Integrating Service-Learning

Langsdorf Hall 206
657-278-3746
www.fullerton.edu/cice

Definitions

Definitions of Service-Learning

Service-learning means a method under which students learn and develop through thoughtfully organized service that: is conducted in and meets the needs of a community and is coordinated with an institution of higher education, and with the community; helps foster civic responsibility; is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students enrolled; and includes structured time for students to reflect on the service experience.

American Association for Higher Education (AAHE): Series on Service-Learning in the Disciplines (adapted from the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993).

Service-learning means a method under which students or participants learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that: is conducted in and meets the needs of a community and is coordinated with an elementary school, secondary school, institution of higher education, [and] or community service program, and with the community; helps foster civic responsibility; is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students or the educational components of the community service program in which the participants are enrolled; and includes structured time for the students and participants to reflect on the service experience.

National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993

Service-learning is a method through which citizenship, academic subjects, skills, and values are taught. It involves active learning—drawing lessons from the experience of performing service work. Though service-learning is most often discussed in the context of elementary and secondary or higher education, it is a useful strategy as well for programs not based in schools.

There are three basic components to effective service-learning:

• The first is sufficient preparation, which includes setting objectives for skills to be learned or issues to consider, and includes planning projects so they contribute to learning at the same time work gets done.

• The second component is simply performing service.

• Third, the participant attempts to analyze the experience and draw lessons, through such means as discussion with others and reflection on the work. Thinking about the service creates a greater understanding of the experience and the way service addresses the needs of the community. It promotes a concern about community issues and a commitment to being involved that mark an active citizen. At the same time the analysis and thought allow the participants to identify and absorb what they have learned.

Learning and practicing citizenship are lifelong activities which extend far beyond the conclusion of formal education. Service-learning can be used to increase the citizenship skills of participants of any age or background. For this reason service-learning can be a tool to achieve the desired results of programs, even those involving older, highly educated participants. For example, service-learning can be part of the training of participants to prepare them to do high quality service that has real community impact.

Some service-learning occurs just from doing the work: after a month working alongside police, a participant has surely learned some important lessons about how to increase public safety, and something about what it means to be a good citizen. However, programs that encourage active learning from service experience may have an even greater impact.

Developed by the Corporation on National and Community Service as part of their briefing materials for national community service.

Service is a process of integrating intention with action in a context of movement toward a just relationship.

Community Service is the application of one's gifts, skills, and resources to provide something of value, to enhance

the quality of life of people who articulate a need or desire for service.

Community Service is a space to practice here and now small scale models of a shared utopian vision.

Service-learning is a form or subset of experiential education and community service.

In service-learning, service is the experiential component of experiential education.

Service-learning is an intentionally designed (course, program, activity, etc.),

and is a process of learning through reflection on the experience of doing service.

Nadinne Cruz, Associate Director - Haas Center for Public Service

Service-learning appears to be an approach to experiential learning, an expression of values—service to others, which determines the purpose, nature and process of social and educational exchange between learners (students) and the people they serve, and between experiential education programs and the community organizations with which they work.

Timothy Stanton

Service-learning is the various pedagogies that link community service and academic study so that each strengthens the other. The basic theory of service-learning is Dewey's: the interaction of knowledge and skills with experience is key to learning. Students learn best not by reading the Great Books in a closed room but by opening the doors and windows of experience. Learning starts with a problem and continues with the application of increasingly complex ideas and increasingly sophisticated skills to increasingly complicated problems.

Thomas Ehrlich, in: Barbara Jacoby and Associates. Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices. San Francisco, CA: Jossey - Bass, 1996.

A service-learning program provides educational experiences:

• under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with school and community;

• that are integrated into the students' academic curriculum or provides structured time for a student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;

• that provide a student with opportunities to use newly-acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; and

• that enhance what is taught by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to foster the development of a sense of caring for others."

From the Commission on National and Community Service (now the Corporation for National and Community Service). In Richard J. Kraft and James Krug, "Review of Research and Evaluation on Service Learning in Public and Higher Education," Chapter 24 of Richard J. Kraft and Marc Swadener, Building Community: Service Learning in the Academic Disciplines. Denver, CO: Colorado Campus Compact, 1994.

Service-Learning is:

...A connection of theory and practice that puts concepts into concrete form and provides a context for understanding abstract matter. This provides an opportunity to test and refine theories as well as to introduce new theories.

...A use of knowledge with a historical understanding or appreciation of social, economic and environmental implications as well as moral and ethical ramifications of people's actions. This involves a strong use of communication

and interpersonal skills including literacy (writing, reading, speaking and listening) and various technical skills.

...An opportunity to learn how to learn—to collect and evaluate data, to relate seemingly unrelated matters and ideas, and investigate a self-directed learning including inquiry, logical thinking and a relation of ideas and experience. A transference of learning from one context to another will allow for the opportunity to reflect, conceptualize and apply experience-based knowledge.

...An emphasis on diversity and pluralism that leads to empowerment in the face of social problems; experience that helps people understand and appreciate traditions of volunteerism; and a consideration of and experimentation with democratic citizenship responsibilities.

At their best, service-learning experiences are reciprocally beneficial for both the community and students. For many community organizations, students augment service delivery, meet crucial human needs, and provide a basis for future citizen support. For students, community service is an opportunity to enrich and apply classroom knowledge; explore careers or majors; develop civic and cultural literacy; improve citizenship, develop occupational skills; enhance personal growth and self-image; establish job links; and foster a concern for social problems, which leads to a sense of social responsibility and commitment to public/human service.

From Brevard Community College, The Power. July, 1994.

Service-learning is a teaching method which combines community service with academic instruction as it focuses on critical, reflective thinking and civic responsibility. Service-learning programs involve students in organized community service that addresses local needs, while developing their academic skills, sense of civic responsibility, and commitment to the community.

Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges

Service Learning is a process through which students are involved in community work that contributes significantly: 1) to positive change in individuals, organizations, neighborhoods and/or larger systems in a community; and 2) to students' academic understanding, civic development, personal or career growth, and/or understanding of larger social issues.

This process always includes an intentional and structured educational/developmental component for students, and may be employed in curricular or co-curricular settings. Even with an expanded vision for the field, service-learning will undoubtedly continue to play a critical role in campus-community collaboration..

From Charity to Change Minnesota Campus Compact

Service Learning is a credit-bearing, educational, experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.

Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher, A Service Learning Curriculum for Faculty. The Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, Fall 1995, pp.112-122.

Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning

An effective and sustained program:

Engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.

Provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.

Articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.

Allows for those with needs to define those needs.

Clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.

Matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.

Expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.

Includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.

Insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interest of all involved.

Is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations.

Jane Kendall & Associates, Combining Service and Learning. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (Now National Society for Experiential Education), 1990.

Principles of Good Practice in Community Service-Learning Pedagogy

Academic credit is for learning, not for service.

Do not compromise academic rigor.

Set learning goals for students.

Establish criteria for the selection of community service placements.

Provide educationally sound mechanisms to harvest the community learning.

Provide supports for students to learn how to harvest the community learning.

Minimize the distinction between the student's community learning role and the classroom learning role.

Re-think the faculty instructional role.

Be prepared for uncertainty and variation in student learning outcomes.

Maximize the community responsibility orientation of the course.

Jeffrey Howard, ed. Praxis I: A Faculty Casebook on Community Service Learning. Ann Arbor, MI: Office of Community Service Learning Press, University of Michigan. 1993.

Seven Elements
of High Quality Service-Learning

Integrated Learning

- The service-learning project has clearly articulated knowledge, skill or value goals that arise from broader classroom or school goals.
- The service informs the academic learning content, and the academic learning content informs the service.
- Life skills learned outside the classroom are integrated back into classroom learning.

High Quality Service

- The service responds to an actual community need that is recognized by the community.
- The service is appropriate to the academic level of the course and well-organized.
- The service is designed to achieve significant benefits for students and community.

Civic Responsibility

- The service-learning project promotes students' responsibility to care for others and to contribute to the community.
- By participating in the service-learning project, students understand how they can impact their community.

Student Voice

Students participate actively in:

- choosing and planning the service project;
- planning and implementing the reflection sessions, evaluation, and celebration;
- taking on roles and tasks that are appropriate to their age.

Collaboration

- The service-learning project is a collaboration among all of the partners, e.g. students, community-based organization staff, professor, and recipients of service.
- All partners benefit from the project and contribute to its planning.

Reflection

- Reflection establishes connections between students' service experiences and the academic curriculum.
- Reflection occurs before, during, and after the service-learning project.

Assessment & Evaluation

- All the partners are involved in assessing the service-learning partnership and project.
- Evaluation seeks to measure how well students' have met the learning and service objectives.

Adapted from Youth Service California - 663 13th St. Oakland, CA 94612
info@yscal.org Retrieved January 2000 from http://www.yscal.org/resources/sltools.html

Policy Documents

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

University Policy Statement

UPS 411.600

POLICY ON SERVICE LEARNING

POLICY

To provide high quality programs that meet the evolving needs of our students, community and region, California State University, Fullerton provides opportunities for its students to learn from external communities through service learning activities. The Center for Internships and Community Engagement or designated unit personnel is responsible for oversight of this policy. All related documentation shall be maintained for a three year period after completion of student service-learning activities.

GUIDELINES

Service learning is separate and distinct from internships (See UPS 320.002), which seek to integrate academic work from an entire major with practical experience in work settings relevant to that discipline. Service-learning activities clarify, illustrate or stimulate additional thought about academic topics covered in the classroom, as well as encourage students to develop or strengthen a habit of service to the community.

