Promoting Innovative Pedagogy and Engagement through Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Programs

Glenn A. Bowen, Pamela M. Kiser

Abstract

This article analyzes the role of service-learning faculty fellows programs in promoting pedagogical innovation and university-community engagement. The analysis is based on the findings of a study conducted among former fellows at two universities in North Carolina, USA. The faculty fellows programs had a strong influence on participants' teaching skills and motivation, relationships with colleagues and students, and scholarly agendas. The analysis highlights the need for institutional change to support service-learning as a vehicle for engagement. Specific recommendations are offered to higher education institutions considering a service-learning faculty fellows program.

Background and Context

Renewed concerns regarding faculty motivation, vitality, and professional growth have prompted higher education institutions across the United States to sharpen their focus on service-learning as innovative pedagogy and an avenue to engagement. Service-learning, which infuses community service with academic instruction and critical reflection, has long been recognized as a method of promoting civic responsibility among students *(Bringle and Hatcher 1996; Richmond 2002)*. Now, as colleges and universities grapple with issues related to faculty development and professional advancement, many have embraced service-learning as an effective strategy to reinvigorate faculty teaching *(Kezar and Rhoads 2005; Stanton 1994)*.

Further, several current trends make the emphasis on service-learning appropriate and desirable. These trends include the deliberate integration of academic learning and student development *(Keeling 2004)*; a paradigm shift to "transformative learning" *(Kreber 2006)*; and a growing commitment to the "scholarship of engagement" *(Boyer 1996)*. The latter trend has emerged in obvious response to criticism of colleges and universities in general, and faculty in particular, for their lack of responsiveness to public concerns *(Bok 1982; Ehrlich 1995; see also Kezar and Rhoads 2005)*. Service-learning offers a pedagogical model that integrates disparate elements of student learning and development while promoting

transformative learning and engagement. The term "engagement" refers to higher education activities associated with serving the public interest. It is seen as both an intellectual endeavor and scholarly practice at the interface between academy and citizenry *(Fear et al. 2006)*.

Service-learning itself is a form of faculty development that addresses concerns raised by Boyer and others *(Kezar and Rhoads 2005)*. Within the service-learning field, faculty fellows programs have been developed explicitly to facilitate faculty development *(Harwood et al. 2005; Richmond 2002; Welch, Liese, and Bergerson 2004)*. Indeed, knowledge- and skill-development activities, systematically designed and delivered, will help faculty members become competent as service-learning practitioners.

Although an increasing number of U.S. universities have established service-learning faculty fellows programs, very little is known about the outcomes or effectiveness of these programs. Harwood and colleagues *(2005)*, who conducted one of the few studies reported in the extant literature, analyzed a two-year faculty fellows program designed to enhance service-learning pedagogy and scholarship at a regional comprehensive university. They found that participation in the program produced "a reflective community of faculty" *(p. 45)*, led to professional and personal development, and improved community and student outcomes.

There is much to learn about effectively supporting faculty use of service-learning in light of the concerns mentioned above. In particular, there is a need for additional research on service-learning faculty fellows programs, especially research that is not confined to a single program or campus. This article, based on a two-campus study, aims to add to our knowledge of how and why these programs work. The study analyzed the role of service-learning faculty fellows programs in promoting innovative pedagogy and engagement at two comprehensive universities—one private, the other public—in North Carolina, USA.

Research Question and Methodology

This study was designed to answer an overarching question: What is the impact of service-learning faculty fellows programs on former participants at Elon and Western Carolina universities? We were interested in the challenges related to incorporating service-learning into courses and the nature of service-learning support that the former fellows currently needed. Furthermore, we wanted to understand how, if at all, the faculty fellows programs influenced professional development of university faculty members

as service-learning practitioners and scholars, and enhanced individual and institutional commitment to engagement. To explore the impact of these two programs, we used a multifaceted research design encompassing document reviews, a survey, interviews, and institutional case studies.[1]

First, we analyzed documentary information on the faculty fellows programs at each institution. We read and reviewed an array of documents, such as program profiles, faculty development manuals, fellows' midyear and end-of-year reports, and fellowship assessment summaries. The systematic procedure that we used was a form of content analysis (*Merriam 1988*). For this, we simultaneously coded the documents and constructed categories that captured the relevant characteristics of the documents' content in relation to the research question.

