

Transformation of, in, and by Learning in a Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program

Mary Cazzell, Shirley Theriot, Joan Blakey, and Melanie Sattler

Transformative learning is the core outcome most desired in adult education (Mezirow, 1997). Transformative learning is defined as “learning that transforms problematic frames of reference—sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets)—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (Mezirow, 2003, pp. 58-59). Marbury (1996) firmly believes that of all the teaching strategies for educational transformation, service-learning offers one of the most unique tools to provoke student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement. As a powerful form of experiential learning, service-learning integrates community engagement with academic coursework through the essential requirement of critical reflection (Deeley, 2010; Mezirow, 1990).

Palmer (1998) observed that a teacher is recognized as effective when engagement with the course goes beyond technique and knowledge transmission. In service-learning, educators, students, and communities have a stake in the expansive outcomes of their teaching and learning (Freire, 1998); thus, students can become agents of change in the educator’s own learning (Foster, 2007). Faculty who create, develop, and implement service-learning may experience transformation of learning in their students, transformation in their own learning about service-learning pedagogy, as well as transformation by

ABSTRACT

Transformative learning is the most desired core outcome in adult education. The qualitative study examined critical reflections for professional transformation related to development and implementation of service-learning courses or projects from four university faculty members during enrollment in a Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program and post-service-learning implementation. Reflective questions related to faculty perceptions of student learning, service-learning as pedagogy, and their own learning—transformation of, in, and by learning, respectively. Content analyses of faculty reflections resulted in three categories of transformation based on three pre-service-learning and three post-service-learning descriptive themes: (1) transformation of student learning from anticipatory integration to conflicts between expectation and reality; (2) transformation in learning about service-learning transitioned from constant search for clarification to searching for relevance in service-learning; and (3) transformation by learning about themselves as educators was described initially as a move from “me” to “we” and afterward to a deconstruction of their professional selves. Critical self-reflection and mentoring throughout the Faculty Fellows program and after at least one service-learning course or project are important elements toward the success of faculty who choose to engage in service-learning.

learning about themselves during and after service-learning implementation. These types of learning transformations in faculty are supported by the theory of human learning. According to Jarvis (2006), four elements are needed for learning to occur: (1) the person, (2) a social situation in which to engage, (3) an experience that occurs, and (4) transformative process. This current study used critical reflections by university faculty to assess professional transformations related to creation, development, and implementation of service-learning courses or projects.

Significance

More published research focuses on the impact of service-learning and community engagement on student transformation than on faculty (see Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001 for overview). It is well known that student successes from service-learning, as a teaching strategy, have translated to higher graduation rates, stronger academic performances, and improvements in social, emotional, personal, and moral development with increased commitment to sustained civic engagement (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler, 2010; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Sax & Astin, 1997). Meyers (2008) found that through written reflections, undergraduates working with at-risk children in the community had increased personal growth in compassion for others and self-awareness. He states: "students can use this experience to discover who they are capable of being and what they are capable of doing" (p. 380).

Being engaged in service-learning outside their usual environment may initially unleash uncomfortable or conflicting beliefs or behaviors; this dissonance has been identified as an impetus to improved critical thinking and problem-solving (Deeley, 2010; Kiely, 2004; Warner & Esposito, 2009). It is in experiencing challenging interactions and experiences that "students develop new theories about what works, what doesn't, and what to do next; then they test through further experience" (Beal, 1996, p. 23).

Bamber and Hankin (2011) explored forms of transformation exhibited by students in British secondary schools after participating in a year-long service-learning course. These students prepared, delivered, and evaluated a workshop on global citizenship to other secondary-level peers in other area schools. Researchers examined students' written self-reflections and found a "complexity of identifying transformative learning" (p. 190) in the forms of political, moral, intellectual, cultural, and personal transformation. Due to a cross-sectional research design, Bamber and Hankin (2011) admit the difficulty of reporting these findings as empirical transformative evidence. It is quite difficult to claim students have transformed their worldview or challenged stereotypes (perspective transformation) based on one reflection that states one "simply considers something they have not thought of before" (p. 199). More rigorous longitudinal studies have revealed student perspective transformation before, during, and after participation in international service-learning (Bamber, 2008; Kiely, 2004). Deeley (2010) asserts, however, that the main gap in service learning literature is *how* student transformation occurs since the outcome of transformation is difficult to measure and cannot be predicted.

