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This article focuses on how service learning can function as a democratizing and empowering approach to pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. The dominant discourse of service learning has evolved into a narrowly-defined alternative pedagogy that promotes student learning and enrichment but very little community development, institutional change, and policy change. For service learning to lead to more meaningful social change, beyond pedagogical innovation, it must be reinvented as a more robust approach including pedagogy, research, organizational learning, and community development. We illustrate weak and robust forms of each of the previously mentioned dimensions with concrete examples from our service-learning work and in particular, from case study research comparing two global service-learning programs in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. We discuss challenges and implications for designing, implementing, and sustaining a more robust approach to service learning, beyond current pedagogical practice and toward social movement learning aimed at policy and institutional change.
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INTRODUCTION

In considering how to problematize service learning, we decided to frame the content of this article as a reflection on our own teaching and research experience with service-learning programs in local and global contexts. Kiely’s (2007) four-fold conceptual framework for reflective practice in service learning guided our reflections on the pedagogical, institutional, research and community dimensions of service learning. This article discusses how we approach these dimensions in our work, how we problematize conventional service-learning theory and practice, and what we have learned from our own experiences and development. We offer examples from our global service-learning practice and research and discuss broader implications of our reflections on each of the four dimensions for the service-learning field. Our emerging model for more robust service learning shifts from service learning as a narrow pedagogical innovation to an approach to movement-building in higher education.\(^1\) With such a shift, we show how faculty must expand service learning beyond a pedagogy of reflection on content to recognize how institutional factors, research, and community development affect its quality and impact.

MOVEMENT-BUILDING SERVICE LEARNING: A COUNTER-NORMATIVE APPROACH

Much of service-learning research and writing focuses on advancing pedagogy—the theory and practice of teaching and learning in service learning (Billig & Eyler, 2003; Billig & Furco, 2002; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Howard, Gelmon, & Giles, 2000). Service-learning literature largely communicates the distinctions between conventional classroom-based pedagogy and service-learning pedagogy, as well as the best practices and key benefits associated with incorporating service learning into K–16 curricula (Billig & Eyler, 2003; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby & Associates, 1996; Welch & Billig, 2004). As this literature points out, service-learning pedagogy departs from conventional classroom teaching and learning processes in substantial ways (Berman, 2006; Howard, 1998; Kaye, 2004; Weigert, 1998). Well-constructed service-learning courses and programs focus on problem-solving, whereas most classroom-based coursework centers on learning subject matter and working with knowledge that rarely engages real issues and stakeholders outside the classroom (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Howard, 1998). The problem-centered

---

\(^{1}\) For an additional perspective on radical pedagogy, service learning, and movement-building see Mahoney (2002). Korten’s (1990) discussion of community development as a “peoples movement” (p. 113) also provides a useful conceptual framework for developing a movement-building approach to service learning.
nature of service learning has several implications for faculty. Content, format, delivery, activities, and teacher and student roles shift so dramatically that service-learning educators refer to their work as *counter-normative* (Clayton & Ash, 2004; Howard, 1998).

The pedagogical shifts that occur in service learning pose dilemmas throughout the semester that can cause faculty, students, administrators, and community members upheaval on both personal and professional levels (Clayton & Ash, 2004). The faculty role as *authority figure* gives way to a new role as resource and facilitator who supports students’ experiential learning in contexts outside the classroom (Howard, 1998). Learning becomes more active as students make choices about how to address problems that emerge from the social contexts where they are working (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003a). Besides renegotiating traditional faculty–student roles, service learning causes students and faculty to engage in new relationships with community stakeholders who have diverse interests, emotions, knowledge, experiences, values, etc. (Sandmann, Kiely & Grenier, 2009; Strand et al., 2003a). Other shifts include changes in the environment, technology, learning process, and criteria for evaluation (Clayton & Ash, 2004). Although these shifts can be challenging, our interactions with service-learning faculty in professional contexts suggest that most veteran service-learning educators are familiar with the dynamics of going from classroom-based pedagogy to service-learning work and have developed innovative strategies to assist students in adjusting to the experience.

