HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The primary purpose of the first U.S. colleges and universities was the development of students' character (historically limited to young, white men) and intellect (Colby, Erlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2000). By the 1900s, innovative institutions such as Cornell, Harvard, Yale, the University of Chicago, and the University of Wisconsin had borrowed the concept of research from European schools and integrated it with the American emphasis on teaching and the formation of citizens (Sullivan, 2000).

Harkavy (2005) notes that higher education's current preoccupation with research is a recent phenomenon that arose from the ashes of World War II. At that time, American society as a whole was preoccupied with the Cold War and competition with the Soviet Union. Consequently, universities became entrepreneurial in their quest for government-funded research grants. With those funds came income and prestige with which faculty members were rewarded as they obtained grants. This, in turn, resulted in a change in faculty reward structures that reinforced research over teaching, especially at universities. As Rice (1996) documented, the role of faculty began to shift from one of service to one of science. Faculty began to develop knowledge not only for its own sake rather than social benefit, but also because they were extrinsically rewarded with promotion and tenure when they engaged in research. The charge to create "new knowledge" became paramount.

Thus, faculty members are impelled to be productive, not only in terms of producing new knowledge but in producing new research dollars. The result is what Benson and Harkavy (2002) call the "commodification" of higher education. As we will see later, however, not all faculty members are subject to this expectation, because of the varying missions of higher education institutions.

A NATIONAL RESPONSE

By the 1980s, society at large and scholars within academia began to sense that higher education was not effectively nurturing students' sense of civic responsibility (Sax, 2000). In 1985, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching released a report entitled *Higher Education and the American Resurgence,* which stated, "If there is a crisis in education in the United States today, it is less that test scores have declined than it is that we have failed to provide the education for citizenship that is still the most important responsibility of the nation's schools and colleges" (Newman, 1985, p. 31). Likewise, the National Commission on Civic Renewal (1998) focused on higher education's "civic *dis*-engagement."

As a response to this indictment, a growing national movement called for colleges and universities to become civically engaged, evidenced by an increasing number of reports, books, articles, conferences, and action taken by higher education. In 1999, the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-grant Universities published a report, *Returning to our Roots: The Engaged Institution,* which defines engaged institutions as those "that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities" (p. 9).

So What?

Service-learning is one way to promote civic engagement (Billig & Welch, 2005), which explains much of the sudden interest and growth of service-learning since the late 1980s and early 1990s. Many presidents of colleges and universities have embraced service-learning not only as a viable form of teaching and learning but also as an effective public relations tool to counter negative public sentiment. Conversely, many faculty members who do not necessarily understand service-learning are dubious about this method and question whether it is really part of the institution's mission. And while presidents, foundations, and scholars have begun to recognize the importance of civic engagement, most faculty remain oblivious to it and misunderstand what it is or how to promote it. Most believe that their identity is inextricably tied to their discipline.

Mission Possible: Understanding Your Institution and Its Mission
What?/So What?

Each type of higher education institution has its own history, traditions, and mission. The historical context of your institution is likely to have an impact on the development and implementation of service-learning.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The American Association of Community Colleges, founded in 1920, charts the emergence and phenomenal growth of community colleges in the mid-twentieth century as a response to an increasing demand in the workforce for college-educated employees. Many potential college students were either unable or unwilling to leave their homes to attend college in the traditional sense of living on campus and earning a degree. The community college was appealing to many underserved or underrepresented groups that needed some technical training rather than a bachelor's degree. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, there are more than 1,100 community colleges with over 11.6 million students. Most are women and come from underrepresented groups; their average age is 29. Nearly two-thirds of these students attend part-time. Most are employed; many work full time or at more than one job.

Tuition at community colleges is usually not as expensive as at four-year institutions, and courses are often taught at nontraditional hours such as evenings or weekends. Over time, community colleges have enabled students to make an easier transition from high school to four-year institutions. Students can take introductory courses (in smaller-class settings) that meet the requirements of baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities.

Now What?

Identify some faculty members or administrators whom you know well and ask them what their role is. Do they mention civic engagement in their responses?

Ask faculty or administrators what academic freedom is and what it means to them. Do their responses reflect a culture of autonomy? Do their answers include preparing students to be good citizens through partnerships with the community? Their responses will reflect faculty members' opinions about civic engagement and hint at their understanding of the role of service-learning.