When transformation is discussed for faculty, significance is typically given to motivations to implement service-learning, changes in teaching styles, perception of student learning processes, and definition of sites of learning (Ayers & Ray, 1996). Using a small sample, Stanton (1994) found that a successful service-learning course is associated with intrinsic faculty motivation, knowledge of learning theory, and perception that institution places value on service-learning. Pribbenow (2005) interviewed 35 university faculty with a wide range of experience in service-learning and found six themes that relate to their professional

transformation: (1) more meaningful engagement in and commitment to teaching, (2) deeper connections and relationship with students as learners and individuals, (3) enhanced knowledge of student learning processes and outcomes, (4) increased use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches, (5) improved communication of theoretical concepts, and (6) greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners. Overall, faculty were motivated to use service-learning pedagogy because they were meaningfully engaged and committed to teaching (Pribbenow, 2005). Because of the heterogeneity of the researcher's sample based on experience with service-learning, it is not known if all of transformative themes were relevant for experienced teachers or which themes were associated with novice implementers of service-learning. The current study utilized a homogenous group of novice faculty with similar service-learning experience.

For transformation to be relevant, professional learning is important if it "is rooted in the human need to feel a sense of belonging and of making a contribution to a community where experience and knowledge function as part of community property" (Lieberman & Pointer Mace, 2008, p. 227). The aim of this study was to explore the professional and transformational effects of university faculty involvement in ten three-hour seminars during a Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program, both pre- and post-implementation of their service-learning course or project. The reflective questions related to faculty perceptions of student learning, service-learning as pedagogy, and their own learning—transformation *of*, *in*, and *by* learning, respectively.

Methodology

A qualitative research design was used to collect and analyze written group and self-reflections from university faculty obtained over a 12-month period (September 2010 – August 2011) during participation in the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program and again during the Fall 2011 semester, one year after service-learning implementation. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained from a large public university in the southwestern United States.

The Faculty Fellows Program at this southwest comprehensive research, teaching, and public service institution provides interested faculty with an avenue for development, resources, and mentoring of the service-learning pedagogy. The program was initially funded in 1995 by the Corporation for National and Community Service under the Learn and Serve America: Higher Education program area to broadly integrate community engagement in all aspects of faculty work (Bringle, Games, Ludlum, Osgood, & Osborne, 2000). Supported by the University and facilitated by the Director of Service-Learning, the program seeks to follow the national model by providing opportunities for faculty to develop service-learning courses, conduct research within faculty and community partner interests, and engage in meaningful community partnerships.

The University's Director of Service-Learning facilitates ten collaborative seminars each year which include interdisciplinary collaboration, guided instruction, selected readings, and reflection during ten three-hour seminars. Seminar discussions and outside readings include such topics as *service-learning theory, research, and practice; reflection as a critical piece in service-learning; strength of interdisciplinary collaboration; building meaningful community partnerships; and an introduction to community-based research.*

An outgrowth of the program is growing numbers of faculty and students, who engage in service-learning, build stronger ties with the community, enhance greater faculty and student

understanding with ownership of local issues, and expand faculty fellow scholarship and research opportunities. Following the year of intensive service-learning collaboration and discussion, faculty are expected to provide leadership in their respective departments across campus encouraging others to develop service-learning courses and engage with the community.

Three tenure-track faculty members from Nursing, Education, and School of Urban and Public Affairs (SUPA) as well as one tenured faculty from Engineering attended the Fall 2010 ten-week Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program. Qualitative data during the ten seminars were collected as weekly written self-reflections and group reflective discussions transcribed verbatim by the secretary of the Center for Community Service-Learning (CCSL). The reflections related to faculty perceptions of weekly seminar themes in preparation for implementation of a service-learning course or project. The planning included: literacy project in an elementary school, graduate-level environmental engineering service-learning course, and pediatric medication administration service-learning project. During the Fall 2011 semester, the Director of the CCSL and three faculty members returned to reflect on their perceptions of service-learning implementation in their courses. Two of the Fall 2010 Faculty Fellows who returned were from Nursing and Engineering. The third Faculty Fellow was from Social Work, had completed the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program during the Spring 2011 semester, and had implemented one service-learning course (development of a model that helps children and families impacted by trauma). Post-implementation data included email discussions initiated by the Director's reflection questions. All Faculty Fellows who participated in this study were females.