Service-learning or "S" course designations are approved through curriculum review processes. Site approval and annual review processes are coordinated by the Center for Internships and Community Engagement or designated unit personnel and shall include assessment of educational appropriateness, identification of potential risks and appropriate site supervisor, evaluation of the educational environment, relationship of service activities to course goals, placement criteria, and signed placement activity agreements.

Criteria for necessary site visits are established by the Office of Risk Management. Before participating in service-learning activities, students must be provided with conduct expectations, health and safety instructions, and emergency contact information. They must also provide their own emergency contact information and submit a learning agreement form signed by themselves, their site supervisor, and course instructor.

Signed placement agreements between service-learning sites and California State University Fullerton must be on file and address student responsibilities as well as the role of the internship site and CSUF.

To be offered for academic credit, service-learning activities must:

(a) Constitute a component of a university course and be described in a syllabus; credit may be granted only for activities so described and approved by the instructor in advance;

(b) Integrate community and classroom learning;

(c) Meet community needs and be identified in conjunction with community-based organizations or sites approved through the Center for Internships and Community Engagement by designated unit personnel;

(d) Provide structured opportunities, including writing assignments, for students to reflect on the connections between their service experiences and the course objectives;

(e) Account for no more than one-third of the course work and grade;

(f) Match a student's academic preparation, specify selection criteria if applicable, and include an accommodation plan for students with special needs;

(g) Occur only at sites evaluated and approved by the course instructor;

(h) Provide an emergency response plan;

(i) Involve no more than forty hours of community service per semester unit of credit per three-unit course (for example, forty hours would be the appropriate amount of community activity on which to base one-third of the grade for a three-unit class, or twenty hours for one-sixth of the grade). In most circumstances, students should be evaluated on their ability to integrate the academic and community experience, not merely on their ability to satisfy the required amount of community activity; and

(j) Provide an opportunity for the student, community supervisor and the instructor to assess the service-learning experience provided by the activity.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 21, 2014
Supersedes: UPS 411.600 dated 6-17-08
and ASD 14-115

Source: Internships and Service Learning Committee 5-7-14

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

University Policy Statement

UPS 411.601

POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTERNSHIPS

I. INTRODUCTION

Internships are processes of education which formally integrate the students' academic study with practical experience in cooperating organizations. Through this interaction of study and practical experience students enhance their academic knowledge, their personal development, and their professional preparation. The teaching faculty and the on-site supervisors share in the educational process of internship. The Center for Internships and Community Engagement or designated unit personnel (i.e. Faculty Internship Coordinators) is responsible for oversight of internship policies. All related documentation shall be maintained for a three year period after student completion of internship activities. Signed placement agreements between internship sites and California State University, Fullerton must be on file and address student responsibilities as well as the role of the internship site and CSUF.

Departments/programs may allow students to earn academic credit for internship and cooperative education experience under supervised conditions. It is essential that internships and cooperative education experiences that qualify for academic credit provide learning experiences for students that:

1. Take place outside the traditional classroom;
2. Provide for integration of academic and experiential learning;
3. Are undertaken only by students with sufficient academic background to benefit from the experiences and include accommodation plans for students with special needs;
4. Are planned in advance through consultation between students and faculty members;
5. Include evaluation by the students and on-site supervisors;
6. Include appropriate oversight of the field experiences by the faculty member responsible for the credit.

II. SPECIFIC POLICIES

1. The grade for academic internships shall be assigned on the basis of the students' ability to integrate academic and field experience, not merely because of faithful performance on a job. The supervising faculty member will meet with the student interns at least four times per semester except when, in the opinion of the supervising faculty member, the distance between the site of the internship and CSUF makes meeting impractical. In

these cases the faculty should confer with the student by telephone, email, or other electronic means on a regular basis. Also, students will submit written reports in which they integrate their academic and field experiences. Evaluations from on-site supervisors shall be considered in assigning final grades.

2. The Center for Internships and Community Engagement or designated unit personnel shall conduct annual review and assessment of educational appropriateness, identification of potential risks and appropriate supervisor, evaluation of the educational environment, relationship of internship activities to course goals, placement criteria, and signed placement activity agreements. Criteria for necessary site visits have been established by the Office of Risk Management. Before participating in internship activities, students must be provided with conduct expectations, health and safety instructions, emergency contact information, and emergency response plans. They must also provide their own emergency contact information and submit a learning agreement form signed by themselves, their site supervisor, and course instructor. The points of view of the students, faculty members, and on-site supervisors will be taken into consideration in the development of learning plans.

3. Faculty Internship Coordinators shall evaluate the academic background of prospective internship students prior to allowing students to choose an internship site. A student's academic background must be suitable to the anticipated field experience. A student will not be allowed to participate in a field experience if his/her academic background has not adequately prepared him/her to benefit from the experience as well as to contribute to the organization.

4. The supervising faculty member shall give approval in advance of any academic internship for credit to be granted.

5. No more than six units of internship credit shall be among the units applied toward the Bachelor's Degree. Departments may request exceptions to this policy, which shall be granted on a program basis rather than an individual basis. Exceptions shall require the approval of the Curriculum Committee and the Internships and Service-Learning Committee; the decision may be appealed to the Academic Senate.

6. The field component of an internship assignment shall total not less than 40 hours per student semester unit of credit.

7. Each department shall keep adequate records of the scope, objectives, and criteria for evaluation of all academic internships.

8. These policies apply to all academic internship courses irrespective of whether they are state-funded or not state-funded; and whether they are campus-based, online, or offered at a distant location.

9. Salaried financial compensation for internship activities, if applicable, shall be no less than minimum wage.

10. These policies apply to all out-of-classroom experiential learning activities that are not otherwise governed by UPS Service-Learning policies, state law, accreditation requirements, or professional licensure requirements. They do not apply to experiential learning that involves only student-teacher interactions, such as laboratory or field trip experiences.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 21, 2014
Supersedes: UPS 411.601 dated 6-16-10
and ASD 14-116

Source: Internships and Service Learning Committee, Spring 2014

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

University Policy Statement
California State University, Fullerton

UPS 400.010

INDEPENDENT STUDY

Academic departments may provide students with the opportunity to pursue, for credit, topics or problems of special interest beyond the scope of the regular course offerings. The following policy shall apply to all Independent Study courses offered under the auspices of CSUF, irrespective of whether they are offered on or off campus or are those involving Independent Travel Study.

1. The course designations shall be: at the lower division level, Independent Study 299; at the upper division level, Independent Study 499; and at the graduate level, Independent Study 599.

2. The Independent Study shall normally be of a research or creative nature and shall culminate in a paper, project, comprehensive exam, and/or performance. Independent Study units shall not be granted for teaching duties, administering classes, tutoring students or grading courses; or for internships.

3. Each department or program shall prepare and document its policy regarding the format and the evaluation of its Independent Study courses. The policy should recognize that the workload involved in the Independent Study should justify the units earned at the appropriate undergraduate or graduate levels.

4. Before the Independent Study is approved, the student shall prepare a proposal in consultation with the instructor(s). This proposal shall be submitted to the department chair or designee for prior approval, and in the case of Independent Study to be used on a graduate study plan, to the Graduate Program Adviser for additional prior approval. The approved Independent Study proposal shall be kept on file in the department/program office.

5. The Independent Study proposal shall include a statement of the basis for the final evaluation of the Independent Study.

6. A student may take no more than 6 units of Independent Study in a given semester or during summer, and no more than 3 units during intersession.

7. A student may apply no more than 9 units of Independent Study toward completion of the undergraduate degree.

8. A student may apply no more than 6 units of Independent Study (499 or 599) toward completion of a graduate degree.

9. For Independent Study used on graduate study plans, 300-level courses may not be used as the sole basis for 499 Independent Study. 300- and 400-level course work may not be used as the sole basis for 599 Independent Study. 100- and 200-level courses may not be used as any part of the basis for 499 or 599 Independent Study.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 8, 2006
Supersedes: UPS 400.010 dated 3-20-93
and ASD 06-32

Selected Readings

Four Myths About Academic Service-Learning*

To clarify the conceptualization for academic service-learning, as well as to distinguish it from other community-based service and learning models, we begin with four common misunderstandings about this pedagogy.

Myth # 1 - The Myth of Terminology: Academic service-learning is the same as student community service and co-curricular service-learning.

Academic service-learning is not the same as student community service or co-curricular service-learning. While sharing the word "service," these models of student involvement in the community are distinguished by their learning agenda. Student community service, illustrated by a student organization adopting a local elementary school, rarely involves a learning agenda. In contrast, both forms of service-learning - academic and co-curricular - make intentional efforts to engage students in planned and purposeful learning related to the service experiences. Co-curricular service-learning, illustrated by many alternative spring break programs, is concerned with raising students' consciousness and familiarity with issues related to various communities. Academic service-learning, illustrated by student community service integrated into an academic course, utilizes the service experience as a course "text" for both academic learning and civic learning.

Myth # 2 - The Myth of Conceptualization: Academic service-learning is just a new name for internships.

Many internship programs, especially those involving community service, are now referring to themselves as service-learning programs, as if the two pedagogical models were the same. While internships and academic service-learning involve students in the community to accentuate or supplement students' academic learning, generally speaking, internships are not about civic learning. They develop and socialize students for a profession, and tend to be silent on student civic development. They also emphasize student benefits more than community benefits, while service-learning is equally attentive to both.

Myth # 3 - The Myth of Synonymy: Experience, such as in the community, is synonymous with learning.

Experience and learning are not the same. While experience is a necessary condition of learning (Kolb, 1984), it is not sufficient. Learning requires more than experience, and so one cannot assume that student involvement in the community automatically yields learning. Harvesting academic and/or civic learning from a community service experience requires purposeful and intentional efforts. This harvesting process is often referred to as "reflection" in the service-learning literature.