In addition, the service-learning community has devoted substantial effort to ensure that knowledge about theories, outcomes, and processes in service learning has accumulated through research and conferences. Although these efforts bring cohesion to a diverse field, most of these efforts have aimed at justifying service learning as a pedagogical innovation to enhance student learning (Kiely, 2005). Ask a faculty member about service learning as an approach to organizational learning, research, policy, or community development and you’ll most likely get a blank stare. With a few exceptions, a review of service-learning research tends to reflect this imbalance. Thus, although service learning presents itself as counter-normative (Clayton & Ash, 2004; Howard, 1998) to conventional classroom pedagogy, this article, and our movement-building approach to service learning, provide a counter-normative response to conventional service-learning pedagogy.
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2 Various publications and professional communities have formed to assist in accumulating knowledge and advancing teaching, research, and scholarship in service learning. See Wingspread Conference’s principles of good practice, Special research issue of *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, and Volumes Advancing Service-Learning Research, as well as many other journals and conferences that take place regionally, nationally and internationally.
A pedagogical shift toward service learning as movement-building would require faculty to rethink how and where learning occurs in service learning. For example, the most important pedagogical innovation to emerge from the service-learning movement is the use of different types of reflection to primarily assist students in learning from their service work (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Eyler, Giles, & Schmeide, 1996; Hatcher, Bringle, & Muthiah, 2004). Much of the field embraces the notion that reflection is the key process that holds the service and learning together (Ash, Clayton, & Atkinson, 2005; Eyler & Giles, 1999, Eyler et al., 1996; Hatcher et al., 2004; Kiely, 2005). Based on our experience, reflection is a necessary, but not sufficient, strategy for fostering the multiple types of learning that actually occur in service learning (Kiely, 2002, 2005). As argued elsewhere, (see Kiely, 2002, 2005) the dominant discourse of reflective tradition in service learning, particularly within a constructivist set of assumptions, has profound implications for how reflection is understood (Brookfield, 2000b; Kegan, 2000; Kiely, 2005; Mezirow, 1998), how the relationship between service and learning is understood and practiced, and how service-learning courses and programs with community partners are planned, designed and implemented (Jacoby & Associates, 2003).

A movement-building approach to pedagogy considers the critical aspects of reflection (see Brookfield, 2000a, 2000b). Critical reflection shifts the focus of reflection from self-discovery, student learning, and practical dimensions of service to examine how relations of power, ideology, institutional arrangements, and social structures influence stakeholder participation in service-learning program planning, the origin and solution to community problems, and the development of sustainable campus–community partnerships (Kiely, 2002; 2005). A movement-building approach to pedagogy also gives equal weight to nonreflective forms of learning. A more critical evaluation of the reflective tradition in service learning, drawing from the rationalist and constructivist traditions of Dewey (1933), Kolb (1984), and Schon (1987), finds little mention of the structural dimensions of reflective learning (i.e., how context, ideology and relations of power shape the learning process) and how nonreflective forms of learning impact service-learning outcomes and processes (Fenwick, 2003; Kiely, 2002, 2005). In fact, we contend, based on our research and practice, that the most powerful transformative learning experiences stem from intentionally structuring service-learning program activities before, during, and after the program to engage students in critically reflective learning and contextual, emotional, visceral, and connected forms of learning (Kiely, 2002, 2005).

For example, Kiely’s (2002, 2005) longitudinal research provides ample empirical evidence that participants in global service learning engage in both reflective and nonreflective forms of learning. The combination of contextual
factors and reflective, connected, visceral, and emotional forms of learning assisted students in understanding their service experiences and, importantly, led to diverse transformations in perspective, lifestyle, and ongoing commitment to struggling with social action work (Kiely, 2002).

Kiely’s (2002) research also found that reflection needed to go beyond students’ identity development and practical aspects of their service work; it needed to be more critically attuned to how context, ideology, hegemony, history, institutions, and policies affect how people perceive and approach social problems and campus-community relationships. For example, Kiely and colleagues intentionally design service and learning activities in Nicaragua so students have direct contact with community members with a variety of spiritual, political, cultural, medical, and ideological perspectives (Kiely, 2002). Community members participate in service work and also coteach seminars. Kiely and colleagues also select readings, seminar and reflection materials, and activities to supplement and inform their community interactions. Students interact with doctors who practice western medicine, herbalists, sukas, midwives, health officials, nonprofits, and community members through clinics, internships, interviews, presentations, and research (Kiely, 2002). Kiely’s (2002, 2004, 2005) research and teaching show that with such interactions, students and community members are exposed to diverse understandings of social problems, of relationship-building and of how campus-community partnerships should function, and they are more likely to critically examine their assumptions in many domains.

The curriculum of the Ithaca College–Justicia Global program\(^3\) involves a process connecting reflective and nonreflective learning. The approach adapts Justicia Global’s method of political education, called *Abrir los Ojos*, or eye-opening, which is a process of consciousness raising. This approach involves creating moments for eye-opening, or visceral or emotional, learning, which expose students to injustices. Then, reflective learning opportunities are created to analyze the structural causes of injustices and possibilities for change by revealing how grassroots organizations address injustices collectively. Setting up this process in a global service-learning context requires grassroots leadership and effective emotional support.

For example, in 2008, when students attended a collective work day of a peasant farmer’s association, called the Convite Association of San Ramón, farmers explained that for the last 30 years they have worked 1 day each week on each others’ land. This time, several members of the Convite were absent for a funeral for a man who lived in a remote area. Upon hearing that he died of hunger, one student captured the emotion of this eye-opening moment by asking, “How can people starve to death when

\(^3\) Justicia Global is a grassroots socio-political organization founded and based in the Dominican Republic that works to organize and mobilize people with the objective of building a society characterized by solidarity, equality, justice, and love (see www.justiciaglobal.com).
Beyond Pedagogy

I’m full after every meal?” Subsequent class discussions addressed the unjust global economic system in which the government neglects health, education, and economic support for the poor to privilege foreign and national elites through debt payments and mega-development projects. Students saw that the community and collective work of the Convite allowed for collective survival in this context. In evaluations, students described the Convite as a key eye-opening moment and wrestled with how to bring their commitment to collective work back to their communities.