Because community colleges focus on teaching rather than research, faculty may be interested in exploring service-learning as a *pedagogy.* Many community-college instructors, however, are employed off campus in other professions and teach only one or two courses. Most part-time instructors feel that they don't have the time or resources for service-learning activities that create additional work outside the classroom. Yet, there are many innovative service-learning programs and courses at community colleges. Some focus on developing the technical skills students seek by working in the community, and others enable students to count the experiences they are already involved in, such as PTAs and youth organizations.

LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The Morrill Act was signed into law by President Lincoln in 1862 to promote the "liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life" (Boyte & Kari, 2000, p. 47). The act was instrumental in creating what are known as land-grant institutions. Part of the reconstruction of the nation following the Civil War included the development of usable knowledge for rebuilding the industrial democracy, resulting in the creation of land-grant colleges to provide technical assistance to communities (Boyte & Kari, 2000). Therefore, the Morrill Act articulated a mission of teaching agriculture, military tactics, and the mechanical arts, as well as classical studies, so that members of the working classes could obtain a liberal, practical education.

In essence, the act led to the rapid development of new kinds of institutions with a very practical mission. The mission was manifested immediately through agricultural extension programs, literally extending the knowledge from the institution out into the fields. In 1887, the Hatch Act allocated federal funds to create experiment stations and extension programs. To this day, most land-grant institutions have extension offices readily accessible to farmers and ranchers throughout their respective states.

This history is important to understand because, although the mission of outreach lends itself nicely to service-learning, the emphasis on the development of technology related to agriculture has also promoted a greater focus on research. Therefore, many faculty members at land-grant institutions are expected to engage in extensive grant-funded research activities and teaching courses. As we will see later, this demand can be a challenge to faculty, making them reluctant to consider creating and teaching service-learning courses.

LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) was established in 1915 to promote liberal education as a philosophy of education that empowers individuals, liberates the mind from ignorance, and cultivates social responsibility (AAC&U, 2005). Service-learning fits well with this mission. Liberal arts institutions are typically smaller and often private. Their missions focus on teaching students to be well-rounded individuals, professionals, and citizens. Most faculty members take great pride in teaching students to be critical thinkers and rely heavily on theoretical constructs or models in their teaching. In many cases, tension between the college and community has developed—sometimes referred to as *town and gown*—because the intellectual emphasis on learning is perceived as impractical at best or elitist at worst.

Teaching is the primary role and responsibility of faculty at a liberal arts institution; research is not considered as essential as it is in research institutions. Initially, it might seem that faculty at a liberal arts college would be receptive to service-learning. Yet, instructors may teach up to three or four different courses a semester. Managing that many courses, which may meet twice or three times a week, plus designing lesson plans and grading papers, takes considerable time and effort. Consequently, the additional logistical challenges associated with service-learning courses may seem daunting.

FAITH-BASED INSTITUTIONS

The U.S. Department of Education estimates that of the nearly 4,000 colleges and universities in this country, approximately 900 identify themselves as religiously affiliated. Faith-based institutions are either directly operated by or affiliated with a specific religion. They have traditionally focused on students' spiritual growth and response to moral issues. Like land-grant colleges, the mission of faith-based institutions often explicitly articulates the value of service to others, or "social justice." This mission often encourages service-learning that addresses academic as well as spiritual goals. The Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) was founded in 1976 with a mission to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and to help institutions transform lives by relating scholarship and service to biblical teachings.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were created to provide an education to African Americans, but they also enroll students from other racial groups. Most of the 105 HBCUs emerged after the U.S. Civil War, although the oldest dates to 1837. Of these, 17 are land-grant institutions, while others are private, public, liberal arts, or community colleges. About 214,000, or 16%, of all African-American higher education students in the United States are enrolled at HBCUs, which comprise 3% of all colleges and universities nationwide. The National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) is a professional association that represents the nation's HBCUs.

Scott (2000b), who provides a comprehensive examination of HBCUs' role in civic engagement, comments: "The experience of historically black colleges and universities in preparing students for civic engagement is inextricably bound to the missions of the institutions" (p. 264). These institutions provide a college education for historically underrepresented students, while creating a sense of community for educated African Americans who can nurture the political, social, and economic welfare of the black community. This historical mission lays an excellent foundation from which to build service-learning courses and programs.

TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Out of the civil rights movement emerged tribal colleges and universities (TCUs) to promote Native American students' self-determination, while maintaining and strengthening tribal culture (Fann, 2003). The American Indian Higher Education Consortium, formed in 1972, consists of over 30 institutions in the United States and Canada. TCUs are typically located in isolated areas and therefore provide much-needed resources to the Native American community. Most students attending TCUs live at home and have jobs outside school. These demographics

present unique challenges to promoting service-learning, although the historical mission of serving the tribal community has a strong connection to service-learning.

RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

A research university is exactly what its name implies—an institution where research is valued and extensively practiced. There are several subcategories of research institutions. Some have doctoral programs in which advanced graduate students, many of whom anticipate a career in higher education, learn how to conduct research. Others have graduate programs only at the master's level.

Faculty members at research institutions are expected to engage in research and publish their findings. In this way, they are creating and disseminating new knowledge. Research expectations also often include writing and securing grants. Some faculty are explicitly required to write grants to bring in funds to the institution.

Many public institutions are receiving less and less support from state legislatures, forcing them to look elsewhere for fiscal assistance. In most major grants, research institutions obtain fiscal resources above and beyond dollars that actually fund the grant project. These funds are often called indirect costs and essentially help pay for the operation and management of the institution itself, right down to paying utility bills. The indirect costs often represent 50% of the grant funding. This competitive process demands a great deal of time and effort. Once a grant is successfully obtained, it requires oversight and management, which helps explain the reluctance of faculty to engage in any type of work that might distract them from these expectations. Both faculty and administrators are keenly aware of the amount of time and energy that service-learning requires. Consequently, depending on the title and role of a faculty member at a research university (described later), some instructors may have little interest in service-learning. I do not imply, however, that researchers cannot or do not teach service-learning courses.

Unlike at faith-based institutions, the term *social justice* will often not resonate at a public research institution. In fact, the term can be aversive, a perception tracing back to the history I described earlier in which academia has traditionally embraced objectivity and eschewed any moral stance as a reaction against religious dogma. The term *civic engagement* seems to be less emotionally charged and thus appears to be perceived as more secular, although most faculty members would not necessarily know what it means or entails.

Now What?

Determine how your institution identifies itself (liberal arts, research, etc.). The introductory section of a course catalogue or a website will probably include a section on the institution's history and mission.

Obtain a copy of your institution's mission statement. Search for explicit language that supports service-learning or civic engagement. How can you use that language in your discussions with faculty and administrators?

Find out more about the national professional associations for your type of institution and see what resources and information on service-learning or civic engagement they can provide.

The type of institution and its expectations for its faculty have an impact on faculty receptivity to teaching service-learning classes. Theoret-ically, service and outreach has traditionally been part of the mission and purpose of land-grant and faith-based institutions. Dialogue with faculty at these types of institutions should tap into that history. Conversely, CSLPs need to recognize the expectations of faculty at other types of institutions and be prepared for resistance. At the same time, specific types of institutions appeal to certain demographic profiles of students. That student profile may or may not lend itself easily to service-learning courses.

Faculty Rank and Role

What? / So What?

So, an instructor is an instructor, right? Wrong. The old saying "semantics is everything" couldn't more accurately reflect the importance of understanding the many different titles and roles for faculty. These differences may matter more at some types of institutions than at others. In general, there are five broad faculty categories, all of which may have some overlap: tenure-track, instructor, adjunct, lecturer, and clinical.

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Tenure-track faculty is a descriptive title literally meaning, "this faculty member is on a path or track working toward *tenure*," which is described in more detail later. In short, a faculty member on this path must meet strict criteria outlining roles and expectations to earn a life-long appointment. Conducting research and publishing are typical expectations for tenure-track faculty at a research institution. Therefore, a tenure-track faculty member without tenure is more likely to be focused on research and publishing than on teaching. Tenured faculty may admonish them to "publish or perish" (see the section on "Retention/ Promotion/Tenure").

