

D R A F T

Lessons Learned from Faculty Fellows 2004-2006

June 30, 2006

Marie Troppe

Table of Contents

1. Seminar Structure
2. Seminar Content
3. Syllabi Revision
4. Logistics
5. Recruitment
6. Student Assessment Survey
7. Course implementation and follow-up
8. Mini-grants
9. Mini-grant applications
10. Mini-grant report format
11. Reflection
12. Mid-semester evaluations of seminar
13. Faculty Fellows Manual
14. Faculty Fellows Letter of Agreement
15. Conclusions

Seminar Structure

The Faculty Fellows seminar employed a learning circle structure. A learning circle is a community of peers who have equal opportunity to teach and learn from each other. It is a group that explores ideas, successes and failures, strategies and hopes. It is a safe space in which group members challenge and encourage each other with civility. A circle is democratic. By allowing space for everyone to have a voice, new knowledge emerges. All group members take responsibility for contributing to the group and shaping its direction.

I first heard the term “learning circle” when working with the Campus Compact’s national faculty network during the mid-1990s. Some leading CBL practitioners attribute the learning circle model to the Highlander Research and Education Center.

According to its website, the Highlander Center is a residential popular education and research organization based on a 106-acre farm in the foothills of the Great Smoky Mountains, twenty-five miles east of Knoxville, Tennessee. Since 1932, Highlander has

gathered workers, grassroots leaders, community organizers, educators, and researchers to address the most pressing social, environmental and economic problems facing the people of the South. Highlander's work is rooted in the belief that in a truly just and democratic society the policies shaping political and economic life must be informed by equal concern for and participation by all people.

We structured the Learning Circle to consist of eight sessions, two hours each. It seemed like we never had enough time, partly due to “housekeeping” business and paperwork associated with the grant. It would be interesting to explore the feasibility of meeting for five sessions of three hours each, although the tradeoff might be that some faculty do not want to meet for that lengthy a session. The seminar’s format, eight sessions over the course of one semester, demonstrates the advantages of ongoing work with faculty. This format allows faculty the time to absorb material, let ideas percolate, and think through different possibilities. The eight-session seminar definitely leaves a greater impact on faculty than a one-time workshop might.

Seminar Content

As a text, we used the 2nd edition of the Introduction to Service Learning Toolkit published by Campus Compact. Based on my past experience of working with faculty who are implementing service-learning courses, I chose eight session topics related to frequently recurring issues:

- Citizenship outcomes for students
- Learning assessments
- Building community partnerships
- Reflection
- Diversity
- Curriculum design
- Community based research
- Institutionalizing service-learning

It was clear throughout the sessions that students from Trinity University and the University of the District of Columbia had different needs and less time for traditional service activities than students from the other campuses. At the same time, those students tended to already be living in and rooted in local communities and involved in those communities through their children’s schools, religious organizations, non-profit organizations from which they had received services in the past. Such faculty development programs will need to continue to be sensitive to the special needs and contributions of non-traditional age students, students with family responsibilities and students employed full-time.

Syllabi Revision

First we started thinking about our current course objectives. Then, as we thought about how community-based learning might help us meet those objectives, we even modified our course objectives. Faculty really understanding and articulating the connection between the service activity and the course content is key to establishing solid course objectives. To this end, questions we discussed included the following:

- How do you ask students to consider the political implications of their community-based work?
- What's acceptable evidence that a student has mastered a concept?
- To what extent are our courses tools for learning or tools for building citizenship?

In order to assess the course's balance of community-based learning and disciplinary content learning, we asked the following:

- Can students ask useful questions. . .
 - . . . about community problem-solving?
 - . . . about disciplinary content?
- Do they have some answers. . .
 - . . . regarding community issues?
 - . . . regarding disciplinary content?
- Can they complete a project. . .
 - . . . in which they apply disciplinary knowledge?
 - . . . in which they demonstrate understanding of community social change?
- Are they ready for the next course. . .
 - . . . in their disciplinary sequence?
 - . . . requiring more advanced community-based work?

During some of the sessions, faculty paired up to review their revised syllabi together. I asked them to discuss their syllabi revisions in light of several guiding questions: How did your vision of the course change since considering integrating CBL? What strategies did you use to integrate CBL effectively? What questions about integrating CBL do you still have?