The Ithaca College–Justicia Global program used two main strategies for providing effective emotional support to students. One was to train several students as mentors to provide emotional support for other students. Mentors should not reassure, judge, nor provide answers to their classmates, but encourage them to work through their feelings. A second strategy is to teach students skills for respectful listening to each other. Challenges occurred for students who typically dealt with emotions by isolating themselves, or who hesitated to open up with faculty or other students, but didn’t have skills for emotional work themselves. Relationships in the program improved when leaders paid attention to students’ emotional issues, created a structure for mentorships, and modeled effective processing.

As a service-learning field, we have substantial evidence to defend the claim that reflective learning with a constructivist bent leads to self-reflective learning and increases students’ understanding of disciplinary content (Eyler & Giles, 1999). However, we cannot make the same claim with regard to deeper, more transformative learning that leads students to engage in and commit to long-term social action (Kiely, 2004). The dominant discourse on reflection in service learning that draws from a constructivist tradition, although beneficial for reflecting on one’s self and practice, will not lead students to reevaluate how relations of power, positionality, ideology, and hegemony constrain individual thinking and social action (see Fenwick, 2003; Kiely, 2002, 2005). Students must be engaged through structured activities and intentional experiences with community members whose perspectives challenge existing social arrangements. We have also selected reading materials and developed seminar- and community-based activities to focus student reflection on the structural dimensions of community problems they engage, as well as on their identity and positionality (i.e., nationality, gender, class, race, ethnicity) and the disparities embedded within these social and historical constructions (Kiely, 2002)

Deeper connections with community members and organizations that offer a structural critique of capitalist ideology and with community members who struggle to survive within such a system, often cause students to develop a more critical understanding of how power relations and existing socioeconomic and political arrangements might be flawed. This coupling of critique and relationships with community members leads to profound reflective and nonreflective, i.e., emotional, visceral, affective, empathic,
and spiritual, forms of learning (Kiely, 2002, 2004). From our research and practice (Kiely, 2002, 2004, 2005), service learning as a movement-building approach to pedagogy tends to lead students and faculty and community members to question existing social, economic, and political institutions. It is not surprising then, that once faculty, students, and community partners step outside a more narrowly defined pedagogical box, they search for ways to change the structures and practices of the institutions and organizations they are affiliated with (Kiely, 2004). It is these new institutional, research, and community development approaches that we now discuss in the next three sections.

SERVICE LEARNING AS AN APPROACH TO INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND CHANGE

A movement-building approach to service learning means developing an effective approach to organizational learning and/or institutional change. It is not unusual to observe a number of discrete service-learning courses offered each semester on college campuses. Yet, it is rare to find participants in service-learning courses collaborating across departments and disciplines, communicating results and/or connecting the knowledge generated through their service-learning coursework to their department faculty, college administrators, and institutional leaders (Furco, 2000; Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, & Kerrigan, 2001; Holland, 1997; Jacoby & Associates, 2003). It is even more infrequent for faculty and students to transfer knowledge from service-learning courses to wider audiences outside the service setting—including community members, academics, policymakers, and business leaders (see Jacoby & Associates, 2003; Sandmann et al., 2009). An institutional approach to service learning highlights the need to develop social networks and communicate the knowledge and impact of service-learning work to important stakeholders in one’s home institution, not only to raise awareness of the social contribution students have made and seek recognition and/or support, but also to foster learning within the institution on the value of service learning (Shrader, Saunders, Marullo, Benatti, & Weigert, 2008). Importantly, a number of scholars have recognized the value of an institutional approach to service learning and have conducted research on institutional factors and structures that enhance and/or hinder service-learning programming (Furco, 2000; Gelmon et al., 2001; Holland, 1997; Jacoby & Associates, 2003). A number of useful measurement tools, criteria, and rubrics have emerged from this research that give the field dimensions for weak and robust institutional models for service learning and engagement (Furco, 2000; Gelmon et al., 2001; Holland, 1997). In spite of this, much of the institutional work often does not inform, provide guidance, and/or encourage faculty and student participation in institutional change.
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as a part of their service-learning course experience (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Furco, 2000; Reardon, 2006; Strand et al., 2003b). We feel that it is often the case that faculty work on service-learning courses is separate from institutionalizing service learning.

One consequence of this separation, especially when combined with the dominant pedagogical approach in service learning, is that it has led to exaggerated attention in the field on student learning to the neglect of community and institutional participation, learning, and change. Even when research is carried out to better understand and support institutionalization of service learning (Furco, 2000; Gelmon et al., 2001; Holland, 1997), it tends to be framed as a separate endeavor disconnected from student and faculty service-learning course work. As a result, faculty tend to focus on integrating service learning in coursework and students enrolled in these courses fulfill service requirements, but very little of their attention is focused on how to harness long-term institutional support and community participation. As a way to overcome this disconnect, an institutional approach to service learning explicitly incorporates program planning theory and models to inform service-learning curricula and program partnerships (Sandmann et al., 2009). Further, an institutional approach to service learning engages in social movement organizing toward collective and institutional change.