Second, we designed a survey to gather data on former faculty fellows' participation in service-learning since they completed their fellowships. The survey questionnaire contained a mix of Likert-style items (requiring respondents to specify their level of agreement with various statements) and both closed- and open-ended questions. The questions addressed the former fellows' continued integration of service-learning into courses; relationships with faculty colleagues, students, and community agencies; and professional presentations and publications. Additional questions sought to elicit responses regarding the challenges of teaching service-learning courses and the strengths and weaknesses of the Faculty Fellows Programs.

Copies of the questionnaire were sent to the 21 former faculty fellows at Elon and the 11 former fellows at WCU (N = 32). Overall, there was an 85 percent response rate. The survey respondents (n = 27; 21 female, 6 male) were drawn from all faculty ranks (full, associate, and assistant professors as well as lecturers) and represented 21 disciplines in all. Responses to all items on the self-administered questionnaire were collated and analyzed using descriptive statistics. We calculated the arithmetic means to determine the strength or importance attached to each response.

Third, after we analyzed the survey data, we selected four fellows from each program for a more detailed interview. They were selected on the basis of survey responses that suggested especially insightful or substantive comments or concerns, as was done in Austin's *(1992)* study of the Lilly Teaching Fellows Program. Interviewees were drawn from different disciplines and faculty ranks. Semistructured interviews, conducted individually on each campus, probed the programs' impacts, and the selected respondents

were asked to elaborate on their survey responses. Key questions addressed the impact of the faculty fellows programs on teaching effectiveness, relationships with colleagues, and faculty engagement in the community.

The short interview sessions also provided an opportunity for member checking—a technique to establish the trustworthiness of findings. Accordingly, we verified data and our interpretations with respondents.

The analysis of qualitative data—responses to the open-ended questions in the survey and interviews—followed an inductive process *(Lincoln and Guba 1985; Patton 1980)*. The inductive process requires that the themes and categories of analysis emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on the data before analysis. Accordingly, each author independently read and coded interview transcripts for major themes, and then we came together to confirm the emerging themes.

Finally, after analyzing the survey and interview data, we visited each other's campuses. Our visits coincided with major service-learning conferences hosted by each university. During the site visits, we heard presentations by current and former fellows as members of larger faculty teams at each conference, and we spoke with a number of university administrators. Our observations and informal discussions were recorded as field notes for concise case studies.

While gathering, analyzing, and interpreting the data, we kept in mind the same cautions noted by Austin *(1992)* in her exemplary study. First, the service-learning fellowship was only one element in the participants' career development; many fellows participated in other professional development activities. Therefore, the impact of the fellowship would be difficult to isolate. Second, because participants invested considerable time and effort in the program, they might overstate its benefits and effects to justify their commitment. Third, we did not design this as a comparative analysis involving program participants and nonparticipants as respondents, which would have been valuable in identifying effects unique to the fellowship. In spite of these cautions, the validity and trustworthiness of the findings are enhanced through the triangulation of data (use of multiple methods and sources) and member checking.

Overview of Faculty Fellows Programs

The faculty fellows programs at both Elon University and Western Carolina University (WCU) got under way at the start of the 2004–5 academic year. Only full-time faculty members are

selected for Elon's program and are offered modest stipends. By contrast, members of all faculty ranks (from adjunct to full professor) can participate in the WCU program and each is typically released from a three-credit course. Both the stipend and course release are strong incentives for faculty participation in the program.

From the outset, program planners at both Elon and WCU were cognizant that faculty involvement was a hallmark of a successful, high-quality service-learning program. Moreover, they were aware that faculty involvement was more likely to occur if efforts to integrate service-learning into the curriculum were a faculty-led initiative *(Abes, Jackson, and Jones 2002)*. To be sure, sustaining faculty participation has been a significant challenge for service-learning administrators *(McKay and Rozee 2004)*. The contributions of faculty fellows as role models, mentors, and advocates among their colleagues were considered crucial to the success of service-learning at both Elon and WCU.

