outcomes. Other topics included bridging the gap

Table 2
Pressing Issues Raised by Faculty

Issue	Number of Instances
Pedagogical	22
Community Partner	18
Institutional	11
Student	11
Risk Management	3
Service-Learning Publication	1

Note. ($N = 66$)

between academics and social issues and integrating reflection activities. Faculty discussed monitoring the instructional process ($n = 6$), tracking problems such as "how to handle the messy process of students working at different paces and not knowing what is going to come out of the project" and handling shifting project definitions. The third area of pedagogical concerns was assessment ($n = 6$), including grading and compiling assessment data.

The challenges of working with community partners as coteachers was frequently discussed during fellows meetings ($n = 18$). Examples of community challenges faced by faculty include choosing appropriate agencies, helping community partners understand the goals and outcomes of the course and their role, establishing and maintaining healthy communication, and dealing with problems that arise as students work with agencies.

Although not described as *challenges* to implementing service-learning, a range of institutional issues ($n = 11$) were brought forth in pressing issues discussion. Examples of institutional issues include the campus general education reform initiative, issues related to the Center for Service-Learning (e.g., budget and locating it at an off-campus community-based site), bringing community partners into existing teaching and learning programs on campus, and faculty-to-faculty communication.

Student issues ($n = 11$) were a frequent topic during pressing issues discussions. Defining a reasonable project workload and helping students handle it, engaging students in the learning process, and defining student roles were all discussed. In addition, a topic discussed during more than one quarter was what one faculty termed the "mid-quarter students work-load freak out" — helping students through the difficult phase when their projects might not yet be coming together cohesively. Other examples of student-based concerns are helping students negotiate problem scenarios within their agencies and resolving conflicts between students' religious beliefs and the stance of their community partner.

Impact of participation in the Faculty Fellows Program

The data from final faculty reports and faculty reflective essays yielded 163 coded data points. Faculty clearly indicated that the underlying factor contributing to all of these outcomes was the creation of a reflective community of colleagues. As one fellow expressed it, "the regular conversations with my service-learning colleagues enabled me to *think through* the challenges I was experiencing in using service-learning pedagogy — not just live through them." In all, faculty identified five primary program outcomes: (a) a reflective community of faculty; (b)

Table 3

Impacts of Participating in the Faculty Fellows Program

Outcome	Number of Responses	Number of Faculty Indicating Outcome
Reflective Community of Faculty	**60**	**8**
pedagogical support	40	8
networking/mentoring	9	4
socialization of newcomers	5	3
relationship-building	3	2
general	3	2
Scholarly Professional Development	**48**	**8**
scholarship of teach. and learning	24	8
research support	16	5
scholarship of integration	8	5
Enhanced Personal Growth	**25**	**6**
attitudinal shifts	19	6
personal support/friendship	5	2
general	1	1
Improved Student Outcomes	**22**	**4**
affective	4	2
professional	7	4
relevant learning	7	3
connecting with community	3	2
understanding the learning process	1	1
Positive Community Impact	**8**	**5**
university/community relations	3	3
impact on cmty. members	5	2

Note. ($N = 163$)

scholarly professional development; (c) enhanced personal growth; (d) improved student outcomes; and (e) positive community impact. These data are summarized in Table 3, and are addressed in the following sections.

Developing a reflective community of faculty. The most frequently mentioned outcome ($n = 60$) in both the final faculty reports and faculty reflections was that the Faculty Fellows Program offered a time and space for like-minded faculty to engage in discussions about teaching. This enabled them to provide one another with pedagogical support, network and mentor, build relationships, and facilitate the socialization of young faculty. Elements of pedagogical support described by faculty include input on teaching, group analysis and trouble-shooting, shared expertise, support, and encouragement. The following quote is representative of the pedagogical support that came through engaging in a community of faculty:

> It is midterm. Students are in a panic. They are trying to put together a focus group to perform some badly needed research for their service-learning community partner. Not enough people have signed up for the focus group so students decide to cancel. Unfortunately, because of a break down in communication among students, an important donor for the nonprofit community partner is not informed that the focus group is canceled. She shows up at 7 p.m. to find the meeting room dark and no one around. The donor is fuming, while the students are desperately trying to blame someone else for their mistake. Two students end up crying in my office, two wind up in a shouting match, another threatens to withdraw from class. Such incidents are unusual, but when they happen it is good to know that you are not alone. As a member of the Faculty Fellows in service-learning, I know that I can count on my colleagues for support and advice when challenges like this arise. (Faculty #6)

Other faculty wrote "our 'burning issues' discussions provide us with a forum to deal with logistical and student concerns associated with service-learning." The shared expertise and importance of working with like-minded colleagues was frequently mentioned. Examples are "As a 'think-tank' we swap ideas, think through strategies for solving knotty situations in service-learning classes, and expand each others' knowledge of the many forms service-learning may take," and "the events I was experiencing in my service-learning class was exactly what they had been experiencing. I was not alone."

