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Fundamentals of Service-Learning Partnerships
Barbara Jacoby

High-quality service-learning that is beneficial to all parties involved must be built on a solid foundation of carefully developed partnerships. It has been said that "service-learning and partnerships are two sides of the same coin" (Ballis, 2000, p. 5). This chapter provides an overview of service-learning and its status in higher education today. It then outlines why service-learning must be based on a web of democratic and reciprocal partnerships. In addition, three frameworks that contain guidelines for the development and sustenance of strong partnerships for service-learning are offered.

Service-Learning Today
The Preface to Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices takes the stance that service-learning has "tremendous potential" to enable colleges and universities to meet their goals for student learning and development while making unique contributions to addressing community, national, and global needs (Jacoby, 1996, p. xvii). In the few years since the book was published, much has been accomplished to tap the vast potential of service-learning.

Regarding both the curriculum and the co-curriculum, we talk much more about service-learning with its underlying concepts of reflection and reciprocity than about the one-directional practices
of volunteerism and community service. The number of students, institutions, and communities involved has grown dramatically, prompting John DiBiaggio, then president of Tufts University, to open his keynote address to the March 2001 national conference of the American Association of Higher Education by stating that “service-learning has taken off.” We have more research about its effects, more models and principles to guide its practice, more support from national organizations, and more financial and other involvement of government and foundations. We are more certain of the powerful ways in which service-learning contributes to what has become an even clearer and sharper focus on the quality and coherence of the student learning experience and the achievement of desired learning outcomes. We have more purposefully integrated service-learning into academic courses and majors as well as into initiatives such as living-learning programs, course-based learning communities, new student orientation, leadership development, and multicultural education.

As more and more colleges and universities actively embrace the concept of “the engaged campus” and make civic education a priority, service-learning is increasingly cited as a driver of the civic engagement of higher education (Hollander, Saltmarsh, and Zlotkowski, 2001; Bringle, 2001). Peter Magdrath defines engaged institutions as those that “work with their community as partners to discover new knowledge, promote learning, and apply it throughout their region” (London, 2002, p. 12). Service-learning can be a relatively low-risk way for institutions to begin partnering with communities and others to work together to identify shared concerns and to provide specific relief. Service-learning also enables institutional leaders to view civic engagement as more than traditional, narrowly defined outreach or public service. Democratic service-learning partnerships can lead institutions away from viewing engagement as “something carried out on behalf of the community instead of in partnership with the community” (London, 2000, p. 4). In many instances, service-learning partnerships have served as the catalyst for broader and deeper engagement and civic responsibility by colleges and universities.

Service-learning has encouraged colleges and universities of all types to reexamine and bolster their missions to prepare students to become civically engaged citizens. Both educators and the general public are concerned that studies reveal that, although youth involvement in community service has increased in recent years, their interest and participation in our democratic institutions have decreased dramatically (Cone, Cooper, and Hollander, 2001; Sax, Astin, Korn, and Mahoney, 1999). We know that service-learning can enhance students’ critical thinking skills and that the combination of community service, academic knowledge, and reflection can help students develop an understanding of the root causes of social problems. Conceptualizing service-learning in terms of civic education enables educators to “make room in our practices and in our curriculum for conversations where students name for themselves what it is they are doing and its connections to community, citizenship, and democratic politics” (Morton and Batisson, 1995, p. 18).

Service-learning has even led to reconsideration of the fundamental tenets of the faculty promotion and tenure process. Several persuasive arguments have been advanced that encourage institutions to include participatory action research as legitimate faculty scholarship (Boyer, 1990; Troppe, 1994; Nylen, this volume). Assessment of teaching is being expanded to include multiple methods of measuring achievement of learning outcomes, and definitions of faculty service are being broadened to include work that enhances the quality of life in surrounding communities (Morton, 1996).

In addition, higher education’s leaders are talking about how colleges and universities can and should model democratic leadership and participation. According to Astin (1999): “If those in higher education want students to acquire the democratic virtues of honesty, tolerance, empathy, generosity, teamwork, cooperation, service, and social responsibility, then they must model these same qualities not only in individual professional conduct but also in their curriculum, teaching techniques, and institutional policies” (p. 37). Astin goes on to state that in order to model democratic behavior, “we have available a wonderfully simple and powerful tool: service learning” (p. 40).