Conversely, tenured faculty members are often free to pursue scholarly interests that may include service-learning. There is an ongoing debate about whether faculty should engage in service-learning before or after tenure. I have explained to faculty and their department chairs that service-learning can be a catalyst or impediment to achieving tenure. It depends on whether the faculty member is meeting the department's criteria. The potential danger is the amount of time and work that goes into developing and implementing a service-learning class, because it could detract from other scholarly work such as research and publishing. Faculty members, however, are more likely to achieve tenure if they integrate their teaching and research. This includes conducting research in a way that is related to their service-learning course, such as community-based research. This is an important talking point when working with tenure-track faculty.

INSTRUCTOR

An instructor is a faculty member whose primary role is teaching, so he or she is not expected to conduct and publish research. You would think, then, that service-learning would immediately appeal to an instructor, but many instructors teach several courses with a large enrollment. Developing and successfully implementing a service-learning course is much more challenging than teaching a traditional course, which may be a negative factor to an instructor.

ADJUNCT INSTRUCTOR

An adjunct instructor's primary employment is generally outside the institution. For example, a practicing attorney may be hired to teach a course on contract law. Often, adjunct instructors teach for the love of teaching and may be interested in service-learning as an innovative pedagogy. Service-learning may appeal to them as a practical way to use knowledge. In addition, because of their positions in the community, they might also be potential community partners.

LECTURER

A lecturer is a faculty member who is hired expressly for teaching and is not expected to conduct research. Lecturers may teach part-time or full-time. They are not on a tenure track, so they may be called non-tenure-track faculty. Like adjuncts, they may be employed elsewhere; many teach at more than one college. Because they are not on the tenure track, they may be prime targets for service-learning. Other characteristics of adjunct instructors, described above, may also apply.

CLINICAL FACULTY

Clinical faculty members supervise students in professional settings outside the institution. They may teach a class or seminar tied to experiential education, but they are generally not expected to conduct research. Typically, the experiential education is referred to as a practicum, clinical, internship, or in the case of education, student teaching. This approach is very common within professional disciplines such as education, social work, and nursing. Many applied sciences such as pharmacy and even engineering require some type of field-based learning

---

Now What?

- Obtain a list and description of the faculty categories at your institution.

- List the faculty who currently teach service-learning and determine their titles. Are they tenure-track and, if so, do they already have tenure? Or are they clinical faculty?

- Identify whom you might target for discussions about service-learning, based on their title and expectations.

- Review the course catalogue. Identify existing classes and instructors for which service-learning might be a practical option.

- Do title and role matter at your institution? Why or why not?

- Do faculty see service-learning and internships as identical? If so, what is your role in clarifying the differences?

- When working with tenure-track faculty, prepare a list of ideas for how they might publish an article or make a conference presentation about their service-learning course. Likewise, think about how a faculty member might conduct research about his or her service-learning class, comparing it to traditional courses with pre- and post-measures.

- Compile a list of journals and conferences in the field of a tenure-track professor to help him or her consider venues for integrating service-learning teaching and research.

experience that needs coordination and supervision. Because clinical faculty are already working with students in community settings, they may be more likely to understand the objective of service-learning. Conversely, clinical faculty members are also more likely to confuse service-learning with internships or to think they are already doing service-learning, when, in fact, they are not incorporating reflection into their classes.

Retention/Promotion/Tenure

What? / So What?

Tenure-track faculty must go through a review process that assesses their scholarly productivity to determine if they are *retained, promoted, or tenured* (RPT). Unsuccessful review can result in the termination of a faculty member's appointment, which is sometimes seen as professional suicide. "Publish or perish" aptly describes the survival mode in which some faculty members find themselves, especially at research institutions. Therefore, CSLPs should understand and appreciate the RPT process. You should expect the review to have an impact on faculty members' decisions about their involvement in service-learning. Understanding the process will enable you to have meaningful conversations with faculty as well as to support those who do engage in service-learning.

The RPT process is intended to maintain quality. It is generally quite arduous and stressful for faculty. The review is conducted by their peers as well as administrators within and often outside the institution. The review process is usually conducted for three distinct yet related stages of a faculty member's career. The steps and time frames vary across institutions and even within institutions. What follows is a general description of the RPT stages and process.

The first stage is for retention. Faculty members are initially contracted as assistant professors for a probation period, usually two years. During this time, an instructor is expected to adhere to a set of criteria in various activities that typically include teaching, research, and service. Peers within the department and/or college use formal criteria to review and assess the faculty member's work. If deemed acceptable, that faculty member is retained for another specified period of time, typically another two to three years.

