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While there has been a steady increase in the understanding of how service-learning affects students, there remains a dearth of research on how using service-learning pedagogy impacts faculty. In this research study six themes emerged that illuminate how using this innovative pedagogy shaped and influenced faculty members' understandings of, and approaches to, teaching and learning.

An abiding belief exists among innovators, researchers, and many others that faculty participation and commitment is critical to implementing and institutionalizing innovative forms of curricula and pedagogy (Bringle, G., & Malloy, J., 1999; Checkoway, B., 2001; Fairweather, H., 1995; Pinkelstein, S., & Schuster, H., 1998; Hall, H., 1991; Kuh, G., & Whitt, J., 1991; Lee, J., 2006). Because of the direct connection to the curriculum and the teaching and learning process, service-learning is one such innovation that requires direct faculty involvement and support. Yet when called upon to implement innovations such as service-learning, many faculty are challenged by the knowledge, skills, support, or motivation needed to engage in this change (Bok, 1988). Moreover, these innovations often confront traditional pedagogical approaches.

To be sure, the primary measure of any effective pedagogy should be its impact on student learning. Although much has been learned about the impact of service-learning on students and student learning (Asimio & Sax, 1998; Bringle et al., 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1997; Kenrick, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1990; Rhoads, 1997; Rhoads & Howard, 1998; Schneider, 2000), there remains a dearth of studies exploring how participating in service-learning impacts faculty. Indeed, despite the obvious importance of faculty participation in service-learning pedagogy, scant research exists to inform understanding how implementation of this approach affects faculty teaching and learning. Driscoll (2000) noted that most of the existing research on service-learning and faculty has focused on how best to prepare faculty to teach using this approach. Moreover, she points out: "Studies of the impact of service-learning on faculty is a fertile research area with the potential to uncover more possibilities than we anticipate at this time" (p. 38). A better understanding of this concept sheds light on the role of service-learning as a strategy for creating and supporting conditions conducive to faculty growth and learning and for improving the quality of undergraduate education and the teaching and learning enterprise (Rice, 1996).

Does use of pedagogical innovations significantly change how faculty teach and learn? The purpose of this study was to describe and interpret how the implementation of service-learning pedagogy affects faculty. Advancing understanding of the meanings and behaviors that faculty associate with using service-learning pedagogy most directly contributes to knowledge and understanding of the impact on faculty instructional approaches, which is the particular category of findings I report here.

What We Know about Impact on Faculty

Despite what is known about the positive effects of service-learning, its implementation and sustainability face significant barriers, including institutional culture and a lack of faculty involvement and preparation (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Rubia, 1996; Ward, 1996, 1998). But while these barriers exist, many faculty on campuses across the country do implement service-learning, and much can be learned from them.

Are faculty who implement service-learning affected? Beyond informal data gathering and anecdotal reports, limited research is available on how engaging in service-learning pedagogy affects faculty. Heuristic models and scant research suggest that faculty and their teaching can be affected in various ways, including recontextualizing classroom norms and roles, enhancing their understanding of student and community needs, and in some cases, expanding opportunities for their scholarship.

For example, some believe faculty are challenged to rethink their traditional pedagogical approaches. Howard (1998) compares a traditional pedagogical model—individualistic, teacher-centered, based on
information dissemination—with a counternormative pedagogy required by service-learning—a synergistic classroom, one in which the responsibility for teaching and learning was shared by students and instructors. This counternormative model requires that the instructor and the students travel together [itides in original] on a journey to remake the classroom" (p. 25) by relocalizing themselves around a new set of roles, relationships, and norms.

Similarly, Zlodowitz's (1994) posits that the faculty experience with service-learning includes more than just learning a new set of techniques; it challenges faculty to understand the context of service-learning within their discipline, acknowledge their role in developing values as well as ethical responsibility and leadership, and see the community as a co-teacher. For service-learning to be successful, Zlodowitz believes faculty must challenge themselves to rethink their pedagogy in light of such dimensions. Indeed, he states that "service-learning packs a whole worldview of theoretical and epistemological changes to the status quo" (p. 62) that faculty must consider. Both Howard and Zlodowitz draw attention to the challenge for faculty and illuminate the potential ways that faculty may be affected by using service-learning.

