8

The Evolution of a Service-Learning Course

Debra DeMeis and Cynthia Sutton

In 1995 we co-created an engaging, bidisciplinary, team-taught liberal arts course, Children in Contexts. The course fit smoothly into the Hobart and William Smith Colleges liberal arts curriculum and was well received by students. As experienced and successful teachers, we modified the course every time we taught it, and in 1997 when the Hobart and William Smith faculty were invited to consider including service-learning in their academic courses, we thought, "Oh, that's a good idea," and simply added a service-learning component to our course. We soon realized we had much to learn.

In this chapter we chronicle the evolution of our course as a liberal arts, service-learning course. As we became better informed on the multiple ways service-learning can contribute to a liberal arts curriculum, we were better able to structure our course to enhance students' learning and understanding of contemporary societal problems. First, we will describe our conceptualization of the primary goals of a liberal education and the dynamic relationship among a liberal education, an engaged citizenry, and service-learning. We then follow the development of the course itself, both in content and pedagogy. And finally, we conclude with a summary highlighting our role as college faculty in promoting a comprehensive and crucial liberal education for our students as they become active, responsible, involved citizens.

LIBERAL EDUCATION

Liberal education is a longstanding and revered tradition in American higher education. Even though American culture changed dramatically in

the last century, liberal education continues to be a powerful experience that prepares young adults to lead lives of consequence. However, the focus and process of liberal education must reflect changes in the world, such as the rise of technology and globalization, and must incorporate new areas of study and new ways of learning to remain relevant. Liberal education itself must go through a transformation that will result in very different ways of learning and teaching.[1]

Cronon raises the question of what a liberal education should look like and concludes that a more important question to consider is what characterizes a liberally educated person. He lists ten qualities, the sum of which is a person who is connected in important and meaningful ways to others and understands that everyone has a responsibility to promote the well-being of the community. His list contains some qualities that have been traditionally associated with a liberal education, including the skills to communicate, both orally and in writing; to engage in critical thinking; and to be a creative and effective problem solver. Yet his list also includes new qualities that expand the definition of a liberally educated person. Cronon addresses the importance of humility, tolerance, and self-criticism that allow people to set aside their own experiences and opinions and to develop an understanding and appreciation of others' points of view. In an increasingly diverse and global world, these attributes are essential for engaging with others.[2] In addition, Cronon stresses the importance of action and describes the liberally educated as people who know "how to get things done" and use their learning as a means to making the world a "better place."[3]

Concern about the continuing relevance of liberal education prompted the Association of American Colleges and Universities to undertake the initiative Greater Expectations, which examined the focus and practice of higher education and produced a set of recommendations that advocates for a radically transformed undergraduate experience. A major outcome of the initiative is the identification of three outcomes of a liberal education that are necessary for students to meet the demands and problems of living in the twenty-first century. The final report states that students should become:

1. Empowered learners who possess intellectual and practical skills such as effective communication and the ability to interpret and evaluate information;
2. Informed learners who have knowledge about human cultures, the physical world, and the natural world; and
3. Responsible learners who have developed a sense of social responsibility and ethical judgment.[4]

The report of Greater Expectations was followed by a second AAC&U initiative called Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP). Like its

on

)e a powerful experience
ience. However, the focus
ges in the world, such as
incorporate new areas of
t. Liberal education itself
in very different ways of

ucation should look like
consider is what charac-
alities, the sum of which
eaningful ways to others
ity to promote the well-
alities that have been tra-
luding the skills to com-
ι critical thinking; and to
is list also includes new
:ducated person. Cronon
ınd self-criticism that al-
opinions and to develop
ıts of view. In an increas-
re essential for engaging
ortance of action and de-
"how to get things done"
rorld a "better place."³
:ral education prompted
ties to undertake the ini-
e focus and practice of
lations that advocates for
A major outcome of the
f a liberal education that
problems of living in the
lents should become:

and practical skills such
o interpret and evaluate

ıut human cultures, the

sense of social responsi-

ed by a second AAC&U
'romise (LEAP). Like its

predecessor, LEAP identifies the aims and goals that should characterize a quality undergraduate education in the twenty-first century. In answer to the question of what matters in colleges, LEAP rejects the customary list of courses and instead, like Cronon, specifies the outcomes of what students learn and acquire. Reiterating the three goals established by Greater Expectations, LEAP also identifies a fourth outcome: the integrated learner who can synthesize information across general and specialized areas of study.[5]