For example, when teaching a program planning course that incorporated service learning, Kiely realized that planning models that consider the technical, practical, and political dimensions of educational program design provided a number of useful frameworks for rethinking service-learning course development (Caffarella, 2002; Cervero & Wilson, 1994, 2005; Kiely, 2007; Sandmann et al., 2009). Drawing from Cervero and Wilson’s (1994, 2005) program planning model, which explicitly theorizes how educators negotiate the practical dimensions of stakeholder power and interests, Kiely transformed his service-learning courses into programs and partnerships that were stakeholder driven and interdisciplinary (see Kiely, 2007; Sandmann et al., 2009). In this way, Kiely saw his service-learning work not only as an innovative approach to pedagogy with students, but also as an approach to institutional learning and change. Such a shift led to networking in the institution and community to find partners to support service-learning projects and student-led projects that focused on structural change within the university as a way to support service learning more effectively in different community contexts (Kiely, 2007).

For example, Kiely taught graduate-level university courses in program planning and community development that focused on advancing service learning on campus, as well as immigrant access to higher education. A community advisory board informed the design of each graduate service-learning course and, as a result, evolved into more substantial program partnership aimed at understanding and addressing a specific issue (i.e., how do we advance service learning and develop more inclusive campus–community
partnerships and how do we provide immigrant communities greater access to higher education?). By including community stakeholders in the planning process, the course, which originated in an institution of higher education, generated a campus–community partnership with a network of stakeholders from nonprofit institutions, organizations, and government agencies (Sandmann et al., 2009).

The goals of the original course outline focused heavily on student-learning outcomes but, after 4 years, program goals expanded to include institutionalizing service learning, and changing policies and institutional support to provide greater access to immigrant communities (Sandmann et al., 2009). The shift from course to program partnerships with multiple stakeholders led to a diverse set of outcomes that went beyond student learning. The service-learning program resulted in new relationships, greater community stakeholder participation and the creation of resources, positions, and structures meant to enhance campus–community partnerships (Sandmann et al., 2009).

For a number of years, Kiely’s service-learning research and teaching focused on course development, student learning, and working with community partners (see Kiely, 2002; Kiely & Nielsen, 2003). However, increasingly, he became aware that service learning as a course-based endeavor, although impacting student learning and community members, was consistently underresourced and peripheral to the core mission and structure of the higher education institution that sponsored the program, and, as a result, was limited in its ability to foster institutional commitment and more substantial community and economic development. Indeed, beyond course offerings and faculty and student involvement, other departments and programs in the sponsoring institution had limited connection with the community and program. There were no institutional structures (i.e., service-learning office, departmental/collegewide commitment of resources, partnership agreement, exchanges, etc.) to assist students, staff, faculty members, and community members in planning, designing, and implementing service-learning courses, programs, and campus–community partnerships.

To address this concern, Kiely offered students enrolled in a service-learning course the option to design a project with institutional and community stakeholders as a way to understand how to make their institutions and organizations more service learning friendly. Students conducted a benchmarking study on service learning at peer institutions. They designed and distributed service-learning surveys to faculty members, students, staff members, and community members, and conducted interviews and focus groups with stakeholders to better understand how to foster service learning and more collaborative and sustainable campus–community partnerships. Based on their research, students produced a report for faculty and senior university administrators with recommendations on how the University might support service-learning courses and campus–community
partnerships. Over 3 years, this project had an important impact on the institutional leaders’ decision making, resources, and support for service learning. Interestingly, Kiely’s experience suggests that service learning can promote institutional learning and change as way to support service learning on campus and in the community (Kiely, 2007). Although institutional barriers (i.e., curricula, tenure, interdepartmental collaboration, community access) and disparities in resource allocations continued to impact the quality and sustainability of the service-learning program, the shift from pedagogy to program planning to institutional planning initiated greater stakeholder participation and the seeds to greater movement-building in service learning were sown (Kiely, 2007; Sandmann et al., 2009).

Swords (2005) also realized that the values of a social movement for global justice were not at the core of the mission of higher education. The Ithaca College–Justicia Global program aims to bring these values to a more central position. Swords and Dominican colleagues and movement leaders first began conversations about transnational organizing in 2001, and in 2006, a full year before their first program, began brainstorming possibilities for a different sort of international study program. Their experience suggests that building collaborative relationships for a movement-centered program requires time, patience, and care to create the trust to work together.

The movement-centered approach begins before the trip by connecting students with grassroots leaders in their own community and continues during the trip as students get to know Justicia Global’s members. After the program, students are encouraged to bring organizing strategies back to their own communities as they join an emerging network of relationships.

Central to the Ithaca College–Justicia Global approach to service learning is coplanning between faculty and a grassroots movement organization. Coplanning activities flip the power relationships in which northern faculty determine the program without regard for local needs and objectives. Besides international travel, e-mail correspondence, and phone calls, coplanning required working with different and sometimes contradictory objectives. Justicia Global hoped to strengthen their own leadership-building processes while guiding students in becoming community organizers. The College mainly focuses on institutional objectives of public relations and the education only of their own students. According to Swords’ (2005) fieldnotes,

From the college I felt the pressures of a bureaucratic logic that required the program to make a profit, imposed an accounting regime that fit poorly with local realities, and introduced a culture of liability. I struggled to keep the transformational goals at the center of our work.