Despite the existence of these heuristic tools, few studies have considered the experience of faculty or explored the extent of faculty engagement in service-learning pedagogy significantly or on their teaching and learning experiences or philosophy. A qualitative study of faculty participation in a service-learning development seminar; Stanton (1994) learned that faculty development and implementation of a service-learning course is affected by intrinsic motivation, prior knowledge of learning theory, perception of institutional value on teaching, and their faculty role. Hammond (1994) surveyed 250 faculty in Michigan and concluded that faculty who become more involved in service-learning are motivated by curricular concerns more than personal or extracurricular concerns. In addition, the study found that faculty were most satisfied with their enhanced sense of meaning associated with their involvement and by the freedom to choose service-learning, and they were least satisfied with how much time was required to implement service-learning and with the "interface between service-learning and scholarly pursuits" (p. 27). Others have considered the factors that encourage and deter faculty from using service-learning (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Mundy, 2002). These studies show that faculty are challenged by institutional barriers and time constraints, but those who use service-learning may find their experience relevant and meaningful.

Most germane to this study is the work of Driscoll et al. (1998), who used a case study approach to study the impact and develop impact variables, indicators of each variable, and suggested assessment instruments to gather data on the impact of service-learning. Variables included awareness of community, professional development, scholarship, teaching philosophy and methods, and commitment to community-based teaching. In another study, this model was identified in a wide range of potential effects on faculty; its limitations include its small sample size, and the fact that only faculty who were currently implementing service-learning were studied.

The Impact of Service-Learning Pedagogy on Faculty Teaching and Learning

Driscoll (2000) observed that these case studies included exploring the process of assessing service-learning experiences, but they also yielded faculty impact variables for the first time in continuing research effords" (p. 36). Indeed, I agree with Driscoll's (2000) call for research in this area: "Not only do the beginning insights from these case studies much to be studied, but this aspect of the research agenda has the potential to influence most of the other agenda items, including faculty motivation, support, and satisfaction." (p. 38).

Research Methods and Design

My approach to understanding faculty experiences was guided by an interpretive perspective, the goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it" (Schwartz et al., 1998, p. 118). Thus, this study was anchored in a qualitative research approach focusing on trying to make sense of faculty members' experience by interpreting the meaning that they make from utilizing this pedagogy (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

For this study, I utilized an embedded single case study design, an approach that is particularly effective in exploratory studies (Yin, 2003). I conducted my research at one institution with an established service-learning program, which allowed me a logical point of access to the institution and a critical mass of experience with service-learning pedagogy. Milwaukee University (MUV) is a Catholic independent university (Doctoral I/ Research Extensive) located in the center of a large, urban Midwestern city. It has an undergraduate enrollment of 7,300 students, most of whom are age 18-24. While MU has always articulated undergraduate teaching as an ethic of service as important values and priorities, this is increasing emphasis on missing the institution's mission profile, a point made both by the faculty and administrators. Indeed, one associate professor half-jokingly shared with me that at MU the breakdown of expected faculty work was "40% research, 40% teaching, and 40% service".

The service-learning program at MU officially began in the early 1990s with 10 service-learning courses and has grown to 40-50 service-learning courses each semester. More than 60 faculty have taken using service-learning, and approximately 800 students participate in the program each semester. Service-learning program activities include course selection, faculty supervision, placement selection, student placement, student preparation, and student monitoring and assistance.

Data collection continued for 11 months. The primary data source for this study was semi-structured interviews with faculty and teaching staff (hereafter "faculty")—selected from a list of 61 service-learning faculty—who had implemented or were in the process of implementing service-learning in a credit bearing academic course at MU. The range of service-learning experience for these faculty was from those who were implementing service-learning for the first time to those with eight or more years of experience using this teaching approach. Those who were using it for the first time were interviewed at the beginning and end of the semester. I purposefully sampled faculty seeking a diverse group based on four guiding criteria (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Glese & Peskin, 1992): (a) those who were currently implementing or had implemented service-learning in their classrooms within the last three semesters; (b) representation by discipline; (c) academic rank; and (d) gender. In addition to 35 faculty interviews, I also interviewed three administrators who provided unique perspectives on the campus, service-learning program, and its impact on faculty.

Interviews with all participants were audio-taped and transcribed for the purpose of capturing all of the participants' comments and noting specific questions and follow-up questions. Other data sources included service-learning syllabi, course materials, institutional documents, field notes, and limited participant observation.