LEAP extends the work of Greater Expectations by identifying principles of excellence that characterize effective and intentional learning. Most of the principles expand the traditional conceptualization of liberal learning by extending the location, focus, or process of learning. Thus, one principle includes connecting college, work, and life, and several of the principles that address the importance of fostering students' engagement with and participation in the wider world. LEAP proposes that learning must engage students in big questions, ones that ask about purpose and moral integrity; it also suggests that students should learn to connect knowledge with choices and outcomes by working on "unscripted problems" in which they test alternative answers and act according to their own judgments.[6] The notion of action is so critical that LEAP's final principle states that the best way to assess whether students' education has resulted in the four outcomes is to measure their ability to apply their learning to complex problems from the real world.[7]

A common theme in both initiatives is the emphasis on expanding outcomes to move beyond knowledge and understanding to action. In addition, both suggest that the means by which students learn must address real-world problems rather than simplified, contrived ones. The process of engaging students in the problems of the real world and preparing them to be engaged citizens is a critical part of a liberal education.

LIBERAL EDUCATION, CITIZENSHIP, AND SERVICE-LEARNING

Citizenship involves relational living in which people consider the ways in which their personal decisions and actions influence others and thereby the community in which they live.[8] To be responsible citizens, people must consider their individual freedoms as well as the welfare of others and the public good because only by protecting the community can people safeguard their own individual rights.[9] The challenge of citizenship is that problems to be solved are "ill-structured" social problems that are not easily defined nor resolved.[10] As communities become increasingly diverse and problems exist on a global as well local level, both the framing and resolution of issues become more complicated, and determining what is the public good becomes even more difficult.

Liberal education has historically been viewed as providing the skills and knowledge necessary for maintaining a free and democratic society.[11] The traditional list of requisites includes critical thinking, problem-solving skills, ethical reasoning, written and oral communication, and social responsibility. Not surprisingly, such skills and knowledge overlap with the previously discussed list of ten characteristics cited by Cronon and of outcomes adopted in Greater Expectations and LEAP, since all were based on the premise that the final goal of liberal education should be to provide students with the education necessary for them to become responsible and active citizens. The lists were purposefully expanded to include valuing of diverse cultures and ideas and the ability and motivation to act so that liberal education will also result in an engaged citizenry that is both able to appreciate the complexity of problems and the need for creative solutions and has the will to take action.[12]

For students to become engaged learners and citizens, they must be invested in the world outside the classroom and understand their own place in that world. Liberal education must create a learning environment that provides students with experiences that aid in identifying, analyzing, and resolving the ill-structured social problems that are characterized by their lack of clear definition and easy resolution.[13] In contrast to the traditional emphasis on disciplinary learning, the "new" liberal education requires a problem-centered process that focuses on unscripted issues.[14] Service-learning has emerged as a pedagogy that meets these ambitions because it possesses three elements essential for developing responsible citizenship: engagement with the community, focus on social problems, and collaboration between faculty and students.[15] In service-learning courses, students are typically required to participate in organized service and to connect what is learned in the classroom and what is experienced at service sites.[16] As Cress observes, service-learning is the intersection of the acquisition of knowledge, the analysis of issues, and the application of skills; it is only when these three components come together that students fully develop critical thinking skills and the motivation to act and to be invested in their communities. By working on real-world problems in their service sites, students come to understand the complexity of problems, the challenge of creating workable solutions and the need for actions.[17]

THE COURSE: CHILDREN IN CONTEXTS

Hobart and William Smith are small, coordinated colleges boasting a historically rigorous and deep liberal arts curriculum. For students who matriculated before fall 1996, as part of that curriculum all sophomore students were required to take an upper-level bidisciplinary course taught by

s providing the skills and
democratic society.[11] The
inking, problem-solving
inication, and social re-
wledge overlap with the
1 by Cronon and of out-
since all were based on
should be to provide stu-
ome responsible and ac-
to include valuing of di-
tion to act so that liberal
that is both able to ap-
or creative solutions and

tizens, they must be in-
lerstand their own place
rning environment that
ntifying, analyzing, and
e characterized by their
ntrast to the traditional
ral education requires a
ipted issues.[14] Service-
se ambitions because it
responsible citizenship:
roblems, and collabora-
irning courses, students
service and to connect
ienced at service sites.[16]
on of the acquisition of
tion of skills; it is only
students fully develop
1 to be invested in their
n their service sites, stu-
ns, the challenge of cre-