The second stage of review is for promotion and tenure, and is usually conducted at the fifth year of an assistant professor's appointment. Another review process determines if the faculty member has demonstrated competency to earn tenure, which means his or her appointment is assured, essentially for life. This may occur around the seventh year of an appointment. If a faculty member earns tenure, he or she is promoted to the rank of associate professor.

Another, third review stage occurs in order to earn promotion to a higher level, such as professor, which indicates the faculty member is an established, competent scholar and teacher. The standards are high, and the rank affords a degree of prestige, some privilege, and sometimes significant financial advancement. The timeline varies considerably. Some faculty are content at the associate-professor level and never attempt to go higher; others apply for promotion and are denied. Their tenure is not affected.

CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES

Each department or institution establishes criteria for what constitutes quality and an acceptable level of productivity in various academic activities, typically the *academic trilogy* of research, teaching, and service. The degree of specificity of the criteria varies greatly. The criteria also include a ranking system with the following ratings: excellent, satisfactory, marginal, and unsatisfactory. The criteria are designed to maintain objectivity as well as to minimize the political or theoretical conflicts that often occur in academia.

In the context of research, some criteria focus on the number of articles published in peer-reviewed journals and the prestige of the journals. Other products may be valued, depending on the discipline. For example, many disciplines rank a book higher than an article. Likewise, the fine arts or architecture programs may emphasize creative works. Large research institutions may expect the successful acquisition of large grants.

In teaching, there may be multiple criteria, including not only the quality and innovative approaches to instruction but also the number of courses taught and the number of students enrolled in each course. Student and peer teaching evaluations may also be factors.

Service in the academic world of faculty is different from what most students or community partners envision. It is typically concentrated in two areas. Governance, such as serving on various committees at the department, college, or institutional level, might include a curriculum committee or an admissions committee. The other form of service focuses on the professional organizations of a faculty member's discipline and might include serving as a reviewer on the editorial board of a journal or on the governing body of a professional association.

REVIEW PROCESS

The review process is complicated, requiring considerable time and effort. Faculty members generally create a portfolio that includes a personal statement, a *curriculum vita* (CV), and samples of their scholarly work, course syllabi, and evaluations. The personal statement articulates their scholarly interests and professional goals and includes a statement of their philosophical approach to research and teaching, as well as the theoretical framework they employ for their work. A CV is similar to a résumé that documents productivity in research, teaching, and service; it lists publications, presentations at conferences, grants awarded, courses taught, graduate student advisory committees on which they serve, and other service activities. A faculty member often must include copies of scholarly work such as journal articles or book chapters.

Documentation of teaching includes copies of course syllabi and sometimes the results of evaluations by students or faculty peers. Reviewers look for evidence of rigor in teaching, including readings, assignments, assessment procedures, and innovative instructional approaches. Here is where service-learning often comes in: the documentation process allows faculty members to describe in detail how they developed and implemented their service-learning courses.

So who exactly is doing all this reviewing? Again, it varies by department, college, and institution, but there is a general chain of events and cast of characters. The first step is usually at the department level. Colleagues review the faculty member's portfolio, using the established cri-

teria. They then rank the faculty candidate's performance and forward a recommendation for retention, promotion, or tenure up the chain of command. The next link in the chain is the department chair, who either validates or challenges the results and recommendation of the faculty colleagues. Next, faculty within the college review the portfolio and also forward a ranking and recommendation. The dean of the college receives this growing file and continues the process. Eventually, the portfolio and the accumulated results may reach the desk of a vice president or even the president of the college or university. But wait, there's more!

Many institutions include an external review of the portfolio. The faculty member submits a list of recognized scholars at the state, national, or international level. A committee or department chair then selects two to three of these experts, requesting that they review the portfolio using the appropriate criteria. Their report is then included in the portfolio.