With the 2004 cohort, I asked faculty to provide a copy of their current course syllabus by the fourth seminar session. I reviewed the syllabi and made notes on them with ideas, suggested readings, potential resources and connections that could be made between particular service activities and the course content. I returned them to faculty at the fifth session.

I gave detailed feedback on original syllabi in order to help faculty produce revised syllabi that would effectively integrate service-learning with course content. Common advice given included defining the concept of service-learning for students in the syllabus, clarifying questions about the types of agencies which would help students

integrate service activities with course content, and recommendations of relevant readings. At the end of the seminar, I asked faculty to post their revised syllabi on the CoRAL Intranet.

In 2005 and 2006, the faculty gave their current syllabi to me at the second session and I made comments on how they might integrate CBL and returned the syllabi to them at the third session. I collected syllabi earlier with the second and third cohort than with the first cohort.

Logistics

I took what Faculty Fellows shared about their interests and experience in their commitment forms and compiled them to share with the group at the first session in spring 2005. In contrast to the first year, this aided us in the crucial task of learning who the Fellows were without spending precious time on lengthy introductions.

Eight campuses with varying semester schedules participated in the program. Some campuses started the spring semester as early as the second week of January and some campuses ended the spring semester as late as the third week of May. Spring breaks at the campuses varied, starting from late February to late March, with the bulk in the middle of March. For this reason, I initially scheduled the seminar sessions from late January to early May, with nearly a month-long break during March.

As the Faculty Fellows Director, I set the dates for the eight spring sessions. Fridays were a good time to schedule the sessions since, on most of the campuses, many faculty do not teach on Fridays. (This did not work so well for two of the eight campuses.) Two-hour sessions always went too fast. We decided to meet at one central location for every session rather than rotating among the campuses as originally planned. We met at the CoRAL office in the Perry School for the first two sessions.

We were fortunate that the Faculty Fellows group agreed to meet at one central location instead of rotating around to different campuses for each session. Some campuses had the ability to be generous in obtaining parking passes for participants. In our urban environment parking and metro accessibility mattered a great deal.

I took detailed notes at each session, wrote quarterly reports for the Executive Director of CoRAL and drafted this document after summarizing and analyzing all the quarterly reports.

Recruitment

In the first year, I wanted to have an extended phone conversation with each campus principal investigator (PI) that was having difficulty recruiting faculty but I wasn't able to connect with some of them. I wanted to serve as a resource for them to brainstorm new strategies but I think some of them may have felt threatened by inquiries into how their recruitment was going. In November and December I made phone calls and sent emails to PIs on each campus. When they gave me names of faculty to call or send more information to, I followed up and that worked well. PIs were really key to recruitment. Without their aggressive outreach, I was limited in what I could do.

There needs to be a certain level of institutional readiness on a campus in order for faculty to emerge who are willing to pursue service-learning. At campuses which had been offering faculty development opportunities on service-learning for several years prior, it was easy to find faculty who were interested in participating in the program with little effort. In the second year the recruitment was much easier because we started earlier and drew on recommendations (of potential participants) from the first year's Faculty Fellows.

I attended the May 2004 meeting of CoRAL campus PIs. I gave them a summary of the spring 2004 Faculty Fellows program. They requested a recruitment flier for the 2005 program by mid-June, which I provided. They also requested a list of faculty that I was currently in contact with on their campuses so that whether they initiated the contact or I did, both could touch base with potential recruits.

In year two, I attended the first PI meeting of the academic year and gave a 20-minute presentation and guided a discussion on service-learning institutionalization. There I proposed to visit all campuses in October to talk about Faculty Fellows and to set up walk-in hours in campus PI's office or do informal presentation to small groups gathered by the PIs. I conducted a "service barometer" exercise with the campus PIs in order to begin a discussion of definitions of community-based learning and how those fit into the different campuses' institutional contexts. I also gave a Powerpoint presentation on community-based learning definitions and concepts. At first, the PIs seemed a bit polarized in their views on service and not quite ready to have civil discourse about the various approaches. Both the exercise and the presentation, however, provided food for thought that might make a subsequent discussion fruitful. Each campus needed an opportunity to indicate what was important to that campus in terms of its community-based learning work. For example, some campuses identified more with terms such as "social change" or "social justice" while other campuses identified more with terms such as "civic engagement," "community service" or "service-learning pedagogy."

