Is Service-Learning Worth It?: A Mixed-Methods Study of Faculty's Service-Learning Experiences

Joan M. Blakey
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Shirley Theriot
University of Texas at Arlington
Mary Cazzell
Cook Children's Medical Center
Melanie Sattler
University of Texas at Arlington

Service-learning benefits students, communities, institutions of higher learning, and faculty. Most studies have focused on the impact of service-learning on students; however, there is a dearth of mixed-methods research examining faculty use of service-learning. Using a two-phase, exploratory, mixed-methods design, the purpose of this study was to understand the factors that influenced 24 faculty fellows' engagement with service-learning. The qualitative component examined four faculty's in-depth experiences with service-learning to understand the meaning they assigned to those experiences and to identify key themes that affected engagement. The quantitative phase of the study explored the extent to which 20 additional faculty fellows' service-learning experiences matched those of the four faculty fellows involved in the qualitative phase. Rigorous qualitative analysis revealed five themes: educational transformation for faculty and students, personal transformation for faculty and students, emotional investment, tenure concerns, and time commitments. Descriptive statistical analyses revealed that 90% of respondents agreed that implementing service-learning made them better and more meaningful teachers and challengers of traditional modes of education, and caused them to evaluate what it meant to be a good teacher. Eighty-five percent of faculty agreed that service-learning provides students with "real world" application and that they were learning alongside students. There were some differences among faculty with regard to emotional investment, tenure concerns, and time commitment. Service-learning is one of the most valuable tools faculty can use to create an active, engaged learning environment. Overall, faculty believed that service-learning was worth the effort.

Keywords: service-learning, faculty experiences

Service-learning is gaining popularity across university campuses because of its promise to enrich students' educational experiences, promote civic and social responsibility, and strengthen surrounding communities by addressing unmet needs and establishing reciprocal relationships with community partners (Bringle, Clayton & Hatcher, 2013; Darby & Newman, 2014; Kuh, 2008; O'Meara, 2008). Research shows that service-learning benefits students, universities, communities, and faculty; indeed, many studies report incredible transformative experiences as a result of service-learning and community engagement (Cazzell, Theriot, Blakey, & Sattler, 2014; O'Meara, 2008). Regarding students, service-learning increases their sense of personal efficacy, personal identity, spiritual growth, and moral development (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009; Rockquemore & Schaffer, 2000). It fosters students' concerns for social problems, social responsibility, and citizenship skills such that students leave college believing they have the power and responsibility to help their community (Darby &

Newman, 2014; Giles & Eyler, 1994). Service-learning also improves students' ability to apply what is learned to the "real world" (Darby & Newman, 2014; Eyler & Giles, 1999; O'Meara, 2008; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Finally, service-learning increases students' overall satisfaction with higher education (Astin & Sax, 1998).

While there has been less research on the impact of service-learning on universities and communities, studies indicate that service-learning increases retention rates at higher education institutions (Astin & Sax, 1998). It also enhances university-community relationships (Astin et al., 2006; Driscoll et al., 1996; Garcia & Robinson, 2005) and increases the vitality and viability of universities themselves (Hammond, 1994). With respect to the community, service-learning has been found to reduce stereotypes and facilitate cultural and racial understanding among diverse groups of individuals (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). Moreover, service-learning meets crucial human needs, thereby providing a useful service to the community (Garcia & Robinson, 2005).

More research is focusing on faculty members' experiences with service-learning (O'Meara, 2008), a topic which until recently has garnered little attention (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Driscoll et al., 1996). The purposes of this study were to understand the impact that service-learning had on faculty at a research-intensive university and to identify the factors that encouraged or impeded their use of service-learning in the classroom. Increased understanding of faculty's experiences will help promote their use of service-learning as well as identify and anticipate barriers so that universities and service-learning administrators/coordinators can proactively develop solutions and implement supports that encourage engagement in service-learning (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Darby & Newman, 2014; Hammond, 1994).

Literature Review

As it relates to faculty, service-learning research has focused primarily on factors that motivate and deter faculty's use of service-learning. Studies suggest four primary motivations related to faculty's use of service-learning. The most cited motivation relates to the educational benefits it provides to students (Darby & Newman, 2014). Other motivations identified in the literature fall into three categories: personal, career-related, and institutional/departmental (Hammond, 1994; O'Meara, 2008).

Factors Motivating Faculty's Use of Service-Learning
Educational benefits
Since service-learning is a teaching strategy intended to enhance students' learning, it is not surprising that the primary motivation faculty report centers around increased quality of education and instruction (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Furco, 2001; Hammond, 1994; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). According to Bringle and Hatcher (1996) "faculty who use service-learning discover that it brings new life to the classroom, enhances performance on traditional measures of learning, increases student interest in the subject, teaches new problem solving skills, and makes teaching more enjoyable" (p. 222). Other studies have found that the quality of students' learning is improved (Hesser, 1995; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Service-learning challenges traditional modes of education (Crews, 1995), actively involving students in their own education by providing experiential learning opportunities (Crews, 1995; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Still other research has suggested that faculty view service-learning as an effective way to present relevant course material and enhance students' critical thinking abilities (Astin et al., 2006; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Garcia & Robinson, 2005; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Hammond, 1994; McKay & Rozee, 2004).

Additionally, studies have found that service-learning helps to develop students' moral character, promotes civic engagement, fosters a sense of community, and assists students in developing a meaningful philosophy of life (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Hammond, 1994; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) found that students' learning (as measured by an increased understanding of course material and enhanced personal development), followed by community outcomes (i.e., developing a deeper understanding of social problems while providing a service to the community)

and professional responsibility (i.e., an increased ability to apply theory to practice) were the most important factors motivating faculty to use service-learning.