INTEXTS

colleges boasting a his-
For students who ma-
im all sophomore stu-
linary course taught by

two professors investigating a particular subject matter from two different disciplinary perspectives. Examples of bidisciplinary courses currently offered at the colleges are Diversity and Adaptation, taught by an economist and a chemist; Men and Masculinity, created by a historian and a sociologist; and Writing Movement, Dancing Words: An Analysis of Composition, taught by professors of rhetoric and dance.

The course we describe in this chapter is a bidisciplinary course created in 1995 and originally titled Children in Contexts: Families and School. The initial purpose of the course was to examine how society's many significant, contemporary changes impact children in their families and in their schools. Taking advantage of our many years of teaching experience, we co-designed the course to reflect our respective disciplines, developmental psychology and education. We continued to teach the semester-long course every other year through 2006, even when the bidisciplinary course requirement was abolished. Each semester we taught the course, we reworked our syllabus to ensure that the assigned readings were current, the writing assignments meaningful, and the individual class sessions offered a variety of engaging formats. Throughout the years in their end-of-semester course evaluations, students rated the course quite highly, adding personal comments such as, "This class should be a requirement for all students at HWS!"[18] and "I thought this course was wonderful."[19] Fortunately, because there were two of us co-teaching the course, we were able to maintain an ongoing, scheduled weekly dialogue between us regarding the progress of the course: what worked, what did not, and what we planned for the following weeks. At the conclusion of each course, we undertook a major course evaluation, highlighting those aspects of the course we would revise and those we would preserve.

We retained key parts of the course content that had proven to stimulate student engagement and learning. The course maintained its focus on societal changes as they affect children. Also, as a foundation for the course, we continued to use David Elkind's analysis of the relationship between modernity and postmodernity and the consequences of changes in society and families.[20] As well, we continued to use Uri Bronfenbrenner's social ecological model each semester as a framework for understanding the interactional relationship between individuals and their environments.[21] Both of these theories were beneficial to students throughout the course each time we taught it. Although we added and deleted readings every semester, Jonathan Kozol's work on school inequities[22] and Edin and Lein's text on living in poverty[23] were mainstays of the course.

In addition to aspects of course content, we also retained significant pedagogical components of the course. For example, although we took turns being the lead teacher depending on the subject matter of the day or week, both of us were present for every class session; this resulted in students

perceiving both of us as equal instructors and both disciplinary perspectives as deserving equal respect. We chose as well to keep certain paper assignments, with slight modification, such as the Using Bronfenbrenner Model paper and the Limited Income project and paper as they challenged our students to apply theory to experience using both practical and analytical approaches. We continued to assign the final bidisciplinary research paper with précis and annotated bibliography each semester because this assignment provided each student the opportunity to explore his or her paper topic deeply and then relate it to other aspects of the course. We always culminated the course with a panel of community experts, and we continued to require a take-home final exam consisting of two new questions, instructing students to synthesize all parts of the course in their responses. We believe these pedagogical approaches were effective in supporting student learning throughout the years we taught the course.

CHANGES TO THE COURSE

To facilitate students' understanding of poverty's influence on children's lives, we made important changes to our course, as well; some were subtle and some fundamental. For example, we altered the stated purpose of the course. Rather than cover multiple related issues, such as poverty, divorce, teen pregnancy, and school dropouts, we chose to focus on poverty as a debilitating social problem. The course became problem-based instead of being discipline-based; that is, the course centered on the problem of poverty. As we chose to reduce the disciplinary divide to fit the broader purpose of the course, we changed the course title from Children in Contexts: Families and School to Children in Contexts in a Changing Society; although this is not a major deviation, it does reflect our intent to concentrate on the social problem of poverty. Accordingly, we tightened course content to examine critical aspects of poverty's impact on children; we emphasized poverty's history; current status; effects on families, neighborhoods, and schools; and attempts through federal policy to lessen the negative effects of poverty.