Myth # 4 - The Myth of Marginality: Academic service-learning is the addition of community service to a traditional course.

Grafting a community service requirement (or option) onto an otherwise unchanged academic course does not constitute academic service-learning. While such models abound, this interpretation marginalizes the learning in, from, and with the community, and precludes transforming students' community experiences into learning. To realize service-learning's full potential as a pedagogy, community experiences must be considered in the context of, and integrated with, the other planned learning strategies and resources in the course.

* The designation of these four myths first appeared in: Howard, J. (2000). Academic Service-Learning: Myths, Challenges, and Recommendations. *Essays on Teaching Excellence*, 12 (3), A publication of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. They appear here with the permission of the editor, Kay Herr Gillespie.

Principles of Good Practice for Service-Learning Pedagogy

This is an up-dated set of "Principles of Good Practice for Service-Learning Pedagogy."*

Principle 1: Academic Credit is for Learning, Not for Service

This first principle speaks to those who puzzle over how to assess students' service in the community, or what weight to assign community involvement in final grades.

In traditional courses, academic credit and grades are assigned based on students' demonstration of academic learning as measured by the instructor. It is no different in service-learning courses. While in traditional courses we assess students' learning from traditional course resources, e.g., textbooks, class discussions, library research, etc., in service-learning courses we evaluate students' learning from traditional resources, from the community service, and from the blending of the two.

So, academic credit is not awarded for doing service or for the quality of the service, but rather for the student's demonstration of academic and civic learning.

Principle 2: Do Not Compromise Academic Rigor

Since there is a widespread perception in academic circles that community service is a "soft" learning resource, there may be a temptation to compromise the academic rigor in a service-learning course.

Labeling community service as a "soft" learning stimulus reflects a gross misperception. The perceived "soft" service component actually raises the learning challenge in a course. Service-learning students must not only master academic material as in traditional courses, but also learn how to learn from unstructured and ill-structured community experiences and merge that learning with the learning from other course resources. Furthermore, while in traditional courses students must satisfy only academic learning objectives, in service-learning courses students must satisfy both academic and civic learning objectives. All of this makes for challenging intellectual work, commensurate with rigorous academic standards.

Principle 3: Establish Learning Objectives

It is a service-learning maxim that one cannot develop a quality service-learning course without first setting very explicit learning objectives. This principle is foundational to service-learning, and serves as the focus of sections four and five of this workbook.

While establishing learning objectives for students is a standard to which all courses are accountable, in fact, it is especially necessary and advantageous to establish learning objectives in service-learning courses. The addition of the community as a learning context multiplies the learning possibilities (see pp. 26-29). To sort out those of greatest priority, as well as to leverage the bounty of learning opportunities offered by community service experiences, deliberate planning of course academic *and* civic learning objectives is required.

* Updated from the original: Howard, J. (1993). Community service learning in the curriculum. In J. Howard (Ed.), *Praxis I: A faculty casebook on community service learning* (pp. 3 - 12). Ann Arbor: OCSL Press.

Principle 4: Establish Criteria for the Selection of Service Placements

Requiring students to serve in *any* community-based organization as part of a service-learning course is tantamount to requiring students to read *any* book as part of a traditional course.

Faculty who are deliberate about establishing criteria for selecting community service placements will find that students are able to extract more relevant learning from their respective service experiences, and are more likely to meet course learning objectives.

We recommend four criteria for selecting service placements:

(1) Circumscribe the range of acceptable service placements around the content of the course (e.g., for a course on homelessness, homeless shelters and soup kitchens are learning-appropriate placements, but serving in a hospice is not).

(2) Limit specific service activities and contexts to those with the potential to meet course-relevant academic and civic learning objectives (e.g., filing papers in a warehouse, while of service to a school district, will offer little to stimulate either academic or civic learning in a course on elementary school education).

(3) Correlate the required duration of service with its role in the realization of academic and civic learning objectives (e.g., one two-hour shift at a hospital will do little to contribute to academic or civic learning in a course on institutional health care).

(4) Assign community projects that meet real needs in the community as determined by the community.

Principle 5: Provide Educationally-Sound Learning Strategies to Harvest Community Learning and Realize Course Learning Objectives

Requiring service-learning students to merely record their service activities and hours as their journal assignment is tantamount to requiring students in an engineering course to log their activities and hours in the lab.

Learning in any course is realized by an appropriate mix and level of learning strategies and assignments that correspond with the learning objectives for the course. Given that in service-learning courses we want to utilize students' service experiences in part to achieve academic and civic course learning objectives, learning strategies must be employed that support learning from service experiences and enable its use toward meeting course learning objectives (see the section "Notes on Reflection" on page 20).

Learning interventions that promote critical reflection, analysis, and application of service experiences enable learning. To make certain that service does not underachieve in its role as an instrument of learning, careful thought must be given to learning activities that encourage the integration of experiential and academic learning. These activities include classroom discussions, presentations, and journal and paper assignments that support analysis of service experiences in the context of the course academic and civic learning objectives. Of course, clarity about course learning objectives is a prerequisite for identifying educationally-sound learning strategies.

Principle 6: Prepare Students for Learning from the Community

Most students lack experience with both extracting and making meaning from experience and in merging it with other academic and civic course learning strategies. Therefore, even an exemplary reflection journal assignment will yield, without sufficient support, uneven responses.

Faculty can provide: (1) learning supports such as opportunities to acquire skills for gleaning the learning from the service context (e.g., participant-observer skills), and/or (2) examples of how to successfully complete assignments (e.g., making past exemplary student papers and reflection journals available to current students to peruse). Menlo (1993) identifies four compotencies to accentuate student learning from the community: reflective listening, seeking feedback, acuity in observation, and mindfulness in thinking.

Principle 7: Minimize the Distinction Between the Students' Community Learning Role and Classroom Learning Role

Classrooms and communities are very different learning contexts. Each requires students to assume a different learner role. Generally, classrooms provide a high level of teacher direction, with students expected to assume mostly a passive learner role. In contrast, service communities usually provide a low level of teaching direction, with students expected to assume mostly an active learner role. Alternating between the passive learner role in the classroom and the active learner role in the community may challenge and even impede student learning. The solution is to shape the learning environments so that students assume similar learner roles in both contexts.

While one solution is to intervene so that the service community provides a high level of teaching direction, we recommend, for several reasons, re-norming the traditional classroom toward one that values students as active learners. First, active learning is consistent with active civic participation that service-learning seeks to foster. Second, students bring information from the community to the classroom that can be utilized on behalf of others' learning. Finally, we know from recent research in the field of cognitive science that students develop deeper understanding of course material if they have an opportunity to actively construct knowledge (Byler & Giles, 1999).

Principle 8: Rethink the Faculty Instructional Role

If faculty encourage students' active learning in the classroom, what would be a concomitant and consistent change in one's teaching role?

Commensurate with the preceding principle's recommendation for an active student learning posture, this principle advocates that service-learning teachers, too, rethink their roles. An instructor role that would be most compatible with an active student role shifts away from a singular reliance on transmission of knowledge and toward mixed pedagogical methods that include learning facilitation and guidance. Exclusive or even primary use of traditional instructional models, e.g., a banking model (Freire, 1970), interferes with the promise of learning in service-learning courses.

To re-shape one's classroom role to capitalize on the learning bounty in service-learning, faculty will find Howard's (1998) model of "Transforming the Classroom" helpful. This four-stage model begins with the traditional classroom in which students are passive, teachers are directive, and all conform to the learned rules of the classroom. In the second stage, the instructor begins to re-socialize herself toward a more facilitative role; but the students, socialized for many years to be passive learners, are slow to change to a more active mode. In the third stage, with the perseverance of the instructor, the students begin to develop and acquire the skills and propensities to be active in the classroom. Frequently, during this phase, faculty will become concerned that learning is not as rich and rigorous as when they are using the more popular lecture format, and may regress to a more directive posture. Over time homeostasis is established, and the instructor and the students achieve an environment in which mixed pedagogical methods lead to students who are active learners, instructors fluent in multiple teaching methods, and strong academic and civic learning outcomes.

Principle 9: Be Prepared for Variation in, and Some Loss of Control with, Student Learning Outcomes

For those faculty who value homogeneity in student learning outcomes, as well as control of the learning environment, service-learning may not be a good fit.

In college courses, learning strategies largely determine student outcomes, and this is true in service-learning courses, too. However, in traditional courses, the learning strategies (i.e., lectures, labs, and readings) are constant for all enrolled students and under the watchful eye of the faculty member. In service-learning courses, given variability in service experiences and their influential role in student learning, one can anticipate greater heterogeneity in student learning outcomes and compromises to faculty control. Even when service-learning

students are exposed to the same presentations and the same readings, instructors can expect that classroom discussions will be less predictable and the content of student papers/ projects less homogeneous than in courses without a service assignment. As an instructor, are you prepared for greater heterogeneity in student learning outcomes and some degree of loss in control over student learning stimuli?

Principle 10: Maximize the Community Responsibility Orientation of the Course

This principle is for those who think that civic learning can only spring from the community service component of a course.

One of the necessary conditions of a service-learning course is purposeful civic learning. Designing classroom norms and learning strategies that not only enhance academic learning but also encourage civic learning are essential to purposeful civic learning. While most traditional courses are organized for private learning that advances the individual student, service-learning instructors should consider employing learning strategies that will complement and reinforce the civic lessons from the community experience. For example, efforts to convert from individual to group assignments, and from instructor-only to instructor and student review of student assignments, re-norms the teaching-learning process to be consistent with the civic orientation of service-learning.