In this book, as in the 1996 volume, service-learning is defined as follows: “Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning” (Jacoby, 1996,
service-learning as discipline-based. As such, programs may be designed to enable students to achieve greater depth in a particular field of knowledge and to apply their knowledge to address real community issues. In addition, they may seek to engage students in exploring the public purpose of their discipline. Other service-learning programs, both curricular and cocurricular, may have goals in the areas of leadership, ethical development, spiritual development, critical thinking, analytical or creative writing, citizenship or civic education, social justice, or increased understanding of human difference and commonality. Service and reflection activities are thus designed to focus on different learning outcomes (Jacoby, 1996).

Service-learning is a philosophy of “human growth and purpose, a social vision, an approach to community, and a way of knowing” (Kendall, 1990, p. 23). It is the element of reciprocity that elevates it to the level of philosophy, “an expression of values—service to others, community development and empowerment, reciprocal learning—which determines the purpose, nature and process of social and educational exchange between learners (students) and the people they serve” (Stanton, 1990, p. 67). Service-learning is a philosophy of reciprocity, which implies a concerted effort to move from charity to justice, from service to the elimination of need (Jacoby, 1996).

Service-learning is also a pedagogy that is grounded in experience as a basis for learning and on the centrality and intentionality of reflection designed to enable learning to occur. It is based on the work of researchers and theorists on learning, including John Dewey, Jean Piaget, Kurt Lewin, Donald Schön, and David Kolb, who believe that we learn through combinations of action and reflection. Kolb’s (1984) model outlines the learning experience as a constantly revisited four-step cycle: concrete experience, reflection on the experience, synthesis and abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation that tests the concepts in new situations. Reflection stimulates the learner to integrate observations and implications with existing knowledge and to formulate concepts and questions to deepen the learner’s understanding of the world and the root causes of the need for service (Jacoby, 1996). In this sense, service-learning as pedagogy relates to service-learning as philosophy.
Why Partnerships for Service-Learning?

Because service-learning educators and advocates are, by definition, reflective practitioners, there is a shared realization that there is much more to be done to fully realize the vast potential of service-learning and a shared commitment to do it. Service-learning is different from many educational endeavors in that it cannot happen within the confines of a classroom, a discipline, or even a campus (Jacoby, 1996). As a program, a philosophy, and a pedagogy, service-learning must be grounded in a network, or web, of authentic, democratic, reciprocal partnerships. By necessity, service-learning involves a range of partnerships within and across the institution; with other institutions, schools, community service providers, and community members; also with governments on all levels, national and regional associations, foundations; and, in some cases, with governmental and nongovernmental organizations around the world.

In the series of seminars on higher education and public life held between 1998 and 2001 by the Kettering Foundation, participants lamented the fact that service-learning programs are often conceived of as “benefits bestowed on the community by the university” (London, 2001, p. 10). As a result, it is not at all uncommon for local residents to view their area college or university as separate and distinct from the rest of the community and to regard academics with suspicion, even scorn. The way around this problem is “to dispense with the traditional outreach paradigm that seeks to provide services to the community, on behalf of the community. What is needed instead is an engagement model that looks for opportunities to partner with communities to meet collective needs. To be effective, the process must be reciprocal: it must serve the community while establishing learning opportunities and a framework for academic research on the part of the institution” (p. 13).

One can differentiate partnerships from other types of institutional relationships by asking the question, Who benefits? “If the answer is not ‘all parties,’ the arrangement is not a true partnership” (Grobe, 1990, p. 6). As Lloyd clarifies, “What binds people together most effectively are shared goals. Organizations also need to see a clear self-interest in collective action to sustain their interests over any length of time” (cited in Hollander and Hartley, 2000, p. 355). Truly reciprocal partnerships are also termed collaborations, defined as “a mutually beneficial and well defined relationship that includes a commitment to: a definition of mutual goals; a jointly developed structure and shared responsibility; mutual authority and accountability for success; and sharing not only of responsibilities but also of the rewards” (Mattessich and Monsey, 1992, p. 7). All individuals and institutions involved in partnerships, or collaborations, learn about themselves and others in the process and are affected, likely changed, in the process.

