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Throughout the service-learning literature, there is a repeated acknowledgment of the critical role and influence of faculty. As Bringle and Hatcher (1998) note, service-learning in its most common form is a course-driven feature of the curriculum, in areas of the university controlled by the faculty. The prominent features of quality service-learning — meaningful and adaptive placements, connections between subject matter and community issues and experiences, critical reflection, and preparation for diversity and conflict (Eyer & Giles, 1999) — depend for the most part on the faculty.

But there is also growing indication of the resulting changes in the nature of faculty work influenced by the service-learning movement. As service-learning becomes increasingly integrated into the broad spectrum of faculty roles and responsibilities and visibly institutionalized in higher education (Zitkowskii, 1999), there are signs of its influence in the professional life of faculty. Such evidence includes "course and curriculum development, faculty development activities, expectations for recognition and rewards, broad understanding of and support for service-learning, and related scholarship" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000).

Thus, faculty are both influential with, and influenced by, service-learning. An agenda is needed to direct both inquiry and development of this expanding attention to faculty in the context of service-learning. Future research must examine both directions of the relationship between faculty and service-learning — the role of faculty with service-learning, as well as the effects of service-learning on faculty. This article reviews foundational studies and poses questions to frame a strategic research agenda for the immediate future.

Current State of Research on Faculty in Service-Learning

For reasons well known in higher education, major research and evaluation efforts have focused on student outcomes of service-learning (Avant & Sax, 1998; Benson & Yoorkin, 1998; Eyer, Root, & Giles, 1998). Evidence that service-learning makes a difference in students' educational experiences has significant implications for funding, resource allocation, program development, and institutional change. For some of the same reasons, there is intense interest in assessing the impact of service-learning on the community and the institution. In contrast, there has been a paucity of research focused on faculty and service-learning.

As early as 1996, Stanton criticized the minimal attention being given to the faculty role. And most of the current literature has focused on the preparation of faculty for service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Bringle & Hatcher, 1998; Stanton, 1994) and on institutional reward systems that support faculty work in service-learning, but we know very little about the relationship between faculty and service-learning (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Holland, 1997; Lynton, 1995).

One notable exception to the gap in service-learning literature is a study by Hammoud (1994) of faculty motivation, satisfaction, and the intersection of the two. Commissioned by the Curriculum Development Committee of the Michigan Campus Compact, Hammoud contacted 250 faculty in 23 Michigan institutions of higher learning to gather baseline data about the characteristics of faculty and the service-learning courses they were teaching. A survey was developed to document those character-
For purposes of adding breadth and depth to the proposed agenda for strategic directions for research related to faculty, each of the potential areas of each of the previous studies (Hammond (1994) and the Driscoll, Holland, Gelinson, and Kerrigan (1996) studies will be elaborated with potential research questions. Each of these five areas of inquiry will address rationales for their respective importance and implications for the future of service-learning.

Motivation and Attraction of Faculty to Service-Learning

As a former director of Community/University Partnerships at an urban university, I was in a position to observe faculty who actively sought a role in service-learning or who were receptive to recruitment to such courses. Two groups of faculty dominated a widespread range of faculty involvement in service-learning at Portland State University (Driscoll, 1998) -- new faculty with three or fewer years of university experience, and very experienced faculty, often at the full professor level. The former group of faculty were graduates of institutions that would be considered engaged campuses, as professionals for whom community connections made sense in their disciplinary contexts (e.g., social work or psychology), so they arrived at their current

Proposed Framework for Inquiry

Faculty play key roles on campus that affect service-learning's future. They develop and teach courses, oversee the curriculum, initiate and maintain relationships with students, and design and evaluate program effectiveness. Therefore, it is essential to know faculty experiences, attitudes towards service-learning and from multiple perspectives to expand our understanding of their role and direct our support. In this article, then, is a beginning lens with which to study faculty and service-learning. And though the perspectives do not form an exhaustive framework for the research agenda, they do provide both an understanding of the influence of faculty on service-learning as well as the influence of service-learning on faculty. The proposed framework includes:

- Motivation and attraction of faculty to service-learning
- Support Needed by Faculty for Their Role in Service-Learning
- Impact or Influence of Service-Learning on Faculty
- Experiences Reported by Faculty for Their Role in Service-Learning
- Obstacles/Challenges and Dissatisfactions Reported by Faculty

There is general agreement that faculty need support for undertaking service-learning classes. This pedagogy may be beyond the faculty member's pedagogical comfort zone, and other forms of community collaboration and service-learning are new for many faculty. There is also a need for support in faculty's early stage of development.