Elon University

Elon is a private institution with approximately 4,800 students and 200 full-time faculty. The Faculty Scholars (Fellows) Program was created by Elon's Kernodle Center for Service Learning to identify and recognize faculty who are interested in incorporating or enhancing service-learning in their courses and are seeking a better understanding of the pedagogy. Applicants identify a particular course that they would like to revise to include service-learning.

Six faculty members are selected for the program each year. They attend a series of seminars during the first (fall) semester, when they explore issues related to service-learning pedagogy. Each scholar (fellow) then prepares a course syllabus that includes a service-learning project and makes a commitment to teach the newly designed course in the next (spring) semester. All faculty members who complete the one-year program are asked to serve as mentors to the next cohort.

Western Carolina University

A public institution with some 9,000 students and 700 faculty members, WCU established the Faculty Fellows Program primarily to develop a cadre of scholar-practitioners who would promote and support the integration of service-learning into the curriculum. The Center for Service Learning selects five fellows each year. Each fellow is assigned to a college within the university and (unlike at Elon) is eligible to participate in the program for two consecutive years. Fellows assist the service-learning administrators in

providing resources and support to their colleagues as they make service-learning an integral part of their teaching, research, and professional service *(Caruso, Bowen, and Adams-Dunford 2006)*.

Fellows benefit from a half-day orientation and attend regular seminars organized by the Center for Service Learning. Seminars cover the "nuts and bolts" of service-learning, "best practices" in service-learning course design, and effective assessment methods. Each fellow is required to teach a service-learning course and to encourage service-learning practice in the assigned college. In addition, each fellow is required to coordinate or support a service-learning seminar/workshop for colleagues, serve as a mentor, and produce a journal article or conference presentation on service-learning.

Major Findings: Program Impact

The study found strong and consistent evidence that the faculty fellows programs at Elon and WCU had a positive impact on former participants' teaching, professional development, and scholarly work. The programs provided support mechanisms and incentives for faculty to be creative and innovative in their teaching. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents (n = 24) indicated that they had improved their use of service-learning as a teaching strategy.

Former fellows at both universities also perceived positive results related to their professional advancement. For instance, 67 percent (n=18) responded that they had assumed institutional leadership roles related to engaged teaching and learning. Significantly, one respondent had assumed leadership of the service-learning office at a small private college in a neighboring state. Just over half (52%) of the former fellows became more engaged in community service in their personal time.

Regarding scholarly work, 74 percent of the respondents (n=20) indicated that they had made professional presentations at conferences, with some reporting as many as five such presentations. Additionally, 41 percent (n=11) submitted manuscripts to journals and other publications for peer review, and these had either been published or accepted for publication. Notably, a service-learning paper presented by one of the former fellows at a national conference won a "Distinguished Proceedings Award" and was later published as the lead article in an issue of the association's journal *(Burke 2007)*.

Table 1. Impact of Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Programs on Participating Faculty

	Respondents Indicating Agreement or Strong Agreement		Mean (1-5 scale)
	Number	Percentage	
Encouraged Other Faculty to Use SL	27	100	4.5
Maintained Relationships with SL Colleagues	26	96	4.3
Strengthened SL Teaching	24	89	4.0
Developed More Collaborative Relationships with Students	23	85	3.6
Developed Deeper Partnerships with Community Agencies	22	81	3.7
Assumed Leadership Role in Engaged Teaching and Learning	18	67	2.9
Became More Engaged in Community Service in Personal Time	14	52	2.6
			Number of Presentations or Articles
Made SL Presentations at Professional Conferences	20	74	1–5
Written Peer-Reviewed SL Publications	11	41	1–3

Eighty-one percent (n = 22) of the respondents reported that they had developed deeper partnerships with community agencies. (See table 1 for a summary of the survey responses.)

These data, combined with responses to the open-ended questions in the survey, follow-up interviews with selected respondents, and informal discussions during campus visits, reinforce the conclusion that the faculty fellows programs generated significant, favorable influence. Such influence was seen in four areas: teaching skills and motivation, faculty-student interaction, contacts and collaboration, and institutional change. However, the data suggest some uncertainty about the place and function of service-learning in the promotion and tenure review process.