> **Now What?**
>
> - Return to your institution's mission statement and determine the relative value of teaching, and service-learning in particular, compared with other scholarly expectations such as research. Is the institution likely to embrace the concept of service-learning?
>
> - Obtain a copy or copies of various RPT criteria and procedures. Examine the nature of expectations and the benchmarks for assessing faculty productivity. Is service-learning explicitly recognized and valued? Where is it listed—under teaching or service? If it is not listed, how might you initiate a discussion about including it?
>
> - Talk with a faculty member, department chair, or dean about the RPT experience. Gain insight into the process as well as the emotional and political dynamics associated with it. Try to probe their understanding of how and where service-learning fits in the process.
>
> - Look at a faculty member's portfolio to see what it consists of.

So what does all of this mean to a CSLP? First, it is absolutely essential to understand and appreciate the RPT process in order to promote service-learning effectively to faculty at your institution. Second, you can assist a faculty member in preparing for the review by working with him or her to describe service-learning as an innovative pedagogy. In your role as service-learning advocate, anticipate that faculty review committees, department chairs, and others involved in the review process may have preconceived notions of what service-learning is (or isn't). If they perceive service-learning as a "touchy-feely service project" that does not reflect academic rigor, they are likely to dismiss it and possibly penalize an instructor who is engaged in service-learning.

Academic Chain of Command
What?
Higher education is a bureaucracy. It is important for CSLPs to understand the chain of command and how it often dictates what gets done, how, and by whom. I will begin with faculty. Depending on the culture of the department or institution, the power of a faculty member directly depends on rank. In some cultures, this ranking system is essentially a caste system in

which lower-ranked faculty members have little or no say or influence in major policy decision making. For instance, clinical or adjunct faculty may have no voice in any decisions regarding the hiring of a new tenure-track faculty member. Similarly, lower-ranked tenure-track faculty members often do not have a role in the review of their colleagues with higher rank. Meanwhile, assistant professors trying to earn tenure must maintain a delicate balance among their research, teaching, and service. Typically, they are eager to please and will often say yes to many things, such as taking on a service-learning course. But higher-ranking colleagues may counsel them to refrain from activities such as service-learning until they have tenure.

Faculty members—even those with the highest tenure status—report directly to a department chair. The chair has considerable power and responsibility as the fiscal manager of the department and as the person who also makes teaching assignments. Ideally, the chair is a mentor to all faculty, especially new non-tenured professors. As mentioned earlier, non-tenured faculty often show considerable energy and enthusiasm in trying to make their mark in the department and will agree to take on new, exciting challenges. Consequently, a department chair might dissuade a non-tenured professor from taking on the additional challenges of a service-learning course early in his or her career. The department chair also serves as the liaison or representative to other entities within the college and institution as well as the local community. Therefore, the chair is also interested in the public-relations image of the department. In addition, the department chair plays a significant role in the promotion and tenure review process. Therefore, it is important that a chair fully understand and appreciate what service-learning is. The chair might see service-learning as either an important contribution or a detriment to the department's image.

Department chairs report directly to a dean, who oversees all of the academic departments within a college. Depending on the size of the institution and college, there may be associate deans responsible for coordinating various administrative duties. For example, in a university setting, an associate dean in a college might oversee research, while another associate dean coordinates the educational programs. The dean is the fiscal manager of the college. Like the chair, the dean plays a critical role in the performance-review process. Unlike the chair, however, the dean is often somewhat removed from direct interaction with students or faculty. Consequently, the role of the dean has often been described as lonely or even "squeezed," because the position is between department chairs, who are still in the trenches, and upper-level administrators involved with larger policy issues.

Deans are under the supervision of a chief academic officer or provost. At large universities, there might be an associate vice president of undergraduate education and one for graduate education. In many ways, the vice presidents actually run the day-to-day administrative functions of the university. Their administrative actions must reflect the philosophy and policy of the president or chancellor.

As the face of the institution, the president or chancellor represents the university to all external stakeholders, including government officials, donors, alumni, and the community at large, by bridging *town and gown*. This top-level administrator generally sets the tone of the institution and communicates its mission. For example, a president with a hands-off approach may

incorporate a decentralized governance of the institution in which policy and decision making are carried out at the departmental or college level. In contrast, some presidents are highly centralized, with a top-down approach. The president is often consumed with policy and budgetary matters. He or she typically assembles and regularly meets with an advisory group, including the vice presidents, to take the pulse of the institution and get input on important policy matters. Given the huge public relations aspect of the president's role, service-learning is often viewed favorably because it depicts the institution as a "good citizen" to the community.