Support Needed by Faculty for Their Role in Service-Learning

Universities will gain insights from what we learn from all of the proposed support questions — insights to inform university decisions of planning, resource allocation, treatment systems, and possibly infrastructure. It is already clear that institutional support is a major factor in the development of campus service-learning, and other factors that make up the kinds of support faculty need to begin and sustain service-learning participation will strengthen and expand campus commitment.

Impact or Influence of Service-Learning On Faculty

As previously noted, the Portland State University study began to identify impact variables related to
faculty's involvement in service-learning (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon & Kerrigan, 1996). The researchers began with the direct question: Will participation in service-learning have an impact on faculty? From there predictions were made about what form the impact would take, most prominent and visible of the impact variables were those related to pedagogy. Personal observations of the service-learning classes as well as interviews of the faculty confirmed significant changes in, and new insights about, such pedagogical issues as class format and organization, interactions with students, teacher/student roles, curriculum, and course outcomes. Faculty were observed to change from traditional, "banking," teacher-centered approaches to constructivist or learner-centered approaches (Driscoll, Steouse, & Longley, 1997). A model of faculty roles and skill development for preparing for participation in service-learning is under development (Gelman, Kerrigan & Agre-Kippenhans, 1999). Not only do the beginning insights from these case studies lead 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 satisfactions.

Other questions for future research may focus on the impact of service-learning on faculty scholarship. Does participation in service-learning influence faculty research and publication? How does service-learning teaching affect faculty's conceptualization of scholarship? Do faculty seek out professional development opportunities - conferences, workshops, meetings - specifically related to service and service-learning? Do faculty seek to present about service-learning at local and national conferences that are related or unrelated to their discipline? The American Association of Higher Education's monograph series on "Service-Learning in the Disciplines" has begun the process of exploring the community engagement activities of faculty in the context of their disciplinary work. These volumes set a context for further inquiries related to the effect of service-learning on faculty's scholarly work.

Finally, future research may probe the impact of service-learning on faculty as individuals. Does their involvement with service-learning change their personal awareness and involvement with community as predicted by the Portland State study (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon & Kerrigan, 1996)? Do faculty begin to volunteer as a result of their service-learning experience? If changes occur, do they persist over time?

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. It is an area of study whose insights can inform the improvement of service-learning programs, faculty development planning, and institutional change. Further study will also inform the movement to sustain service-learning in various kinds of higher education institutions.

Satisfactions Reported by Faculty for Their Role in Service-Learning

As Weigert commented, "Given the formidable challenge presented by service-learning, why should faculty take on the hard work of incorporating service-learning into their courses?" (1998). She and others have answers that derive from experience and from strong intuitions about what faculty satisfactions are possible from service-learning. However, once again, it is time to move from conjecture to empirical evidence. Given Weigert's question, the research agenda can be framed with questions about the kinds of satisfactions faculty experience with service-learning:

- Does involvement in service-learning reduce faculty teaching?
- Does involvement in service-learning stimulate faculty leadership?
- Does involvement in service-learning open new opportunities and interdisciplinary opportunities for faculty?
- Does involvement in service-learning offer an enhanced sense of making a difference in students' lives?
- Does involvement in service-learning help faculty "make meaning" of disciplinary content?
- Does involvement in service-learning stimulate new interest and vitality for the faculty role?
- Does involvement in service-learning make faculty feel more connected?

With a growing awareness of the developmental changes that occur in faculty careers, answers to these questions could significantly influence faculty development efforts. There is also much potential here for insights that can be used to attract and motivate faculty.

Personal communication with service-learning faculty reveals faculty satisfaction with service-learning because it allows them to integrate their academic goals with their own desire to "make a difference" in communities, to work toward social change. Interviews of newly hired faculty in the Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon & Kerrigan (1996) case studies revealed that a number of recent graduates from doctoral programs sought out university appointments in which there was potential for just such integration. Thus, an investigation of this source of satisfaction can also yield insights for attracting or motivating faculty.