Using content analyses, emails, written reflections, and group discussion transcripts were first separated into the time periods of Pre-Service-Learning (SL) and Post-Service-Learning (SL) Implementation and then scrutinized line-by-line for identification of repeated ideas, words, or phrases. The initial coding was done by one member of the research team but identification of key themes, based on initial coding, occurred in collaboration with the CCSL Director. All study participants were given direct access to data analyses, defined as member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and all verified the key themes and supporting narratives. The three main themes in the Pre-SL Implementation phase were anticipatory integration, constant search for clarification, and move from "me" to "we." Three key themes were found in the Post-SL Implementation phase: conflict between expectation and reality, searching for relevance in service-learning, and deconstruction of professional self.

Results

Pre-Service-Learning Implementation Phase

Anticipatory integration. Throughout the ten service-learning seminars, all participants acknowledged that changing their present course to a service-learning course or adding a service learning project would involve allowing the "unfamiliar" to question the "familiar" (Bamber & Hankin, 2011), integrating past and present ways of thinking, acting, and feeling into a new set of approaches. The Nursing faculty member discovered that the:

strong connection between long-held Jesuit values of lifelong commitment to service, civic responsibility, and purposeful action in societal issues blend well with service-learning. I see that I need to "reframe" my course, don't really need to change or add any new teaching strategies—maybe it won't be so difficult.

Three Faculty Fellows-in-training acknowledged that their service-learning goals as faculty would be more thoughtful, possibly more expansive:

- (1) *stimulate student interest in math and science careers through role modeling and build relationships between the university and the community* (Engineering);
- (2) *provide educational community with helpful resources, build relationships, whatever helps the partner* (Education); and
- (3) *develop “deliverables” that actively sustain community relationships* (SUPA).

In reflections about reframing their courses, faculty also discussed potential ambiguities and dilemmas that could arise when implementing their service-learning courses.

How do I find creative ways to meet learning needs that need to address student acceptance, their innate egocentrism, and their peer-centeredness? What if my service-learning project is not well accepted by students and my teaching evaluations are affected?

Another faculty member summarized the majority of “opening-night” implementation jitters at the end of the seminars:

When we plan for service-learning, we plan for the perfect community experiences. I sense that we all feel uncertain, scared, nervous, and vulnerable. We do not know all of the answers and need to admit this.

Constant search for clarification. While enrolled in the Faculty Fellows program, all faculty members echoed similar needs to discern, first, a clear and concrete definition of service-learning and next, the process of developing and implementing a service-learning course or project. In seeking to define service-learning, the Nursing faculty member initially thought that all nursing clinical courses were service-learning courses:

Everyone always tells me that nursing is a natural fit for service learning, but I’ll need to change the misconception that all clinical hours involve service learning. There are no structured reflection activities and students gain more benefit than the community partners during their clinical experiences.

The Engineering faculty defined service-learning as linkages between *theory and practice and between community involvement, service to the profession, and professional development*. All participants reflected that service-learning is an enhanced teaching strategy with broader student learning goals where the *“rubber hits the road” and course information is now practically used in a real world setting*. In the search for a personal definition, the faculty wrote definitions of service-learning in their reflections taken directly from their Faculty Fellows workbook, *Introduction to Service-Learning Toolkit* (Campus Compact, 2003); most utilized the definition from Bringle and Hatcher (1995).

The Faculty Fellows curriculum included development of a proposed service-learning course or project using a Service-Learning Course Development template which included an assignment and outcomes planner. Seeking clarification on development and implementation came in the form of multiple questions:

What is meant by “deliverables” that the community partner will receive from us? How do I get my team to “buy-in” to service learning? Do I need to come up with all of my own ideas for what students will do outside the classroom? What is the

role of the community partner in service learning? Help, I don't even know how to begin!!