In early discussions with leaders in the service-learning field, questions arose regarding the appropriateness and accuracy of the use of partnership to describe relationships between universities and communities. In other words, is the power differential between institutions of higher education and communities too great to permit a truly equal relationship to develop? It should be noted that some chapters in this book distinguish between partnerships and collaborations, while others use these terms interchangeably. Despite these issues, this book generally uses the term partnership because it is as appropriate for its purpose as any other and is used as “coin of the realm” by the majority of service-learning practitioners and advocates.

Among many definitions, the working definition of partnership put forth by the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health is as good as any for the purposes of this book. A partnership is “a close mutual cooperation between parties having common interests, responsibilities, privileges and power” (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2001). The Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health at the New York Academy of Medicine elaborates on this definition as follows: “A successful collaborative process enables a group of people and organizations to combine their complementary knowledge, skills, and resources so they can accomplish more together than they can on their own. We call this unique combining power ‘partnership synergy’” (Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health, 2002, p. 2). The center does not view a partnership as simply an exchange of resources among participants. Rather, the partners work together to create something new and valuable, a whole that
is greater than the sum of the parts. Partnership synergy enables a partnership to think and act in ways that surpass the capacities of the individual participants: “When a collaborative process achieves a high level of synergy, the partnership is able to think in new and better ways about how it can achieve its goals; carry out more comprehensive, integrated interventions; and strengthen its relationship with the broader community” (Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health, 2002, p.2).

Guidelines and Frameworks for Service-Learning Partnerships

It is quite clear that there can be no recipe or formula for successful, sustainable, democratic partnerships for service-learning. Because the work of service-learning is complex and multidimensional, it must be undergirded by a web of strong, interconnected partnerships. The complicated relationships that are internal to the potential partnering entities add yet another layer of complexity. Ramaley (2000a) explains: “Often partnerships are fragmented by competing interests within the community, or on campus, or both” (p. 3).

In addition, there are few models of sustained and truly reciprocal partnerships between colleges and communities. There are even fewer examples of multisector partnerships. We are still cautiously testing the waters, most often dipping our toes in gingerly. As such, I have resisted the temptation to select a single framework or set of principles as a standard for the service-learning partnerships described in this book. Likewise, I feel it unwise to select a single theoretical lens through which to conceptualize partnerships for service-learning. In this spirit, I encouraged the chapter authors to ground their work in the principles and theoretical perspectives that seemed most appropriate to them. It is significant, however, that there are similarities among the several lists of characteristics of high-quality partnerships that have emerged in the last five years. Three such lists, or frameworks, are offered below. It is also notable that there are differences in emphasis among them. The recently published frameworks are clearly inspired by sets of principles now widely regarded as classic, including Robert Sig-omon’s three principles (1979) and the Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning, commonly referred to as the “Wingspread principles” (Porter Honnet and Poulsen, 1989).

It is important to note that although they are intended to inspire cross-sector partnerships, all three sets of principles described in this chapter focus primarily on colleges and universities. Torres explains the reasons for this approach:

Campuses are our primary constituency and would benefit most from the expertise gathered. Forming partnerships with communities is difficult terrain for colleges and universities to travel. Although many college and university mission statements include public service as a priority, there are a number of obstacles that compete with that mission, such as the emphasis on research, publishing, and numerous disciplinary requirements. Moreover, the cooperative, collaborative model is not native to the university. Campuses are more likely to think of themselves as curators of knowledge rather than as students with much to learn from their neighbors. In true partnerships, all participants will both teach, learn, exchange resources, and reap mutual benefits [2000, p. 3].

Campus Compact Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships

In 1998, Campus Compact staff convened a meeting of practitioners with expertise in campus-community partnerships at the Johnson Foundation’s Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin, to “examine the anatomy of campus/community collaborations” (Torres, 2000, p. 1). The benchmarks that resulted represent the eight essential features of genuine democratic partnerships identified at the Wingspread conference. These features are loosely grouped into three overlapping stages of partnership development (see Exhibit 1.1).