Research At A Glance:
What We Know About The Effects of Service-Learning on Students, Faculty, Institutions and Communities, 1993-1999

JANET EYLER, DWIGHT E. GILES, JR. AND CHARLENE J. GRAY

Vanderbilt University
December 7, 1999
Funded by the Corporation for National Service,
Learn and Serve America Subgrant through
National Service Learning Clearinghouse

I. What We Know: The Effects of Service-Learning On Students

A. Personal Outcomes

Service-learning has a positive effect on student personal development such as sense of personal efficacy, personal identity, spiritual growth, and moral development:

Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, (in press); Boss, 1994; Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Fenzel & Leary, 1997; Freidus, 1997; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Gray, Ondaatje, Fricker, Geschwind, Goldman, Kaganoff, Robyn, Sundt, Vogelgesang, & Klein, 1998; Greene, 1996 (dissertation); Gorman, 1994; Jordan, 1994 (dissertation); Keen, & Keen, 1998; Kendrick, 1996; Loewen, 1998 (dissertation); Markus, Howard, & King 1993; Ostrow, 1995; Peterson, 1998; Rauner, 1995 (dissertation); Rhoads, 1997; Sledge, Shelburne, & Jones,1993; VCU, 1997; Wade & Yarborough, 1996; Western Washington University, 1994.

Service-learning has positive effect on interpersonal development and the ability to work well with others, leadership and communication skills:

Astin & Sax, 1998; Bacon, 1997 (dissertation); Dalton & Petrie, 1997; Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Freidus, 1997;Giles & Eyler, 1994; Gray, et al., 1998; Keen, & Keen, 1998; Mabry, 1998; McElhaney, 1998 (dissertation); Raskoff, 1997; Rauner, 1995 (dissertation); Rhoads, 1997; Sledge, Shelburne, & Jones, 1993; Peterson, 1998; Wade & Yarborough, 1996.

B. Social Outcomes

Service-learning has a positive effect on reducing stereotypes and facilitating cultural & racial understanding:

Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos (in press); Balazadeh, 1996; Bringle & Kremer, 1993; Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Dunlap, 1997; Dunlap, 1998; Eyler, Giles & Braxton, 1997; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Fenzel & Leary, 1997; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Gray, et al. 1998; Greene & Diehm, 1995; Greene, 1996 (dissertation); Hall, 1996 (dissertation); Hones, 1997; Jordan, 1994 (dissertation); Keen, & Keen, 1998; Kendrick, 1996; McElhaney, 1998 (dissertation); Myers-Lipton, 1996a; Myers-Lipton, 1996b; Ostrow, 1995; Rauner, 1995 (dissertation); Rhoads, 1997; VCU, 1997; Western Washington University, 1994.

Service-learning has a positive effect on sense of social responsibility and citizenship skills:

Astin & Sax, 1998, Astin, Sax, & Avalos (in press), Barber, Higgins, Smith, Ballou, Jeffrey, Dedrick, & Downing,

Service-learning improves student satisfaction with college:

Astin & Sax, 1998; Berson & Younkin, 1998; Gray, et al., 1998.

Students engaged in service-learning are more likely to graduate:

Astin & Sax, 1998; Roose, Daphne, Miller, Norris, Peacock, White, & White, 1997.

F. Process examined in Qualitative Studies

There is a growing body of studies that attempt to describe the process of student development involved in service-learning:

Bacon, 1997(dissertation); Dalton & Petrie, 1997; Dunlap, 1997; Dunlap, 1998; Freidus, 1997; Hall, 1996 (dissertation); Hones, 1997; Ostrow, 1995; Rhoads, 1997; Schmiede, 1995; Smith, 1994; Ward, 1996; Wade & Yarborough, 1996.

II. What We Know: The Effects of Particular Program Characteristics on Student

A. Placement Quality

Placement quality has a positive impact on student personal and interpersonal outcomes:

Eyler & Giles, 1999; Mabry, 1998.

B. Reflection

Written reflection has an impact on student learning outcomes:

Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray, et al. 1998; Greene & Diehm, 1995; Loewen, 1998 (dissertation); Mabry, 1998.

Discussion reflection has an impact on student learning outcomes:

Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray, et al., 1998; Mabry, 1998.

C. Application of service

Application of service to academic content and vice versa has an impact on students, particularly learning outcomes:

Boss, 1994; Batchelder & Root, 1994; Eyler & Giles, 1999.

D. Duration and Intensity of Service

Duration and intensity of service have an impact on student outcomes:

Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, (in press), Mabry, 1998.

E. Exposure to Diversity

Diversity has an impact on students, particularly personal outcomes of personal development & cultural understanding:

Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray, et al., 1998.

F. Community voice

Community voice in a service-learning project has an impact on student cultural understanding:

Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray, et al., 1998.

III. What We Know: The Impact of Service-learning on Faculty

A. Faculty using service-learning report satisfaction with quality of student learning:
Berson & Younkin, 1998; Fenzel & Leary, 1997; Hesser, 1995; Sellnow & Oster, 1997; Serow, Calleson, & Parker, 1996; Stanton, 1994.

Service as Text: Making the Metaphor Meaningful

Lori Varlotta
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

The primary audience for this article are faculty who utilize or wish to utilize a service-learning pedagogy. One of the most effective ways for faculty to conceptualize and operationalize this pedagogy is to configure the service activity as an actual course text. When service is conceived in this way, faculty are implicitly prompted to answer the two questions that should frame any service-learning course: (1) What type of service text should I assign, and (2) How will I meaningfully incorporate the service text with other texts utilized in the class? This paper uses interdisciplinary theory to help faculty formulate detailed responses to each of these crucial questions. In doing so, it focuses on the "learning" side of the service-learning equation.[1]

From a faculty perspective one of the most constructive ways to conceptualize service-learning is to refine the pedagogically purposeful metaphor "service as text" (Morton, 1996; Varlotta, 1996). Unfortunately, service-learning's own theory is insufficiently developed to explicate this metaphor. Therefore, a related theoretical framework—interdisciplinary theory—is, for two reasons, an appropriate choice:[2]

1. Interdisciplinary theory introduces an assortment of terms—"partial," "full," "narrow," and "broad"—that can help faculty contemplate and, ideally, answer the question: What type of service text should be utilized in this course? Faculty may assign, for example, a one-time or short-term project, dubbed a "partial" text; or, they may expect students to uphold an ongoing service commitment, labeled a "full" text. Additionally, faculty may require a "narrow" service text in which all students work on related projects at the same agency, or "broad" texts in which each student works on a unique service project.
2. Interdisciplinarians utilize terms like "multidisciplinary," "crossdisciplinary," and "interdisciplinary" to describe and differentiate various types of disciplinary integration. Because service itself is not a discipline, interdisciplinarity's terminology—one that reflects the integration of *disciplinary* perspectives—is not completely transferable to service-learning. When service is configured as a text, however, the prefixes of interdisciplinarity's terminology ("multi," "cross," and "inter") can be affixed to the root word "text" to answer the question, How will the service text be meaningfully integrated with other course texts (e.g., films, books, journal articles)? A crosstextual course, for example, will integrate the service text more fully than a multitextual course but less fully than an intertextual one.

This paper does more than simply raise the pedagogical questions that too few have posed. It uses interdisciplinarity to offer viable answers.

What Types of Service Texts are Feasible?

Interdisciplinary theory can help faculty conceptualize at least four types of service texts. Two types of service texts may be described by invoking the "broad" and "narrow" rhetoric of interdisciplinarians Van Dusseldorp and Wigboldus (1994), the other two by employing the "full" and "partial" terminology of William Newell (1998).

Broad or Narrow Service Texts

For Van Dusseldorp and Wigboldus (1994), a "broad" interdisciplinary course pulls together a wide range of disciplines. An example of such a course is one that draws from a liberal arts discipline like philosophy, a natural science like chemistry, and a social science like anthropology. Such a diversity of disciplines entertain a broad range of inquiries, coin and utilize a broad variety of terms, and construct a broad assortment of arguments. A "narrow" interdisciplinary course, on the other hand, pulls together a more related set of disciplines. An example of this type of course is one that draws from three natural sciences, e.g., biology, chemistry, and physics.

Though service itself is not a discipline, interdisciplinary terminology can provide service-learning instructors with two important options in course design. First, faculty may choose to design and teach a "broad" service-learning class in which individual

students or student groups are engaged in very different types of projects. In a broad class, faculty may allow each student to choose a unique service-learning project, or cluster students in groups and assign a different project to each group (e.g., one group of students may be working with homeless men at a local shelter, a second may be volunteering at a YWCA's outreach program that assists survivors of domestic violence, and a third group may be supervising after school programs at a junior high school).

To determine whether or not to use a broad approach to service-learning, faculty might consider some of the pros and cons associated with this approach. On the positive side, numerous university-community partnerships can be forged through a broad service-learning class that engages various community-based organizations (CBOs). Hence, this approach may work well for urban universities surrounded by a plethora of agencies that need and request volunteers. Here, faculty can use service-learning to address the multiple and disparate issues emerging in the community. Potentially, then, the broad approach is both advantageous to the community and professionally stimulating to faculty as it requires them to integrate into their course students' experiences from a wide range of service sites and projects.

On the negative side, the communication and coordination involved in multiple placements can be very time consuming. Because supervision, agency expectations, hours of operation, and potential risks vary from site to site, faculty must spend a great deal of out-of-class time communicating with each site supervisor. In addition, faculty must spend a great deal of in-class time allowing students from various sites to "bring others up to date" on what they are doing, who they are serving, and what it is they are learning.

As opposed to the broad course, a "narrow" service-learning course requires all students to work on the same or related projects at a single agency. This approach may be appropriate for universities situated in small towns or rural areas in which community- based agencies do not abound. In these areas, a single agency might be able to tackle more issues or serve more clients when twenty college students commit to working with their particular program(s).