I visited campuses in October to recruit for the Faculty Fellows spring 2005 seminar. Some visits included an informal presentation on community-based learning theory and implementation to a group of faculty gathered by the campus PI. In some cases the visit

took place within the context of a departmental faculty meeting or a cross-disciplinary service-learning faculty reception, or a lunch meeting sponsored by the campuswide service-learning initiative.

Recruitment went much more smoothly in the second year. The campus PIs were in a much better position to interest faculty in the program. PIs saw me as a resource rather than someone judging their performance. Campus visits by the CoRAL Network Director and me in the fall of 2004 helped prime the pump for recruitment for spring 2005 also. We used the April conference each year as a recruiting tool for the following year's Faculty Fellows. I also asked each cohort of Faculty Fellows to identify colleagues for the next year's cohort early on.

From the beginning in 2004, for each Faculty Fellows applicant, I acknowledged their commitment form with an email or phone call within a week or two after receiving their form. I sent a welcome email with assignments, etc. a few weeks before the first session.

The 2005 Faculty Fellows Learning Circle reflected the growth of CBL on the campuses from year one to year two. The 2004 Faculty Fellows cohort had nine participants representing 6 campuses and 7 disciplines; the 2005 cohort had 14 participants representing 7 campuses and 10 disciplines. The 2005 group was almost double the size of the 2004 group, which increased the variety of disciplines represented and made discussion even livelier. The most creative approaches in integrating community-based learning had to be employed by the two computer science faculty and two philosophy faculty participants. The facilitators each week took ownership through active facilitation such as bringing handouts and rubrics to aid our work. The 2005 Faculty Fellows were much more able to draw on experience with CBL and contribute to cross-fertilization within the group, particularly in the case of Trinity University faculty who were teaching the First Year Seminar as a CBL course

We accepted 16 Faculty Fellows for the 2006 cohort. They came from eight local universities and 12 different disciplines. We had many pairs of faculty in the group who benefited from the similarity of each others' disciplines and courses. For example, we had two communication faculty, two writing faculty, two biology faculty, two foreign language faculty, two faculty teaching courses on domestic violence, and two faculty teaching courses on women in organizations/women in the workplace. We had faculty from disciplines ranging from Urban Affairs to Nursing to Business.

We frontloaded the 2006 sessions by meeting weekly (instead of bi-weekly, as in the past) for the first four sessions. This worked well in terms of frontloading content to better prepare faculty for syllabi revision.

In the 2006 cohort, two of the Fellows always had to arrive to the sessions late due to teaching conflicts. We admitted these faculty to the program anyway because of their value to their campuses as expressed by the campus PIs. We should consider not allowing this situation to occur in future seminars. The seminar sessions were specifically scheduled far in advance and potential recruits were given the dates before they apply to avoid this very situation.

Because we had a larger cohort in the third year, it was possible at times to recruit two faculty from the same discipline. Such pairings lead to more fruitful interchange and synergy. More clearly than other years, I explained to the Fellows that they should choose to revise a course that will likely be offered during the coming academic year.

For the first time, we had two faculty from Gallaudet University in the Faculty Fellows 2006 group. Both faculty were hearing and thus did not require ASL interpretation services. We realized, however, that we would need to consider in the future how we could accommodate deaf and hard-of-hearing faculty in the group and how to handle interpretation costs. It was very exciting for CoRAL to begin to facilitate the integration of hearing and deaf faculty in the network. In addition, CoRAL was eager to realize the opportunity for employing CBLR with deaf and hard-of-hearing students and helping others view them as assets.

In the third year, in addition to the application, we asked all applicants for curriculum vitae. We also publicized the dates of the spring seminar sessions earlier than we had in the past. I circulated a copy of the Letter of Agreement for the 2006 Faculty Fellows to all new Fellows in mid-December so that they were better prepared to make the commitment when they signed the LOA at the first session in January.