By reducing the course's disciplinary focus and creating a more problem-based course, we made clear that for us poverty is a major systemic, societal problem that demands a systemic, policy-based solution instead of individual, volunteer help. To this end, in 2002, we introduced the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), designed by the U.S. Department of Education to close the academic achievement gap between children in poverty and middle class children. We focused as well on the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act (TANF), the federal Welfare to Work policy created by Congress to decrease recipients' passive reliance on the welfare system by participating in work training or actual work. Through careful and thorough

disciplinary perspectives
ep certain paper assign-
Bronfenbrenner Model
they challenged our stu-
ctical and analytical ap-
iplinary research paper
ster because this assign-
xplore his or her paper
e course. We always cul-
erts, and we continued
two new questions, in-
e in their responses. We
e in supporting student

SE

nfluence on children's
well; some were subtle
e stated purpose of the
ich as poverty, divorce,
cus on poverty as a de-
m-based instead of be-
he problem of poverty.
the broader purpose of
n in Contexts: Families
ociety; although this is
ncentrate on the social
se content to examine
emphasized poverty's
oods, and schools; and
e effects of poverty.
ating a more problem-
najor systemic, societal
ution instead of indi-
oduced the federal No
Department of Educa-
n children in poverty
Temporary Assistance
Work policy created by
the welfare system by
careful and thorough

policy analysis of these two federal mandates, students began to grasp the enormous potential of public policy to decrease the negative impact of poverty on families and children. Students also recognized that creating public policy in Congress is not sufficient; the policy must be acted into law, adequately funded, and monitored to make a difference in people's lives.

However, our most far-reaching course change, one that also precipitated other correlated changes, was the implementation of a service-learning component as a course requirement. We found it fitting and even essential that a course dealing with the impact of poverty on children in families and schools would include experiential learning for students. We could envision appropriate field placements in our community and believed that students' real-life interactions in the community would enhance their learning and their academic success in the course. Our initial goal for the service-learning component was an increased awareness of and sensitivity to the inequities children who live in poverty experience every day. Originally, we required that each student in the course participate in a community placement for three hours a week for six weeks; students selected a general topic area relevant to the course, such as working with children in school or with single mothers in the community, and the Hobart and William Smith Public Service Office aided in securing related field placements. Students wrote daily journal entries describing their community experiences, and an evaluation of their completed journals contributed to their final grade in the course.

During the first few years of including community placements in our course, we were not especially effective in using service-learning as a pedagogical tool.[24] We were naïve and assumed students would benefit instinctively, without our guidance, simply by being in the community for a few hours a week. Indeed, they did benefit, although at a very basic level. For example, students working in a Head Start program that first year of community placements noted in their journals that the children always wanted to sit near them and wanted to hold their hands while walking in the hall. On the other hand, those students placed at a teen center felt as though the teens were ignoring and excluding them. Our students centered on themselves, not the individuals with whom they were working. They wrote about their own wishes to be liked and respected by the children and teens, but they neglected to discern the deeper meaning of the young children's hunger for attention and the teens' ambivalence toward them.[25]

We expected students to automatically integrate their community involvement with all the course material to create a thorough understanding of the impact of poverty on children's lives. We did not consider Rhoads's notion of service-learning "as a vehicle for fostering active and engaged citizens."[26] We were not familiar with the complexity of Saltmarsh's service-learning

goal of "civic learning,"[27] nor of Rimmerman's concept of "the New Citizenship" as being closely linked to experiential service-learning.[28] Our goal for student awareness was notable, but we discovered that it was limited and was just a first step; gradually we began to think about our students moving beyond the awareness and helping model of service-learning.