Teaching skills and motivation

The impact of the fellowship experience on teaching skills and motivation was reflected in former participants' responses to survey and interview questions. For most of the former fellows (89%), service-learning was instrumental in strengthening their teaching effectiveness. More than half of the fellows had never

included service-learning in a course prior to the fellowship. As part of the fellowship, they were exposed to "curricular innovation" that was congruent with their goals and interests. During seminars and workshops, they also had many opportunities to reflect on their teaching. One of the respondents noted:

> The Faculty [Fellows] Program helped me to gain a deeper and more formal understanding of the service-learning pedagogy. The workshop sessions were very helpful in encouraging excellence in teaching using service learning.

Another expressed similar appreciation of the workshops: "I had been engaged in service learning for many years but was unaware of the scholarly body of work that existed on the topic until I attended the workshops."

After completing the fellowship, not only had all fellows taught at least one service-learning course but most (75%) had employed service-learning as a teaching strategy in two or more courses. Consequently, the number of courses with service-learning components increased considerably. Several respondents said the program made them more enthusiastic and confident in their work as service-learning practitioners. It was therefore easy for all of them to encourage their colleagues to try this pedagogical strategy. As one respondent declared, "I now feel equipped to sell service learning—to make the case for faculty in my college to integrate service learning into the curriculum." Another respondent pointed out that she felt "motivated to do more with, and for, service learning because it is such a powerful teaching method."

"Several respondents said the program made them more enthusiastic and confident in their work as service-learning practitioners."

Only two of the respondents (both at the same institution) revealed that they no longer use service-learning in their teaching. For one respondent, this was due to departmental concerns that too many of their courses had become service-learning courses; for the other, it was as a result of being "overwhelmed by new administrative responsibilities" assigned to her. Still, the former fellows' enhanced knowledge and abilities, and their commitment to "engaged teaching and learning," was worth their participation in the program.

Faculty-student interaction

Most respondents (85%) indicated that they had developed more collaborative relationships with students. According to one of them,

> My involvement in the program helped me think about the way I approach my teaching. Service learning requires collaboration on campus and in the community. I realize I needed to model appropriate behaviors for my students. As we discussed service learning, I built a great relationship with my students. The relationship between my students and [me] was definitively collaborative.

Echoing this sentiment, another respondent commented: "The interaction in class improved, and most of my students really enjoyed the opportunity to share their experiences in the community."

Improved faculty-student interaction would contribute to improved student learning as the classroom milieu became more conducive to instruction. In line with earlier research findings *(Bringle and Hatcher 1996)*, this study found that service-learning brought new life to the classroom and made teaching more enjoyable. Former fellows also gained a new perspective on their roles in the academy. They began to see themselves "not as purveyors of knowledge but as facilitators of knowledge generation."

Contacts and collaboration

Respondents' comments about the programs generated three intertwined themes: (1) *Making contacts*, (2) *valuing collaboration*, and (3) *sense of community*. These themes were consistent across respondents and institutions. As found in the survey, nearly all respondents (n = 26, 96%) developed closer working relationships with other faculty members through their service-learning involvement. Respondents noted that the fellowship "allowed me to develop contacts with other faculty" and was instrumental in "creating contact with faculty and staff in other departments, and greatly enhancing my understanding of service learning and how it can be applied." The fellowship fostered socialization and made many feel "less isolated" from colleagues.

Several respondents felt it was collaboration that made each program strong. According to one respondent, "collaboration made us feel that we are part of a community—a community of scholars." Likewise, another respondent observed that "our collegial relationships

fostered a sense of community." Yet another remarked that the program provided "one of the strongest academic communities I've had the opportunity to be a part of," while a colleague commented on the "nurturing environment" created by the program. This sense of community was stimulated by the seminars and workshops, which also contributed to their "intellectual enlightenment." Respondents explained, too, that they had an opportunity to "share our knowledge and newly developed expertise with one another," and that the program provided "the ability to share ideas with others and receive feedback on service-learning projects."