Though many of the participants expressed early uncertainty completing this assignment, the Nursing faculty member realized that *my course and student clinicals will need to be evaluated in a different way; I have to find a relevant way to tie course readings with clinical experiences.*

Move from "me" to "we." The Faculty Fellows realized that service-learning as pedagogy was strongly focused on student and community outcomes rather than primarily teacher ability to teach a course. Faculty from SUPA, Nursing, and Education shared that student outcomes must reflect *caring, professionalism, accountability, communication, and ability to digest and discuss ethical dilemmas. I have to find more holistic experiences for students so I can develop the "whole" student.* The Nursing faculty member discussed the need to *let go, be a collaborative teacher, and a co-learner.* But this same faculty also saw community partners included in the "we." The Education faculty member projected that her curriculum and instruction will need to focus beyond students, with a *focus on families, relationships, and communication using constructivist learning.*

Another way to assess student learning outcomes was discussed in the critical role that reflection plays in service-learning. Since all Faculty Fellows were required to send in weekly reflections after each seminar, they all agreed on the value of structured or guided reflections in their projected courses. *Reflection offers students a chance to be honest with themselves, to look beyond themselves and start to test out their higher-order critical thinking skills in a safe venue.* Even though all were excited about the prospects of looking at their course from a new perspective and observing student advancement from concrete to critical thinkers, all anticipated a higher workload and wondered if this focus on "we" could qualify for higher workload compensation as well as be relevant during tenure-track review.

Post-Service-Learning Implementation Phase

Conflict between expectation and reality. The anticipated "ambiguities" and "dilemmas" from the pre-implementation phase did occur with implementation of their service-learning courses or projects. The faculty member from Nursing found that what a potential community partner requested would only serve the partner's needs without addressing student engagement or learning. In addition, she also found that her colleagues were:

not so open to hearing the differences between service-learning and service. Some believe service-learning is already embedded in the Nursing curriculum. Faculty buy-in is a very slow process and I had to change my idea of converting my existing course to a service-learning course. Instead, I changed to a service-learning project.

The Engineering Faculty Fellow stated that:

service-learning doesn't always go as planned—it is uncertain and messy. First go-round is survival with unpredictable surprises. Imperfect service-learning is preferable to "perfect" non-service-learning. We need to remind ourselves that traditional pedagogy is far from perfect.

All Faculty Fellows agreed that the CCSL Director has a role to play in addressing these conflicts:

It would be great if she could make a list of ways faculty feel when implementing service-learning, basically predicting how each will feel. It would help faculty work through challenges and confusion and realize the benefits as worthwhile.

Searching for relevance in service-learning. One year after completion of their Service-Learning Faculty Fellowship, the returning faculty members expressed continued motivation for implementing service-learning, still voiced many questions, but did find clarity toward a working definition of service-learning.

I had to change my initial idea of implementing a service-learning course; I created a service learning project instead but I have a strong motivation to be creative for the good of student learning. I will continue to refine my course with consideration of reward incentives for students. However, my gut feel is that it takes a certain breed to develop and implement service-learning (Nursing faculty).

In evaluating the engineering service-learning course:

I found that service-learning helped engineering students think in grays, rather than black and white. Rather than a faculty "memory dump," this service-learning course helped the students develop application skills, judgment, and critical thinking, necessary for a job. The world is messy and complex and service-learning deals with the messy world. Students have to deal with this mess in an environment of constructive feedback.

While the Faculty Fellows expressed personal motivation to continue service-learning implementation, reflections and group discussions illuminated more questions.

Is there a service-learning continuum with service on one end and service-learning on the other end? Regardless of project size, what pushes a project into the service-learning area? Is it reflection? Is it the give-back piece? Are there essential elements that must be present no matter how big or small a service-learning project? How do we encourage new ways of teaching and engaging students by service-learning? Do we ever reach the total threshold of service-learning? Do we encourage colleagues to do something rather than nothing? Should we be satisfied one classroom, one school, on family at a time? Are there times we should be focusing on "service" rather than "service-learning"?

Though the faculty had many questions, they also found that after gaining experience in the implementation of their service-learning course or project, they could unanimously agree upon a working definition of service-learning.

Service-learning includes a trifecta of requirements: (1) increased student learning as a result of their involvement with a community partner, (2) a need that community partners express as important to be addressed by students, and (3) written reflections that follow the What, So What, and Now What format with feedback given to the students.