There are logistical and academic advantages associated with a narrow service-learning course. In terms of the former, the service in a narrow class is typically easier to coordinate than the service in a broad one. Similarly, it is easier for a professor to maintain communication with a single CBO than with multiple ones. From a learning perspective, a narrow class is likely to create a "connected" ambience as a cohesive community of learners reflects on its common service text. Here, each student in the class has an informed understanding of what his/her classmates are doing at the agency, and all students know the key issues, concerns, and "players" at the site. Reflection in a narrow course may be deeper and more analytical, as cursory updates, summaries, or introductions are precluded in this arrangement.

The major disadvantage associated with narrow courses is that accountability and responsibility are diffused. In narrow classes where twenty students serve at the same site, it may be difficult for both the agency director and the course instructor to differentiate each student's service effort. Therefore, the agency director must continuously ensure that each student is pulling his/her own weight at the site. At the same time, the faculty member must make sure that all students are engaged in educationally purposeful service that augments both individual and communal learning.

The terms "broad" and "narrow" remind faculty that they can weave service into coursework in at least two very different ways—requiring a common service text or assigning students to (or allowing them to choose) individual service texts. The broad-narrow differentiation provides pedagogical options rather than pedagogical prescriptions. No hierarchy is implied in these options: a broad class may be best suited for some faculty, universities, students, and communities, while a narrow class may be a better fit for others.

Partial or Full Service Text

While Van Dusseldorp and Wigboldus (1994) theorize the broad and narrow forms of interdisciplinarity, William Newell (1998), another interdisciplinarian, describes the "partial" and "full" approaches. From this view, a "partial" course integrates its constitutive disciplines on a "component level." A partial course may integrate the *terminology* of each constitutive discipline to answer a course question, or the *research techniques* of each to conduct a class experiment, or the *key readings* from each discipline to explore an issue. A "fully" interdisciplinary class, on the other hand, would integrate all (or most) of these components during the course of the semester. In a fully interdisciplinary sociology/psychology class that explores a complex theme like ethnic prejudice, for example, an instructor might first assign key "ethnic" readings from each discipline. The instructor may then compare and contrast the disciplinary terminology utilized throughout the readings. After students have mastered a basic understanding of fundamental terms and prevalent theories, the instructor may prompt them to generate the types of questions or arguments posed by psychologists and sociologists who study ethnic prejudice.

Finally, the faculty member might expect students to propose or conduct an interdisciplinary experiment informed by the theories, data, terminology, and questions they have studied all semester.

In applying Newell's terminology to service-learning, a "partial" service-learning course may draw from one or two short but potentially intensive service projects. A women's studies course that requires all students to visit a battered women's shelter on a designated weekend and explain (in class) how their service experience helps them to understand "co-dependency" and "material power" may be labeled a partial service-learning class.

Using the same women's studies example, a "full" course would assign a semester-long project that requires students to visit the shelter regularly throughout the term. Rather than use service as a one-time text to interpret two terms (co-dependency and material power), a full course might utilize the service text to explore major terms, key theories, prominent experiments, hallmark writings, significant data, etc.

Like the broad and narrow types described above, advantages and disadvantages are associated with partial and full service texts. One of the most appealing features of a partial course is that the service component has a clearly identified beginning and end. This can be seen positively for a number of different reasons. First, the brevity of this type of service may make it low-risk for students who are ambivalent or skeptical about serving. Partial programs that require a relatively small commitment may provide students who would otherwise not serve an opportunity to experiment in a service-based activity. Second, the brevity of a partial program lends itself to the "retreat-style" format that many students enjoy. Partial courses, for example, may require students to spend a weekend, a spring break, or a holiday vacation participating in a service project. If they stay together on or near the site, students may forge long-lasting bonds as they work, relax, retreat, and recreate together. Third, partial programs may force faculty, students, and community partners to set realistic expectations for the program. Typically, it is easier to determine what feasibly can be accomplished during a weekend program than during a semester-long project. Fourth, faculty frequently find it easier to arrange and/or obtain university assistance for short-term projects than for semester-long ones. On many campuses, for instance, it is possible for students to secure the use of university vehicles for short-term service retreats. Moreover, these particular types of service activities (i.e., retreats, alternative spring breaks, urban plunges) are often supported, both financially and logistically, by university offices that promote service programs.

Despite the advantages mentioned above, there are at least two critical limitations associated with partial programs. First, it may be difficult for students to establish and maintain relationships with the servees. The clients at a homeless shelter, for example, may be hesitant to engage in any type of meaningful conversation with students who are only scheduled to work for a day or two. On a related note, it may be the case that the types of projects undertaken in partial classes are superficial. It is doubtful that students can complete any type of meaningful project if they are spending only one or two days at the service site. Substantive projects that potentially have long-lasting benefit typically require more time than a partial class model affords.

"Full" service-learning classes may avoid some of the problems mentioned above. First, a full class is more likely to sustain the server-servee relationship as it requires students to visit the same agency throughout the course of an entire semester. Second, these long-term commitments lend themselves to more substantial community projects. Students who serve regularly at a local agency may become an integral part of that environment. Without regular volunteers, many agencies would find it difficult to maintain the programs and services for which they are responsible. Finally, a full class may create a "service habit." By serving continuously throughout the term, students may come to see service not only as something they do now, but also as something they want to continue.

On the down side, student interest may periodically wane during a full semester project. To reduce the likelihood of diminishing interests, faculty must creatively revisit the service text throughout the course. For example, faculty might need to dedicate a portion of class during week one, four, eight, and twelve to discussing the service text and its relationship to other course materials. Such discussions can be stimulating, but time consuming as well.

As introduced in Part One, interdisciplinarity's "broad and narrow" and "full and partial" terminology helps faculty conceptualize and then choose various types of service texts,[3] thereby addressing the question, What type of service is best? To help faculty answer the second question, How can the service text that I have chosen be integrated with other course texts, we now turn our attention to other terms utilized in the interdisciplinarity literature.

How Can the Service Text Be Integrated With Other Course Texts?

According to Markus, Howard and King (1993), service-learning is grounded upon the notion that

community-based service (i.e., practice) is integrated with in-class academic work (i.e., theory) so that each will inform, confirm, and challenge the other:

> We found that the academic payoffs of having students engage in community service are substantial when the service activity is integrated with traditional classroom instruction. The key word here is *integrated*. 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. (p. 417)

These service-learning educators rightly accentuate the importance of integration, but they neither fully describe the multiple ways integration occurs nor carefully theorize the intricate ways it can be conceptualized.

When service-learning pedagogues fail to explicitly define "integration," they are unlikely to answer—or even pose—the critical "how-to-integrate" question. Unless this question is thoughtfully entertained, curriculum revision is impeded. After all, faculty who are new to, or skeptical of, service-learning are unlikely to redesign a course around an underdeveloped concept (i.e., integration). Simply "telling" faculty to integrate service into their course is insufficient, as most instructors want to hear "how" integration can be structured. Interdisciplinarity terminology may help faculty answer this "how-to" question.

Overview of Interdisciplinary Terminology

Interdisciplinarians theorize integration by conceptualizing the relationship between the various disciplines utilized in their class (Newell & Green, 1982). They use the term "multi-disciplinary" to describe a class where several disciplinary perspectives are introduced but not integrated. They use the term "crossdisciplinary" to describe a class where one discipline is used to analyze another. A cross-disciplinary class integrates the disciplines more fully than a multidisciplinary one. But in a crossdisciplinary class, one discipline operates as the tool of analysis, and the other as the subject of analysis. Because the former is utilized as the lens, or the frame of reference from which the other is interpreted, evaluated, or judged, it maintains a position of power or privilege throughout the course. Unlike the crossdisciplinary course that habitually valorizes one discipline over the other(s), however, an "interdisciplinary" class uses each discipline to confirm and challenge the other discipline(s); no single discipline is habitually privileged (i.e., immune to scrutiny) as each is, at one time or another, the probe and the probed.

Again, because service is not a discipline, per se, this terminology is not completely transferable to service-learning. However, when service is configured as a text, the prefixes of interdisciplinarity's terminology ("multi," "cross," and "inter") can be affixed to the root word "text" to describe three types of textual integration:

1. Multitextual integration—the service text is an optional one that is recommended, but not required, for the course.
2. Crosstextual integration—service is a required text, but it often becomes subordinate to the theoretical text(s) in the course.
3. Intertextual integration—the service text (as a form of practice) and the academic texts (as forms of theory) mutually inform each other so that neither habitually occupies a privileged position in the course.

These terms have theoretical and pedagogical importance for service-learning because they describe three forms of textual integration for faculty consideration as they design a service-learning course.

The Multitextual Course

As the prefix "multi" and the root word "text" denote, a multitextual service-learning course is one that utilizes several texts. In this particular type of course, service is a text that is recommended but not required. For example, a multitextual "World Religions" course may award extra credit to students who volunteer at faith-based centers associated with local churches, mosques, synagogues, or temples. In this case, the course requires all students to read excerpts from the Bible, the Torah, and the Koran and from secondary sources that analyze each of the primary scriptures, but only recommends a service text (i.e., volunteer participation in the faith-based groups) to give interested students the opportunity to experience how various faiths practice their religion. Here, the service text functions as an optional one: students explore it on their own time, outside the classroom. As such, it is not often integrated into classroom activities. It is unlikely, in other words, that faculty will rely explicitly on this text to illuminate key issues, themes, or details introduced in the primary scriptures or secondary sources. Thus, the service text itself is not carefully examined nor used as a pedagogical probe for analyzing other texts used in class.