Swords and colleagues (2010) found many institutional barriers to effective movement-driven service learning. The schedule and budget priorities
of the College were often incompatible with the rhythms and values of community work. At first, College administrators questioned Swords’ budget proposal. Swords and Dominican colleagues had to communicate clearly to make sure that local expertise was recognized.

Support for movement-driven service learning requires universities to change curricula, faculty responsibilities and budget. To date, pre- and postprogram mentoring and community-building have been accomplished entirely in a volunteer capacity. College support could include creating a required curricular sequence with pre- and postprogram courses and activities.

We have found that unpacking traditional discourses on reflection and incorporating program planning models with frameworks for analyzing stakeholder interests, resources, power, and participation has led us to consider not only how service-learning pedagogy affects student content learning, but also how service learning is affected by, and in turn affects, institutional structures and community relations. A movement-building approach to service-learning pedagogy is an ongoing process that should be driven by curricula, as well as community and institutional stakeholders. Consistent with program-planning models (Cervero & Wilson, 2005; Sandmann, Kiely, & Grenier, 2009), such a shift means that assessment is expanded to include processes and outcomes related to student learning, the quality of participation among diverse stakeholders, program partnerships, resource allocation, and institutional change.

In sum, a movement approach to institutional learning and change shifts the faculty focus from curricula, pedagogy, reflection, and student learning of disciplinary content to examining how the higher education institution supports and/or precludes meaningful campus–community partnerships. It means drawing from theories of planning and organizational change and focusing on identifying and organizing campus and community stakeholders, finding allies and building coalitions to support service-learning partnerships (Furco, 2000; Gelmon et al., 2001; Holland, 1997; Jacoby & Associates, 2003; Kiely, 2007; Sandmann et al., 2009).

RESEARCH: PROBLEMATIZING KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION AND USE

Service learning is also a useful approach for engaging in research and public scholarship (Kiely, 2007; Reardon, 1997; Shrader et al., 2008; Strand et al., 2003a). Unlike traditional classroom-based courses, undergraduate students have very little opportunity to conduct collaborative research that generates knowledge for addressing a community problem or that informs a wider audience outside the classroom (Reardon, 1994, 1997; Strand et al., 2003b). Service-learning courses provide excellent opportunities for undergraduate
students to learn how to undertake research and present knowledge that raises public awareness and understanding on possible sources and solutions to complex social problems. A movement-building approach to research in service learning requires students and other stakeholders to construct knowledge to better understand and improve people, programs, practices, institutions, communities, and policies (Kiely, 2007; Reardon, 1997; Nyden, Figert, Shibley, & Burrows, 1997a; Strand et al., 2003b). Such a shift necessarily entails problematizing traditional approaches to knowledge construction and use in institutions of higher education (Greenwood & Levin, 1998).

Kiely has incorporated research into his service-learning work in a number of ways. First, he conducted research on his own coursework aimed at program improvement, but also conducted longitudinal research to advance knowledge in the field (Kiely, 2002, 2004, 2005). His research has focused on how students learn, generating learning theory in service learning and assessing the transformative impact of service learning on students, faculty, and communities (Kiely, 2002, 2004, 2005). Kiely has incorporated into the design of service-learning courses a focus on research and, in particular, an emphasis on gaining an understanding of how knowledge is constructed in universities and in communities. He has also worked with colleagues to conduct studies to better understand the process of engaging in collaborative research with stakeholders (Sandmann et al., 2009). This type of service-learning coursework encourages students to engage in community-based research and to ask questions about how knowledge is constructed, who constructs knowledge, how knowledge is used, and who benefits from knowledge generated in universities? (Chambers, 1998; Deshler & Grudens-Schuck, 2000; Greenwood & Levin, 1998; Sandmann et al., 2009).

Incorporating research and epistemological questions into service-learning courses has a number of implications. Students often begin to better understand and appreciate the role of research and the practical, political, and value-laden nature of knowledge construction. When students conduct research with community members, they begin to value local knowledge and see that there are multiple valid sources and uses of knowledge and research (Kiely, 2004; Reardon, 1994, 1997; Strand et al., 2003a). At the same time, community partners appreciate the fact that university stakeholders value their knowledge. Community members and organizations also receive research training, share resources, and conduct collaborative research with university stakeholders that is more specifically aimed at solving community problems defined by experience and engagement, rather than originating in hypotheses developed by university researchers in isolation from community and context (Reardon, 1997, 2006; Strand et al., 2003b).