SEA-Q: Student Assessment Survey

A summer subgroup met three times in 2004 and designed the student assessment survey piloted that fall. CoRAL staff put the survey online so that students would find it easy to complete, faculty would not need to take class time distributing surveys, and raw results could be tallied more efficiently. By mid-September, more than 140 responses from 7 campuses had been submitted. The instant results available to CoRAL staff were very exciting. For example, 38 out of the 47 respondents (who had responded by the first week of September) agreed or strongly agreed that the community-based learning would make them feel a greater connection to the community. Academic administrators would view that data favorably in relation to retention.

Number of questions in the student assessment survey: 30.

Estimated completion time: 10 minutes.

One of the surveys that we used as a model for the fall 2004 CoRAL pilot survey was the University of Maryland Service-Learning Survey. The Maryland survey was adapted from a survey designed by the Center for Academic Excellence at Portland State University. The then office of Commuter Affairs and Community Service began administering the Maryland survey in fall 1999 and by spring 2003, it had been completed by 1600 service-learning students.

The UM survey was distributed at the end of each semester to faculty who were known to the campus service-learning office to be teaching service-learning courses. This means that, quite possibly, there were numerous service-learning courses whose students were not surveyed, since the UM course catalog does not indicate service-learning courses with any special designation. Service learning staff asked faculty to administer the surveys during class time in the last few weeks of the semester.

The survey was administered continuously each semester at the University of Maryland through spring 2004. During that period, the survey was revised twice. The first revision was to refine questions, eliminate confounded variables and respond to the invited critique given by faculty in the College of Education. The second revision created three sets of surveys, one that could be administered to students participating in curricular service-learning courses, one for students participating in co-curricular service-learning activities, and one for America Reads mentors.

The Maryland survey was a paper survey. It included a cover sheet that asked faculty course format questions such as if the service-learning was a required or optional course component, the number of hours required, etc. In 2002, a graduate student analyzed the survey results using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). In the fall of 2003, the Office of Community Service Learning (OCSL) obtained UM IRB approval for the use of the survey.

Other campuses in the CoRAL Network (Trinity University, the Catholic University of America and Georgetown University) had piloted similar surveys in the previous few years. The summer survey subgroup that designed the fall 2004 CoRAL pilot survey looked at iterations of all of these as they prepared their survey. An interesting feature of the GU surveys was that, in addition to generic questions that would apply to any service-learning course, these surveys also contained a discipline-specific section for two different disciplines -- sociology and biology. These sections measured content knowledge gains in the service-learning students.

Course Implementation and Follow-up

By December 2005, we noted some unforeseen obstacles with follow-up implementation, in terms of Faculty Fellows actually teaching the CBLR course they committed to

teaching. This happened for several reasons: (i) faculty getting promotion to higher-level administration and not teaching during that assignment; (ii) the course is offered only every two years; (iii) faculty attrition due to the person leaving academia.

We initially asked mini-grant applicants to obtain the signature of their academic department chair or dean on the mini-grant application indicating that he/she supported the course; in the third year we asked them to obtain the department chair signature as an assurance that the course would be taught in the coming academic year. In 2006 we also asked mini-grant applicants to obtain the signature of their campus CoRAL PI indicating that they were collaborating with their campus-wide efforts to advance CBL.

We also realized impacts beyond faculty simply teaching the CBLR courses. We observed significant ripple effects of participation in Faculty Fellows, where participants mentored other colleagues or a faculty promotion to academic administration had broader institutionalization implications. For example, several Faculty Fellows went on to present on CBL at national and disciplinary conferences, thus increasing the dissemination reach of CoRAL's faculty development work. Several mini-grants leveraged campus mini-grants and other external grants to further faculty's CBL work. In the interest of developing disciplinary-based networks of faculty interested in CBL, I gathered the names of primary disciplinary associations to which the 2006 Faculty Fellows belong.

In spring 2006, we created a comprehensive chart of all courses implemented by Faculty Fellows from all three cohorts (2004-2006). We made phone calls and emails to faculty in order to fill in incomplete information and find out the status of various courses.

Mini-grants

The mini-grant recipients provided brief narrative reports on the course implementation by the second week of the following semester.

Discuss format/content for mini-grant application and report.