The multitextual course is hardly an ideal one for integrating course theory and service-learning practice. Indeed, its failure to intentionally integrate the service text with other course texts makes its educa-

tional value suspect. Given its academic shortcomings, perhaps the multitextual course is best conceived as a gateway to service-learning. A new faculty member, or a service-learning novice may "test the *teaching* waters" by recommending service as an optional text. Similarly, first year students, or those new to service-learning, may use a multitextual course to "test the *learning* waters." Clearly the multitextual type course is not the one toward which service-learning faculty should aspire. But it may be the one for faculty beginning their service-learning journey.

The Crosstextual Course

Recognizing the inherent problems associated with a course that merely recommends service, faculty may design a "crosstextual" course in which service is required. As a required text, the service is integrated more fully with other course texts than would be in the multitextual class. By definition, however, crosstextual integration always precedes in a unilateral direction, usually theory to practice: theory ⇒ practice. When a crosstextual course promotes a theory-to-practice translation, the theoretical text(s) take academic priority over the service text. In other words, theory is utilized to probe, scrutinize, and critique practice (i.e., the service text), but the service is not similarly utilized to analyze and scrutinize the theory.

Professional experience at service-learning meetings and conferences suggests that many service-learning courses fall into a crosstextual category that privileges the academic text over the service text. In these courses, faculty instruct students to apply classroom theory to their out-of-classroom experiences. This seems especially common in upper-division theory courses that provide in-depth analysis of a specific perspective, such as "John Dewey's Theory of Education" or "Marxist Interpretations of Culture." In such courses, faculty ask students to use theory to analyze and dissect that which they observe and experience at the service site. Here, faculty may ask students to answer questions such as: "What advice would Dewey offer to improve the academic and co-curricular programs featured at the school being served"? Or, "Drawing from the three Marxist theories discussed this semester (classical, neo, and feminist Marxism), which one could be used to revise Food Bank X's mission statement to shift the emphasis from its 'Lunch Line' program to its counseling outreach program?" Ideally, students' responses to such question not only augment their own learning but also may improve the contribution the students make to the organization being served.

Neither of the aforementioned examples illustrates another type of crosstextual course—one much less common—that requires students to translate practice to theory: practice ⇒ theory. This type of crosstextual course would habitually use the service text to test theory. The theoretical text in this case is the subject of inquiry. It is scrutinized by the service text that operates as the tool of analysis. This practical probe of the theoretical may be catalyzed by regularly posing questions such as these: Based on your concrete experience at High School X, describe two or three ideas that Dewey's theory of democratic education ignores or trivializes. Or, based on your personal work with female clients at the food bank, how do real life identities—those constituted by race, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation—challenge the foundational assumptions of classical Marxism? How can Marxist theory be improved to take into account such complex identities? If feasible, students might share their responses (to these questions and others posed throughout the course) with the organization being served.

Regardless of the academic direction (theory ⇒ practice or practice ⇒ theory) instructors of a crosstextual course should insure that all participants (students, CBOs, clients, etc) potentially benefit. After all, mutual benefit or reciprocity *is* a cornerstone of service-learning. Mutual benefit does not mean, however, that all participants give and receive the same exact things. The benefits that students experience in service-learning (e.g., increased comprehension of course material, more developed critical thinking skills, growing interest in their academic major) may vary significantly from the benefits enjoyed by the agency (e.g., more one-on-one attention with clients, timely delivery of programs, additional staff hours). Nevertheless, it is imperative for faculty to insure, ideally in collaboration with the community organization, that some benefits accrue for all service-learning participants.

The chart on the following page provides a comprehensive overview of crosstextuality by combining the types of service texts introduced in Part One with the more common theory ⇒ practice course described above. The chart first defines four forms that the crosstextual course may take (partial and narrow, partial and broad, full and narrow, and full and broad), provides a concrete example of each, identifies the audience to whom this particular option may appeal, and summarizes a few of the strengths and weakness associated with each.

The Intertextual Course

The third type of textual integration that faculty might choose for their service-learning course is "intertextual" integration. In an intertextual course, service and theory are mutually informing. Neither the theoretical text nor the service text habitually

FIGURE 1
Overview of Four Types of Theory ⇏ Practice Crosstextual Courses.

Partial & Narrow	*Definition:* All students are required to participate in the same one-time or short-term project. This project is analyzed by the theoretical texts used in the course. *Example:* As a mandatory part of ECON 335, students participate in a five day alternative spring break project with Habitat for Humanity. Upon return, they are required to write an essay that addresses this question: How would the author of our textbook explain the purpose, importance, and problems of an organization like Habitat for Humanity? *Appropriate Users:* Upper class students who are capable of translating theory to practice in concrete ways. *Pros:* Short-term projects may be easier to coordinate than on-going ones. The shared service experience may strengthen relationships between students and facilitate class reflection. *Cons:* The service text itself is probed, but the instrument of analysis (i.e., the theory) remains untouched. Furthermore, this uni-directional translation of theory to practice is an "academic" exercise that may not significantly benefit the agency.
Partial & Broad	*Definition:* Individual students, or student groups, choose or are assigned their own service project. This project is a mandatory one that will be analyzed by course theory. *Example:* Students in ECON 335 are required to choose a one-time service project from a "menu" supplied by the instructor. Students can work on their own project or work on a project with 2-3 other students. *Appropriate Users:* Same as above. *Pros:* When students choose their own project, they may feel more ownership for it. This ownership may prompt them to see the relevance in the theory to practice translation. *Cons:* May be time consuming both logistically (generating lists of sites and communicating with personnel at those sites) and pedagogically (structuring reflection that focuses on multiple sites).
Full & Narrow	*Definition:* For the better part of an entire semester, all students in the class serve at the same agency. The activities they perform are examined through the theoretical lens of the course. *Example:* Each of the students in ECON 335 works at a local food bank throughout the semester. *Appropriate Users:* Students who have both the requisite academic skills and the time and energy to uphold an ongoing service commitment. *Pros:* Students share a common ongoing experience that lends itself to class discussion. The extended time they serve allows students to develop and maintain relationships with each other and the community partners they serve. *Cons:* May be difficult for commuter students. Some agencies cannot handle 20 students. Faculty and on-site supervisors must work at keeping the service meaningful. Long-term commitments can wane. Accountability and responsibility can be diffused when 20 students are serving the same site.
Full & Broad	*Definition:* Each student or student group serves at a different agency. Numerous agencies are served by a single class. *Example:* In ECON 335, students choose their own project and they work at the same site throughout the semester. If a student does not have a preference, the professor assigns him/her a site and a project. *Appropriate Users:* Same as the Full and Narrow Course. *Pros:* Extended commitment allows relationships to develop between servers and servees. *Cons:* Difficult or time consuming for faculty to coordinate multiple projects. Students at one site may have no idea what students at the other sites are doing. This may interfere with quality classroom discussion.

occupies the privileged position, nor is either immune from scrutiny or modification. Here, the terminology and theory from traditional texts (i.e., textbooks, films, novels, or course readers) are used to explain, support, and/or challenge practices or policies at the service site. Coorespandingly, the service experience is used to confirm and/or contradict the theories and concepts presented in the course's textbooks, films, journal articles, etc.

This does not necessarily mean that theory and practice are eternally balanced, with each contributing equally to emerging perspectives. Because there will be times when theory needs to inform the practices unfolding at the site, and other times when service experiences are needed to challenge the presuppositions of theory, service and theory will alternately hold the position of privilege.

In an intertextual course, then, theory and practice critically inform each other so that a new, more comprehensive perspective emerges. Importantly, this

new perspective is not simply an additive one formed by the sum of its parts. Because an intertextual course uses the theoretical and service text as both the object and subject of analysis, each informs and ultimately improves the other. By refining both abstract theory and concrete practice, service-learning instructors and students become critical theorists and reflective practitioners. For these reasons, intertextual integration is arguably the model to which service-learning instructors should aspire. Given that this bilateral integration (theory ⇔ practice) is complex, an intertextual course may be best utilized by veteran service-learning instructors who teach upper-division or applied theory classes. As in the previous section, I conclude this section with the same summary-analysis chart.

FIGURE 2
Overview of Four Types of Intertextual Courses.

Partial & Narrow	*Definition:* All students participate in the same service activity. As a requirement of the course, this service text functions as both an object of, and tool for, analysis. *Example:* All students in PHIL 465, "Theories and Political Activities of Liberal Philosophers," spend their Fall Break at a non-profit residential center for pregnant, drug-addicted women. Upon return, they write an essay that explains (1) How their service supports & challenges John Rawls' notion of the rational, autonomous self, and (2) How Rawls' theory of distributive justice could support and legitimize the center's pleas for local and state subsidies. *Appropriate Users:* Upper class students who are capable of translating theory to practice and practice to theory in concrete ways. *Pros:* Short-term projects are easier to coordinate than on-going ones. The shared service experience may strengthen relationships amongst students and facilitate a discussion that catalyzes the bilateral theory¤practice translation. *Cons:* To orchestrate effective bilateral theory¤practice translation, faculty must spend considerable time structuring the reflection process. Because this process is more than a mere academic exercise, on-site supervisors should also be included. Such inclusion takes time and energy to coordinate.
Partial & Broad	*Definition:* Individual students, or student groups, choose or are assigned their own service project. This project is a mandatory one that will analyze and be analyzed by course theory. *Example:* Students in PHIL 465 are required to choose a one-time service project from a "menu" supplied by the instructor. Students can work on their own project or work on a project with 2-3 other students. *Appropriate Users:* Same as the partial and narrow course. *Pros:* When students choose their own project, they may feel more ownership for it. This ownership may prompt them to take the bilateral theory ¤practice translation seriously. Both theory & practice are potentially improved. *Cons:* May be time consuming logistically (generating lists of sites and communicating with personnel at those sites) and pedagogically (structuring reflection that focuses on multiple sites).
Full & Narrow	*Definition:* Throughout the semester, all students in the class serve at the same agency. The uniform service text examines and is examined by the other texts utilized in the course. *Example:* Each of the students in PHIL 465 volunteers at the local NAACP chapter throughout the semester. *Appropriate Users:* Students who have both the requisite academic skills and the time and energy to uphold the ongoing service commitment. *Pros:* Students share a common ongoing experience that facilitates the theory¤practice translation. Thus, learning is augmented and community practices may be improved. The extended time they serve allows students to develop and maintain relationships with each other and the community partners they serve. *Cons:* May be difficult for commuter students. Some agencies cannot handle 20 students. Faculty and on-site supervisors must work at keeping the service meaningful. Long term commitments can wane. Accountability and responsibility can be diffused when 20 students are serving the same site.
Full & Broad	*Definition:* Each student or student group volunteers (on an ongoing basis) at a different agency. The individual student maintains the same site assignment, but there may be numerous agencies served by a single class. *Example:* In PHIL 465, students choose their own project and work at the same site throughout the semester. If they do not have a preference, the professor assigns a site and a project to them. *Appropriate Users:* Same as the Full and Narrow Course. *Pros:* Extended commitment allows relationships to develop between servers and servees. *Cons:* Difficult or time consuming for faculty to coordinate multiple projects. Students at one site may have no idea what students at the other site are doing. This lack of familiarity may interfere with quality classroom discussion.