Deconstruction of professional self. After implementing at least one service-learning course or project, the Faculty Fellows had an opportunity to separate and examine the components of being a teacher in higher education:

I realized that creativity is a large part of this job—especially when courses are not overtly geared to community participation (Nursing). Being involved in service-learning is freeing; the pressure to know everything is off. We admit we are learning with our students and we give importance to the idea of uncertainty (Engineering). Service-learning is the answer to shifting the paradigm. Shame on the professors who stand up and demand attention because they know they are the experts. How many miss out on creating a broader picture of their world? (Social Work).

Discussion

Transformation of Learning

The faculty were concerned with not only the quality of the service-learning course they were planning to implement; they also considered the effects of service-learning and community engagement on the transformation of student learning—moving from anticipatory integration to conflicts between expectation and reality. Pre-implementation, faculty intended to stimulate student learning through service-learning by developing more expansive learning goals that included students, community, and reflection. They also addressed concerns about being creative enough to meet not only student learning needs but student acceptance.

Their reflections closely parallel Mezirow's (1997) concepts of changing our "frame of reference" to set a "line of action;" moving from "habits of mind" to a newly shaped "point of view" (p. 5). Normally, our existing foundation of actions, feelings, perceptions, and cognition (*frame of reference*) directly influence the actions we take (*line of action*) based on cultural assimilation, life experiences, and family influences. Mezirow (1997) divides the frame of reference into *habits of mind* and *point of view*. When faculty discussed concerns about student acceptance and course evaluations, they were focusing on the student's *habit of mind*, how and what the student has previously learned and their predispositions, value judgments, and attitudes about learning in a course. What faculty hoped for was an opportunity to shape a new *point of view*. "Points of view are subject to continuing change as we reflect on either the content or process by which we solve problems and identify the need to modify assumptions" (Mezirow, 1997, p. 6). Faculty's early feelings of "implementation jitters", fear, and uncertainty are well supported since Mezirow (1997) posits that "habits of mind are more durable than points of view" (p. 6). Bamber and Hankin (2011) designed their service-learning project on global education to purposely contradict students' habits of mind, challenge stereotypes, and through critical reflection, set the familiar aside and develop their own meanings.

Faculty also shared that they "plan for the perfect community experience." It makes sense why faculty were scared and vulnerable in planning for service-learning implementation: in his transformational learning theory, Mezirow (1997) states that "the nature of adult learning implies a set of ideal conditions for its full realization" (p. 11). Marbury (1996), however, correlates outstanding (not perfect) service-learning programs with faculty who exemplify determination and courage. The ten-week Faculty Fellows Program offered faculty information, guidance, and mentoring in the process of developing and implementing a service-learning course or project, but the faculty wanted "a list of ways faculty feel when implementing service learning...It would help faculty work through the challenges and confusion and realize the benefits as worthwhile." The faculty were willing to work hard, but it is important to note that they wanted more from the Director in terms of "emotional" information during the seminars.

Post-implementation, faculty discussed that their first attempts at service learning “did not go as planned,” “first go-round is survival with unpredictable surprises.” Several authors have discussed the “dark side” of service learning, when students may not benefit from community engagement: (1) student resistance due to inability to make logical connections between their community service and classroom learning and (2) student frustration because they may not be developmentally or cognitively ready to demonstrate higher-order thinking in self-reflections (Jones, 2002; Jones, Gilbride-Brown, & Gasiorski, 2005). When students display negativity toward service-learning, it could be that students are “facing their own demons,” that unanticipated negative feelings or emotions by students are actually “symptoms” of transformation (Deeley, 2010; Felten, Gilchrist, & Darby, 2006). In support, Mezirow (1991) describes these negative feelings in students as “disorienting dilemmas” which, though disturbing for faculty, can promote personal and intellectual development. Teachers in a university divinity school expressed acceptance of students who were “disarranged,” “taken aback,” and open to surprises” (Foster, 2007, p. 38). Marbury (1996) stresses that “faculty transformers” of student learning and/or curriculum must not be afraid to fail and learn to face indifference and opposition.