Glesne and Peskin (1992) note that the process of analyzing qualitative data is "a continuing process that should begin just as soon as your research begins. It follows, then, that interviewing is not simply devoted to data acquisition. It is also a time to consider the relationships, salience, meanings, and explanations." (p. 81). Consistent with qualitative methods, I utilized a constant comparative method, which emphasized the context and interpretation between data collection and analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The use of coding strategies served as the primary method for analyzing data, including coding, field notes, and documents. Data were collected and analyzed, resulting in the development of hundreds of codes. These codes were sorted and further analyzed, leading to the emergence of categories about how implementation of service-learning pedagogy affected faculty. To assist in the coding and analyzing data, I used the software application Atlas.ti which supported the development of a database and helped in the process of identifying patterns and themes.

As a way of reflecting on the emerging themes, I employed memo writing (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glesne & Peskin, 1992) to develop my emerging interpretations and memo checks to determine the accuracy of my analysis (Glesne & Pergamiton, 1988). For example, as ideas and themes emerged, I used subsequent interviews with faculty and discussions with administrators to check for accuracy. A significant audit trail and triangulation was used in two ways to increase the trustworthiness of my findings. Glesne & Peskin (1992); Janesick, 2000). First, participants included faculty with no experience using service-learning pedagogy ("new faculty"), those with varying experience levels, and administrators who had working knowledge of the service-learning program. Second, although the primary data source for this study was interviews, I also included student feedback and faculty with no experience using service-learning pedagogy ("new faculty"), those with varying experience levels, and administrators who had working knowledge of the service-learning program. Second, although the primary data source for this study was interviews, I also included student interviews of faculty that gathered directly from faculty and does not include student interviews or other evaluative data.

Findings

In this study I identified six themes that describe the impact of service-learning on how faculty teach and learn. To be sure, not every faculty member interviewed addressed all six themes that they reflected on their experience and the influence of service-learning on them. More broadly, these themes portrayed—some in cases with many of the faculty and others times fewer—my interpretation of their voices describing the ways in which using service-learning pedagogy shaped and influenced their understandings of, and approaches to, teaching and learning.

In broad strokes, service-learning pedagogy led many faculty to more meaningful engagement in, and commitment to, teaching. In addition, it was common to hear faculty describe an enhanced understanding of students, which often led to deeper student-faculty connections. Faculty indicated that these connections allowed them to understand students as individuals and learners. Not all but some faculty noted that this increased understanding.
fostered a better sense of students' learning styles and methods for demonstrating learning. An enhanced commitment to teaching and greater understanding of student competencies nearly all the faculty in this study to continue using service-learning pedagogy. But, interestingly, increased understanding did not always translate to action or a significant change in pedagogy. StilL, for a few faculty, their new knowledge of students and community-based experiences led to changes in classroom pedagogical practices—including much use of cooperative teaching and learning approaches, and improved communication of theoretical concepts through the accessibility of community-based examples. Notably, nearly all the faculty in this study acknowledged their association with the service-learning program and use of service-learning pedagogy led to a greater sense of connection to other faculty and the institution. The significance of this finding is considering that a greater sense of connection keeps faculty involved and increases the likelihood that using service-learning pedagogy will lead to positive effects associated with the use of this teaching and learning approach.

In the remainder of this section, I describe each of the six themes that explain how service-learning pedagogy affected the teaching and learning of faculty in this study. In addition to my interpretations of these issues, I have integrated faculty voices to add depth and meaning to these themes.

**More Meaningful Engagement in and Commitment to Teaching**

Many faculty I interviewed spoke of the engaging and rewarding nature of service-learning. While previous studies have demonstrated how participation in service-learning enhances student learning by engaging them in their learning experiences, the findings from this study suggest faculty who use service-learning pedagogy can be affected in similar ways. Anne (Education), who used service-learning a number of times, described how she became empowered through service-learning: "I guess what I would say is that it’s always new, which is another form of talking about empowerment."

A sense of excitement and engagement, common among experienced service-learning faculty, was particularly evident with nearly all the new service-learning faculty. Randy (Spanish) described his "surprise and gratification" with students’ reactions: "I have seen students learn in new ways, ways that are meaningful to them and bring confidence in their necessarily imperfect abilities...I continue to find the student reaction to be a source of surprise and gratification."

Recognising the sense of self-effectiveness that service-learning fostered with students led to a sense of satisfaction for most faculty and, in turn, enhanced their own engagement in teaching. Ellen (Nursing) said seeing her students energized by the community-based experience renewed her own energy level: "I detected that energy that I didn’t think I had again. I was renewed by their enthusiasm."