Fellows identified the importance of connecting with faculty at varying stages of their careers. Faculty wrote of the "wonderful mentoring and guidance" and how other fellows served as role models. The net-

working also provided important interdisciplinary opportunities for both faculty and students. As one fellow expressed, "My connection with the service-learning fellows has opened doors for cross-curricular learning simply because I am able to advise my students more appropriately as to the services and faculty available to them on campus for various needs."

Finally, three junior faculty mentioned that the fellows program provided important socialization for them. They wrote of how the program helped to connect them to the University:

> The Faculty Fellows Program has provided me with community. I joined the program in my fourth year at the University; to that point, I had primarily developed relationships in my (small) department (with only one other female tenure-track colleague). As a junior faculty member trying to take root in the university environment, I needed a better view of the landscape and honestly felt lost. (Faculty #4)

One faculty member provides a nice summary for the results related to the development of community in her final reflection: "The faculty member coordinating our Faculty Fellows Program created what Kina S. Mallard has called a 'community of dialogue,' where scholars feel that their individual well being is being addressed, where the 'soul of scholarship' can thrive (Faculty #1)." By providing a sense of community within the faculty group, the program created the foundation for fellows to grow as scholars and individuals, summarized in the next two sections.

Scholarly professional development. The second most frequently mentioned impact is the scholarship of teaching and learning, research, and the scholarship of integration ($n = 48$). The program engaged participants in examining their pedagogical practice. This outcome — the scholarship of teaching and learning — was identified by one faculty member who wrote "of direct personal benefit has been the intellectual stimulation in discussing the pedagogy of service-learning and having a context for discussing the scholarship of teaching and learning." Another fellow noted that the program "encouraged me to spend time (in both quality and quantity) evaluating my teaching, which I have found meaningful," and a third fellow stated:

> Not only did they help me sort through the practical concerns of communicating effectively with community partners and the curricular challenges of embedding service-learning into learning outcomes, but they enabled me to think about and analyze my instructional experiences in a scholarly way. (Faculty #1)

The discussions of teaching led participants to new understandings of service-learning pedagogy, as expressed in the following two examples:

> A colleague, who was familiar with my work, suggested that I apply for the Faculty Fellows Program because as she said, "You're already doing service-learning anyway." In fact, she was only partially right. Yes, I was practicing the concept, but I would have been wrong to call what I was doing service-learning. The Faculty Fellows Program helped me realize that, and helped me formalize what I call my "seat of the pants" approach to service-learning. (Faculty #6)

In addition to engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning, new and experienced faculty both reported that the fellows program provided support for their growth as researchers:

> The second year Fellows Program, designated by group consensus to have a focus on writing, has been a wonderfully productive experience for me. . .As an academic who has written and published mostly in isolation, I have found the supportive atmosphere of our writing fellows group to be very nurturing. (Faculty #3)

Another faculty member indicated agreement, stating "Our development of a writer's club has been invaluable. My writing has improved on multiple levels; I have learned to work in a writing group, gained confidence and satisfaction in my writing, and learned handy writing and grammar lessons."

Faculty also mentioned that the program helped them establish their scholarly agenda. One fellow wrote that although she had never previously engaged in scholarship about service-learning,

> After my involvement with the faculty fellows group, I began to document the process and began to focus my research on the use of service-learning in public relations. . .As a result, I have written and presented one conference paper, have another in the works, and have a larger service-learning research project planned. (Faculty #6)

Finally, faculty who participated in the fellows program engaged in the scholarship of integration, in some cases reenvisioning departmental programs and in others connecting the theory and concepts of service-learning pedagogy in new and creative ways, leading in one case to a faculty member rethinking her entire disciplinary approach:

> My experience with service-learning in the class and with the Faculty Fellows Program has influenced my ideas about how we are training community health educators for their profession. Not only are the professional core competencies important in training health pro-

fessionals but there is a holistic component (compassion, empathy, understanding, etc.) that we do not include. Throughout my career I have been wondering about this component and how to present holistic growth experiences for students. I have been thinking about this, collecting data about this and working through my ideas with the faculty fellows group. (Faculty #5)

Enhanced personal development. "It is almost impossible to separate the affective benefits from the pedagogical gains that participating in this service-learning group has provided" began one faculty reflection. In addition to the increased sense of community and professional development, the six faculty reflections contained 25 impacts that were coded as "personal development." Attitudinal shifts reported by faculty included increased confidence in their scholarship and teaching, inspiration and motivation to work, and renewed commitment to and interest in their careers. As one faculty member wrote:

I used to be afraid and anxious when I felt things weren't going well and how could learning possibility happen? I learned that these are the types of learning opportunities I was trying to create. I was just unsure of myself and my ability to turn these moments into important learning experiences. (Faculty #5)

Others echoed this sentiment, writing "By engaging in group problem-solving and discussion, I have learned to think about problems creatively, which helps me feel confident about future situations and myself" and:

When the Director of the Center for Service-learning said, "you have important ideas to add to the field" — I believed it and began writing it up. When the Distinguished Faculty Fellow brought us special notebooks for our emerging scholarly articles and then special calendars to plot in writing time, I felt affirmed that what I had to say was worth pursuing and worthy of submission. (Faculty #1)

This increased confidence resulted in inspiration and a determination to continue service-learning practice. As one fellow wrote, "Because my faculty fellow colleagues expressed genuine interest in what I was thinking about service-learning and first-year students, I felt inspired — even compelled — to write about it." Another fellow wrote that in the group, "I can strengthen my own convictions and further explore the value of community-based learning for students." A third fellow reflected, "Teaching can be hard, and sometimes lonely work. The faculty fellows group inspired me during long, exhausting days, supported me with encouraging words, and

challenged me to stay committed." Finally, another fellow summed up her newfound drive:

This program has motivated me to accomplish my research, not because I have to for tenure, but because I want too. This has significantly increased my confidence in my writing and my self. Further, working with my colleagues has also rekindled my love of research and writing — something I had almost lost in the push for tenure. (Faculty #4)

Student and community impacts. In addition to indicating how the Faculty Fellows Program directly impacted their personal and professional development, faculty wrote about how their students and community partners were affected. Although these outcomes are not central in answering our major research questions, faculty pointed to the critical relationship between their growth and outcomes for students and community. They perceived affective, skill-building, and career development as student benefits derived from engaging in real-life and relevant instruction. Faculty also indicated important community benefits. Their partners reported "I was unaware that the service-learning center had so much to offer in terms of experience and connection with the University." Partners benefited from networking with each other as a result of improved programming, viewed themselves as cofacilitators in student learning, and regarded "the university more as the valuable resource it is, rather than an exclusive academic institution 'on the hill.'" One fellow wrote that "The University's support of the Faculty Fellows Program led to more open communication between the community and the faculty, thereby creating opportunities to capitalize on the resources of both parties."

Discussion and Implications

Barriers

Our findings are consistent with those previously reported. In our study, as in many others, faculty report that time concerns are a big barrier, as are student and community concerns, lack of resources, attitudinal issues, and the need for support (Hammond, 1994; Stacey & Foreman, 1999; Abes, Jackson, & Jones, (2002); Stanton, 1994). The consistency of these findings underscores the importance of the existence of campus resource centers that can assist faculty as they endeavor to transform their teaching. Although more time cannot be created for faculty, by easing the logistical barriers and helping them establish community contacts, we can lower these barriers. Administrators should strongly consider released time for course development and reduced teaching loads for service-learning faculty if they want to

encourage use of the pedagogy. This will be especially important in working with "second-generation" adopters of the pedagogy, who may be less motivated than early adopters and therefore less willing to tackle these thorny issues on their own (McKay & Rozee, 2004).

Pressing issues facing faculty

Once faculty decide to integrate service-learning into their courses, it is critical to recognize the issues that concern them as they engage in teaching. Navigating the murky waters of a teaching pedagogy that can be so impacted by others poses many challenges. Elements of implementing the pedagogy and working effectively with community partners and students were recurring elements of concern for faculty fellow participants in this study. Although every issue raised by faculty in our pressing issues discussions was contextual to their own experience, those who have worked in the field supporting faculty may recognize these as common concerns faculty face as they implement service-learning. These concerns underscore the need for these components to be thoroughly addressed in faculty development programs initially, but also the need to provide a forum for discussion of such issues while faculty engage in their practice. Failure to do so may result in negative experiences for faculty that would affect their future use of service-learning. Providing consistently scheduled time and space for faculty to meet and discuss teaching challenges was important to our fellows.