Finally, Pribbenow (2005) found that service-learning not only provided educational benefits but also improved relationships between faculty and students. Faculty experienced a renewed commitment to teaching and meaningful interactions with students. They had deeper, more significant connections and relationships with students. Faculty found that they had a better understanding of student learning processes and outcomes, and used more constructivist teaching and learning approaches in the classroom. They also were able to more clearly communicate theoretical concepts as a result of service-learning. Finally, students and faculty alike were more actively involved in the community. Research shows that as long as faculty see increased learning along with other educational benefits, they will continue to engage in service-learning (Abes et al., 2002; Bringle et al., 1997; Hammond, 1994; O'Meara, 2008).

Personal motivations

Faculty also have personal motivations for adopting service-learning pedagogy (O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009) which, according to research, have often stemmed from a prior history and commitment to service instilled by: faculty's family of origin, high school or college service-related experiences, and/or the importance placed on service by faculty's religious faith (O'Meara, 2008; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Commitments to social change, social issues, or social justice also has been cited as personal motivations for embracing service-learning (O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). In a study by O'Meara (2008), she found that 50% of faculty indicated that their motivation for incorporating service-learning was related to a personal commitment to social change. Other personal reasons faculty engage in service-learning have included a belief that it improves their teaching as well as observing students grow and mature personally and professionally as a result of community engagement (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; O'Meara, 2008).

Career-related motivations

Career-related motivations focus on the extent to which service-learning helps faculty succeed in their careers (O'Meara, 2008). For some faculty in earlier studies, service-learning became an integral part of their professional identity; consequently, they were asked to conduct service-learning-related trainings campus-wide, were often seen as the "resident experts" on campus, or oversaw and were responsible for development of service-learning initiatives on campus (O'Meara, 2008). Other motivations to engage in service-learning included faculty's belief that service-learning was cutting edge and their desire to be frontrunners in their respective disciplines (O'Meara, 2008).

Institutional/departmental motivations

Institutional motivations to engage in service-learning focus on the extent to which institutions and departments support faculty's use of service-learning. Some faculty reported working at universities or within departments with a strong, longstanding tradition of service-learning that was integral to the institutional mission and context (O'Meara, 2008; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009; O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles, 2011; Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2010). Some studies found that faculty members' discipline was related to engagement in service-learning. Disciplines with an orientation toward or a history of community involvement (i.e. faculty in life sciences, social services, or professional schools) demonstrated a stronger orientation toward service-learning than faculty in the physical sciences or humanities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; O'Meara, 2008; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009; Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Still other studies reported that faculty who had colleagues whom they respected or received encouragement to engage in service-learning were more likely to incorporate service-learning into their classes (O'Meara, 2008). Research indicates that institutional/departmental motivations also include: inheriting a course that already had service-learning as a component; departmental requirements for service-learning; and viewing service-learning as the best way to present discipline-related content.

Motivations are often categorized as extrinsic or intrinsic (Deci & Ryan, 1982). In the context of faculty engagement in service-learning, extrinsic motivations focus on factors that are externally derived and/or provide an external reward to faculty (O'Meara, 2008). Career-related and institutional/departmental motivations tend to be more extrinsic because they include reward systems such as tenure, workload-related reasons, and improved working relationships with colleagues. By contrast, intrinsic motivations focus on factors that are internally derived and pertain to one's work or how it affects the faculty member (O'Meara, 2008). Educational and personal motivations tend to be intrinsic because they include personal commitment to service, a desire to provide students with the most rigorous meaningful learning experience possible, a belief in a civic duty to meet community needs, and an eagerness to teach students the importance of community involvement and civic responsibility (Abes et al., 2002). Repeatedly, studies have found that intrinsic motivation is often more impactful and long-lasting than extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1982). Service-learning-related studies have found that while extrinsic rewards, such as stipends, letters of commendation, public praise, and credit toward tenure, did motivate faculty to incorporate service-learning into their courses, faculty were more motivated by intrinsic factors (Abes et al., 2002; Garcia & Robinson, 2005).

Factors Deterring Faculty's Use of Service-Learning

Generally, faculty who use service-learning are committed to its pedagogy (Hammond, 1994). Nonetheless, some factors deter faculty's use of service-learning. In earlier studies, the time commitment and logistics required to incorporate service-learning into a course and implement the project were cited as the most significant deterrents (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Furco, 2001; Hammond, 1994). Another significant challenge was adjusting for students' differing levels of readiness and willingness to participate in service-learning projects and courses (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Darby & Newman, 2014; Hammond, 1994). According to Darby and Newman (2014), students' lack of motivation, negative course feedback, and their inability to incorporate their service-learning experiences into the course material deterred faculty from engaging in service-learning. Additionally, faculty members felt discouraged when they believed their service-learning projects were not making a difference or when they faced challenging relationships with community partners (Darby & Newman, 2014). Faculty's discomfort with effectively using service-learning was another deterrent (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). Finally, a lack of support and recognition (i.e., financial, tenure and promotion reward structure, and course accommodations) served as a deterrent to using service-learning for some faculty (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Hammond, 1994; Kezar & Lester, 2009; O'Meara, 2008; 2002; O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Sandmann, 2006).