For some faculty, heightened engagement and commitment to teaching came from recognizing that service-learning was a very effective pedagogical approach and brought their discipline "alive." John, an experienced service-learning faculty member in Philosophy, told me that he "learned that even in a discipline like Philosophy, the [service-learning] students can make connections that probably couldn’t make in a classroom setting." Jean (English), a professor and admitted skeptic, noted that "there’s a deeper commitment to the issue. And there was much more of an intense need to try to understand of academic questions."

Altogether, the apparent increase in students’ sense of self-effectiveness, greater focus of learning, and range of meaningful disciplinary experiences led many faculty to describe service-learning as an effective pedagogical approach.

To the sure, the effort required to implement a service-learning course was identified as a potential barrier—"It’s a lot of work, a lot of time, a lot of money."

The satisfaction gained by having a successful teaching experience appeared worth the effort. One of Tim’s colleagues captured this sentiment: "Oh well, it’s a lot of work. It’s a whole lot of work, but it’s really worth it. This experience, and I think that means this, it was the most rewarding teaching experience to date for me."

**Deeper Connections and Relationships with Students as Learners and Individuals**

By design, service-learning pedagogy depends on a relatively seamless link in which students’ experiences from the classroom are brought into the classroom, and content learning in the classroom are applied in the community. As research has demonstrated, this can be a rich and powerful experience for students (Eyler & Giles, 1999). According to the faculty in this study, as students came to make sense of their experiences and the learning that occurred inside and outside the classroom, faculty, in turn, gained new insights into the emotional, social dimensions of students’ learning experiences.

For many faculty, using service-learning pedagogy led to deeper connections and relationships with students as learners and, more holistically, as individuals, beyond just intellectual acumen. In many cases, increased awareness of and respect for students developed as a result of service-learning, leading to these enhanced connections. These connections are of particular interest when considering that much research on student learning outcomes has consistently shown increased student-faculty interaction positively affecting student learning (Astin, 1993; Kuh et al., 1991; Pascarella, 1980; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

It follows, then, that positive student-faculty relationships also can affect faculty. Through the process of implementing service-learning, faculty in this study described coming to see students as whole persons. Simply put, "It was nice to know them better...it draws them out," said Linda (Anthropology). Kevin (Philosophy) described a similar perspective: "It gives me a real, more vivid picture of the whole range of student education experiences...it gives me a sharper idea, a vision of the student as a whole person, both emotional and social needs." By understanding more about their students, faculty felt connected to their students and better able to relate to them.

Heightened respect for students was a key element in deeper faculty-student interactions and relationships. A sense of respect for his students was evident in Harold’s (Philosophy) description of his students: "I guess maybe the main thing I learned is that students can really make some sometimes good, sometimes brilliant applications and insights as insights to the meaning of the issues and theories that we studied."

For a few faculty, seeing more of their students also encouraged the faculty to reveal more of themselves. Upon reflection with Michael, an experienced service-learning faculty member said how this affects him:

I think I gained deeper respect for the students because I see more of them. When I do their [writings] on service-learning, they can’t help but reveal more about themselves than a typical research paper would because they’re talking about their relationships and people...So that in a sense opens them up to me as more complete human beings. And so I can respond in class with more of my own commitment. It encourages me, though, it encourages me to be more complete human being in class, to kind of be myself more rather than just in the role of teacher.

Michael’s comments indicate a type of reciprocity and trust in the teacher-student relationship. By being more open, Michael had more meaningful interactions with his students, which in turn had a positive impact on the quality of his teaching and learning experiences.

Indeed, most faculty interviewed held a common belief that implementing service-learning in the classroom provided them with new, more human perspectives of their students that led to a greater sense of engagement with them. Brenda (Sociology) described it as having an "avenue to reflect with them." This comment was also reflected in a greater sensitivity to students’ needs and higher quality interactions with students.

Unlike with more traditional pedagogical approaches, by placing students in community-based settings and then connecting that experience back to learning through journaling, class discussions, and other reflective strategies, faculty gained new understandings of students. This knowledge led to greater respect for students and sensitivity to their needs and sometimes faculty members’ willingness to share more of themselves. More importantly, this understanding of students often led to deeper connections and relationships between faculty and students. One faculty member described it, “it’s like having a picture of their soul.”