Conclusion

Service-learning educators can use interdisciplinarity to stretch the service-as-text metaphor. Such an alliance is extremely beneficial, for the following reasons:

1. *Along with the theory of reciprocity, interdisciplinarity helps to differentiate service-learning from other forms of service.* My visits to campuses throughout the country reveal that increasing numbers of students, faculty, academic administrators, and student affairs professionals are becoming generally familiar with "service-learning." When I ask faculty and staff to talk specifically about service-learning pedagogy, however, there is oftentimes some hesitation or confusion. Presumably, this is because service-learning is still conflated (on some campuses) with community service and volunteerism. From an academic perspective, it is crucial to differentiate service-learning from community service and volunteerism, as the latter forms of service typically focus more on the service provided than on the learning potential (Furco, 1996). One of the most effective ways to help faculty structure the learning side of the equation is to prompt them to configure the service itself as a text. When faculty think about service as a text, they begin to address the pedagogical questions that frame this article.
2. *Interdisciplinarity illuminates numerous options in course design.* As argued throughout this article, service-learning pedagogy—as both an academic concept and an educational practice—is still under-developed. Most faculty, especially service-learning novices, do not have the time nor the training to carefully conceptualize the types of service options that might make sense for their particular course. Bearing these limitations in mind, the two charts offered herein (a) delineate eight distinct models of service-learning courses, (b) summarize the pros and cons associated with each, and (c) suggest the type of student for whom each course is appropriate. Ideally, these charts will assist service-learning educators to conceptualize and ultimately operationalize their own service-learning pedagogy.
3. *Interdisciplinarity creates—or at least augments—a vocabulary for service-learning faculty to use when describing their own teaching.* At almost every campus in the country, promotion and tenure decisions are based on three main criteria: research, teaching, and service. The work associated with research and service is clearly visible; it is manifested in "public ways" and is therefore more readily accessible for evaluation. Judging teaching, however, may be a more difficult task because the teaching is performed on a "private stage," with students (not faculty colleagues) as the audience. To accurately describe both the learning that transpires in the class and the pedagogy that brings it about, it is imperative that faculty members be equipped to talk about their teaching styles. This is even more critical when instructors utilize a "new" or commonly misunderstood pedagogy like service-learning. Ideally, faculty can use the nuanced terminology and detailed taxonomies introduced in this article as they write their own or others' evaluations, submit grants, apply for teaching awards, or compile their professional portfolios.
4. *Interdisciplinarity introduces to established service-learning theorists and practioners a set of concepts that they can use, refine, and further develop as they facilitate faculty development institutes, conference sessions, and professional workshops.* Simply put, conference and workshop attendees neither want a service-learning sales pitch nor a service-learning mandate. To use the words of one participant, "We want relevant information that will allow us to make decisions for our own students, classes, and universities." The terminology introduced in this article should help faculty answer the following types of questions: Why should I utilize this type of pedagogy, what type of "extra" work will service-learning generate, what is the best way to ease into service-learning, and where should my students serve?
5. *Interdisciplinarity reminds senior administrators who call for service-learning that there is no simple or uniform way to implement a service-learning program.* As convocation addresses, commencement speeches, and orientation greetings make clear, some of the strongest advocates for service-learning on many campuses are university presidents, provosts, and deans. It is important that those who call for expanding service-learning to be in a position to contribute to setting its overall direction. Does the president or provost, for example, expect faculty to initiate on-going relationships with the community by teaching "full" service-learning courses? Or would campus leaders be equally satisfied with several one-day service projects where students log an eight-hour shift? If faculty opt for nar-

row projects that serve relatively few numbers of CBOs, are the deans and department chairs ready to field questions from "concerned" community members who want volunteers at their agency? Before university leaders rally the troops around service-learning, they first ought to inventory the types of service-learning options currently in place at their institution. Second, they should articulate their plan for the future, informing faculty about models that they would like them to offer. Again, the lists and taxonomies presented here can help leaders to review the current state of offerings and to plan—responsibly and realistically—for future directions.

As argued throughout this paper, interdisciplinarity does more than make meaning out of a metaphor. It prompts faculty to conceptualize and operationalize a pedagogy that can augment student learning, address real-life community needs, and enhance their own teaching skills. Ideally, then, this article can help faculty realize the pedagogical potential of the commonly invoked, but until now only dimly illuminated, service-as-text metaphor.

Notes

The author thanks Carolyn Haynes and William Newell of Miami of Ohio University's Interdisciplinary College for comments made on an earlier draft of this paper.

[1] This focus does not suggest that the learning side is more important than the service side of service-learning. Rather it identifies this paper as a pedagogical tool to help faculty choose a course design that augments student learning.

[2] "Interdisciplinarity" does not exist as a monolith. Indeed there are various, and at times, conflicting camps subsumed under this label. I want to be clear from the onset, however, that my particular deployment of the term connotes neither a rejection nor complete combination of the disciplines themselves. Accordingly, it should be explicitly distinguished from "adisciplinarity" and "transdisciplinarity." Because adisciplinarians believe that disciplines are "misguided," they attempt to abandon or completely dismantle them. Transdisciplinarians, on the other hand, believe in the unity of all knowledge; therefore, they want to create a meta or "superdiscipline" (See Newell & Green, 1982). Resisting the directions charted by each of these terms, I utilize "interdisciplinarity" to denote the purposeful integration of disciplinary perspectives. For me, interdisciplinarity refers to the process of using more than one academic discipline to examine a question, issue, or concern too broad to be addressed by a single discipline. This definition is borrowed directly from J.T. Klien & W. Newell (1996).

[3] As will be delineated in forthcoming charts, these approaches can be *combined* in pedagogically-purposeful ways such that a faculty member can opt to teach a partial and narrow course, a partial and broad course, a full and narrow course, or a full and broad course.

References

Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. *Expanding boundaries: Service and learning*, 2-6.

Klein, J.T., & Newell, W. (1996). Advancing interdisciplinary studies. In J. Gaff & J. Ratcliff (Eds.), *Handbook of the undergraduate curriculum* (pp. 393-415). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Markus, G., Howard, J., & King, D. (1993). Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15*, 410-419.

Morton, K. (1996). Issues related to integrating service-learning into the curriculum. In B. Jacoby & Associates (Eds.), *Service-learning in higher education* (pp. 276-295). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Newell, W. (1998). Professionalizing interdisciplinarity: Literature review and research agenda. In W. Newell (Ed.), *Interdisciplinarity: Essays from the literature.* New York: The College Board.

Newell, W. & Green, W. (1982). Defining and teaching interdisciplinary studies. *Improving College and University Teaching, 30*, 23-30.

Van Dusseldorp, D. & Wigboldus, S. (1994). Interdisciplinary research for integrated rural development in developing countries: The roles of social sciences. *Issues of Integrative Studies, 12*, 93-138.

Varlotta, L. (1996). Service-learning: A catalyst for constructing democratic progressive communities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 3*, 22-30.

Author

LORI VARLOTTA is the Dean of Student Life at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. In recent years, she has used her interdisciplinary doctorate degree in Educational Leadership, Women's Studies, and Philosophy of Education to conceptualize and operationalize service-learning and non-hierarchical leadership programs on several campuses throughout the country.

Resources

Links to Service-Learning Resources on the World Wide Web

Campus Compact
http://www.compact.org

A comprehensive site that includes resources for service-learning practitioners, including faculty, presidents, and administrators. Includes a calendar of events, extensive links to web resources, job listings, news, model programs and sample syllabi, a section dedicated to "Building the Service-Learning Pyramid," and much more.

American Association of Colleges & Universities
www.aacu-edu.org

AAC&U's site provides detailed descriptions of its projects, including the Diversity Initiative, in which service-learning and campus-community partnerships play an important role. The site also contains general information about membership, meetings, and publications.

American Association of Community Colleges Service-Learning Page
www.aacc.nche.edu/initiatives/SERVICE/SERVICE.HTM

The site for AACC's service-learning project. Includes links to model programs at various community college campuses, general information about federal initiatives such as America Reads and practical information about applying service-learning in the community college curriculum. Also includes a listing of workshops and events and links to service-learning organizations.

American Association of Higher Education Service-Learning Project
www.aahe.org/service/srv-lrn.htm

A description of AAHE's Service-Learning Project, including coalition-building conferences and the 18-volume monograph series on service-learning in the disciplines. Also includes links to other service-learning resources and to other AAHE programs and partnerships.