We began to understand the larger role service-learning can assume in motivating students to become engaged citizens. Kahane, Westheimer, and Rogers suggest that participating in service-learning can enhance students academically and also in terms of their civic responsibility.[29] Cress identifies the goal of service-learning as the development of civically minded students who have learned to problem solve and become change agents. She presents a ven diagram schema for understanding this process that includes knowing/understanding, doing/applying, and analysis. She explains that by relating course content to actual community issues, students can use knowledge from the course for problem solving in the community and thus move beyond simple charitable service. She refers to this process as a "civic responsibility paradigm."[30]

Because there is no one accepted definition of good citizenship, Musil outlines six developmental expressions of citizenship: (1) exclusionary/ civic disengagement, (2) oblivious/civic detachment, (3) naïve/civic amnesia, (4) charitable/civic altruism, (5) reciprocal/civic engagement, and (6) generative/civic prosperity as a goal. She believes that colleges have an obligation to work through these levels of service-learning and participate in educating students for democratic citizenship.[31] Although an active, problem-solving citizenry was not an articulated part of our original service-learning expectation for students, we recognized the need to enlarge our role as faculty to consider aspects of good citizenship and to actively facilitate the incorporation of the community service component into the rest of the course, as suggested by Astin and his colleagues[32] and Zlotkowski and Williams.[33]

The primary way we advanced this broader perspective and focus on poverty was by intervening with pedagogical structure in students' journals, assignments, and class discussions. Initially, as we introduced the service-learning component, we assigned a daily journal when students were in the field. We reminded students to be thoughtful in their journals and not merely report what happened in their placements. We talked about the difference between reporting and reflection in their journals.[34] In spite of this guidance, students' entries often were simple reports of activities in their placements and unexamined descriptions. A typical example of this kind of journal entry would be a student writing that a young child, a first grader, brought in three bags of Oreo cookies to share with the class for snack. The entry detailed three bags of a certain cookie but offered no discussion of common barriers to healthful eating when single mothers work three low-

on

cept of "the New Citizen-
e-learning.[28] Our goal for
nat it was limited and was
our students moving be-
earning.

-learning can assume in
Kahane, Westheimer, and
ng can enhance students
onsibility.[29] Cress identi-
t of civically minded stu-
come change agents. She
this process that includes
ysis. She explains that by
students can use knowl-
mmunity and thus move
is process as a "civic re-

good citizenship, Musil
ship: (1) exclusionary/
nt, (3) naïve/civic amne-
vic engagement, and (6)
s that colleges have an
learning and participate
.[31] Although an active,
d part of our original
ized the need to enlarge
nship and to actively fa-
component into the rest
es[32] and Zlotkowski and

rspective and focus on
re in students' journals,
introduced the service-
nen students were in the
their journals and not
We talked about the dif-
urnals.[34] In spite of this
rts of activities in their
example of this kind of
ung child, a first grader,
the class for snack. The
ffered no discussion of
nothers work three low-

paying jobs just to pay basic bills. There was no mention of the absence of both time to shop and prepare healthful snacks and affordable fresh fruits and vegetables in the neighborhood bodega.[35] We expected students to be reflective in their journals, but we neglected to give them sufficient supportive tools to accomplish this.

Once we realized that students were thinking about their placements as separate from the course, what Eyler refers to as "the isolation of learning from experience,"[36] we initiated several assigned topics for their journal entries. For example, one journal assignment was to describe the ways that poverty is manifested in the students' placement settings; another journal assignment invited students to compare the experiences individuals in their placements have to cases from specific course readings. Half of the students' entries were responses to these structured questions, and half were free-write entries. These several direct assignments were well received by the students and supported their efforts to link their placement experience with the course on the effects of poverty.

Over the years we and the students made progress through Musil's citizenship topography as reflected in the students' journals. Early on, as previously described, students did participate in their placements and wrote daily journal entries. However, using Musil's terms, they were detached from and oblivious to any hint of their civic responsibility. They utilized a charity model or civic altruism, and viewed themselves solely as helpers to those in need. Once we actively intervened to create and support a larger and more integrated perspective, students became more insightful and began to think about the inequities they were observing in their placements; they were becoming truly engaged in their work in the community. For instance, journal entries in 2006 reflected a much stronger grasp of children's needs as a part of the societal problem of poverty. In trying to understand the irony of isolation within crowded public housing, one student wrote,

> These poorer areas of the community are where many if not all of the children who attend the Boys and Girls Club live, mostly in housing projects and developments. . . . They still probably have a sense of isolation simply living in housing projects filled with mostly minority families. . . . This sense of isolation and the frustration that arises from this situation brings with it many risk factors that these children become susceptible to.[37]