**Enhanced Knowledge of Student Learning Processes and Outcomes**

In addition to learning more about their students both as learners and individuals, implementing service-learning provided a window for faculty into student learning processes and the achievement of class learning goals, a third theme. In some cases, because service-learning increased the level of interaction between faculty and students, faculty were able to assess more effectively what students were learning. In other cases, increased awareness or interaction provided faculty with a deeper understanding of how students construct knowledge and experience the course—knowledge that engaged the faculty in their students’ learning and opened them up to learning from their students.

Understanding students’ learning processes: As one faculty member stated, service-learning is “a whole other way of learning... They learn differently.” One of the effects faculty consistently described was that implementing service-learning made them more aware of how students were learning in and experiencing the course.

Deeper awareness often developed from the need to pay close attention to the service-learning experiences in which students were engaged. Tim (History) indicated he regularly asked about his students’ activities so that he can intercede if necessary. A number of faculty shared the following perspective: "The thing we find is that you really have to interact with students quite frequently... If you’re going to have success at all, you do have to try and keep in touch." By paying attention to students and increasing the level of interaction with them, these faculty felt they could enhance their students’ therapeutically.
The Impact of Service-Learning Pedagogy on Faculty Teaching and Learning Authority and Classroom Roles. One faculty member acknowledged that she had come to see that "students are sometimes the authors of their work." And Brenda (Sociology) indicated that it convinced her to rethink how she views students: "I would say that this service learning has caused me to treat the student as more of an 'expert.' When I didn't [use service-learning], I brought in speakers from the community. . . . Now I think students do it more often." Similarly, Wendy (Communication) says when we do the [service-learning] project it does require a little bit of giving up, on my part, of control or coverage. But only a few faculty were as comfortable as Ned with these changes: "I never get threatened if a class gets way behind schedule as you go along, because that's a good sign." Faculty members' awareness of how service-learning contributes to knowledge construction and shared authority led, in a few cases, to changed classroom activities, content, or format. These changes included selecting new texts that would address issues germane to the project, eliminating certain activities to enable focus on discussing students' experiences, and utilizing peer learning techniques. More often, faculty demonstrated their commitment to student-centered classrooms through slight changes in their syllabi and creating class time for service-learning students to discuss and reflect upon their experiences. Other faculty set aside regular time for talking with students about their experiences. One of the more common illustrations of faculty members' increased use of peer learning approaches was evident in their use of peer learning strategies designed to allow students to learn from one another. In Carl's (History) case, creating in-class opportunities to learn from students who were in the community working with families on welfare challenged pre-conceptual ideas held by some non-service-learning students. Because of this, Carl committed himself to continuing to use a form of constructivist pedagogy such as peer learning. Despite their enhanced knowledge of how students learn and the need to have students play a more prominent role in shaping their learning, a number of the faculty admitted that they needed to improve in the area of integrating students' experiences into classroom activities and discussion. In some cases it seemed faculty struggled because they felt they lacked the skills to do so effectively. Ellen's (Nursing) comments provide insight into this:

We talked about building in an in-class opportunity to discuss it more. I hadn't really, I think partly because I was unsure about service-learning, where it was going, what people were getting out of it, I was not too skilled even to spend the amount of time in class talk-
Deborah, an experienced and introspective service-learning faculty member, had her departure on the powerful dynamic that can occur in the classroom when a faculty member, with knowledge of the community and the experiences that students are engaged in, creates opportunities for students to actively participate in their learning:

As far as the classroom goes, I guess the biggest distinction is when you have a service-learning semester, you’re drawing on a fund of experiences that the students have or are getting and you can count on that. Where as normally I would be hypothetically drawing on what I hope is students’ experiences, I can be sure that the students know just how many experiences that are raising questions for them and so then I can draw on those.

Greater Involvement in a Community of Teachers and Learners

Nearly everyone I interviewed indicated that service-learning and the accompanying opportunities for professional development in this area had introduced them to other faculty, who shared a common cause for improving undergraduate education. While this theme does not directly relate to the specific topic of pedagogy, it has broad implications for teaching and learning. Many faculty spoke with passion about these interactions, which were often organic and occurred in service-learning workshops or luncheons but sometimes involved less formal encounters. The sense of community and collegiality created from these interactions connected faculty to each other, enhanced their commitment to the institution, and assisted some in overcoming isolation. These three effects gave faculty a sense of greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners.