Gaps in the Literature

Service-learning benefits students, communities, institutions of higher education, and faculty (Driscoll et al., 1996). The majority of studies have focused on the impact service-learning has on students (Bringle et al., 2013). Yet, service-learning often falls under the purview of faculty since they are primarily responsible for the institutionalization of service-learning on college campuses (Astin et al., 2006; Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, 1996, 2000; Garcia & Robinson, 2005). Though still relatively nascent, research focusing on service-learning as it relates to faculty is becoming more sophisticated, asking deeper questions (O'Meara et al., 2011). Therefore, it is imperative that more mixed-method studies explore faculty's experiences with service-learning, what they are learning about service-learning and themselves, and whether they see these factors as challenges or opportunities that ultimately influence engagement with service-learning (O'Meara et al, 2011). Guiding this study was a central research question: What are faculty fellows' experiences with service-learning at a research-intensive university?

Research Methods and Design

The purpose of the study was to understand the impact that service-learning had on 24 faculty fellows, what they learned from their service-learning experiences, and whether they viewed these factors as

challenges or opportunities that ultimately influenced their engagement with service-learning. After institutional review board approval was granted, the study was implemented using a two-phase exploratory mixed-methods design (qualitative semi-structured reflections followed by a quantitative survey). The case-study method provided the unique opportunity to examine four faculty's in-depth experiences with service-learning, understand the meaning they assigned to their experiences, and identify key themes across cases. Previous service-learning studies have used a case-study approach whereby researchers identified potential effects of service-learning on faculty and gathered rich, descriptive contexts of faculty members' service-learning experiences (Driscoll et al., 1998; O'Meara et al., 2011; Pribbenow, 2005). Case studies are ideal for conducting exploratory research (Driscoll, 2000; Yin, 2009); moreover, they allow researchers to understand individuals' lived experiences within their real-life contexts (Gillham, 2000; Padgett, 2008; Scholz & Tietje, 2002; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009).

The quantitative phase of the study examined 20 additional faculty fellows' service-learning experiences and compared these to the experiences of the four faculty fellows involved in the qualitative phase. The quantitative survey, created from the themes identified from the case study, was administered to all service-learning faculty fellows at the university, excluding the four faculty members involved in the qualitative phase. Descriptive statistical analyses were conducted to strengthen and expand upon the qualitative findings.

Participants

Using criterion sampling, it was determined that faculty who (1) served as service-learning faculty fellows, (2) had incorporated service-learning in a course or developed a service-learning project, and (3) had engaged in service-learning for at least one year were eligibile for study participation. To elicit participation in the qualitative phase, the director of the Center for Community Service Learning (CCSL) sent emails to all 65 faculty fellows who had participated in service-learning seminars from fall 2006 through spring 2011. Three fellows indicated that they were interested in designing and participating in this study. The CCSL director joined the research team.

The quantitative survey was sent via email to the remaining 62 service-learning faculty fellows at the university who were not involved in the qualitative phase. Over three weeks, 20 faculty fellows responded to the survey (33% response rate). Demographics of study sample are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Demographics

Demographic Data	Qualitative (N=4)	Quantitative (N=20)
College or School	Nursing (1) Social Work (1) Engineering (1) Director of CCSL (1)	Business (2), Education and Health Professions (5), Engineering (1), Liberal Arts (6), Nursing (3), Science (2), Urban and Public Affairs (1)
Tenure	Tenured (1) Tenure-Track (2) Non-Tenured Position (1)	Tenured (5) Tenure-Track/Non-Tenured (15)
Years teaching-higher ed	Mean: 9 (SD 7), Range: 3-16	Mean: 13.4 (SD 9.3), Range: 2-38
Years implementing service-learning	Mean: 2.9 (SD 1.4), Range: 2-5	Mean: 6.6 (SD 6.6), Range: 1-20

Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis

Three faculty fellows and the CCSL director began sharing their service-learning experiences via email over a three month period from February 2012 to May 2012. Their semi-structured reflections centered on the following questions: (1) What have been your experiences with service-learning? (2) What were some of your experiences working with community partners? (3) What aspects of the service-learning seminars were particularly useful in your development as a service-learning faculty fellow? (4) How did service-learning affect you personally? (5) How did service-learning affect you professionally? (6) What were some of your students' experiences with service-learning?

All reflections were uploaded into NVIVO, a qualitative data-analysis software program that helps researchers store, code, manage, and analyze qualitative data (Creswell, 2013). Analysis began by open-coding (i.e., the codes emerge from the data) the reflections (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Padgett, 2008). Open-coding involved reading the data multiple times and generating a list of descriptive codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The researcher then looked repeatedly within and between cases to check for disconfirming and corroborating evidence, as well as alternative explanations. This case study analytic technique creates a robust analysis because it moves beyond description to more conceptual explanations of the data (Yin, 2009). Finally, pattern matching—a type of thematic analysis and the most desirable technique for case study analysis—was conducted (Yin, 2009) by dissecting the data to understand "the patterns, the recurrences, the plausible whys" of individual cases, as well as the aggregation of cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 69).

To enhance rigor and credibility of the findings, all codes and coded passages were reviewed by the researchers (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Padgett, 2008). When there was disagreement, the researchers supplied justifications for why they thought the data should be coded differently. Discussion continued until the researchers agreed upon the best code to use. This organic, iterative process allowed the research team to find the codes that best fit the data (Padgett, 2008).