Although research with communities is key to problematizing how universities understand knowledge generation and use, as well as how to learn
research skills and value the multiple locations and uses of knowledge, finding space within institutions, courses and service-learning programs to prepare students for conducting research in communities is challenging (Shrader et al., 2008; Strand et al., 2003b). Often, the research training occurs as an add-on to predeparture programming and/or on-site and both of the authors have experienced a number of challenges in training students how to do research while doing it. For example, both Kiely and Swords incorporated stakeholder and asset-mapping (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993) into coursework and incorrectly assumed that students already had, or would have, little difficulty developing the skills to map stakeholders and assets. More often than not, students had never examined or mapped dimensions of a community or the stakeholders that constitute a community. Time is often spent examining the meaning of community, how it is defined and understood, by whom, and so on. In the end, considerable attention is devoted to researching context and identifying those who have a stake in the program and/or partnership prior to learning research design, sampling, data gathering methods, data analysis, interpretation, reporting and presentation of findings. In addition, attention is also spent identifying the foci of research, resources, time commitments, skill development, and stakeholder participation in the research process. Another consideration has to do with requirements for research with human subjects and ethical considerations. Given the challenges associated with engaging in community-based research, it is not surprising that faculty members are less inclined to pursue research opportunities partnering students with community members and as a result, compelling empirical examples in the literature are few and far between (Jacoby & Associates, 2003; Nyden, Figert, Shibley, & Burrows, 1997b; Reardon, 1994, 1997, 2006; Strand et al., 2003b). Our experience conducting research within service-learning programs has taken on different forms before, during and after program participation.

In initial meetings, Swords and Justicia Global members decided that students would not conduct individual research projects in the Dominican Republic because they did not have the skills, background, or time to contribute useful research, and because taking a traditional research posture would create distance and assume a false knowledge monopoly over their Dominican peers. Instead, students’ final project is a letter of commitment to identify lessons for social change that they will take home to their communities. Swords and colleagues from Justicia Global are engaged in an action research project to systematize knowledge constructed through this program about leadership building and processes of transformational learning.

Kiely and colleagues have also incorporated a covenant or contract for individual and social action into service-learning course requirements. Students attach their covenant to the end of reflection papers submitted after returning to the United States. Kiely found that having a covenant allowed students to focus their reflection more concretely and helped alleviate some
of the difficulties adjusting to the United States post-service learning in Nicaragua (Kiely, 2002, 2004). In addition to a covenant that reflects students’ understanding of, and commitment to, social responsibility, Kiely and colleagues train students in participatory action research methods prior to the program and require students to research the culture, history, and context of the community and associate issues and problems that are the focus of service work (Kiely, 2007). Students have the opportunity to participate in ongoing community-based research projects. To ensure continuity of collaborative research, Kiely and other faculty members must continue to work with community partners, as well as to incorporate projects into service-learning and related coursework (Kiely, 2007; Kiely & Nielsen, 2003). In some cases, students continue work with community and institutional stakeholders as part of independent study courses. Finally, students are required to share their research with stakeholders and/or with students who participate in service-learning programs in subsequent semesters, ensuring that knowledge generated through community-based research is presented and used by multiple stakeholders (Kiely, 2007). This process also means that students and community members can build on previous knowledge generated through the service-learning program. In this way, knowledge construction and use benefits multiple stakeholders and is more sustainable. It behooves faculty to keep in mind the community refrain, “The university has done a lot of research here but, as far as we know, it has never been used.”

**SERVICE LEARNING AS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: A MOVEMENT-BUILDING VISION**

Last, we have learned that service learning is a useful approach to community development (Korten, 1990; Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). Service-learning courses should be structured with a set of short- and long-term goals and objectives that supplement and complement existing project work locally and/or to build capacity (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993; Nyden et al., 1997b; Reardon, 2006). It is rare for a semester-long service-learning course to make a substantial contribution to alleviating long-standing and complex community problems. Using service-learning as a community development approach means demonstrating a willingness to commit to long-term community capacity building through relationship building with stakeholders, coursework, research, resources, technology, and ongoing networking (Nyden, et al., 1997b; Reardon, 1997, 2006). Service learning as a community development approach means developing a movement-building vision that finds linkages and integrates each approach to service learning into a more robust theoretical framework for guiding practice.

To ensure the movement from a focus on pedagogy to an understanding of service learning as community development, we ask our students
to engage in readings and discussions that assist them in understanding community and development and different theoretical approaches and frameworks for understanding community development. We assign readings and activities before, during, and after the program to ensure that students understand community development, organizing and social movement literature, and how these practices include community stakeholders and local and international organizations.

Korten's (1990) four-fold framework is useful for understanding community development as an approach to technical assistance, community capacity building, policy change, and movement-building through a network of voluntary action. Students also attend seminars and presentations in which community organizations explain their approaches to community development. Students work in local organizations and learn first-hand by participating in activities that foster the goals, mission, and vision of the organization. Students gain a substantial understanding of the strengths and limitations of theories and approaches and the concrete and historical macro and micro dimensions of community development that have been used in specific community context. Students’ on-site experience working within local community development organizations provides them with a deeper knowledge of the complex nature of community development and they begin to develop their own theory of community development. Not surprisingly, this emerging theory often include an examination of how well the service-learning program they participated in fosters community development viewed through the literature, their experience, and multiple stakeholder lenses (Kiely, 2002, 2004).