Satisfactions with service-learning may be directly related to service-learning's impact on students. For most faculty, a commitment to students is central to their work. The studies of Astin and Sax (1998), Cohen and Kinskey (1994), Dunlap (1998), Eyler and Giles (1999) and many others confirm the rich spectrum of outcomes for student participants in service-learning. While the effects of service-learningengaging on students receives much attention, it is also an area ripe for research related to faculty satisfaction.

Obstacles/Challenges and Dissatisfactions Reported By Faculty

On a campus with a large number of faculty engaged in service-learning, it does not take very long to develop an understanding of the obstacles, challenges, and dissatisfaction experienced by faculty. In my former role as Director of Community/University Partnerships, one of supporting those faculty, I learned a great deal from their stories, their frustrations, and their dreams. On a basic level, the issues of time and additional course preparation needed to be studied as starting points. With some baseline data on time commitments, it will be useful to ask, Does service-learning course demand as much time and work the second time it is taught?

Ward (1996) conducted five campus case studies to investigate how various constituencies (faculty, staff, etc.) perceive support for service and to probe actual barriers and support. She found that the faculty role in advancing service-learning was "famous and varied by institutional type." That lack of funding was frequently seen as a barrier for faculty in their implementation of service-learning, and that actual support for service-learning faculty was uneven from campus to campus. Ward's findings are supported by the Portland State case studies (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon & Kerrigan, 1996) in which institutional support was a major force in faculty participation in service learning.

In addition to the time and logistics required for a service-learning course, faculty teaching service-learning courses must connect with and collaborate with their primary and secondary partner. I have heard faculty describe with great satisfaction their partnerships and the benefits of their collaboration; I also heard of equally unsatisfactory relationships with community partners who did not have clear goals or needs, didn't have the time to commit to the partnership, and/or who were not sufficiently organized to receive student participants. New faculty-community relationships are complicated by the immediate need for a large group of students to be placed, scheduled, and accommodated. Recently we have been hearing much about the process of building community partnerships for service-learning and other forms of engagement (Driscoll, Drang, & Pollack, 1999; Driscoll, Drang, & Yerke, 1998), but investigations about how faculty experience community partnerships would inform studies of faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction with service-learning.

In addition to the role of the quality of the partnership with the community, how does faculty feel with the social and political stability and predictability of community experiences, which contrast sharply with the controlled faculty exercise in the classroom, affect faculty satisfaction?

Faculty also have communicated disappointment in a lack of impact on their students. There are expectations that service-learning can greatly affect and even transform students, and often these effects don't measure up. While there is much to learn about how the impact of service-learning on students, and while some faculty disappointment may be connected to our inability to adequately assess student outcomes, we need to know more about the relationship between faculty receptivity to service-learning and faculty's perceptions about service-learning's impact on students. There is also the faculty concern and responsibility for adequately covering academic course content. While service-learning can either extend and enhance content learning or interfere and weaken it; we must investigate how faculty perceive the role of service-learning in students' learning of course content.

These are the kinds questions that need to be included in a widespread survey focused on faculty views of difficulties, obstacles, challenges, and dissatisfaction associated with service-learning. With a big picture and a comprehensive set of issues, those committed to studying faculty in service-learning can proceed to deeper investigation of how those difficulties influence the effectiveness of service-learning programs as well as their impact on faculty motivation. From that base of information, we can begin to explore ways to better support faculty who undertake this new form of pedagogy.

A Clarion Call

The needs and the possible directions for the research agenda for faculty involvement in service-learning may look daunting but demands immediate and expanded attention. The future growth and sustainability of service-learning depends on a large extent on the faculty. The success with which universities are able to support and reward their efforts. We have many intuitive and experiential insights and informal anecdotal data, but like so many higher education reforms, we lack the scholarly study of our own work. Studying the
faculty role in service-learning responds to the call (K. Reardon, Personal communication, September 5, 1996) for examining faculty lives with rigorous academic standards for more informed decision-making, programmatic changes, and directions for our efforts. Research on the influence of faculty on service-learning will enhance our capacity to understand their roles and needs vis-à-vis service-learning, and will promote a more reflective practice. Research on the influence of service-learning on faculty will help to accelerate and inspire campus efforts to make service-learning an integral and permanent fixture in higher education.

Notes
1 For more information about this project, contact Amy Driscoll at California State University Monterey Bay (831) 582 4517 or Lonie Sandman at Cleveland State University (216) 687 6915.
2 For more information visit the AAHE website [www.aahhe.org]
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