Similarly, other respondents stated that the fellowships provided

> . . . exposure to this new pedagogy and an opportunity to become acquainted with colleagues in different disciplines;

> . . . the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues outside my department [which allowed us to see] great leaps in integration and interdisciplinary work—on and off campus;

> . . . the chance to deepen understanding of both the theory and practice of service learning, to connect with others interested in the same goal, to be part of planning and implementation of campus-wide growth in service learning, [and] to experience the diversity in people and academic programs that are connected to service learning.

Becoming connected to colleagues was identified as good practice in early faculty socialization. At the same time, the collaborative relationships and sense of community experienced by the former fellows proved crucial to their professional development.

Institutional change

Respondents observed that their institution was supportive of service-learning, as evidenced by its investment in the Faculty Fellows Program. They welcomed the "institutional change" that made service-learning an integral element of the educational landscape and mentioned the strides toward creating "engaged campuses." Nevertheless, respondents underscored the need for increased service-learning project funding, transportation for students to go to service sites, and support from department heads

and colleagues. The implication is that further changes at the institutional level may be warranted.

Seventy-four percent of the respondents (n = 20) did pinpoint a need for institutional change to support service-learning as a vehicle for university-community engagement or "community-engaged scholarship." Some respondents commented insightfully on the strong influence of institutional culture on the acceptance and adoption of service-learning. One wrote: "If there is evidence that the institution pays more than lip service to service learning, then we can expect positive results as far as service-learning growth is concerned." Another respondent spoke of the "need for communicating the effectiveness and significance of this pedagogy with faculty and administrators who do not use service learning and may question its validity."

The former fellows experienced growth in their awareness of how vital it was for top-level understanding and support of service-learning to be an institutional priority. In their view, allocation of substantial funds would be a clear indication of institutional commitment to service-learning.

Promotion and tenure

Approximately 80 percent of the respondents (n = 21; 78%) identified the need for assistance with documenting service-learning as a scholarly activity, while nearly 90 percent (n = 24; 89%) specified the need for assistance with conducting service-learning research. The present study was not designed to identify tenure-track faculty and hence to compare their responses with those of other participants. Therefore, interpreting the data is somewhat difficult. In interviews with some of the former fellows, however, it became clear that integrating service-learning effectively into tenure and promotion portfolios was not a pressing issue for them, relative to other concerns. Some of the former fellows probably sought to present the views of their colleagues regarding assistance with documenting service-learning as a scholarly activity and were not necessarily seeking help for themselves. The literature had reported a concern among faculty about the lack of reward and recognition of service-learning as reflected in guidelines for promotion, tenure, and hiring *(Bringle et al. 2000; Stanton 1994)*. Clearly, the faculty reward system can be a mediator of faculty involvement in service-learning activities.

Senior administrators at both institutions view scholarly work in service-learning as a strong indicator of faculty and institutional achievements in this field. The former fellows were aware that "slow

progress" was being made in revising institutional tenure policies to support the pursuit of community engagement as the basis for recognized scholarship. Since many of the former fellows had produced publications and presentations, their fellowship experience was seen as having a positive impact on their scholarly work even if it was not linked to promotion and tenure decisions.

The "increased visibility" given to faculty members during and after their service-learning fellowships was a valued outcome of the faculty fellows programs. The programs simultaneously served to increase the visibility of service-learning itself, across the campus and in the wider community.

Yet, regarding the place and function of their service-learning practice on the promotion and tenure process, uncertainty remained. The tripartite divisions of teaching, research, and service made it difficult for faculty to communicate adequately their efforts in service-learning, which often combines two or even all three of these dimensions of faculty work (*Kezar and Rhoads 2005*). The situation in our institutions mirrored that in many universities throughout the United States. Despite increased institutional commitment to community-based scholarship and engagement, there has been a "very strong trend toward rising research expectations" *(O'Meara 2005, 505)*, with an emphasis on the traditional "scholarship of discovery" *(Enos and Morton 2003, 34)*.

Individual academic departments typically determine the applicability of service-learning to promotion and tenure decisions, and it is incumbent on individual faculty members to explain compellingly to promotion and tenure committees the relevance of their service-learning work. However, as O'Meara and Rice *(2005)* have suggested, institutional policies and interventions are necessary to assist faculty in deliberately conceptualizing relationships among their roles as teachers and scholars, at the same time broadening their understanding of what constitutes scholarly work. The service-learning faculty fellows programs, by enhancing faculty practice and commitment to engagement, made participants intensely aware that promotion and tenure policies needed to change to recognize and reward this work.