The Big Dummy's Guide to Service-Learning
www.fiu.edu/~time4chg/Library/bigdummy.html

This site is organized around frequently asked questions and divided into faculty and programmatic issues. Includes "101 Ideas for Combining Service & Learning" in various disciplines.

Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges
www.mc.maricopa.edu/academic/compact/

Includes listings of events, awards, and publications (with an on-line order form and a number of on-line versions). Also includes detailed descriptions of CCNCCC's mission and major projects.

The Colorado Service-Learning Home Page
Csf.Colorado.EDU/sl/

A comprehensive site with definitions of service-learning; a thorough listing of undergraduate service-learning programs with online course lists and syllabi; links to college and university homepages; and a list of links to service-learning organizations, networks, and resources. This site also houses a searchable archive of the Colorado Service-Learning listserv.

Essential Reading

AAHE's Series on Service-Learning in the Disciplines monograph series. Washington, DC: AAHE Publications, 1999.

Bringle, Robert G., Games, Richard, and Malloy, Edward A. (eds.) Colleges and Universities as Citizens, Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1999.

Bringle, Robert G. and Hatcher, Julie A. "Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, 67 (2), p. 221-239; 1996.

Delve, Cecilia I., Mintz, Suzanne D., Stewart, Greig M. (eds.) Community Service as Values Education, New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 50, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Eyler, Janet and Giles, Dwight E. Jr. Where's the Learning in Service-Learning? San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

Eyler, Janet, Giles, Dwight E., Jr., Schmiede, Angela. A Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service-Learning: Student Voices and Reflections. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, 1996.

Howard, Jeffery (ed.) Praxis I: A Faculty Casebook on Community Service, and Praxis II: Service Learning Resources for University Students, Staff and Faculty. Ann Arbor, MI: Office of Community Service Learning, 1993.

Jacoby, Barbara, and Associates. Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1996

Kendall, Jane et al. Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service. Vols. I and II. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 1990.

Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning. (3), Fall 1996. Ann Arbor: OCSL Press, The University of Michigan. Available through the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning website at http://www.umich.edu/~ocsl/MJCSL/.

Rhoads, Robert A. and Jeffrey P. F. Howard (eds.) Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (73), Spring 1998.

Stanton, T., Giles, D., Jr., Cruz, N. Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

Zlotkowski, Edward (ed.) Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company, 1998.

Questions to Consider

1. Who are your students? First-year? Majors? Re-entry? International?
2. Where will they go? Transportation issues?
3. What will they do?
4. How many hours will they devote?
5. What is their meaningful service?
6. Who will supervise them?
7. What support is available to your co-educators?
8. Will co-educators provide evaluation? Feedback? Grades?
9. Do the students need training or orientation to do their service?
10. Any other preparation required?
11. Groups or individual service projects?
12. Concentrated time commitment or spread out over time?
13. Direct contact with those served?
14. Are you incorporating the use of technology?
15. What's the timing and connection with what you are doing in the classroom?
16. Will the students be civically engaged?
17. How will you define civic engagement?

Bloom's Taxonomy

Bloom's taxonomy is a well-known description of levels of educational objectives. It may be useful to consider this taxonomy when defining your objectives.

Level	Cognitive Behaviors
Knowledge	To know specific facts, terms, concepts, principles, or theories
Comprehension	To understand, interpret, compare & contrast, explain
Application	To apply knowledge to new situations, to solve problems
Analysis	To identify the organizational structure of something to identify parts, relationships, and organizing principles
Synthesis	To create something, to integrate ideas into a solution, to propose an action plan, to formulate a new classification scheme
Evaluation	To judge the quality of something based on its adequacy, value, logic, or use

Relevant Verbs (taken from Joe Larkin)

Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
▪ Define ▪ Identify ▪ Indicate ▪ Label ▪ List ▪ Memorize ▪ Name ▪ Recall ▪ Record ▪ Relate ▪ Repeat ▪ Select ▪ Underline	▪ Classify ▪ Describe ▪ Discuss ▪ Explain ▪ Express ▪ Identify ▪ Locate ▪ Paraphrase ▪ Recognize ▪ Report ▪ Restate ▪ Review ▪ Suggest ▪ Summarize ▪ Tell ▪ Translate	▪ Apply ▪ Compute ▪ Construct ▪ Demonstrate ▪ Dramatize ▪ Employ ▪ Give examples ▪ Illustrate ▪ Interpret ▪ Investigate ▪ Operate ▪ Organize ▪ Practice ▪ Predict ▪ Schedule ▪ Shop ▪ Sketch ▪ Translate ▪ Use	▪ Analyze appraise ▪ Calculate ▪ Categorize ▪ Compare ▪ Contrast ▪ Criticize ▪ Debate ▪ Determine ▪ Diagram ▪ Differentiate ▪ Distinguish ▪ Examine ▪ Experiment ▪ Inspect ▪ Inventory ▪ Question ▪ Relate ▪ Solve ▪ Test	▪ Arrange ▪ Assemble ▪ Collect compose ▪ Construct ▪ Create ▪ Design ▪ Formulate ▪ Manage ▪ Organize ▪ Perform ▪ Plan ▪ Prepare ▪ Produce ▪ Prose ▪ Set-up	▪ Appraise ▪ Assess choose ▪ Compare ▪ Contrast ▪ Decide ▪ Estimate ▪ Evaluate ▪ Grade ▪ Judge ▪ Measure ▪ Rate ▪ Revise ▪ Score ▪ Select ▪ Value

center for internships & community CICE engagement

CICE Faculty Interface tool

Faculty can now access and download updated information about their students' status in completing CICE's risk management procedures. The online tool allows you to choose which of your courses you want to review, and lists each student who has begun the CICE online registration process (your enrolled students who have not yet begun the process will not appear on the reports). The three steps in the process (registration, placement, and consent) are given for each student. The risk management procedures are not completed until the student's "consent" status is marked YES.

How to utilize CICE Faculty Interface

⇨ Navigate to the CICE homepage: http://www.fullerton.edu/cice

⇨ Under the **Faculty** menu (in purple), click on **CICE Faculty Interface.**

⇨ On the login screen, use your campus portal id and password to log in.

⇨ Click on the appropriate **Term/Course** you would like to search. Student registration information will appear.

⇨ Click on **Detail** button to get detailed student and placement information

How to pull reports from CICE Faculty Interface

⇨ Once you are logged in to the Faculty Interface, click on **Reports** link.

⇨ Select the appropriate **Term/Course.**

⇨ Click on **Generate Report** to generate a spreadsheet showing students' status in the processes of registration/placement/consent on the CICE system.

NEED HELP?

Center for Internships & Community Engagement
800 State College Blvd, LH 206
Fullerton CA 92831
Call Us: (657) 278-3746 -- Email Us: cice@fullerton.edu

Revised: 2/7/11

center for internships & community CICE engagement

Service-Learning Registration Instructions

What is Service-Learning?

Service-learning is a teaching methodology, which utilizes service experiences in the community as text for learning in the classroom. At Cal State Fullerton, students enrolled in service-learning courses engage in up to 40 hours of service per semester, to meet unmet community needs.

Step 1: Find a Service-Learning Site

Option One: Choose from List provided by Instructor
Check your syllabus or with your instructor whether there is a list of specific sites from which you can choose a service-learning experience. If not, it is your responsibility to find a site.

Option Two: Find one in Titan Connection
➢Log on to the ***CSUF homepage, www.fullerton.edu***
➢At the ***Portal Logon*** and the bottom of the page, input your Campus-Wide ID number and pin number.
➢Under ***Quick Links*** on your Student Portal page, click on ***Career Center***.
➢If you have never been to this page before, you may have to fill out a short form to access the database.
➢Click on ***Jobs & Internships*** on the blue toolbar on the left
➢Click on ***Jobs & Internships on Titan Connection***
➢Click on ***Jobs & Internships*** on the toolbar at the top toolbar on the webpage.
➢Highlight and Click ***Titan Connection jobs***
➢Click the "Show More" button
➢Highlight **Service-Learning** under position type
➢Enter a relevant **keyword** and click **Search**

Option Three: Find your own
If you found a site on your own and were offered to complete your service-learning there, great! Simply ask the agency or organization to register in our database on our website,www.fullerton.edu/cice/partners/service_learning.php
Please allow a minimum of 3 weeks to complete site registration.

Step 2: Complete the CICE Registration

After you have contacted the agency or organization and been offered a service-learning position, ask for an orientation. Also, inform the site supervisor of the number of hours you need to complete for the semester. Once you are ***certain*** that you have been accepted by the organization, complete the CICE Registration as follows:

➢Navigate to http://www.fullerton.edu/cice
➢Click on ***CICE Registration***
➢Input your Campus username and password ***(Same as your portal login)***
➢ Select: Service-learning
➢ Click ***Login.***
➢Click **Begin Registration**
➢Complete *all* boxes that are not already completed for you on the ***Student Registration*** form. Click **Continue**.
➢Enter **Emergency Contact** info and click **Continue**.
➢Enter your course **schedule number** for your course and click **Search**
➢Enter the number of units you will be taking the course for and click **Continue**
➢After page updates click **Continue**.
➢ Select your Service-Learning site and position from the drop down menus and click ***Continue***
➢To add more than one site, click **Add a placement site** and repeat step above or click **Continue**
➢ The next screen will be the ***Consent Form.*** Please read the consent form carefully and check the box next to "***I Agree to this consent form"***
➢ Click on "**Submit Registration Form**"
➢ Print a copy for your records or to turn in to your instructors if required

Need Assistance?
Visit Us: Langsdorf Hall 206
Hours: Mon-Friday 8am-5pm
Call Us: (657) 278-3746
Email Us: cice@fullerton.edu