First, interacting with other faculty and staff, particularly those outside their department, was of significant value to many faculty. Nancy noted:

Everybody gets so busy and so focused on your discipline that we don’t do a whole lot of interdisciplinary things. And so, it’s one of the rare experiences that you—I got to talk to people in foreign languages. To talk with faculty in other disciplines on a common interest: faculty building.

On occasion, experience with service-learning led to service-learning faculty connecting with non-service-learning faculty. One faculty member pointed out to me that “people will just drop by and say, ‘Hey, can I see your syllabus, how do you do this service thing? I want to try this.’”

I learned that in most cases these connections were not made with faculty in their own departments, which Sally (Theology) described as a “missed opportunity.” A number of faculty in her department were doing service-learning, but rarely talked with each other about because they were too busy.

Faculty members’ understandings of their interactions and connections with other service-learning faculty were at least two-dimensional: relational and learning-oriented. It was evident that many faculty appreciated and benefited from the social aspects of sharing a common interest with colleagues they might not normally meet. Nick (Philosophy) noted that “this is one of the ways, running the workshops, that’s helped me get to know quite a few people.”

Another faculty member reflected back on her first year using service-learning:

And that was a shock to me the first year that here were all these people and I never saw them unless they happened to teach on the same day…Service-learning—the workshops, luncheons, and things that go along with all that—provide a kind of transdisciplinary, an avenue, to be cozy for a little bit.

Kevin (Philosophy) clarified that renewal did not occur only because of implementing an innovative pedagogy. “The renewal has come by way of getting in contact with [other] teachers and introducing [service-learning] to them.” Christine’s (Social Work) opinion was that it was “a breath of fresh air” because it connected her to “a cohort of people who really are interested in students, the community, and have an enthusiasm and kind of a synergy that leads excitement!” The relational dimension of service-learning “faculty building” enlarged faculty members’ circles of encounters and relationships with other faculty. In turn, this allowed them to know and be known by the people on campus, creating a greater sense of community and belonging.

In addition to a relational dimension, service-learning faculty connections provided opportunities to increase one’s pedagogical knowledge and confidence—a learning-oriented dimension. Russell (English) said he learned that service-learning “works very differently in different kinds of classes, and that it’s always interesting to hear about how philosophers are doing it, how theologians do it.” Organized discussions provided a venue for discussing and reflecting upon different pedagogical strategies and faculty roles, “because it’s just how we can implement service-learning, but how we can, in general, teach better,” noted another faculty member.

As faculty from the Spanish Department indicated, learning-oriented interactions with other faculty
colleagues appeared especially important for first-time users of service-learning. New-service-learning faculty indicated how connecting with other experienced service-learning faculty through the workshop provided them with specific examples of how to deal with student and community issues as they arose. Second, in addition to connecting faculty to each other, using service-learning fostered, among some faculty, a sense of commitment and connection to the institution and its purposes. In the cases, faculty expressed respect for the institution and a sense of pride in being connected to it. In other cases, involvement in service-learning allowed a number of faculty to feel like active members of the university community. One faculty member described feeling as if she was "giving to the university as much as I could be giving to them. And, I think that’s why I really want to do service-learning." Another faculty member shared: "I think it’s simply the best way; a great, wonderful way that Middletown is able to express something about its identity that I can connect in within the classroom. It enables me to bring to life some of the broader words we like to hang on the street." And Martha’s (Psychology) comments further illustrated this point: I feel better about being here, then I did for a long time, because I think in a small way, by sharing these opportunities available for students...I mean it’s something that I think is really worthwhile...it gives me a sense of purpose and...makes me feel better about being in Middletown.

Third, as a result of feeling more connected to other faculty and to the institution, some faculty were able to overcome the isolation that accompanies much of faculty work (Rice, 1996). Perhaps the most powerful story about isolation was told by a new assistant professor who confessed that, because of isolation and hostility with her department, she was prepared to leave the university, until she discovered her service-learning colleagues.

By the end of my first year I was considering that I should look for something else and was pretty depressed. I mean, the department had so much political problems. And then I went to this first-service-learning workshop where people from other disciplines were there and it was so nice to meet people who were professionals and to see people work inter-disciplinary, collaborating, all talking about how we can teach better... And that this workshop really helped me stay, because I was ready to go.