Mini-grant application

By year two, we clearly stated the purpose of the mini-grants right on the application: The implementation mini-grants were awarded to promote high-quality community-based learning courses that were particularly innovative (for example, a CBL course in a discipline underrepresented in CBL – ancient philosophy – or a CBL course for a population underrepresented in CBL – engaging students with disabilities in the community – or a CBL course that employs unique reflection methods).

How many students would you typically expect to enroll in this course?

How would you characterize the nature of this course (first-year, core curriculum, required, elective, taken mostly by majors in your discipline, etc.)?

In order to best learn about the elements of each course, we asked applicants to attach a syllabus for the proposed course.

What types of service-learning activities do you plan to ask your students to engage in? Please be specific. (For example, students will conduct storytelling sessions for preschool children; students will write newsletter articles for non-profits working on housing issues; students will work with agencies that serve new Latino immigrants.) If you already have some agencies in mind, please name them.

How have you or will you identify community groups or non-profit agencies with which your students will work?

Have you listed or will you list your course and needs for a community-based project on the CoRAL website's ProjectFinder?

How will you relate the service-learning component with the academic course content? Be specific. Name some key course concepts and explain how they relate to the proposed CBL activities.

What are the ongoing reflection activities in which you will engage your students? Be specific. Name several readings or exercises that you plan to employ.

Have you sent a copy of your revised syllabus for the CBL course to your campus CoRAL PI?

Administer the SEA-Q Student assessment survey

What are your plans to disseminate lessons learned from this course?
a brief presentation on your service-learning course at next year's CoRAL conference (in DC), a presentation to other faculty in your academic department or institution, or a presentation at a national disciplinary conference or other venues.

Are you willing to post results of your students' service-learning papers, projects or other products on the CoRAL website (with the appropriate permission)?

Will you (or your department) be able to offer this course in subsequent semesters (after the mini-grant period) without additional CoRAL funds? _____ How will this course be sustained over time? _____

We asked mini-grant applicants to include a detailed budget. Possible expense categories included stipends, partial course release, teaching assistant, transportation, travel, photocopying, and publications. We asked applicants to attach a Scope of Work outlining the roles for guest lecturers or teaching assistants, if they planned to use the mini-grant funds for those purposes. We requested that they include any matching funds provided by their own campus or other sources.

Mini-grant reports

[check file on home computer]

2005

A mid-semester evaluation of the 2005 Faculty Fellows seminar resulted in the following feedback:

- * Faculty Fellows like the interactive exercises.
- * Some would like to see a learning circle for faculty in the humanities.
- * They would like to see more resource documents posted online.
- * Some expressed that the peer-facilitated sessions were uneven in format, and that some faculty were newer to CBL while others are more expert in CBL. My analysis of this expression is that we could more explicitly discuss the purposeful design of the learning circle format up front so that people better appreciate each other as teachers, learners and resources.

April 30, 2005 Conference – Faculty Fellows Panel

Members of the Faculty Fellows Learning Circle discussed the process of developing community-based learning courses and guiding students through these courses. Panelists focused specifically on how faculty and students can work together to make explicit connections between the service activities and key course terms and concepts.

Reflection

Reflection is multi-faceted, has structure, and is productive. In this session, we demonstrated various “reflection stations” that could be used with students. The FFLC Program Director asked the faculty to write a response to each statement. Other options include asking students to write two questions and two comments about each statement or asking students to write down one idea that supports a given position and one idea that challenges a given position.

Ask students: How do you come to know what you know? We can instruct students in the notion of theory as a set of glasses. We can ask them: What do you see when wearing these glasses or those glasses?

How do we know if a student has made an independent insight? Did students make a connection with the material that the professor didn't make for them in the course? There are various kinds of connections: connection with text, connection between text and experience. We discussed how to manage and facilitate dialogue so that political discussions don't get ugly. Establishing ground rules up front can provide a constructive framework.

One Faculty Fellow observed that, according to C. Wright Mills, the "sociological imagination" makes connections between private lives and public issues. According to this Fellow, the sociological imagination has been inappropriately limited to sociology. It doesn't impose an ideology; it just asks the question, "Is the issue at hand a social phenomenon (rather than an individual one)?"