Service-learning programs reflect underlying theories about how community development should occur and what knowledge it requires (Kiely, 2007). For example, global service-learning programs based on modernization theories educate US students in area studies and positivist research for development institutions. Graduates of these programs are hired as experts to develop less-developed countries. Some service-learning programs teach about historical relations of exploitation and oppression and question the universality of US and European development, drawing on dependency theories (see Gunder Frank, 1969, for example) or World-Systems analysis (Wallerstein, 1974). Yet, they tend to assume that global capitalism will impose its logic on local communities, assuming precisely what research should examine, which, thereby, undermines possibilities for change. Postmodern approaches “dwell on fleeting experiences, telltale anecdotes or aesthetic works that offer glimpses into a fractured, fragmented, all-encompassing ‘globality’” (Burawoy, et al., 2000).

The Ithaca College–Justicia Global program reflects critiques of conventional development theories as it aims to build knowledge for transforming the current economic system. Its analysis reflects Mohanty’s (2003) pedagogy of solidarity, originally intended for US university women’s studies programs. Rather than a tourist approach, to teach about the Third World as Other, or a
comparative approach that simply highlights differences among social experiences, the solidarity approach supports students in identifying possibilities for global solidarity and collaborative actions. The program intends students to see local relationships with broader global processes (including colonialism, capitalism, and neoliberalism), and relationships among communities, and envision possibilities for coordinated movement-building.

The program employs a pedagogy of solidarity (Mohanty, 2003) before, during, and after the program. For example, students met hotel workers in Ithaca, NY, as well as miners, free trade zone workers, and sugar cane cutters in Dominican Republic. Student evaluations revealed that these encounters motivated them to see themselves as part of a larger movement for social change.

Based on our reflections, we propose a vision of a movement-driven university. This vision suggests that the institutions dedicated to knowledge construction should be centered on the needs of people most directly affected by the oppressive systems in our society. Most universities are quite far from this vision, as key players in the contemporary ideological and material reproduction of exploitative labor relations. Our vision is that universities pay close attention to and follow the lead of the growing social movement for social and ecological justice. Service learning is a key part of this vision and must include organizing and relationship-building with diverse stakeholders within the university and community.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

We write this article with unabashed enthusiasm for the movement-building local and global service-learning programs we are involved in, as well as with great appreciation for the challenges faced by anyone who takes on this work. In conclusion, we offer a reflection on the challenges and opportunities in movement-driven service learning.

The model described here is primarily aimed at faculty and draws from a developmental framework (Kiely, 2007) entailing four dimensions to service learning. Importantly, the service-learning model offers three additional conceptual lenses (i.e., institutional, research, and community development) for faculty to reflect on as they consider the limitations of a purely pedagogical approach to service-learning (Kiely, 2007). Although movement-building service-learning thrives on collaboration and relationship building, an

---

4 The Poverty Initiative at Union Theological Seminary in New York City offers a model by which a university can dedicate resources and curricula to building a movement to end poverty with leaders at the center of the knowledge-building process (see www.povertyinitiative.org). In this model, universities move from community involvement and service learning to engagement and collaboration with social movement organizations alumni and trustees etc.
important implication to emphasize is that faculty, at least for the present, remain at the core of this approach (Sandmann et al., 2009). In addition to the central role that faculty members play in planning, designing, and implementing each of the four service-learning dimensions, it is important for faculty to consider how to bridge each of the four approaches. We discuss the implications for faculty in particular in learning how to navigate and work with each of the four approaches. Understanding how to negotiate dimensions within each approach and creating linkages among them is key to getting beyond pedagogy and fostering movement-building service learning.

From our experience, it has become clear that faculty who lead movement-driven service-learning must take on a variety of roles beyond pedagogue and facilitator. Although service-learning faculty often start with coursework and there is a temptation to succumb to the obsession with curricular development and reflective tools, faculty who have been working in communities for a long time begin to develop the realization that course-based service learning that moves toward a movement-building vision needs to address the flaws in existing institutional arrangements within the sponsoring institution that preclude more substantial and sustainable campus–community partnerships (Jacoby & Associates, 2003; Sandmann et al., 2009). Faculty members that embrace a movement-building model begin to see their role as more than teachers, reflective technicians, and facilitators of coursework. Their concerns extend beyond students’ learning, the practical dimensions of service work and how to process the experience within their discipline. Faculty members in movement-building service learning become reflective practitioners, mediators, organizers, and change agents who work with a variety of stakeholders in their home institution, in community organizations and in communities outside the institution (Sandmann et al., 2009). One’s role and affiliation shifts according to ongoing assessment of stakeholder needs and interests (Sandmann et al., 2009). Connecting service-learning pedagogy with institutional change, faculty members must begin to identify and include the interests of important institutional stakeholders (i.e., department faculty, Chair, Dean, Provost, President, Staff, other departments and so on) into their emerging service-learning program and partnership.