The importance of creating opportunities to bring faculty together around important efforts like service-learning should not be underestimated. As discussion earlier, few studies have explored how implementing service-learning pedagogy affects faculty. This gap in the literature has been identified by a number of leading researchers in service-learning (Bringle, Hatcher, & Jones, 1997; Driscoll, 1999; Driscoll, Holland, Gelman & Kerrigan, 1996; Gelman, Holland, Driscoll, Spring & Kerrigan, 2001; Giles & Eyler, 1998; Rhodes, and Howard, 1998; Stanton, 1994; Zlotkowski, 1998). This study begins to fill this gap. The findings from Hammons’ (1994) research most relevant to this study concern faculty members’ satisfaction and dissatisfaction with service-learning. She found that faculty were most satisfied with autonomy and control (i.e., they freely chose to do it), the purpose and meaning associated with using service-learning, and the level of positive feedback they received. Faculty were dissatisfied with the time commitment and the logistical requirements of using this approach. The outcomes of this study confirm some of these findings. A sense that, by implementing service-learning, they were doing important and meaningful work was evident among faculty. Reflecting on faculty members’ meaningful engagement in and commitment to teaching, among other themes, were comments indicating that faculty found meaning in enhancing student learning, by providing a service to the community. In addition, deeper relationships with students and enhanced knowledge of learning processes and outcomes detail how faculty students, student feedback, and increased connections to other faculty, using service-learning provided feedback and support. Although faculty in this study admitted being challenged by the time and logistical requirements of service-learning, few dwelled on or indicated high levels of dissatisfaction due to these factors.

The work of Driscoll, Gelman, and their colleagues (Driscoll et al., 1998; Driscoll et al., 1996; Gelman et al., 2001) aligns most directly with this study. Although documenting service-learning’s effects on faculty was one aspect of their work, their primary aim was developing a comprehensive model—impact variables, indicators, and measures—for assessing the impact of service-learning on four major stakeholders: students, faculty, community, and institution.

My findings affirm their variables as legitimate and to explore the impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty. Moreover, the results of this study extend their work and enrich what is known about faculty impact in at least four important ways. First, my findings offer the opportunity to consider additional impact variables (such as "reflective practice," "involvement in community of teachers and learners," "expanded faculty roles," and "quality of relationship with students") or to reconsider those previously studied. Second, I have added to the list of potential indicators of impact. For example, under the variable "philosophy of teaching/learning" it is important to consider additional indicators such as "broadened student perspectives," "new student learning styles," or "quality of student learning." Under the variable "teaching methods," indicators such as "use of reflection strategies" or "use of peer learning" should be considered.

Third, my findings offer salient examples—in the voice of the faculty—of how these factors, indicators, and experiences find expression and the nuances of their meanings. Giving voice to these factors makes more real the excitement, satisfaction, and struggles and opens a window into the myriad ways that faculty can be affected by using this innovative teaching approach. Simple cause-effect relationships fail to capture adequately how faculty change. For example, the indicator "faculty/student interaction" was rich in context when faculty described their deeper connections and relationships with students as both learners and individuals. By adding depth and breadth to the potential areas of impact, I have illuminated how faculty in this study interpreted and made meaning of using service-learning pedagogy. Finally, my findings call attention to the relationship between pedagogical innovations such as service-learning and the way the players active in the innovation can be affected by their involvement. In the case of most innovative pedagogies, this includes students and faculty; in service-learning, the community and institution are recognized as additional key players.

Implications for Practice and Research

This study has implications for those who participate in, coordinate, and support innovative pedagogy in higher education. In addition, it may be of interest to those who care about university engagement with communities and improving undergraduate education. My focus on faculty will matter to those committed to understanding and supporting faculty—one of higher education’s most important resources.