And don't forget the board of trustees or board of regents! All institutions of higher education have a governing board that oversees the educational mission and financial administration of the school. The board essentially acts as a body of accountability to ensure that the entire academy, from the faculty to the president, is serving as a good steward of the resources allocated to the institution. Public institutions have additional accountability to the state legislature.

So What?

A faculty member's decision to engage in service-learning is influenced by an array of complex cultural, political, financial, and professional factors from peers and administrators. Yet, instructors are generally focused on what constitutes good teaching and learning (Welch, Liese, Bergerson, & Stephenson, 2004), which serves as a way for CSLPs to get their foot in the door to talk about service-learning. At the same time, a CSLP must be mindful of these factors and explore ways in which service-learning can be either a catalyst or a deterrent to promotion and tenure.

Chairs and deans are consumed by a preoccupation with infrastructure issues such as resources and budgets (Welch et al., 2004). When they are approached with a new idea such as service-learning, they will ask bottom-line questions, such as, "How much will it cost?" and "What are its benefits to the department or the college?" They also look out for faculty to ensure they are not distracted from their work. Why does any of this matter to you as a CSLP? Chairs and deans won't embrace service-learning if they don't understand it or if it costs too much in time and money. A CSLP must highlight the important pedagogical role of service-learning and demonstrate how service is tied to instructional objectives. You must provide the technical and financial assistance.

> **Now What?**
>
> • Learn who's in the chain of command by studying the organizational chart of your institution.
>
> • Schedule a one-on-one meeting with a department chair, dean, and vice president. Ask them to describe their roles and priorities. Describe how service-learning fits within their roles and priorities and how you can assist them.
>
> • Create a one-page or tri-fold brochure of talking points about service-learning and its benefits to share with faculty and administrators when you have one-on-one meetings.
>
> • Give your president talking points on a regular basis so he or she can use them with donors, alumni, and legislators to illustrate the impact and value of service-learning.

A vice president's support of service-learning depends on his or her understanding of it. Your job is to articulate the instructional dimensions of service-learning, coupled with the value-added components of good public relations. A president is likely to be especially interested in how service-learning will appeal to alumni, donors, and the legislature. Arming yourself with testimonials from students and community partners, impact data, and research will help you articulate the value of service-learning.

Conclusion

Understanding the customs presented in this tour guide and the culture's language in the accompanying glossary will help you enjoy the journey through the sometimes confusing world of academia and minimize any faux pas. The "Now What?" sections will assist in preparing you for your interactions with professionals in this unique culture.

In conversations with academicians, ask them to describe the mission of the department or institution and their role in meeting that mission. Ask about the type and rank of faculty within a department as well as their roles and responsibilities in research, teaching, and service. Ask about the RPT process. Conduct these conversations at various rungs of the institutional ladder. Engaging in these dialogues will serve three important purposes. First, you will demonstrate your basic understanding of the cultural and political organization of the institution, which establishes your credibility. Second, you will demonstrate an interest in their work and the challenges associated with their roles and responsibilities. Establishing a relationship is absolutely essential to promoting and incorporating service-learning. Finally, the valuable information you glean from the conversations and your understanding of the institution will help you to strategically promote and implement service-learning.

"Acadamese" or "Facultyspeak" Glossary

Academic freedom: A deeply embedded and highly valued tenet within academic culture in which faculty are free to engage in a search for intellectual truth, without the influence of politics, religion, superstition, or other institutions. Faculty members are afforded freedom in their teaching in terms of what and how it is taught. Hence, they are often initially cautious of forming partnerships with community agencies to teach service-learning because it might be construed as an impingement on their academic freedom.

Academic trilogy: Faculty and administrators typically engage in three scholarly activities—teaching, research, and service—to varying degrees, as stipulated in retention-promotion-tenure (RPT) criteria.

Curriculum vita: Similar to a résumé, it is a detailed list of a faculty member's scholarly activity, usually in teaching, research, and service.

Epistemology: This impressive, intimidating word means "the intellectual process of understanding the world," using theory or experience to understand how the world works or how one behaves in the world. For example, people often subconsciously refer to how their parents modeled money management in order to manage their own. That experience defines how things are

done. Academically, faculty use theoretical models to teach students how to construct their understanding of the field or world as a whole.