This student saw the children she worked with not just as individual children who needed help with their homework, but as a minority group with few housing options because of de facto housing segregation and the poverty that enveloped their families. Another student from the 2006 class became interested in family dynamics and asked the following critical questions in her journal, "How [do] economic pressures, such as living in poverty . . . affect parent-child relationships? Is there a correlation between

lower-income families and poor parent-child relationships?"[38] She was try-ing to understand how society's stresses impact children and their families. Although we have not yet reached Musil's final stages of reciprocal and gen-erative civic engagement, the students have begun to think more broadly about the relationship among poverty, the need for change, and their role as informed citizens.

We also adapted and structured assignments so students were required to apply knowledge, rather than just know the information. For example, in 2004 and 2006 we redesigned the required group projects to be application exercises. For example, one group's assignment was to prepare for a mock U.S. Senate hearing on particular day care issues and then develop a solu-tion to the problems; another group worked on a school finance case study in which neighboring public schools were funded inequitably. The students researched their group assignments and created dynamic presentations for the class describing the historical background of the problem in question, a thorough critique of current approaches to solving the problem, and pos-sible feasible alternative solutions that the group proposed. The cognitive processes necessary for developing a successful project demanded an appli-cation of theory to practice, not simply an understanding of the theory.

In addition, we made room in the class schedule for full-period service-learning placement discussions and supplied directed questions to help stu-dents make meaning of their experiences in the community. For these dis-cussions we often designed groups so that those students who were in similar placements could work together to discover parallels in their expe-riences. For example, students working with single mothers might group to-gether, while students who worked in various day care programs would come together in a group. Other times we created groups of students who were in very different kinds of placements so they could each learn about the dynamics of a variety of placements. For example, on one occasion stu-dents were asked to select one example from their placements that demon-strated the critical role the absence of resources plays in the lives of the in-dividuals at their site and then discuss the meaning of their example with their group. The group discussions were lively and fruitful. Using the think (about field experience), write (in daily journal), and share (work in groups) kinds of exercises encouraged students to become more reflective and analytical as they related their community placement experiences to other students; hearing their student colleagues' perceptions was also valu-able to them and broadened their understanding.

Whether it was students' inability to link their experience in the field to course content or their resistance to deal with the complexities of connect-ing practice with theory, either way our structuring journal assignments, group projects, and class discussion questions were helpful to students and resulted in their higher-level thinking. They became more reflective practi-

nships?"[38] She was try-
dren and their families.
s of reciprocal and gen-
to think more broadly
change, and their role

idents were required to
ation. For example, in
ojects to be application
to prepare for a mock
d then develop a solu-
1ool finance case study
equitably. The students
amic presentations for
problem in question,
the problem, and pos-
oposed. The cognitive
ct demanded an appli-
ding of the theory.
for full-period service-
l questions to help stu-
munity. For these dis-
students who were in
parallels in their expe-
others might group to-
care programs would
oups of students who
ould each learn about
, on one occasion stu-
acements that demon-
in the lives of the in-
of their example with
uitful. Using the think
and share (work in
ecome more reflective
ement experiences to
eptions was also valu-

erience in the field to
mplexities of connect-
journal assignments,
elpful to students and
more reflective practi-

tioners and were more able to link their community placements to the course. In applying theory to practice and relating practice to theory, many students began to see themselves as playing a role as advocates for children and families living in poverty.

NEXT TIME

We have made important changes to enhance our course, but there is always more to do. The next time we teach the course we plan to continue refining it, knowing that it is the dynamic development process that leads to an en-riching experience for students. First, we plan to increase our emphasis on students actively considering systemic solutions to societal problems rather than rely on individual, volunteer efforts. Systemic problems such as poverty deserve systemic solutions. Policy analysis will continue to play an important pedagogical role in the course.

Second, we plan to enlarge the options for community placements to in-clude the usual direct service settings, such as Head Start, and also involve indirect or policy-focused settings, such as the local state House of Repre-sentatives office or the city Human Rights Commission.[39] Such placements would be particularly important for helping students move beyond the charitable expression of citizenship to civic engagement or civic prosperity. For those students majoring or minoring in public policy, or for those sim-ply interested in how policy is developed, this kind of community place-ment will be especially meaningful.