Transformation *in* Learning

Through involvement in the Faculty Fellows program and implementation of service-learning, faculty reflected on their transformation in learning about service-learning—transitioning from a constant search for clarification to searching for relevance in service-learning. The need for faculty to first settle on a definition of service-learning is extremely important and well supported in the literature. Marbury (1996) emphasizes that the “first and foremost obstacle to be overcome within an institutional setting is the attainment of an authentic definition of the term service-learning” (p. 8). Faculty reflections on a service-learning definition included the components of linkages “between theory and practice, community involvement, service to the profession, and professional development.” By using “concrete and “down-to-earth terminology,” the faculty have overcome another Marbury (1996) obstacle: not understanding the meaning of the definition of service-learning (p. 14). While Herrmann (2011) states there is no consensual service learning definition, the faculty chose the Bringle and Hatcher (1995) service-learning definition as their guide during their program. Currently in service-learning literature, the most cited operational definition is an updated version:

Service-learning is a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility (Bringle, Hatcher, & McIntosh, 2006, p. 12).

It is interesting to note that post-implementation, faculty developed their own working definition in their search of relevance in service-learning.

The faculty, however, asked many questions during the development and implementation phases of their service-learning course or project. Deeley (2010) supports the faculty’s queries, adding her own questions: What makes service-learning unique? Is service-learning a pedagogy? A teaching or learning philosophy? A program? Or is it just an experience for students and teachers alike? Many educators believe service-learning is high-impact engaged

pedagogy related to its strong emphases on reflection, experiential approaches to teaching, and development of contextual and social learning communities (Carrington & Selva, 2010; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Rice, 2003). Others believe that service-learning can be considered a tool for social justice or a process for community engagement (Felten & Clayton, 2011; Meyers, 2009). It is understandable that faculty asked, “Help, I don’t even know how to begin!!”, when service-learning literature describes its implementation as “counternormative:” moving beyond a traditional teaching model to remaking a classroom with shared responsibility for teaching and learning (Howard, 1998, Felten & Clayton, 2011).

In their search for post-implementation relevance, faculty posed more questions about service-learning. Literature supports the transformative and motivational potential for both faculty and students in service learning when unexpected questions or ideas occur (Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill, 2007; Kiely, 2004). King (2004) suggests that there is a continuum of service-learning; service-learning can be charitable on one end (reinforces current attitudes and prejudices) and transformative on the other (confronts and disrupts previously-held understandings). In addition, others have discussed the balance on the pendulum between volunteerism and service-learning where student volunteers do interact in the community but students and community partners mutually derive benefits in service-learning (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Furco, 1996). Critical self-reflections by students should expose students’ placement on the continuum. Marbury (1996) purports that until systemic change in curriculum redesign is achieved, faculty will always have many questions and obstacles in revising courses or adding projects with service-learning components. In framing the faculty’s many questions for relevance, Tennant (2012) identifies this as the development of the socially constructed self: “we become driven by a sense of incompleteness, that there is always something more to be discovered or invented both in the external world and in ourselves” (p. 74).

Transformation *by* Learning

Faculty experienced transformation by learning about themselves as educators—as a move from “me” to “we” and afterward to a deconstruction of their professional selves. Even in the pre-implementation phase, faculty voiced a “we” need for “more holistic experiences for students,” to “be a collaborative teacher, and a co-learner.” Freire (1972) envisioned the “me” teacher perspective as oppressive and authoritarian inclusive of passive student roles and learners viewed as empty receptacles to fill with a teacher-centered curriculum. Freire’s answer is teacher-student and students-teachers in education. “The teacher is no longer merely the one who teaches, but one who is himself taught in the dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach” (Freire, 1972, p. 53). Tenant (2012) adds that “the teacher must become a student of the learner’s knowledge in order to be effective” (p.72). The faculty also embraced a service-learning challenge presented by Felten and Clayton (2011): to be not only knowledge producers but knowledge consumers.

Faculty agreed on the value of critical and structured reflections, not only to see their own growth in the Faculty Fellows program but also as a way to assess student learning outcomes. Mezirow (1990) links reflection to higher-order critical thinking used to challenge or validate previous learning and problem solve more effectively. While faculty found their “we” perspective, they also wanted students to find their “we” as well: “to be honest with themselves, to look beyond themselves.” Meyers (2009) used student reflection exercises in higher education to allow students to “reach in” through critical introspection, link service-learning to community interaction, and analyze resulting personal attitudes, values, history, and presuppositions.