The Campus Compact benchmarks explicitly state the fundamental purpose of campus-community partnerships as “critical to sustaining the health of our democracy” (Torres, 2000, p. 2). Rather than focusing only on service-learning partnerships, the benchmarks address both broader and deeper issues: “to identify benchmarks for critical components of a genuine democratic partnership
Exhibit 1.1. Campus Compact Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships

STAGE I: DESIGNING THE PARTNERSHIP

Genuine democratic partnerships are:

 Founded on a shared vision and clearly articulated values. Partnerships proceed from the idea that participants are members of a common community that they seek to improve for the sake of their own and each other's benefit. In collaborative conversation, partners develop a vision of how their immediate environment—the community in which they live and work—can be strengthened. Resources and skills are pooled and used to help the partnership realize its vision.

 Beneficial to partnering institutions. The work of a partnership holds tangible incentives for partners. It satisfies some of their unique self-interests as well as the shared interests of the group. Concrete benefits are an important piece of why institutions remain faithful to a partnership.

STAGE II: BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Genuine democratic partnerships that build strong collaborative relationships are:

 Composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect. Strong relationships take time to build and energy to maintain, but partnerships form between people, and acknowledge that the building of strong communities happens through networks of individual relationships that deepen with time and experiences shared. Strong collaborative relationships are intentional and are characterized by the following: trust and mutual respect; equal voice; shared responsibilities; risks and rewards; forums to support frequent and open communication; clear lines of accountability; shared vision; and mutual interest.

 Multidimensional: they involve the participation of multiple sectors that act in service of a complex problem. Multidimensional relationships are those formed between diverse institutions in order to address a neighborhood problem, or network of problems, that no one institution can resolve on its own. They necessitate the participation of multiple sectors of society and are inclusive. Partnering institutions actively seek out the unique assets of each partner; each partner provides a contribution that enables the partnership to have comprehensive problem-solving strategies. Partnering institutions should, however, be prepared for the culture clash that may occur when a multisector approach is used.

Genuine democratic partnerships that build strong collaborative relationships are:

 Clearly organized and led with dynamism. Partnerships function best when participants understand their individual responsibilities and how these relate to the work as a whole. A combination of clear lines of accountability and energetic leadership fuels a partnership with the clarity of purpose and the inspiration necessary to effect change.

STAGE III: SUSTAINING PARTNERSHIPS OVER TIME

Genuine democratic partnerships that will be sustained over time are:

 Integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions. The most effective way to sustain a partnership is to secure the support of influential neighborhood institutions, and to spread the work of the partnership throughout your own institution. Successful partnerships are aligned with their institutional missions, frequently linked to the academic curriculum and have full institutional support. The important questions to ask are: What does your institution value, and how does the work of the partnership relate to those values? What degree should the work of a partnership link to the curriculum, and how might this link be made? Ideally, a partnership both reflects and influences the priorities of its sponsoring institution.

 Sustained by a “partnering process” for communication, decision making, and the initiation of change. A strong partnership process provides ample opportunity for the sharing of opinions and ideas. This solidifies the commitment of partners to collaborate over time, and facilitates their ability to change direction and redefine their work as the world around them changes. Three major elements form the basis of a strong partnership process: a method for revisiting the premises of the partnership; a structure that allows for evolution and growth; and practices that support frequent communication both within the partnership and in the immediate community.

 Sustained by a focus on both methods and outcomes. A partnership can be evaluated on several levels simultaneously—the impact on participating groups (particularly the community), the products of a partnership, and the processes by which work is accomplished. The results of evaluation can be used to guide future work and modify existing practices. Sometimes evaluation can provide a context to convene partners and stakeholders. In this way, the activity itself serves the important purpose of bringing participants together in analytical conversation.

Source: Torres, 2000, pp. 5-7. Used with permission.
with communities; to discuss ways to integrate these partnerships with the academic mission of the university; and to develop strategies for sustaining the partnerships" (Torres, 2000, p. 1). The intention of Campus Compact is clearly to "examine the anatomy of campus/community collaborations" (Torres, 2000, p. 1). The benchmarks seek to harness the power of genuine democratic partnerships to transform the partnering institutions and to "invest the campus with a desire for community action" (Torres, 2000, p. 2).