We did the Barometer Exercise which asks participants to line up on a spectrum according to their beliefs in the extent to which they view certain activities as community service. Discuss why they consider certain activities as community service or not. We talked about the various kinds of service (direct service, advocacy, political action, etc. as referenced in the Social Change Wheel by Minnesota Campus Compact) that students might be involved in and how we can encourage all of these forms.

2005 MINI-GRANTEE REPORTS

Having the mini-grantees write such a report gives them time to reflect on the semester's progress and enables them to think about needed changes for subsequent semesters. Participating in the Faculty Fellows Learning Circle and receiving mini-grants clearly equipped them with more effective tools for teaching a service learning course and for deepening the connections between course content and service experiences.

Quotes from reports

"I believe the S-L component helped concretize many of the concepts explored in class. For example, students had an opportunity to actually see the physical environment in which many of the people they studied were struggling to survive." Greg Squires

"When I first started teaching the service learning course, I simply told my students to find a service learning site. Consequently, it was difficult for me to establish strong partnerships with any particular site or organization. By limiting the number of

partnerships [after I became a Faculty Fellow], I was able to develop stronger relationships and provide students with an increased level of support.” Karen DiGiovanni

“I was much more pleased with my ability to relate the service learning to the course content this past semester than I have ever been before. Partnering with a homeless shelter for women allowed for a much clearer connection to the course content on girlhood narratives and identity. In class we read narratives by and about girls and women, and in their service learning students experienced the narratives that homeless women told of their struggles. Students learned a central point in narratological theory that I had hoped to teach them, that is, that all narratives share similar patterns and codes. They clearly saw similar issues of identity, respect, strength, and loss in the literary and the oral narratives by the homeless women.” Jackie Padgett

In the first year, most of the faculty had problems in accessing the mini-grant funds through their campus PIs.

Summary of 2005 seminar themes

For some faculty, we need to do more training on how to manage and facilitate dialogue. Some faculty feel intimidated at the thought of guiding students in discussions that might involve conflict. We could use Common Ground's tools for dialogue as a resource. Other faculty have fears of getting into “counseling” territory. Because community-based learning engages students' as emotional beings, faculty need to know what to do when reflection veers off track, or when students might need a referral to the counseling center. Students don't have much opportunity to discuss controversial issues with civility. The need more models of that and faculty can provide some of those models, if equipped to do so. Faculty want to know how to help students reflect on personal experience, sort out what might be sociological phenomenon, establish criteria for evaluating evidence, and draw reasonable conclusions from their observations.

A recurring theme we talked about was approaching students differently in preparing them for CBL if they are privileged students or disadvantaged students. CBL can be an identity-changing experience for disadvantaged students who begin to recognize their own agency. CBL can be a powerful experience for privileged students who begin to recognize their privilege. Faculty need to model the way to consider cultural differences in ways other than strict dichotomies. We often assume that privileged students are serving the disadvantaged. On some of our campuses, the majority of students are the same races and classes as the people they're serving. As a field, we need to address student identity issues. Implementing ongoing service helps avoid the danger of reinforcing stereotypes through one-time service. How can students monitor their discomfort level and understand it? Discomfort helps us learn about our own cultural

assumptions. Important to consider cultural differences in ways other than strict dichotomies.

Faculty development workshops at the partnering campuses

The third year saw an increase in the number of faculty development workshops requested by the partner campuses. Total campus consultations/faculty workshops in grant year/academic year: 8 presentations (fall 05 and spring 06)
[Look up the number of workshops in year one and two.]

Place-based focus

Nadinne Cruz, our keynote speaker in 2005, said that the CoRAL conference was one of the rare place-based conferences that she has seen in this field. She also said that the Faculty Fellows Learning Circle, as a place-based faculty development seminar for CBL is a first. CoRAL operates within a community context grounded in time and place. CoRAL recognizes DC as the anomaly that it is, a predominantly African American city with no Congressional representation. Diversity of student bodies in the DC metropolitan area greater than most other areas of the country. Gallaudet's participation in CoRAL would contribute a great deal to the research literature in the field about implementing CBL with deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

Faculty exploring the community

I attended the SELF (CoRAL's Student Fellows program) ward presentations in the spring of 2006 in the hopes of adapting the exercise for faculty. Student Fellow pairs would select a ward in DC and research its assets, demographics, services and social issues. They would obtain information from websites, walking tours, personal interviews with community leaders, and census data. Then they would present their findings to each other. As a time-intensive exercise, we thought it would be difficult, although invaluable, for faculty to complete such studies.