Challenges encountered

The former fellows encountered a number of challenges over a period of one to three years (depending on when they completed the fellowship). The most significant challenge cited by respondents was "lack of time" (see table 2). Service-learning requires a substantial investment of time, and faculty members often have competing

Table 2. Challenges Related to Continuing Service Learning

	Respondents Indicating Challenge Faced Often or Always		Mean (0-3 Scale)
	Number	Percentage	
Lack of Time	15	55	1.8
Large Class Size	11	41	1.2
Logistical Difficulties	11	41	1.2
Lack of Appropriate Service Opportunities	9	33	0.5
Student Resistance	8	30	0.9
Difficulties with Community Partnerships	4	15	0.6
Lack of Course/Project Funding	4	15	0.5
Lack of Departmental Support	2	7	0.4
Lack of Institutional Support	0	0	0.07

demands on their time. Program administrators provided support that helped participating faculty members deal with the challenges they faced. The former faculty fellows, as individuals, realized that they were not alone. As one said, "I enjoyed being around others who had experienced many of the same joys and challenges of service learning, and I learned a lot from the experience."

Whereas former fellows "appreciate and value the continuing support," they indicated a need for support in different forms and at a more advanced level. Allocation of additional resources, especially funds for service-learning projects, was a major form of support specified.

In effect, the former fellows were willing to continue pursuing scholarly excellence in the face of the challenges and to encourage their colleagues to do likewise. Also, they accepted that the Faculty Fellows Program could enhance faculty skills and confidence, and even help them deepen relationships, but not necessarily assist them with the inevitable task of trying to balance service-learning with other commitments.

"[T]he former fellows were willing to continue pursuing scholarly excellence in the face of the challenges and to encourage their colleagues to do likewise."

Discussion and Implications

This study has found that the faculty fellows programs at Elon and WCU had a positive impact on former participants' teaching, professional development, and scholarly work. The programs had

significant, favorable influence in the areas of teaching skills and motivation, faculty-student interaction, collaboration, and institutional change.

The most notable impact of participation in the faculty fellows programs was the enhanced use of service-learning as a teaching strategy and the attendant increase in the number of service-learning courses. Given that most respondents (25 of 27) continued to teach service-learning courses and all encouraged their colleagues to use service-learning, it seems that the fellowships were both a stimulus and a source of sustenance for them, both personally and professionally. The fellowships were also catalytic in building collaborative relationships on campus and with community partners, thus contributing to service-learning development at each institution.

It seems that participation in a faculty fellows program can partially "inoculate" faculty against the challenges usually experienced in teaching service-learning courses that make many faculty members quit. Certainly, the programs examined in this study provided a system of support and building blocks for faculty commitment to service-learning, which enabled the former fellows to persist and to address challenges that arose rather than become overwhelmed by them.

Furthermore, a faculty fellows program can target institutional change so that administrators better understand and reward service-learning and professional service in the community. This institutional change goal is regarded as vital in light of enduring faculty concerns about the lack of recognition of their service-learning practice. The scholarship of discovery remains the "most highly respected and rewarded by the academy as far as promotion and tenure and the likelihood of receiving research grants and prestigious awards" *(Enos and Morton 2003, 34)*. The need for institutional reform, reflected in policies and procedures that respond to the real and perceived vulnerability of engaged faculty, cannot be overemphasized. Faculty members who make service-learning and other community-based teaching approaches an integral part of their work should benefit from altered recognition and reward systems.

Conclusion

This study provides an enhanced understanding of a faculty fellows program and its pivotal role as an engine for faculty development in service-learning. The study contributes to strengthening the groundwork for future research in evaluating faculty fellows

programs across multiple institutions with a view to determining their impacts.