Pedagogy: Simply, a way or method of teaching and learning. Service-learning is a form of pedagogy.

RPT: Retention, promotion, and tenure. Every institution has a process and criteria that faculty members must complete to be retained for their appointment, promoted in rank, or to achieve tenure.

Scholarship: The topical area of faculty's teaching or research efforts and interests, scholarship typically takes the form of writing articles, books, chapters, and grants, or teaching courses. Students and community partners often erroneously think of this term as referring exclusively to a financial grant or award for tuition or expenses associated with college.

Service: Faculty must participate in various activities within the institution or profession. Institutional service often takes the form of serving on governance committees such as a curriculum committee. Professional service can include serving on an editorial review board for a scholarly journal or an advisory board of a professional association. Within academic culture, service is generally regarded as having less status because committee work takes time from research or teaching. Faculty or administrators often confuse service-learning with academic service or service projects (e.g., food drives) and view it with disdain. Service means something very different to community agency partners and students.

Tenure: The earned right of faculty members who have demonstrated their scholarly competence to retain their appointment indefinitely. Tenured faculty are periodically reviewed by their colleagues to assess their productivity.

Tenure-track: A faculty member who is working toward tenure is on a tenure-track.

Town and gown: Refers to the historical separation and tension between the community and the perceived elitism of institutions of higher education.

References

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2005). Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/about.

Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (2002). Democratization over commodification!: An action-oriented strategy to overcome the contradictory legacy of American higher education. *Journal of Public Affairs, 6,* 19–38.

Billig, S. H., & Welch, M. (2005). Service-learning as civically engaged scholarship: Challenges and strategies in higher education and K-12 settings. In M. Welch & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 221–242). Greenwich, CT: IAP Publishing.

Boyte, H., & Kari, N. (2000). Renewing the democratic spirit in American colleges and universities: Higher education as public work. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 37–60). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., Rosner, J., & Stephens, J. (2000). Introduction. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. xxi–xxiii). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Fann, A. (2003). *Tribal colleges: An overview.* Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. Retrieved from http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS43173.

Harkavy, I. (2005). Service-learning and development of democratic universities, democratic schools, and democratic good societies in the 21st century. In M. Welch & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 3–22). Greenwich, CT: IAP Publishing.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-grant Universities (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution.* Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

National Commission on Civic Renewal. (1998). *Nation of spectators: How civic disengagement weakens America and what we can do about it.* College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Newman, F. (1985). *Higher education and the American resurgence.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Rice, R. E. (1996). Making a place for the new American scholar. Working paper series: Inquiry #1. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Sax, L. J. (2000). Citizenship development and the American college student. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 3–18). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Scott, D. K. (2000a). Spirituality in an integrative age. In V. H. Kazanjian & P. L. Laurence (Eds.), *Education as transformation: Religious pluralism, spirituality, and a new vision for higher education in America* (pp. 23–36). New York: Peter Lang.

Scott, G. D. R. (2000b). A historically black college perspective. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 249–262). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Sullivan, W. M. (2000). Institutional identity and social responsibility in higher education. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 19–36). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Welch, M., Liese, L., Bergerson, A., & Stephenson, M. (2004). A qualitative assessment project comparing and contrasting faculty and administrators' perspectives of service-learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 9*(2), 23–42.

Campus Compact Resources
Indicators of Engagement
(http://www.compact.org/category/resources/service-learning-resources/indicators-of-engagement-project/)

Resources from a three-year project, funded by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, to combine documentation and dissemination of best practices of the engaged campus with an organizing effort to help campuses achieve broader institutionalization of civic engagement.

Service-Learning Syllabi Project (http://www.compact.org/category/syllabi)

The Service-Learning Syllabi Project contains over 300 exemplary service-learning syllabi across a wide variety of disciplines.

Publishing Outlets for Service-Learning and Community-Based Research (http://www.compact.org/category/resources/service-learning-resources/publishing-outlets-for-service-learning-and-community-based-research/)

A dynamic list of print and online publishing outlets.

Additional Resources

Association of Public and Land-grant Universities. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org.

Frye, N. (1967). The knowledge of good and evil. In N. Frye, S. Hampshire, & C. C. O'Brien (Eds.), *The morality of scholarship* (pp. 1–28). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

O'Meara, K., & Rice, R. E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.