Impacts of participating in the Faculty Fellows Program

Adopting innovative pedagogy such as service-learning is a challenging prospect for many faculty. It is therefore imperative they be given support to develop and refine their teaching practice, philosophy, and scholarship. Our data show a range of benefits to be derived from faculty development programs specifically targeted to enhance teaching and scholarship skills.

Establishing a reflective community of faculty with shared expertise was important to our fellows and is consistent with previous research documenting the influence of colleagues and the importance of their support (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; McKay & Rozee, 2004). Because service-learning faculty share similar attitudes and values (McKay & Rozee), they need an affinity group that enables them to examine practice, stay motivated, and address barriers they encounter. The program successfully created a culture for faculty to practice the art of encouragement, and provided research support and collaborative scholarship opportunities. Each of these elements is noted by faculty development experts as essential for effective programs. (Clark, Corcoran, & Lewis, 1986; Sorcinelli, 2002; Zahorski, 2002).

The program employed characteristics of a supportive teaching culture (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999) by establishing frequent interaction and ongoing dialogue in a caring environment in which colleagues see and affirm the consequences of each other's work — all characteristics found to enhance faculty performance (Bowman, 2001). Such supportive cultures are also reported to enhance new faculty socialization, which could help counteract the challenges of loneliness or lack of collegial support faculty face as they seek to fit in at new institutions (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Junior faculty participants in this study indicate that the program fulfilled this function for them.

Faculty reports clearly indicated that the program engaged them in the primary elements of the scholarship of teaching and learning. The development from novice to expert scholars of teaching includes developing theory and technical skills, analysis and reflective critique of one's teaching, dialogue with colleagues, and then developing scholarly knowledge that has significance and impact for the field (Smith, 2001; Weston & McAlpine, 2001). Our participants' reflections indicate this development. By collectively exploring and investigating teaching and learning phenomena, and collaborating in writing this piece, fellows engaged in the other critical elements of the scholarship of teaching and learning: making it public and susceptible to critical review, and making it accessible for exchange and use by other members of the scholarly community (Theall & Centra, 2001).

Fellows also reported that the program helped them to develop their personal research agenda and consider the service-learning field as a potential focus for their scholarly work. Although not recorded in their reflections, the productivity of the second-year scholarship fellows is impressive. At the time of writing, scholarship fellows have several service-learning papers under review and in progress, and accepted and pending conference proposals. This productivity, along with their commentary, provides data that help to answer the question of how faculty development programs impact scholarship in service-learning (Driscoll, 2000), building on initial data that suggest that engaging in service-learning teaching influences scholarship (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996). Explicitly stating scholarship goals, as the scholarship fellows did, no doubt contributed to their high level of productivity, as Lucus (2002) suggested it may.

The development of our fellows' scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship, and community partnering skills is in accordance with what Kezar & Rhoads (2001) described as service-learning's poten-

tial to synthesize the tripartite of faculty responsibilities. This integration should help faculty to frame their work for successful tenure and promotion review. Drawing on existing reports of how engaged scholars have approached this is also helpful for faculty (Gelmon & Agre-Kippenhan, 2002). Previous researchers reported that opportunities for combining teaching, scholarship, and research are motivational factors for the faculty adoption of service-learning (McKay & Rozee, 2004).

The elements of personal development reflected in our data are also consistent with findings from other researchers. By increasing the motivation and commitment of faculty, such programs can help them counteract the potential for burnout (Mintz, 1999). Froh, Meges, and Walker (1993) reported that greater mastery of teaching, expanding teaching variety, and having opportunities to discuss teaching contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty, which is consistent with our findings.