Mini-grants

In 2004, we funded four mini-grants. In 2005 we funded eight. We decided to offer three mini-grants of \$1,200 each in the third year. We established a June 15th deadline for mini-grant applications from the 2006 Faculty Fellow cohort. Five faculty (two from Trinity, two from GW and one from Gallaudet) applied. Since then (in light of the CNCS grant not being renewed) we decided that we would not be able to offer the mini-grants this year, so the applicants were notified.

Faculty Fellows Manual

The 2005 Faculty Fellows requested that we hold a Faculty Fellows reunion in the fall. We invited the 2004 and 2005 cohorts to a reunion at a restaurant on DC's historic U Street for late September.

CoRAL staff worked with me to create a binder for all information and resources that were needed by the 2006 Faculty Fellows, including seminar readings.

① Faculty Fellows Learning Circle

Contacts and Responsibilities

Activity log responsibilities, commitment form (what we called the application), letter of agreement, contact lists of fellows, campus PIs.

② Faculty Fellows Seminar

Syllabus and Schedule

what is a learning circle,

③ CoRAL Network

Resources and References

SEA-Q Survey, Faculty Development Workshop Menu

④ Community-based learning and research

CBLR Resources

Campus Compact website

MJCSL

AAHE Monograph Series *

⑤ Sample Syllabi

⑥ Syllabus Revisions

⑦ Reflection Tools

⑧ Notes

Summary of 2006 seminar themes

The 2006 Faculty Fellows had tentatively held two dates in Sept. and Oct. for a Faculty Fellows reunion for all three cohorts. Since the CNCS grant to CoRAL has not been renewed, perhaps the Fellows can still hold an informal reunion on a self-pay basis.

We discussed higher education's tradition of community outreach and the historic mission of higher education. We discussed how CBL involves trial and error learning for both students and faculty. Some faculty remind their students that there are no right answers but that they should offer their brainstorming ideas. Several faculty talked about the learning that occurs despite obstacles. For example, difficulty with a community-based agency turned out to be a learning moment for students.

We talked about students often lacking the patience or the knowledge of history to take the long view of struggles for social change. Case studies highlighting the history of resistance and survival help students to feel their political agency. Giving students multiple ways of entering the political discourse makes it more likely that they will engage with it. Students can benefit from discussing the concepts of a social contract, corporate social responsibility and enlightened self-interest.

In the third year, we only had one male in the group. There were 7 African-American women in the group.

Discussion focused on race more than other dimensions of diversity. One faculty fellow did the exercise in which we step forward for each white privilege she reads that we feel we experience. She did written reflection too. I compiled the responses.

I spoke about my concerns related to the compiled responses to the written reflection exercise in the diversity session. Perhaps for future Faculty Fellows diversity sessions, we should continue the practice of making sure the two facilitators are of different races/ethnicities and we could invite the UM Intergroup Dialogue program staff to facilitate.

One faculty member mentioned an article that said when whites talk about diversity, they talk abstractly but when people of color talk about diversity, it's grounded in concrete conditions like housing, etc.

Institutionalization barriers discussed:

- TENURE (and how status of faculty affects ability to implement CBLR)
- student concerns (making a most appropriate match with community organizations, students as "consumers" of education/university clients)
- looking towards the office of community-service for assistance and university financial commitment to that office
- communication and accountability between professor and CBO(s).

MID-SEMESTER EVALUATIONS FROM THE 2006 SEMINAR

What faculty valued about the seminar sessions:

- Faculty-led, rotating facilitation duties
- Vibrant discussion
- Insightful readings
- Sample syllabi
- Informal setting, seminar format, environment conducive to learning
- Variety of disciplines and perspectives

What faculty would like to improve:

- Spring break month is too long to be away from seminar group
- Would like even more time for discussion
- More time for syllabi revision work in the seminar
- Explicitly link the day's topic with the overall picture of CBLR

We asked Faculty Fellows to sign a Letter of Agreement.