Leadership in this area of service-learning program design is inherently political and affects stakeholder participation, relations of power, and decision-making (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, 2005). Faculty members must take a stand on issues; they cannot hide behind a cloak of objectivity. It also means that faculty leaders will need to learn how to listen more attentively to marginalized stakeholders and represent their interests in faculty meetings and decision-making bodies to ensure that neglected stakeholders have a voice in university decision-making processes around long-term budgeting, strategic planning, and resource allocation. This type of role means that
faculty members must be prepared to take risks and to face fairly challenging political and moral dilemmas, including the possibility of risking tenure and/or alienating other colleagues. Offering to lead a movement-driven university program invites criticism ranging from “Don’t you think you should focus on your tenure file?” to “Don’t you think it’s too dangerous to bring students there?” to criticisms of the worldviews and ideological perspectives of participants and collaborators. This approach also invites the possibility that others may attempt to co-opt the program to fit with their own agendas. It is critical to develop a clear analysis with stakeholders’ set of interests, capital, and decision-making authority to maintain clarity on goals, vision, and objectives; especially because funders, administrators, and others will propose collaborations that may or may not have grassroots stakeholders and their values in mind (Sandmann et al., 2009).

Faculty members who lead these programs must also act as organizers in their institutions. They must strategize to gain institutional support, to develop collective vision, clarity, and skills, and to prevent programs from being led by one visionary, charismatic individual. Faculty must find strategies to avoid burn-out and advocate for themselves and for others so that their leadership in these programs can count, for teaching, research, and service, especially in institutions that place heavy demands on faculty. An institutional approach to service learning suggests the need to engage more thoughtfully with organizational theories and practices that address the barriers imposed on service learning by existing structures and conventional practice in higher education institutions. Such barriers, which are well known in the literature but very rarely incorporated into faculty and students’ service-learning coursework and programming, include the lack of long-term institutional commitment, resource allocation, disciplinary myopia, promotion and tenure, and so on (see Furco, 2000; Holland, 1997; Shrader et al., 2008). Movement-building service learning that connects pedagogy to institutionalization of service learning means shifting one’s criteria for success and assessment of outcomes from students’ learning toward institutional change. Indeed, part of the shift requires critical reflection on how institutional structures enhance and/or hinder service-learning programs and partnerships (Furco, 2000; Holland, 1997; Jacob & Associates, 2003; Sandmann et al., 2009; Shrader et al., 2008).

Movement-building service learning also compels faculty to rethink conventional approaches to research, knowledge construction, and use (Deshler & Grudenschuck, 2000; Greenwood & Levin, 1998; Strand et al., 2003b). How does one construct knowledge that is aimed at institutional and community change? What criterion does one use beyond objectivity, internal and external validity, and replicability, to ensure the quality of knowledge process and product? Does building stronger relationships with the community constitute success? Should community members participate in the design and implementation of a survey? Whose knowledge counts?
One way to address these questions is to incorporate into service-learning programs an explicit research dimension before, during, and after the project work is undertaken. As a way to link pedagogy, institutional, research, and community development approaches to service learning, we create advisory boards that include community members, students, and other faculty and staff members to solicit feedback on research and other service-learning programming. Campus–community partnerships that create advisory boards representing multiple stakeholder groups ensure that knowledge is constructed in both a systematic and inclusive manner. Faculty who use research as an approach to service learning need to consider research as a pedagogical device with students and community members as well as an approach for understanding and addressing specific community-based problems (Strand, 2000). Incorporating research into service-learning practices requires faculty members to be well versed in mixed-methods, prepared to train other stakeholders, and skilled in collaborating with multiple stakeholders—including stakeholders who are often marginalized from the process (see Deshler & Grudens-Schuck, 2000; Greenwood & Levin, 1998; Strand et al., 2003b).

Last, a movement-building approach to service learning requires faculty to create networks and ongoing linkages among stakeholders to build capacity and foster development as a more sustainable approach to campus–community partnerships (Jacoby & Associates, 2003; Korten, 1990; Sandmann et al., 2009; Shrader et al., 2008). Definitional issues aside, one might argue that all service-learning programs should, in some way, endeavor to facilitate community development in resource-poor communities, whether that’s building capacity in an area of concern (i.e., housing, food, access to water, health care, employment, education) or supplementing and/or complementing existing community initiatives (Reardon, 2006). A community development approach entails knowing what community development means to different stakeholders, and what community development approaches exist (Korten, 1990; Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993; Nyden et al., 1997b; Reardon, 2006) and what approach fits in a particular context. A community development approach in service learning requires stakeholders developing and committing to a short- and long-term vision for social change. For some faculty, such a commitment might seem risky and/or untenable, given myriad institutional barriers. However, based on our experience, what distinguishes a movement approach to service learning from a purely pedagogical approach to service learning is the integration of pedagogy, institutionalization, research, and community development into a more robust model for building sustainable campus–community partnerships (Kiely, 2007). Without going beyond pedagogy to build a service-learning movement, service-learning educators will continue to engage in a discourse of reflection, student learning, and service and the potential for more meaningful impact on communities, institutions, and knowledge will remain on
the periphery at best and invisible at worst. Like good organizers in any community context, the goal for faculty members leading movement-driven service learning should be to work themselves out of a job. We look forward to that day!
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