Impact on institutionalization

Although data about this outcome were not explicit in the faculty fellows' reflective responses, it was in their actions. Given that faculty integration of service-learning is noted as a key to institutionalization (Ward, 1996), creating faculty development programs can have a tremendous impact. Our fellows took action that resulted in enhancing institutionalization on our campus. The faculty fellows who participated in the first year of the program moved from what Calleson, Serow, and Parker (1998) described as service-learning "sponsors" to service-learning "brokers." For example, they independently scheduled meetings with the University president and provost to share the impact of the fellows program, which resulted in funding for its continuation. In doing so, they acted as what Davidson (1997) called a nucleus of faculty who possess deep convictions about university-community partnerships, and in advocating for service-learning support as a core group of faculty they helped us improve the University's service-learning program (Zlotkowski, 1998). Faculty Fellows' additional campus activity included participation in our Teaching-Learning Academy and a variety of teaching and learning seminars, and their students' participation in the university-sponsored Scholars' Week presentations. These actions hold promise for our efforts to institutionalize service-learning on campus. This aligns with Prentice's (2002) report that faculty development is an important step toward campus institutionalization of service-learning.

Conclusions

This study adds to the understanding of the complex interplay of barriers faculty face to initiating service-learning, the challenges they face in implementing it, and the potential for faculty development programs to support and enhance faculty growth. Our findings reinforce those of other researchers who have studied service-learning faculty issues. We break new ground by documenting the effects of participation in a faculty development program, and by considering the literatures of the scholarship of teaching and learning and that of general faculty development. Further researchers would find fertile ground in exploring the possible differential impact of faculty development for female and male faculty, and the potential for such programs to contribute not only to the institutionalization of service-learning, but also the retention of faculty. Because faculty in this study noted the importance of the program for student and community partner development, more focused research in these areas could help to understand the bigger-picture impacts of faculty development. Finally, this study serves as an initial exploration of the impacts of service-learning faculty development. We encourage other researchers to build on this research by designing and implementing both qualitative and quantitative measurements that could be used across institutions to determine the generalizability of these findings.

Note

References

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning [Special edition]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *9*(1) 5-17.

Bogden, R., & Bicklen, S. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bowman, R. (2001). Building community in academia. *Contemporary Education*, *72*(1), 29-32.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *2*, 112-122.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Games, R. (1997). Engaging and supporting faculty in service-learning. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, *2*(1), 43-51.

Brukardt, M. J., Holland, B., Percy, S. L., & Zimpher, N. (2004). *Calling the question: Is higher education ready to commit to community engagement?* (Wingspread Conference Statement). Milwaukee, WS: Milwaukee Idea Office, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Retrieved March 1, 2005 from www.milwaukeeidea.org.

Calleson, D. C., Serow, R. C. & Parker, L. G. (1998). Institutional perspectives on integrating service and learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *31*(3), 147-154.

Cambridge, B. (1999). *The scholarship of teaching and learning and learning: Questions and answers from the field.* Retrieved February 15, 2005, from http://aahebulletin.com/pubic/archive/dec99f2.asp

Clark, S. M., Corcoran, M., & Lewis, D. R. (1986). The case for an institutional perspective on faculty development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *57*(2), 176-195.

Davidson, S. L. (1997). Divide and flourish: Nurturing the nucleus of faculty change. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, *2*(1), 26-32.

Diamond, R. M. (2002). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. In K.J. Zahorski (Ed.), *Scholarship in the postmodern era: New venues, new values, new visions* (pp. 73-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Driscoll, A. (2004). Studying faculty and service-learning: Directions for inquiry and development [Special issue]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 35-41.

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *3*, 66-71.

Erlich, T. (Ed.). (2000). Civic responsibility and higher education. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Feldman, K. A., & Paulsen, M. B. (1999). Faculty motivation: The role of a supportive teaching culture. In M. Theall (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 71-78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Froh, R. C., Menges, R. J., & Walker, C. J. (1993). Revitalizing faculty work through intrinsic rewards. In R. M. Diamond & E. A. Bronwyn (Eds.), *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000* (pp. 87-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gelmon, S., & Agre-Kippenhan, S. (2002). *Promotion, tenure, and the engaged scholar: Keeping the scholarship of engagement in the review process.* Retrieved February 15, 2005, from http://aahebulletin.com/pubic/archive/engaged.asp

Gillespie, K. H. (2002). (Ed.). *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Glasser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1999). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *1*(1), 21-28.

Hesser, G. (1995). Faculty assessment of student learning: Outcomes attributed to service-learning and evidence of changes in faculty attitudes about experiential education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *2*, 33-42.

Hudson, W. E. , & Trudeau, R. H. (1995). An essay on the institutionalization of service-learning: The genesis of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *2*, 150-158.

Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. (1999). The scholarship of teaching and learning: New elaborations, new developments. *Change, 31*(5), 10-15.