Quote from FF LOA:

As a Fellow of the 2006 Faculty Learning Circle, you agree to attend seminar sessions throughout Spring 2006 and implement a course in either Fall 2006 or Spring 2007 that incorporates community-based research and service-learning in the curriculum design. Specifically, Faculty Fellows are expected to:

- Attend at least six of the eight sessions scheduled from January to May, 2006. Further absences may result in a pro-rated stipend. Sign attendance sheets at each session.
- Complete monthly online activity logs documenting time spent in Faculty Fellows sessions, preparing for them, and revising course syllabus.
- Rotate responsibility for preparing resources and leading session discussions.
- Assist in reserving meeting space on their campuses for subsequent FFLC sessions.
- Attend CoRAL's 3rd annual conference, *Transforming DC through Community Based Learning and Research* on Saturday, April 29, 2006 at American University. Faculty Fellows are strongly encouraged to submit papers or poster sessions on topics related to community-based research and service-learning.
- Design a new course or modify an existing course to include service-learning and/or community-based research and implement the course in the 2006-07 academic year.

- Assign the SEA-Q as a class requirement for the 2006-2007 academic year, ensuring that students take the on-line pre- and post-test survey to assess student engagement, career choices and skills acquisition related to community-based learning and research.

As a Faculty Fellow, you will receive an honorarium of \$750 in recognition of your participation in the Faculty Fellows Learning Circle, your course redesign and its implementation within the following academic year. In addition, Fellows completing the Learning Circle seminar will be eligible to apply for CoRAL teaching mini-grants to help defray implementation costs associated with integrating a community-based learning and research component.

Conclusions

Accomplishments 2004-2006

General

- Faculty practicing CBLR are feeling less isolated
- Faculty exchange across network has fostered creativity, cross-fertilization
- Raising awareness on individual campuses, approaching a critical mass on some campuses
- CBLR course quality, numbers of CBLR courses increased

Specific

- Faculty Fellows submitting articles to *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (MJCSL)
- Faculty Fellows collaborating across campuses on teaching, writing and community projects
- Faculty Fellows spearheading CBLR and related initiatives on their own campuses
- Interaction among Faculty Fellows cohorts from 2004 (9 participants), 2005 (14), and 2006 (16) – total of 39 participants – through CoRAL Network conference, service learning events on individual campuses, etc.
- Potential for collaboration in common programs across campuses (Ex. First Year Seminar, Honors Programs)

Future Focus

Ideas for future focus include creating learning circles for particular academic disciplines or disciplinary clusters. For example, one learning circle could specifically target English literature and composition faculty from all campuses. Or another learning circle could

specifically target faculty in the social sciences from all the campuses. Ideally, it would be great to have a learning circle on each campus.

Vision for 2007-2009

Give each network campus a certain bank of hours of faculty development time so Faculty Fellows Director can offer more specialized training.

Offering modules, menu of options for campuses for faculty development:

- Engaged department (four to eight sessions for group of three or more faculty – including department chair – from one academic department on a single campus)
- Campus learning circles on CBLR (four to eight sessions for group of six or more faculty at one campus)
- Learning circle focused mainly on CBR (four to eight sessions for group of ten or more faculty across campuses)
- Disciplinary learning circles (four to eight sessions for group of six or more faculty in common disciplinary fields across the campuses – ex. social sciences, humanities, urban affairs, education)
- First Year Experience (FYE) and other clusters (four sessions for group of six or more faculty focusing on common programs from across campuses)
- Professional schools (four sessions for group of six or more faculty focusing on professional programs from across campuses – ex. medical, dental, education, law)

For experienced CBLR faculty, offer sessions to deepen understanding and practice of CBLR:

- Four sessions for faculty on getting to know DC metropolitan area needs and services (like SELF – community mapping of wards) for group of ten to fifteen faculty from across campuses
- Four to eight sessions for faculty on civic dialogues, inter-group dialogues, reflection tools for group of ten to fifteen faculty from across campuses
- Four sessions for faculty on African-American history/literature related to DC area for group of ten to fifteen faculty from across campuses