This study revealed that faculty connections and opportunities to reflect on teaching with others in a community of teaching and learning were both outcomes of service-learning and that factors that contributed significantly to shaping and deepening their experience. The sense of connection between faculty and students was certainly evident in this research. But community also refers to how faculty learn from one another. Palmer (1995) asks, "Could colleagues gather around the great thing called ‘teaching and learning’?... We need to know how to do so, for such a gathering is one of the few times that we have to become better teachers." (p. 141). For the service-learning faculty in this study, opportunities to talk about good teaching occurred but in varying degrees of depth and meaningfulness. Based on my observations, it appears that a strong need exists for a broader and more comprehensive approach to service-learning faculty development, an approach that encourages faculty reflection and growth within the context of a community or communities of teachers and learners. Many have indicated the importance of providing faculty development opportunities of which others have suggested curricula for guiding faculty preparation for using service-learning. (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Kolb, 1996, 1999; Rice, 1996). In most cases, however, faculty development in general and service-learning faculty development in particular has focused on preparation; what knowledge and skills do faculty need to possess and what extent of their course must they reconsider to implement service-learning? This approach assumes that faculty will gain everything they need to know before the course is implemented that will allow them to be successful. Common sense indicates that this is often not the case. Indeed, faculty development does not begin and end with the preparation stage. It begins with preparation, continues through implementation, and includes evaluation that cycles around to further preparation. To this extent, it mirrors the major components of students’ service-learning experiences: preparation, meaningful action, reflection, and evaluation. To approach faculty development in this way leads us to Zlotkowski’s (1998) point—service-learning pedagogy is faculty development. In this sense, reliance on Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model (1984) model—a model oft-cited in developing students’ service-learning experience—is equally applicable for faculty. An approach to faculty learning must be developmental, accepting them with the skills, knowledge, and perspectives they bring and allowing them to grow in the directions they choose.

Creating supportive and connected communities has noteworthy implications for those who direct or coordinate programs that facilitate faculty implementation of service-learning pedagogy. What level of support will these programs provide to faculty? On one hand, when these programs assume a significant level of responsibility for service-learning processes (e.g. designing service-learning experiences, building community relationships, facilitating
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Forms and Dimensions of Civic Involvement
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This research assesses (a) students' perceptions of civic involvement from either a charity or social justice perspective, and (b) the relationship among six dimensions of civic involvement (Knowledge, Skill, Efficacy, Value, Responsibility, and Commitment) for developing a charity or social justice perspective. The study also examines how the six dimensions were perceived across different contexts.

An often-stated goal of service-learning is to prepare students for civic involvement, defined as "involvement in civil society" (Gries, 2011, p. 2), or to participate in the democratic process. Other authors use terms such as civic participation, civic engagement, or citizenship to describe involvement or activity related to participation in the democratic process. This study notes that different visions of democratic society will produce different meanings of citizenship and civic participation. Watson (2002) also maintained that "it is not enough to argue that democratic values are as important as traditional academic priorities" and "we must ask what kind of values," because different political and ideological interests are embedded in or easily attached to various conceptions of citizenship (p. 257).

Forms of Civic Involvement

Models or paradigms have been developed to theorize or explain the different forms, visions, orientations, or approaches to civic involvement, and the discussion mainly focuses on the concept of charity and social justice and their relationship to each other. Some theorists see charity and social justice as two ends of a continuum with social justice as the preferred outcome (Barber, 1994; Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990; Kahne & Westheimer, 1999; Maybach, 1996; O’Grady, 2000; Rendall, 1994; Rhoads, 1997; Wade, 2000), others see these two forms of civic participation as distinct paradigms and draw no clear line between the two (Deans, 1999; Foss, 1998; Leeds, 1999; Morton, 1995).

Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) were among the first to emphasize the movement from charity to social justice as a goal of service-learning. They developed a model of service-learning to describe different phases of social responsibility and specified a goal of transition from one phase to another, i.e., to move students "from charity to justice" (p. 26). Barber (1994) believed that citizen education through community service should be about political responsibility. Thus, to develop students' political responsibility, a service-learning program must be developed to intentionally foster student awareness of social justice and the "place of ethics, religion, race, class, gender and sexual orientation in a community" (p. 91).

Kahne and Westheimer (1999) summarized the goals for service-learning into three domains: moral, political, and intellectual, with two approaches for each domain: charity and change. For the political domain, the two approaches are responsible citizen (charity) and critical democrat (social change). The charity approach emphasizes the importance of altruism and joy that comes from giving. The change approach emphasizes participation in political action and providing solutions to structural problems.

Kahne and Westheimer claimed that "citizenship in a democratic community requires more than kindness and decency; it requires engagement in complex social and institutional endeavors," and it requires that individuals work to create, evaluate, criticize, and change public institutions and programs" (p. 34). The view of civic involvement preferred by Kahne and Westheimer included active engagement in social issues and efforts to examine, critique, and change social policy—in addition to concern for one's fellow humans.

Advocacy for service-learning with a social justice approach is based on a belief that a successful democratic form of government requires active citizens who question current practice and work to develop new forms. This belief carries over to a critique of viewing civic involvement as acts of charity (Maybach, 1996; O’Grady, 2000; Rendall, 1994; Rhoads, 1997; Wade, 2000). Charitable involvement may enhance students' feelings of self-worth...