Jones, S. R. (2001). The service-learning scholars roundtable: A model for engaging faculty in service-learning theory and practice. In J. E. Anderson & K. J. Swick (Eds.), *Service-learning in teacher education: Engaging the growth of new teachers, their students, and communities* (pp. 220-233). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Kendall, J. (1990). (Ed.) *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*. Vols 1-3, Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kezar, A., & Rhoads, R. A. (2001). The dynamic tensions of service-learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(2), 1148-1157.

Kreber, C. (2001a). Conceptualizing the scholarship of teaching and learning and identifying unresolved issues: The framework for this volume. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 1-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kreber, C. (2001b). The scholarship of teaching and learning and its implementation in faculty development and graduate education. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 79-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lucas, A. F. (2002). Engendering trust through institutional policies and practices. In K.J. Zahorski (Ed.), *Scholarship in the postmodern era: New venues, new values, new visions* (pp.49-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mauresse, D. J. (2001). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. New York: Routledge.

McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service-learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, *10*(2), 21-33.

Mintz, J. A. (1999). Faculty development and teaching: A holistic approach. *Liberal Education*, *85*(2), 32-37.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Q*ualitative evaluation and research methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Paulsen, M. B. (2001). The relation between research and the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 19-31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Prentice, M. (2002). *Institutionalizing service-learning in community colleges* (Report No. AACC-RB-01-3). Annapolis Junction, MD: Community College Press. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 465 399).

Ramaley, J. (2000). *Embracing civic responsibility*. Retrieved February 15, 2005, from http://aahebulletin.com/pubic/archive/march00f2.asp

Rice, D., & Stacey, K. (1997). Small group dynamics as a catalyst for change: A faculty development model for academic service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *4*, 64-71.

Richlin, L. (2001). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 57-69). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, R. (2001). Expertise and the scholarship of teaching and learning. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 69-78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (2000). *Principles of good practice: Supporting early career faculty*. American Association for Higher Education. Retrieved February 15, 2005, from http://www.aahe.org/ffrr/principles_brochure2.htm

Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). Ten principles of good practice in creating and sustaining teaching and learning centers. In Gillespie, K. H. (Ed.). *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Stacey, K. H. & Foreman, C. W. (1999). Faculty incentives: A necessity for integrating service-learning. In D. Droge, & B. Ortega Murphy (Eds.), *Voices of strong democracy: Concepts and models for service-learning in communication studies* (pp. 47-60). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Stanton, T. K. (1994). The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *1*(1), 7-20.

Theall, M. & Centra, J. A. (2001). Assessing the scholarship of teaching and learning: Valid decisions from valid evidence. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 31-44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierny, W. G. & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Ward, K. (1996). Service-learning and student volunteerism: Reflections on institutional commitment. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *3*, 55-65.

Weston, C. B., & McAlpine, L. (2001). Making explicit the development toward the scholarship of teaching and learning. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 89-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zahorski, K. J. (2002). Nurturing scholarship through holistic faculty development: A synergistic approach. In K.J. Zahorski (Ed). *Scholarship in the postmodern era: New venues, new values, new visions* (pp. 29-40). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass..

Zlotkowski, E. (1998). A new model of excellence. In Zlotkowski (Ed.), Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education (pp. 1-14). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Authors

ANGELA M. HARWOOD is associate professor of Secondary Education. She engages in collaborative service-learning with local middle schools and serves as a service-learning faculty mentor.

LESLIE OCHS is a community health educator who recently relocated to the Ashville, NC area, where she is teaching and serving as a community health resource for the U. S. Government.

DEBORAH CURRIER is assistant professor of Theatre Arts. She has been recognized for her outstanding teaching by the Western Region Theatre Arts Association, and engages theatre arts education students in service-learning projects.

SHEARLEAN DUKE is chair of the Department of Journalism where she integrates service-learning into public relations courses.

JOYCE HAMMOND is professor of Anthropology and employs participatory action research with her students, who serve many local agencies.

LISA MOULDS is director of the Center for Service-Learning and long-time champion of academically rigorous learning approaches. She supports between 20 and 30 service-learning faculty each year.

KAREN STOUT is assistant professor of Communication. She is known for her supportive mentoring of students and for her service-learning courses.

CARMEN WERDER is the director of the Teaching-Learning Academy and engages campus members in challenging dialogue, in addition to using service-learning in first year seminar courses.