More specifically, Campus Compact aims to increase civic participation and to redefine both how cities and towns solve problems and how universities use the knowledge they generate and teach. There is a clear statement of the importance of the development of a shared vision of the future and of the partners as members of a shared community (Torres, 2000). Further, the benchmarks emphasize that partners from different sectors each possess "a different kind of access to . . . social systems" and that "collaboration among these diverse parties holds the potential to transform the systems that perpetuate inequity" (p. 16). The concept of equity is profound, reaching far beyond mere equality among service-learning partners.

Although campuses and communities are necessary members of these partnerships, the principles are general enough to inform collaborations with the private sector, government agencies, and others. And although service-learning is fundamental to the partnerships described by Campus Compact, the benchmarks are designed to "extend the reach of service-learning" toward "fully engaged campuses" (p. 2). Multisector partnerships, especially those that transform the partners in ways that increase their capacity to bring their resources to bear on mutually defined problems, have far more potential to address problems at higher levels and in more comprehensive ways.

The Campus Compact benchmarks are accompanied by follow-up questions and program examples. The Benchmarks publication stresses that it was designed to stimulate further thinking and discussion. In this vein, several chapters in this book refer to these principles and have even adapted them to apply more directly to specific kinds of service-learning partnerships, including those with students.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health: Principles of Good Community-Campus Partnerships

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) is a nonprofit organization whose mission is "to foster partnerships between communities and educational institutions that build on each other's strengths and develop their roles as change agents for improving health professions education, civic responsibility, and the overall health of communities" (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2001). The organization promotes service-learning as a core component of health professions education and as a means of developing partnerships. In addition, CCPH has intentionally established "a governing model and membership that reflect the full range of partners in community-campus partnerships" (S. Seifer, personal communication, June 2002). The CCPH partnership principles in Exhibit 1.2 were discussed at its 1998 conference and approved by the board of directors in October 1998.

The CCPH principles are easily generalizable to partnerships outside the area of health. Like the Campus Compact benchmarks, they emphasize the process of partnership—the development of mutual trust, respect, genuine commitment, and continuous feedback—through open and accessible communication. CCPH goes beyond the sharing of resources by clearly stating the need to balance power among partners as well. The CCPH website provides the full text of articles that explain in detail how to put each of the nine principles into practice (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 2001).

Judith A. Ramaley's Lessons Learned from Existing Partnerships

In Civic Responsibility and Higher Education (Ehrlich, 2000), Judith A. Ramaley examines what it means for a university to embrace its civic responsibility by linking learning to community life and serving as a center of community life. Although the Campus Compact benchmarks seek to weave partnerships into the philosophy and practices of higher education by transforming research, teaching, and service, Ramaley goes even further. Focusing on the comprehensive university, she proposes replacing the traditional concepts of
Exhibit 1.2. Principles of Good Community-Campus Partnerships

1. Partners have agreed upon mission, goals, and measurable outcomes for the partnership.
2. The relationship between partners is characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness, and commitment.
3. The partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, but also addresses areas that need improvement.
4. The partnership balances power among partners and enables resources among partners to be shared.
5. There is clear, open, and accessible communication between partners, making it an ongoing priority to listen to each need, develop a common language, and validate/clarify the meaning of terms.
6. Roles, norms, and processes for the partnership are established with the input and agreement of all partners.
7. There is feedback to, among, and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and its outcomes.
8. Partners share the credit for the partnership’s accomplishments.
9. Partnerships take time to develop and evolve over time.


research, teaching, and service with "the richer and more multidimensional terms discovery, learning, and engagement" (Ramaley, 2000b, p. 233).

By broadening the definition of legitimate scholarly work to discovery, which involves a research agenda created in partnership with community members outside of academia, faculty and students can engage in new avenues of discovery, sharing, and application of knowledge. As the emphasis shifts from faculty as teachers and transmitters of knowledge to the centrality of learning and the role of students as co-creators of knowledge, many possibilities of learning in and with the community open up. Engagement differs from the customary definitions of outreach and professional or public service in that it involves a shared agenda that is beneficial to both the institution and the community, rather than the usual one-way transfer of knowledge and resources from the university to the community (Ramaley, 2000b).

Ramaley goes on to state that "collaborations and long-term partnerships are especially appropriate as a means for addressing the reform of large-scale systems, such as education, health care, public safety, economic development, and job creation, corrections and social services or workforce development" (p. 240). She offers nine lessons that can be learned from partnerships already in place (see Exhibit 1.3).