Quantitative Survey Development

Using themes developed from the qualitative study phase, the Faculty Experiences with Service-Learning Survey was created based on five themes: educational transformation for faculty and students (8 items), personal transformation for students and faculty (2 items), emotional investment (4 items), tenure concerns (2 items), and time commitments (9 items). The 25 items were randomized. To establish content validity, the survey was reviewed by two leading service-learning experts, and changes to specific items were made based on the experts' feedback.

The survey was divided into two sub-surveys. The first 25-item sub-survey focused on the extent to which participants agreed or disagreed with the statements, using a 5-point Likert scale. The second 25-item sub-survey asked participants to rate the extent to which they saw the same items as a challenge or opportunity, using a different 5-point Likert scale. Descriptive statistical analyses included frequencies and percentages for item responses. For its first-time use, the total 5-item survey demonstrated adequate reliability ($\alpha = 0.87$). Both sub-surveys also produced satisfactory reliability with Cronbach's alphas of 0.81 and 0.91, respectively.

Qualitative Findings

Five themes emerged from four faculty's service-learning experiences: educational transformation for faculty and students, personal transformation for faculty and students, emotional investment, tenure concerns, and time commitments.

Theme 1: Educational transformation for faculty and students. This theme focuses on the educational benefits that both faculty and students experienced as a result of service-learning. Faculty believed that the process of incorporating service-learning into their courses made them better teachers. Karen, an assistant professor of social work, stated:

[Service-learning] means having a lesson planned, but not sticking so tightly to it that we can't deal with whatever might come up. However, that is the scary part, because what if something comes up that I can't answer. I realized that I do not have to have all the answers. I just need to be there and be present with the students as we figure things out together. That is what service-learning has taught me.

Service-learning encouraged faculty to evaluate their teaching in ways they had not done before engaging in service-learning. They felt that service-learning often led them to replace traditional views of education, in which students are empty vessels and faculty pour knowledge into them, with models in which the faculty and students learn from one another. According to Nancy, an associate professor of civil engineering:

I think that it takes courage for faculty to admit that we're learning … In service-learning pedagogy, faculty have to be willing to learn along with students…. Even faculty who have done service-learning many times will learn something new from each project. Admitting that we will be learning along with our students means giving up control, which for me was somewhat scary. When we lecture from notes we have used 10 times before, everything is under our control and predictable. Admitting that we're learning along with our students also means admitting that we don't know everything ... It may be hard on the ego to admit that there's much that we don't know. I admit it was humbling for me.

For students, educational transformation related to the type of education they were seeking. They wanted to know how the things they were learning in class applied to the "real" world. Nancy, the associate professor of civil engineering, stated:

Preparing students for the real world is a great strength of service-learning! The world is messy and complex, and service-learning has students attempt to deal with that, related to their own field, while we can still offer them support and guidance.

Students were also educationally transformed by the service-learning projects themselves. Many projects exposed students to real-world situations they might not otherwise have experienced, which was disheartening and heartbreaking for many students. Nina, an assistant professor of nursing, talked about one of her student's experiences with service-learning:

My undergraduate Honors student … has completed 3 sessions already and 2 of them were full of challenges, not what she expected, and she states that she has been "haunted" by these experiences … On her third presentation, apparently all chaos broke loose…, as the staff filled her room with students with "behavioral" issues with very minimal supervision and she attempted to readjust her presentation and activities, but to no avail. She sent me a quite reflective and emotion-filled email. In a response email, I reflected back that I could see this was a painful experience for her; I then listed what I identified as strengths she is gaining from this experience—maturity to handle difficult emotions and situations in public settings, flexibility, sensitivity, and an ability to see where she did make a difference by being there.

The educational transformation that took place among the faculty and students led both to value the educational process in new and different ways. Service-learning taught the faculty the importance of being flexible, that they did not have to all the answers, how to be present with and to learn alongside the students. Service-learning taught the students the importance of being open to new experiences, that the real word is messy, complex, and full of unanticipated challenges, and that if they could sit with the discomfort they often felt, they would develop a deeper understanding of the course material. Educational transformation was seen as an opportunity

because it created conditions whereby faculty were often learning alongside students. Although that made some faculty uncomfortable—because they are often taught that they should know everything—it was liberating for those who allowed themselves to embrace the uncertainty.

Theme 2: Personal transformation for faculty and students. Faculty talked about the ways in which service-learning not only transformed their approach to teaching but transformed them personally. Theresa, the director of CCSLand who was previously a faculty member in education, reported:

Service-learning is about trusting ourselves … Finding your voice in service-learning and speaking to the challenges, crazy challenges that occur that cannot be predicted … It changed my life. I came back from training about service-learning and moved all the desks and we read great books, wrote great stories and poems, and talked about books. My students thought that I had lost my mind … But I changed the culture and many of the faculty resented my new style … and me. It was scary and I often thought that this is too hard … Some of us … didn't want to participate anymore because of the pressure from our peers, some just kept on doing what they knew was right, and some left. I left … It did take a dissonance … disequilibrium to make me find my voice and appreciate my "way of knowing" and move forward without fear of making a mistake. I had to trust myself to move through my confusion.

Students also experienced personal transformation as they engaged in service-learning projects. Students learned important things about themselves. Nina, the assistant professor of nursing, built upon her earlier observations:

There are three concepts I associate with service-learning: trust, unpredictability, and humility … These can truly be life skills for success, but I believe these are successful skills in the implementation of service-learning in our classrooms and other venues for real-life experiences … What this student is experiencing (and myself, vicariously) during this service-learning project is the need for trust in yourself and your abilities, realization that there are no "cookie cutter" experiences in service-learning (unpredictability), and humility (because you have a much less height to fall when all does not work out as planned).