After service-learning implementation, faculty realized that their role required creativity, uncertainty, and less pressure to know everything. The actions of deconstructing their professional selves are supported by Palmer (1998):

My ability to connect with my students, and to connect them with the subject, depends less on the methods I use than on the degree to which I know and trust my selfhood—and am willing to make it available and vulnerable in the service of learning (p. 10).

The post-implementation faculty reflections outlined needs to be adaptable, flexible, creative, and willing to make personal changes, identified as authentic self by Tennant (2012) and resulting from lifelong learning (Selkrig, 2011). These findings of faculty transformation by learning support Marbury's (1996) premise that service-learning empowers teachers.

Limitations

Qualitative data were collected on four faculty members from four different disciplines; the small sample size may be a limiting factor in the depth of faculty reflections obtained during the pre- and post-service-learning implementation phases. Many common themes, however, were found within the multiple types of reflective data collected (emails, written reflections, and group discussion transcripts). Even with the small sample size, this was a homogeneous sample based on newly-acquired service-learning experience and the data reflects their common experiences.

Conclusion

The Faculty Fellows, from learning about service-learning through implementation of their first service-learning course or project, demonstrated three significant forms of transformation. First, faculty demonstrated transformation *of* learning by revealing how they were working to improve student learning and community engagement—from anticipatory integration to the reality of conflicts between expectation and reality. Second, a transformation *in* learning occurred as faculty gained more service-learning knowledge from the Faculty Fellow seminars through service-learning implementation—from searching for clarification then ultimately, for relevance. Third, faculty exhibited transformation *by* learning, realizing their new role as co-learners, and moving from “me” to “we” to a deconstruction of their professional self post-implementation. Critical self-reflection and mentoring throughout the Faculty Fellows program and after at least one service-learning course or project are important elements toward the success of faculty who choose to engage in service-learning. Beal (1996) answers one of the faculty's burning questions (“Should we be satisfied one classroom, one school, on family at a time?”) by responding: “Social change occurs person by person, as each individual changes behaviors and influences other to do the same” (p. 23).

Further qualitative ethnographic research would be valuable in examining the transformations that occur simultaneously across students, faculty, and community partners during a service-learning experience. Encouraging community partner participation in relevant reflection activities would further elaborate on faculty and student transformations during

service-learning implementation. Future research could compare service-learning and non-service-learning faculty experiences during a year-long period incorporating reflection of both faculty groups.

References

- Astin, A. W. & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39, 251-263. Retrieved from <http://www.jcsdonline.org/>
- Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education*, 22, 187-202. Retrieved from http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/review_of_higher_education/
- Ayers, G. E. & Ray, D. B. (1996). *Service learning: Listening to different voices*. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Baldwin, S., Buchanan, A. M., & Rudisill, M. E. (2007). What teacher candidates learned about diversity, social justice, and themselves from service-learning experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(4), 315-327. [doi:10.1177/0022487107305259](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107305259)
- Bamber, P. (2008). Transforming perspectives through international service-learning. *Pedagogical Research in Maximising Education*, 3(1), 43-56.
- Bamber, P. & Hankin, L. (2011). Transformative learning through service learning: No passport required. *Education + Training*, 53(2), 190-206. doi: 10.1108/00400911111115726
- Beal, D. (1996). Prelude: Student participation. In G. E. Ayers & D. B. Ray (Eds.), *Service learning: Listening to different voices* (pp. 21-31). New York: Ford Foundation.
- Bringle, R. G., Games, R., Ludlum, C., Osgood, R., & Osborne, R. (2000). Faculty fellows program: Enhancing integrated professional development through community service. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(5), 882-894. [doi:10.1177/00027640021955531](https://doi.org/10.1177/00027640021955531)
- Bringle, R. & Hatcher, J. (1995). A service learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2(1), 112-122. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcsl/about>
- Bringle, R., Hatcher, J., & McIntosh, R. (2006). Analyzing Morton's typology of service paradigms and integrity. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13, 5-15. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcsl/about>
- Campus Compact. (2003). *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty* (2nd ed.). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Carrington, S. & Selva, G. (2010). Critical social theory and transformative learning: Evidence in pre-service teachers' service-learning reflection logs. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(1), 45-57. [doi:10.1080/07294360903421384](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903421384)