Next, we will work to create stronger partnerships with the community agencies that host our students, as recommended by Trostle and Hersh[40] and by Calderon.[41] Truly reciprocal partnerships will support our move away from the charity model, as Musil suggests.[42] By regularly including community agencies in our classes rather than waiting until the end of the semester for a final panel, we will benefit from an ongoing, reciprocal dis-cussion. We will also ask our community partners for an evaluation of our students' performance in their agencies and not just rely on our assessment and the students' journals for evaluation.

Finally, we will create an informal group of all Hobart and William Smith faculty who teach service-learning courses. The group will become a com-munity of learners recommending strategies and materials, discussing cur-rent service-learning research, and sharing service-learning teaching experi-ences. As co-teachers in our bidisciplinary course, we could discuss our course every day and found it useful to do so, but other faculty function as isolated, single instructors. In fact, our own development as effective service-learning instructors would have moved more quickly if we had had addi-tional colleagues with whom to talk and share ideas. All service-learning

faculty would benefit from this kind of discussion, and our students would be the ultimate recipients of improved teaching.

CONCLUSION

Service-learning is an effective pedagogy for supporting liberal education and engaged citizenship. Our experience in teaching the course was that it was possible, and indeed more effective, to base our course around the "ill-structured" problem of childhood poverty in America, and to help our students develop the outcomes prized in a liberal education: critical thinking, communication skills, ability to problem solve, and appreciation and respect for diverse worldviews. The challenge of studying a problem that has multiple causes and multiple outcomes and has no easy or clear solutions forced the students to engage with the material at a deeper level and develop their analytical and problem solving skills. As the course evolved, we came to appreciate that the shift from a disciplinary focus to a problem-based focus did not diminish the power of the course as a part of the curriculum, but, to the contrary, enhanced it.

The incorporation of a service-based component to the course was essential for students to become engaged with the problem of childhood poverty and to develop a sense of social and civic responsibility. As they moved between their placements and the classroom, the problem of poverty became real in a way that could not have happened through class discussions and reading assignments alone. However, left with just the experience of their service placements, they did not engage in analysis that resulted in an understanding of either the systemic nature of the causes and outcomes of poverty or the need for systemic rather than individual solutions. Embedding structured reflection into the course, in multiple ways and at multiple times, was necessary to allow students to move to a level of analysis that engaged, rather than avoided, the messiness of studying childhood poverty. Through structured reflection, students began to understand their own responsibilities and to begin to grapple with their own obligation to take action. As Falbo notes, asking students to engage in the world is the first step, and accompanying them upon their return is the necessary second.[43]

Even as we have improved the course, we know that we can and should do more. Despite the changes, students still found it difficult to conceive of solutions that were not parochial but rather were systemically based. While students often became committed to taking personal action, many did not necessarily view themselves as social change agents. The use of placements that only involved direct services contributed to this narrower view and we know that we must expand the kind of service placements if we are serious about our goal of developing habits of citizenship. Similarly, we need to in-

id our students would

ing liberal education
the course was that it
ourse around the "ill-
, and to help our stu-
ion: critical thinking,
appreciation and re-
ig a problem that has
asy or clear solutions
deeper level and de-
ie course evolved, we
focus to a problem-
: as a part of the cur-

the course was essen-
of childhood poverty
y. As they moved be-
m of poverty became
lass discussions and
e experience of their
at resulted in an un-
es and outcomes of
il solutions. Embed-
ways and at multiple
il of analysis that en-
; childhood poverty.
rstand their own re-
bligation to take ac-
orld is the first step,
sary second.⁴³

we can and should
fficult to conceive of
nically based. While
ction, many did not
e use of placements
rrower view and we
nts if we are serious
larly, we need to in-

clude our community partners as educators because of their expertise and experiences.

We will continue to employ service-learning in our course because we are convinced of its contribution to both liberal education and an educated citizenry. Our goal is to help students find their place in the world, as learners and citizens, and it is hard to imagine a better way than through service-learning.

NOTES

1. Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College, 2002.