Personal transformation led to faculty learning to trust themselves, finding their voice, relinquishing control, and embracing new ways of teaching, all of which slowly led to change in the culture of departments and workplaces. With respect to the students, personal transformation taught students to trust themselves and their abilities, and embrace unpredictability, while making them more humble as they often were placed in circumstances outside their comfort zone. If faculty and students were able to work through the chaos and uncertainty that often ensued during the service-learning experience and allowed themselves to be transformed by the process, it often served as an opportunity to grow personally and professionally.

Theme 3: Emotional investment. The educational and personal transformations would not have been possible without an emotional investment from faculty. Some of them described how service-learning affected them as they were learning a new way of teaching and engaging students. Karen, an assistant professor of social work, described feeling like a "fish out of water" during her first experience with service-learning. She stated:

This was not only a new class for me, but I was trying something new in this class (service-learning) … My students could tell. They wanted something from me that I could not give them. I tried to respond to their needs, but the truth is I didn't know how to. I felt very uncomfortable in this place and basically said that I would never teach the class again. If I cannot do it well, I don't want to do it. There is a need to be vulnerable. There is a need to admit to

students that I do not know and that I am learning along with you, but I feel like I should be ahead of them. We have to sometimes sit in this place where we don't know and we don't have all the answers, but know that we still have something valuable to contribute.

The emotional investment resulted from trying something new and feeling apprehensive because faculty did not have the answers to challenges that arose, nor did they know how to guide students. Karen's initial response was to stop teaching the class because she felt so inadequate as a teacher. However, with the help of the faculty fellows and the director of the CCSL, she was ultimately transformed rather than repelled by the emotions. Theresa, the director of CCSL, reflected on her role:

> When I became service-learning director and had to speak to faculty about a different way to teach, or "counter normative" pedagogy … I felt a bit apprehensive … I see faculty transform each year. It's exhilarating! I saw Nancy from "I can't do service-learning now; I'll wait until after I have tenure." I saw Nina's reaction to my telling her that the workshop she and I had just attended was not service-learning. Her expression was like … oh, really. But it made her curious enough to want to hear more. When Karen was a faculty fellow, it was her first semester here, and she had just received her degree the semester before. I felt for her … we all know what the first semester is like … I help faculty work through their challenges and confusion, and realize the benefit is worth it.

Emotional investment was seen as both an opportunity and a challenge. Emotional investment was viewed as an opportunity when it paid off—that is, when students or faculty were transformed in some way. For example, some faculty figured out that they needed to be vulnerable by admitting they did not have all of the answers and that they were learning alongside students, as well as realizing that their value as a teacher did not come from knowing everything but through creating a classroom environment where learning could take place. At other times, emotional investment was seen as a challenge because faculty questioned whether service-learning was worth the effort, particularly when their efforts resulted in lower student evaluations and less-than-enthusiastic support from faculty colleagues.

Theme 4: Tenure concerns. Tenure concerns focused primarily on student course evaluations and the ways in which less-than-favorable evaluations could affect faculty's ability to receive tenure. Tenure is the ultimate goal for any tenure-track professor, and the pressure to obtain it can rule every decision that assistant professors make as they navigate tenure and promotion process. Karen, the assistant professor of social work, felt, however, that there was more at stake than just tenure:

> We need to get tenure. Everything we do or don't do is around getting tenure. Some believe that they will do service-learning once they get tenure. The problem with this mentality is that tenure dictates our lives and how we do our job. We don't challenge students in the classroom because bad evaluations will not look good for tenure. We do not stand up for what we think is right because it could jeopardize tenure. Service-learning is a new way of teaching. We feel we must stick to the old way because faculty members might get offended if we change the courses they have worked hard to create. Tenure is important, don't get me wrong, but we have a responsibility to teach students. There is more at stake besides tenure, particularly in professional schools like social work and nursing. I feel a responsibility to provide students with the best possible knowledge in the best possible way.

Faculty believed firmly that they had a responsibility to students as well as their professions to teach in the most effective way possible; this meant using service-learning, even though it might lead to lower ratings on student evaluations. Nonetheless, tenure concerns are a reality for many tenure-track faculty. Some faculty may be reluctant to do anything (such as engaging in a service-learning project) that may jeopardize their ability to obtain tenure.

Theme 5: Time commitments. All faculty fellows participated in semester- or year-long seminars in which they learned about service-learning and how to incorporate it into one course. Homework and reflections were part of the seminars., and each faculty participant was required to find a community partner, design a service-learning project, and work out all of the logistics. In the seminars, faculty fellows planned for a "perfect" learning environment and experience; in reality, however, service-learning occurred imperfectly and sometimes unpredictably. Nancy, the associate professor of civil engineering, learned that service-learning does not always go as planned:

> Service-learning … can be uncertain and "messy." But I think that imperfect service-learning is preferable to "perfect" non-service-learning. I've come to accept that the first time I teach a course … my goal is "survival." The second time I refine and the third time the course is pretty much where I want it to be. I think we should think of implementing service-learning similarly, and not expect everything to go right the first time. But I'll take unpredictable surprises over teaching with the same set of yellow notes for 20 years!

Many of the faculty in practice professions (i.e., social work, nursing, and education) believed they already do service-learning because service is part of their professional identity. Nina, the assistant professor of nursing, described her colleagues' reactions:

> Most of the nursing faculty I work with believe that service-learning is so innately "embedded" in the nursing curriculum. When I discuss what is involved with service-learning—enhancing student learning, contributing to community partner needs, and student reflections of their work in the community—that's when they say that this is "too much work, I'll just do what I'm already doing."