Higher education institutions considering a service-learning faculty fellows program should be prepared to allocate substantial funding and should provide course releases to stimulate and sustain faculty interest in the program. Provision should be made for regular, ongoing faculty development workshops to assist participants with their efforts to use service-learning as a pedagogical approach. Professional development strategies that maximize opportunities for community building, collaboration, and mutual support among participating faculty should be instituted.

Further, given the relatively scant attention to peer-reviewed publications (only four in ten of the former fellows had submitted service-learning papers to journals), this is a fertile area for growth among faculty and for the programs at both institutions. Faculty should receive assistance with developing a service-learning research agenda and with pursuing engaged scholarship. As faculty members intensify their scholarly pursuits, they are likely to experience the kind of transformation that Fear and colleagues *(2006)* describe as essential to engagement.

Special attention needs to be paid to assisting faculty with demonstrating the effective use of service-learning as part of the promotion and tenure process. This is vital as institutions seek to clarify what counts as scholarship. It is vital, too, as institutions respond to the call to be more responsive to public concerns.

As institutions increase and deepen the integration of service-learning into the curriculum, faculty members can leverage their use of this innovative pedagogy to enhance their teaching effectiveness, build collaboration with colleagues and students, and become truly responsive to the needs of the wider community. In effect, service-learning can provide a pathway to university-community engagement and faculty growth, which will benefit individual faculty members and their students as well as institutions and society.

Endnote

1. Survey responses and interview transcripts are on file with Glenn A. Bowen, Western Carolina University.

References

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

Austin, A. E. 1992. Supporting the professor as teacher: The Lilly Teaching Fellows Program. *The Review of Higher Education* 16 (1): 85–106.

Bok, D. 1982. *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. Cambridge, MA: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. 1996. The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1): 11–20.

Bringle, R. G., R. Games, C. Ludlum, R. Osgood, and R. Osborne. 2000. Faculty fellows program: Enhancing integrated professional development through community service. *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (5): 882–94.

Bringle, R. G., and J. A. Hatcher. 1996. Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education* 67 (2): 221–39.

Burke, D. D. 2007. Service learning: Opportunities for legal studies in business. *Journal of Legal Studies Education* 24 (2): 129–63.

Caruso, R., G. Bowen, and J. Adams-Dunford. 2006. Student affairs and service learning: Promoting student engagement. *The College Student Affairs Journal* 25 (2): 186–98.

Ehrlich, T. 1995. Taking service seriously. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin* 47 (7): 8–10.

Enos, S., and K. Morton. 2003. Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In *Building partnerships for service-learning*, ed. B. Jacoby, 20–41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fear, F. A., C. L. Rosaen, R. J. Bawden, and P. G. Foster-Fishman. 2006. *Coming to critical engagement: An autoethnographic exploration.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Harwood, A. M., L. Ochs, D. Currier, S. Duke, J. Hammond, L. Moulds, K. Stout, and C. Werder. 2005. Communities for growth: Cultivating and sustaining service-learning teaching and scholarship in a faculty fellows program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 12 (1): 41–51.

Keeling, R. P., ed. 2004. *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience.* Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and American College Personnel Association.

Kezar, A., and R. A. Rhoads. 2005. The dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education: A philosophical perspective. Special issue: The social role of higher education, *The Journal of Higher Education* 72 (2): 148–71.

Kreber, C. 2006. Developing the scholarship of teaching through transformative learning. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 6 (1): 88–109.

Lincoln, Y. S., and E. G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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

Merriam, S. B. 1988. *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K. 2005. Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education* 46 (5): 479–510.

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

Patton, M. Q. 1980. *Qualitative evaluation methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Richmond, J. 2002. The University of Rhode Island's new culture for learning. In *Service-learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility* [Monograph no. 34], ed. E. Zlotkowski, 65–67. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Stanton, T. K. 1994. The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1:7–20.

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

About the Authors

• Glenn A. Bowen, Ph.D., is the director of the Center for Service Learning at Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723 (gbowen@email.wcu.edu). He developed and currently coordinates the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows Program.

• Pamela M. Kiser, MSW, is the Watts-Thompson Professor, Department of Human Services, and the Kernodle Service-Learning Faculty Development Fellow at Elon University, 100 Campus Drive, Elon, NC 27244 (kiserp@elon.edu).