2. William Cronon, "'Only Connect': The Goals of a Liberal Education," *Liberal Education* 85, no. 1 (1999).

3. Cronon, "'Only Connect,'" 11.

4. Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College, 2002.

5. National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007.

6. National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007, 35.

7. National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007.

8. See Cronon, "'Only Connect'"; Robert Rhoads, "How Civic Engagement Is Reframing Liberal Education," *Peer Review* 5, no. 3 (2003).

9. Cronon, "'Only Connect.'"

10. Janet Eyler, "Reflection: Linking Service and Learning—Linking Students and Communities," *The Journal of Social Issues* 58, no. 3 (2002): 11

11. National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007; Rhoads, "How Civic Engagement Is Reframing Liberal Education."

12. Cronon, "'Only Connect'"; National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007.

13. Eyler, "Reflection."

14. National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, 2007.

15. Eugene Lang, "Distinctively American: The Liberal Arts College," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 128, no. 1 (1999).

16. See Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher, "Institutionalization of Service Learning in Higher Education," *Journal of Higher Education* 71, no. 3 (2000).

17. Christine Cress, "Defining a Service Learning Pedagogy of Access and Success," in *A More Perfect Vision: The Future of Campus Engagement*, ed. B. Holland and J. Meeropol (Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006). Available at: www.compact .org/20th/papers.

18. Student evaluation no. 15, 1995.

19. Student evaluation no. 6, 1995.

20. David Elkind, "School and Family in the Postmodern World," *Phi Delta Kappan* 77, no. 1 (1995).

21. Uri Bronfenbrenner, "Toward an Experimental Ecology of Human Development," *American Psychologist* 32, no. 7 (July 1977).

22. Jonathan Kozol, *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools* (New York: Crown, 1991) and *The Shame of the Nation: Schooling in America* (New York: Crown, 2005).

23. Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein, *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997).

24. See Rachel Parker-Gwin and J. Beth Mabry, "Service Learning as Pedagogy and Civic Education: Comparing Outcomes for Three Models," *Teaching Sociology* 26, no. 4 (1998).

25. These comments were taken from generic notes we took from student journals when we first introduced service-learning to the course in 1997.

26. Rhoads, "How Civic Engagement Is Reframing Liberal Education."

27. John Saltmarsh, "The Civic Promise of Service Learning," *Liberal Education* 91, no. 2 (2005).

28. Craig A. Rimmerman, *The New Citizenship: Unconventional Politics, Activism, and Service*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001).

29. Joseph Kahane, Joel Westheimer, and Bethany Rogers, "Service Learning in Higher Education," special issue, *Michigan Journal of Service Learning* (2000).

30. Cress, "Defining a Service Learning Pedagogy of Access and Success," 3

31. Caryn Musil, "Educating for Citizenship," *Peer Review* 5, no. 3 (2003): 5

32. Alexander Astin et al., *How Service Learning Affects Students* (Los Angeles: HERI, 2000). Available at: www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/PDFs/HSLAS/HSLAS.PDF (accessed May 24, 2007).

33. Edward Zlotkowski and Dilafruz Williams, "The Faculty Role in Civic Engagement," *Peer Review* 5, no. 3 (2003).

34. See Donald Shoen, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Eyler, "Reflection."

35. This entry was taken from generic notes we took on student journals when we first introduced service-learning to the course in 1997.

36. Eyler, "Reflection," 517.

37. Journal 8, L. M., April 3–7, 2006.

38. Journal 1, E. B., February 16, 2006.

39. See Eyler, "Reflection."

40. James Trostle and Richard Hersh, "Lessons from a College Promoting Civic Engagement," *Peer Review* 5, no. 3 (2003).

41. Joes Calderon, "Partnership in Teaching and Learning: Combining the Practice of Critical Pedagogy with Civic Engagement and Diversity," *Peer Review* 5, no. 3 (2003).

42. Musil, "Educating for Citizenship."

43. Mark Falbo, "Dare American Higher Education Build a New Social Order? In the Service of Whom and the Promotion of What in Education?" in *A More Perfect Vision: The Future of Campus Engagement*, ed. B. Holland and J. Meerpopol (Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006). Available at: www.compact.org/20th/papers.