When some faculty realized that there is more to service-learning than just providing service, they often decided not to engage in service-learning, believing it was too much work or too much of a time investment. The time involved in developing and implementing a service-learning course was seen as a challenge, particularly depending on where in the tenure process faculty were situated. Faculty fellows felt that time was a major factor when deciding if and when to embrace service-learning pedagogy.

Quantitative Findings

The majority (90%) of respondents agreed that implementing service-learning made them better and more meaningful teachers, encouraged them to challenge traditional modes of education, and caused them to evaluate what it meant to be a good teacher. Eighty-five percent of faculty fellows agreed that service-learning provides students with "real world" application and that they were learning alongside students. The most highly rated service-learning opportunities were related to educational and personal transformation.

While faculty, in their reflections, discussed feelings of vulnerability and other kinds of emotional experiences, most survey respondents did not agree that service-learning made them feel vulnerable (10% agreed/strongly agreed) or like a "fish out of water" (15% agreed/strongly agreed). At least 75% of participants indicated that they do not question whether service-learning is worth the effort. Less than half of responses (40%) described concerns about receiving tenure, though 65% did admit that achieving tenure while implementing service-learning is a challenge. Only 35% were concerned about their teaching evaluations, but 50% felt this was a definite challenge as it could potentially impact the tenure process. Time commitments respresented the greatest challenge to faculty; most felt that service-learning takes a lot of time (60%) and investment (85%), stating that these were significant challenges (75% and 55%, respectively). Finally, finding community partners was also a definite challenge for 70% of respondents. Table 2 displays faculty fellow survey responses.

Table 2. Faculty Experiences with Service-Learning Survey (N=20), Frequencies and Percentages

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Challenge	Somewhat Challenge	Neither Challenge nor Opportunity	Somewhat Opportunity	Opportunity
Theme 1. Educational Transformation for Faculty and Student										
Service-learning makes me a better teacher.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	9 (45%)	9 (45%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)	15 (75%)
Service-learning helps me challenge the traditional modes of education.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	8 (40%)	10 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	5 (25%)	11 (55%)
Service-learning has caused me to evaluate what it means to be a teacher.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	9 (45%)	9 (45%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	10 (50%)	8 (40%)
When implementing service-learning, I feel like I am learning alongside students.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	9 (45%)	8 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	11 (55%)
I see community partners as co-educators.	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)	7 (35%)	9 (45%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	7 (35%)	8 (40%)
Relationships with community partners have enhanced the service-learning experience for students.	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	5 (25%)	12 (60%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	3 (15%)	5 (25%)	9 (45%)
Relationships with community partners have enhanced the service-learning experience as a faculty member.	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	11 (55%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)	7 (35%)	8 (40%)
Service-learning provides students with experiences that they can immediately apply to the "real world."	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	6 (30%)	13 (65%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	15 (75%)
Theme 2. Personal Transformation for Students and Faculty										
Service-learning transforms	0	0	4	10	6	0	2	1	3	14

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Challenge	Somewhat Challenge	Neither Challenge nor Opportunity	Somewhat Opportunity	Opportunity
students.	(0%)	(0%)	(20%)	(50%)	(30%)	(0%)	(10%)	(5%)	(15%)	(70%)
Service-learning transforms professors.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	10 (50%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)	3 (15%)	13 (65%)
Theme 3. Emotional Investment										
Service-learning has made me feel like a "fish out of water."	5 (25%)	8 (40%)	4 (20%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	15 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
When implementing service-learning I feel vulnerable, which makes me question my ability to effectively do service-learning.	3 (15%)	9 (45%)	6 (30%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	5 (25%)	10 (50%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)
Service-learning has caused me to step outside the box.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	6 (30%)	10 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	10 (50%)	6 (30%)
I question whether service-learning is worth the effort.	5 (25%)	10 (50%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (25%)	13 (65%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)
Theme 4. Tenure Concerns										
When implementing service-learning, I have concerns about how it will affect my ability to get tenure.	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)	7 (35%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	9 (45%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
When implementing service-learning, I have concerns about my teaching evaluations.	3 (15%)	5 (25%)	5 (25%)	5 (25%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	7 (35%)	5 (25%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)
Theme 5. Time Commitments										
Implementing service-learning takes a lot of time, more than I anticipated.	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	5 (25%)	7 (35%)	3 (15%)	12 (60%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Service-learning requires an investment from me.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	7 (35%)	10 (50%)	2 (10%)	9 (45%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	4 (20%)
I have had to spend some time educating some of my colleagues about service-learning.	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)	6 (30%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	11 (55%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)
In our department/school, there is often confusion about the difference between service and service-	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (55%)	7 (35%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Challenge	Somewhat Challenge	Neither Challenge nor Opportunity	Somewhat Opportunity	Opportunity
learning.										
When implementing service-learning, it doesn't always go as planned.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	12 (60%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)	7 (35%)	6 (30%)	4 (20%)	2 (10%)
It has been easy to identify community partners when implementing service-learning.	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	4 (20%)	9 (45%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	6 (30%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)
It has been difficult to identify community partners when implementing service-learning.	2 (10%)	8 (40%)	5 (25%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	13 (65%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Having non-traditional students affects my ability to effectively do service-learning projects.	5 (25%)	5 (25%)	5 (25%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	5 (25%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)
Everyone's experiences with service-learning are different and therefore, it is hard to use someone else's experience as a model for how to do service-learning.	1 (5%)	8 (40%)	2 (10%)	8 (40%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	6 (30%)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)	2 (10%)

Discussion

Incorporating service-learning in an academic environment can facilitate a rich, innovative, transformative experience for faculty, students, universities, and communities (Furco, 2001). The purpose of this study was to understand faculty members' experiences with service-learning and to explore the extent to which they saw their various experiences as opportunities or challenges. Understanding faculty members' experiences with service-learning is necessary and critical to supporting faculty members' continued use of service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996).