- Deeley, S. J. (2010). Service-learning: Thinking outside the box. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(1), 43-53. doi: 10.1177/1469787409355870
- Eyler, J. (2010). What international service learning research can learn from research on service learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (Volume 2, pp. 225-242). IUPUI Series on Service Learning Research, Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., & Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 5-15. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcsl/about>
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., Stenson, C. M., & Gray, C. J. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993-2000* (3rd ed.). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Felten, P., Gilchrist, L. Z., & Darby, A. (2006). Emotion and learning: Feeling our way toward a new theory of reflection in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12, 28-46. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcsl/about>.
- Foster, C. R. (2007). Teaching and learning in the service of transformation. *Change*, 38-42. Retrieved at <http://www.changemag.org>
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham: MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In B. Taylor (Ed.), *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning* (pp. 2-6). Washington DC: Corporation for National Service.
- Herrmann, S. L. (2011). Holding on to transformation: Reflections on global service-learning. In B. J. Porfilio & H. Hickman (Eds.), *Critical service learning as a revolutionary pedagogy: A project of student agency in action* (pp. 273-295). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Howard, J. P. F. (1998). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 21-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jarvis, P. (2006). *Towards a comprehensive theory of human learning*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, S. R. (2002). The underside of service learning. *About Campus*, 7(4), 10-15. Retrieved from <http://www2.myacpa.org/publications/about-campus>

- Jones, S., Gilbride-Brown, J., & Gasiorski, A. (2005). Getting inside the “underside” of service-learning: Student resistance and possibilities. In D. W. Butin (ed.) *Service-learning in higher education: Critical issues and directions* (pp. 3-24). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 5-20. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs//about>
- King, J. (2004). Service-learning as a site for critical pedagogy: A case of collaboration, caring, and defamiliarisation across borders. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 26(3), 121-137. Retrieved from <http://www.aee.org/publications/jee>
- Lieberman, A. & Pointer Mace, D. H. (2008). Teacher learning: The key to educational reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(3), 226-234. [doi:10.1177/0022487108317020](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108317020)
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Marbury, C. H. (1996). Curriculum transformation and service-learning. In G. E. Ayers & D. B. Ray (Eds.), *Service learning: Listening to different voices* (pp. 7-18). New York: Ford Foundation.
- Meyers, S. A. (2009). Service learning as an opportunity for personal and social transformation. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 21(3), 373-381. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Mezirow, J. (1990). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In J. Mezirow, *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipator learning* (pp. 1-6). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 74, 5-12. [doi:10.1002/ace.7401](https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.7401)
- Mezirow, J. (2003). Transformative learning as discourse. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1(1), 58-63. [doi:10.1177/1541344603252172](https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344603252172)
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pribbenow, D. A. (2005). The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(2) 25-38. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs//about>
- Rice, R. E. (2003, Fall). Rethinking scholarship and engagement: The struggle for new meaning. *Campus Compact Reader*, 1-9. Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/publication/>

- Sax, L. J. & Astin, A. W. (1997). The benefits of service: Evidence from undergraduates. *Educational Record*, 78, 25-33. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/publicliterature.PublicLiterature.search.html>
- Selkrig, M. (2011). Learning about ourselves from others: Transformation of artists' identities through community-based arts practice. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 30(5), 577-589. [doi:10.1080/02601370.2011.570875](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2011.570875)
- Stanton, T. K. (1994). The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service*, 1(1), 7-20. Retrieved from <http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcs/about>
- Tennant, M. (2012). *The learning self: Understanding the potential for transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Warner, B. & Esposito, J. (2009). What's not in the syllabus: Faculty transformation, role modeling and role conflict in immersion service-learning courses. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 510-517. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>

Authors

MARY CAZZELL, (mary.cazzell@cookchildrens.org), Director of Nursing Research and Evidence-Based Practice, Cook Children's Medical Center

SHIRLEY THERIOT, (theriot@uta.edu), Director, Center for Community Service Learning, University of Texas at Arlington

JOAN BLAKEY, (blakey@uwm.edu), Assistant Professor of Social Work, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

MELANIE SATTLER, Associate Professor, Civil Engineering, Environmental and Earth Sciences Program, College of Engineering, University of Texas at Arlington