Following these lessons, drawn heavily from Holland and Gelmon (1998) and Holland and Ramaley (1998), Ramaley elucidates how institutions can create a receptive environment for the development of meaningful partnerships and for the practice of discovery, learning, and engagement. Ramaley’s lessons learned from partnerships affirm the Campus Compact benchmarks and add to them both philosophical and practical dimensions.

On the philosophical level, Ramaley emphasizes the necessity for the institution as a whole to commit itself to engagement by embracing the broader concepts of discovery, learning, and engagement. Practically, she cautions us that partnerships must be firmly grounded in the institution’s mission and strengths and that leaders must thoughtfully consider institutional limitations before making partnership commitments. She openly recognizes that university partners have a role in assisting community organizations that would like to partner with them but lack the infrastructure to do so. For both university and community partners, she stresses the importance of developing and sustaining broad-based capacity to engage in shared work.

Some of the chapters that follow refer specifically to one or more of these three partnership frameworks. In other chapters these principles are implicit, or similar principles are stated in the authors’ own terms. In yet others, including Chapters Two, Three, and Nine, the authors propose their own frameworks for developing reciprocal service-learning partnerships.

Conclusion

In order to reap the tremendous potential benefits of service-learning for students, institutions of higher education, and communities,
Exhibit 1.3. Ramaley's Lessons Learned from Existing Partnerships

1. Each partnership has unique elements shaped by the history, capacity, cultures, missions, expectations, and challenges faced by each participating group or organization. What must remain as a constant, however, is that any partnership must be based on the academic strengths and philosophy of the university. The other constant feature must be the fact that the needs and capacities of the community must define the approach that the university should take to forming a partnership.

2. An ideal partnership matches up the academic strengths and goals of the university with the assets and interests of the community.

3. There is no such thing as a universal "community." It takes time to understand what elements make up a particular community and how people experience membership in the community. It is not easy to define who can speak for the community just as the university itself is not monolithic. Often, partnerships are fragmented by competing interests in the community itself.

4. Unless the institution as a whole embraces the value and validity of engagement as legitimate scholarly work and provides both moral support and concrete resources to sustain it, engagement will remain individually defined and sporadic. Such limited interventions cannot influence larger systems on a scale necessary to address community issues.

5. It is important to take time to think about what the university actually can bring to a partnership. Universities with limited research capacity and few graduate programs will find it difficult to provide the kinds of applied research and technical assistance that many communities need. Sometimes it is possible to make an alliance with a research university to broker and focus the research interests of faculty and graduate students on local problems. If sufficient research capability is not available, it is best to consider engagement as primarily a function of the curriculum.

6. A good collaboration will continue to evolve as a result of mutual learning. To be successful, collaboration should be built on new patterns of information gathering, communication, and reflection that allow all parties to participate in decision-making and learning. This requires time and face-to-face interactions.

7. Some communities are being partnered to the point of exhaustion. It is often necessary to identify ways to help community organizations and smaller agencies create the capacity to be an effective partner.

8. The early rush of enthusiasm can be replaced by fatigue and burn out unless the collaboration begins early on to identify and recruit additional talent to the project or the collaboration. This is true both within the university community, where a few dedicated faculty cannot be expected to carry the entire engagement and civic responsibility agenda, and within the broader community, where a small number of community leaders and volunteers cannot be expected to handle a sustained effort over time. Both the university and its partners need to find ways to involve a truly representative cross-section of the talent in the community.

9. Like any other important effort, community partnerships must be accompanied by a strong commitment to a "culture of evidence." It is important to keep a running assessment of how well the partnership is working from the point of view of all participants.


Service-learning must be grounded in solid, authentic, and reciprocal partnerships. Although there is no step-by-step plan for initiating, building, and sustaining partnerships, several sets of guidelines are available to inform our work. Although mutually beneficial democratic partnerships between colleges and communities are fundamental, a wide range of other partnerships is also essential. The remaining chapters of this book examine service-learning partnerships on campus, among institutions, in urban and rural settings, and involving relationships across social sectors and around the world. Although stunning in their variety, these partnerships share the goals of enhancing learning and bringing human and other resources to bear on addressing society's most pressing problems and meeting its greatest needs.
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