Five themes were identified in this study: educational transformation of faculty and students, personal transformation of faculty and students, emotional investment, tenure concerns and time commitment. Overall, faculty members saw educational and personal transformation as opportunities motivating them to continue using service-learning. This finding has been confirmed by previous studies (Abes at al., 2002; Bringle et al., 1997; Hammond, 1994; McKay & Rozee, 2004), while tenure concerns and time commitments arose as faculty challenges to the use of service-learning as a teaching tool. Emotional investment was seen as both an opportunity and a challenge, depending on whether faculty felt that the investment led to positive or negative outcomes (e.g., transformation versus poor student evaluations).

In this study, there were some differences among faculty with regard to emotional investment, tenure concerns, and time commitment. In terms of emotional investment, some of the differences might have been related to the amount of time or investment faculty put into teaching. Faculty who are new to academia and/or new to service-learning want projects to go smoothly; thus, wanting to ensure that everything went well might have caused some of the faculty to be more emotionally invested in the process than others. Differences in tenure concerns were primarily due to whether one was earning tenure, had already received tenure, or was in a position in which tenure was not a concern. Although tenure was a concern for 40% of respondents, it still did not appear to be faculty's main concern. Most of the differences relating to time commitments tended to center on educating colleagues and departments about the differences between service and service-learning. These differences seemed to be primarily determined by a faculty member's discipline or department. Within disciplines rooted in service, such as nursing, social work, and education, faculty who engage in service-learning often have to educate colleagues about the differences between service and service-learning. Moreover, faculty who use service-learning often became departmental spokespeople for service-learning, which often meant that other faculty came to them for answers to questions about anything related to service-learning. There were also differences among faculty in terms of the time spent identifying community partners, which appeared to be less of an issue for faculty who had been doing service-learning for more than five years. Faculty who have engaged in service-learning for a long time often have established relationships with community partners, thereby making it easier to establish future partnerships.

These findings are consistent with those of earlier studies that have demonstrated that service-learning has transformative impacts on students and faculty (Cazzell et al., 2014; Crew, 1995; Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001; Hammond, 1994; O'Meara, 2008). Studies have produced mixed results with respect to the effect that service-learning has on the tenure and promotion process. Some research indicates that service-learning-related activities are devalued in the tenure and promotion process and that this lack of reward and recognition serves as a strong deterrent to faculty incorporating service-learning pedagogy (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997; Darby & Newman, 2014; Eyler et al., 2001; Hammond, 1994; Kezar & Lester, 2009; O'Meara, 2008; O'Meara & Braskamp, 2005; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). However, Abes and colleagues (2002) found that only 16.7% of faculty indicated that their continued use of service-learning was related to a lack of reward in the tenure and promotion process, which is consistent with this study's findings. While tenure concerns were important, they were not a determining factor when deciding to use service-learning. Faculty were driven more by students' learning and making sure students were prepared for future professional pursuits than by tenure and promotion concerns. Finally, several studies found that the time commitment was one of the strongest deterrents to faculty using service-learning—a major theme in this

study (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Darby & Newman, 2014; Furco, 2001; Hammond, 1994; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009).

Limitations of the Study

While this study used a mixed-methods design, which the research team believes strengthened the study, the sample size was small. The qualitative phase involved four respondents, and of the 62 possible respondents, 20 faculty fellows (33%) responded to the survey. Though this is slightly above the average response rate (32.52%) for survey-based research (Hamilton, 2003), a larger sample size could have changed the survey results. Another limitation relates to the quantitative phase of the study in that it was based on the reflections of four faculty fellows' experiences with service-learning. Specifically, there is no way of knowing whether the experiences of the four faculty fellows were representative of the other faculty fellows' experiences. It is possible that other fellows would have highlighted other themes that were not mentioned. Finally, although the authors sought feedback from service-learning experts and the scores from the survey obtained adequate reliability, the survey itself could have influenced the findings.

Conclusion

Overall, faculty fellows believed that service-learning was worth the challenges and effort. Service-learning is one of the most valuable tools faculty can use to create an active, engaged learning environment. More attention and mixed-methods research are needed to assess faculty's experiences with service-learning so universities can encourage the continued use of service-learning as well as address barriers that may deter some faculty from embracing service-learning pedagogy (Garcia & Robinson, 2005).

Author Note

Joan M. Blakey, Helen Bader School of Social Welfare, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Shirley Theriot, Center for Community Service Learning, University of Texas at Arlington; Mary Cazzell, Nursing Research and Evidence-Based Practice, Cook Children's Medical Center; Melanie Sattler, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Texas at Arlington.

Correspondence

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Joan M. Blakey, Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Helen Bader School of Social Welfare, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2400 E. Hartford Avenue, Enderis Hall, Room 1177, Milwaukee, WI 53211. Phone: (414) 229-3998. E-mail: blakey@uwm.edu

References

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 9*(1), 5-17.

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Misa, K., Anderson, J., Denson, N., Jayakumar, U., … Yamamura, E. (2006). *Understanding the effects of service-learning: A study of students and faculty.* Los Angeles: UCLA, Higher Education Research Institute.

Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*(1), 32–45.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, *2*, 112-122.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 221-239.

Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J.A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(3), 273-290.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Clayton, P. H. (2013). Research on service-learning: An introduction. In P. Clayton, R. Bringle, & J. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service-learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment. Vol 2A: Students and faculty* (pp. 3-25). Arlington, VA: Stylus.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Games, R. (1997). Engaging and supporting faculty in service learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 2*(1), 43-51.

Cazzell, M., Theriot, S., Blakey, J. M., & Sattler, M. (2014). Transformation of, in, and by learning in a service-learning faculty fellows program. *Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education*, *3,* 30-46.

Colbeck, C., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R. Eberly, & J. Cohen (Eds.), *A laboratory for public scholarship and democracy* (pp. 17-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crews, R. (1995). What is service-learning? In *University of Colorado at Boulder service-learning handbook* (first edition).

Darby, A., & Newman, G. (2014). Exploring faculty members' motivation and persistence in academic service-learning pedagogy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 18*(2), 91-120.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1982). Instrinsic motivation to teach: Possibilities and obstacles in our colleges and universities. In J. Bess (Ed.), *Motivating professors to teach effectively* (pp. 27-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Driscoll, A. (2000). Studying faculty and service-learning: Directions for inquiry and development [Special Issue]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Fall 2000*, 35-41.

Driscoll, A., Gelmon, S., Holland, B., Kerrigan, S., Spring, A., Grosvold, K., & Longley, M. J. (1998). *Assessing the impact of service-learning: A workbook of strategies and methods* (2nd ed.). Portland, OR: Portland State University, Center for Academic Excellence.

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 66-71.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gelmon, S., Holland, B., Shinnamon, A., & Morris, B. (1998). Community-based education and service: The HPSISN experience. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 12*(3), 257-272.

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.

Furco, A. (2001). Advancing service-learning at research universities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *114*, 67-78.

Garcia, R. M., & Robinson, G. (2005). Transcending disciplines, reinforcing curricula: Why faculty teach with service-learning. *American Association of Community Colleges*, *1558,* 1-12.

Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. S. (1994). The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 327-339.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. New York: Continuum.

Hamilton, M. B. (2003). *Online survey response rates and times: Background and guidance for industry.* Tercent, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.supersurvey.com/papers/supersurvey_white_paper_response_rates.htm

Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 21-28.

Hesser, G. (1995). Faculty assessment of student learning: Outcomes attributed to service learning and evidence of changes in faculty attitudes about experiential education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2*, 33-42.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, 715-740. doi:1007/s11162-009-9139-6

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *10*(2), 21-33.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*   (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education*, *26*(1), 57-80.

O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 7–29.

O'Meara, K., & Braskamp, L. (2005). Aligning faculty reward systems and development to promote faculty and student growth. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *42*(2), 369-386.

O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is . . . How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(1), 17–32.

O'Meara, K. (2005). Effects of encouraging multiple forms of scholarship nationwide and across institutional types. In K. O'Meara & R. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship* (pp. 255–289). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles Jr, D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(2), 83-96.

Padgett, D. K. (2008). *Qualitative methods in social work research* (2nd ed.). New York: Sage Publication.

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.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Schaffer, R. H. (2000). Toward a theory of engagement: A cognitive mapping of service-learning experiences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7*, 14-25.

Sandmann, L. R. (2006). Scholarship as architecture: Framing and enhancing community engagement. *Journal of Physical Therapy Education, 20*(3), 80–84.

Scholz, R. W., & Tietje, O. (2002). *Embedded case study methods: Integrating quantitative and qualitative knowledge.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

Vogelgesang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2000). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning, 7*, 25–34.

Vogelgesang, L. J., Denson, N., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *The Review of Higher Education, 33*(4), 437–472.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Author Bios

Joan M. Blakey, MSW, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Department of Social Work in the Helen Bader School of Social Welfare at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Her primary research interests include trauma and substance abuse among women who are involved with the child protection and criminal justice systems. She is particularly interested in creating trauma-informed social service systems that are equipped to effectively address women's histories of trauma and substance abuse.

She also is interested in understanding the process of healing from trauma, creating trauma-informed systems of care, and testing the effectiveness of trauma-informed interventions. She teaches direct practice courses in which she incorporates service-learning. Her scholarship focuses primarily on substance abuse and trauma.

Shirley Theriot, PhD, has directed the Center for Community Service Learning at the University of Texas at Arlington, which has noted seven annual President's Honor Roll Awards as well as the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Award in 2010. She has published numerous articles on service-learning and teacher efficacy and created faculty programs at her university such as Faculty Fellows and the Engaged Department.

Mary Cazzell, RN, PhD, is currently the director of Nursing Research and Evidence Based Practice at Cook Children's Medical Center. Previously she was an assistant professor at the University of Texas at Arlington. She was the lead teacher of the Undergraduate Pediatric Nursing Program in which she created a service-learning project involving pediatric medication administration simulation with senior-level undergraduate nursing students to help prevent adverse medication errors in the clinical practice setting.

Melanie L. Sattler, PhD, PE, serves as an associate professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), where she teaches courses and conducts research related to air quality and sustainable energy. She has served as a Service-Learning Faculty Fellow at UTA, and has incorporated service-learning into her courses for the past three years.