

Best Practices: Service-learning in Teacher Education in New Hampshire

Nitschke-Shaw, Debra, Bauer, Dottie, Brown, Meeta, Bryant, Laurie, Gibans-McGlashan, Amy, Taylor, Kyra, Muscott, Howard, Preble, William, Raymond, Angie, Scire, Deborah, Shumway, Debbie, and Warren Tilea,

Executive Summary

The integration of service-learning into teacher education programs in New Hampshire is relatively new. Each faculty member who has integrated service-learning has done so to a different degree (depending on where he or she is on the community service-service-learning developmental continuum.)

It is clear, however, that there are principles which guide teacher education programs that integrate service-learning into their curriculum.

1. An authentic community need and assets must be identified and clearly communicated to all partners in the service-learning experience.
2. Personal and participant goals, which must be developed, can only be developed when the need is clear.
3. The service-learning efforts of individual faculty members and their community partners must be aligned with the mission statements of their institutions.
4. Goals must be written in measurable terms so formative and summative evaluation tools can be created to monitor the progress individuals are making to meet the goals and, as a result, meet the need.
5. A plan to meet the student/community need must take into consideration the assets each partner has and must be done in collaboration with all partners. This

plan should be revisited throughout the project so that adjustments can be made as appropriate.

6. Preservice teachers should be given ownership for their project. The more ownership they have, the more learning that will occur. When possible, preservice teachers should work in collaboration with the youth in their placement sites to identify community needs and assets, develop a plan, implement the plan, evaluate progress, and celebrate and recognize the efforts of all participants.
7. Faculty must clearly link course content, course goals, critical skills and dispositions skills development to the service-learning project. Service-learning must be seen as a strategy to implement curriculum frameworks, not be seen as an add-on.
8. Identifying needs and assets, creating goals, developing a plan, implementing the plan, evaluating progress, celebrating the efforts of all participants is a collaborative process, a process that evolves as the project evolves.
9. Assessment tools and processes must be fully understood by all partners. Qualitative and quantitative data should be collected, and formative and summative evaluation should be included.
10. Reflection must be planned for, purposeful, and linked to course goals. A variety of reflective practices should be used to allow preservice teachers to use their diverse learning styles and to model for them creative reflection practices. For true learning to happen, students cannot just participate in a service-learning project. Instead, they must reflect on their experience to come to new

understandings, develop new skills, and make meaning out of their “real world” experiences.

11. Continual formal and informal communication must happen between and among all partners.
12. Everyone has expectations; it is essential that every partner share his/her expectations and see how the project can meet these expectations, if appropriate.
13. Training of all participants, supervisors, preservice teachers, and student participants, must be planned for and carried out.
14. Supervision of preservice teachers must provide opportunities for dialogue between all participants. In this way the need can be clarified, new goals developed as necessary, and the plan to meet the need adjusted as appropriate.
15. All participants must be recognized for their efforts.
16. Service-learning needs to be sanctioned by administrators and other leaders if the work of faculty and students is to be accepted and valued by others.
17. For service-learning initiatives between teacher education programs and other agencies to be successful, a partnership between these agencies needs to be developed and helped to grow if the efforts of all individuals are to be sustained.

In order for faculty in teacher education programs to feel comfortable integrating service-learning into their curriculum, they must be provided with support and their efforts must be recognized. In addition, the individuals who will be working with the preservice teachers and the preservice teachers must be trained in understanding service-learning as a philosophy and pedagogy. If we ultimately want our preservice teachers to use service-learning in their

classrooms, then we must systemically integrate service-learning into teacher education programs, teach preservice teachers and educators the pedagogy of service-learning, and provide the preservice teachers with role models, on the college campus and in our public and private schools, who demonstrate effective service-learning programs. And, we must develop meaningful partnerships resulting in learning communities in which service-learning can occur.

Acknowledgments

There were many individuals and agencies who supported the efforts of the Research Group, and to all of them we extend our gratitude. The State Department of Education, under the guidance of Joanne Baker and Michelle Jones, provided the funding to support our work. The Campus Compact for New Hampshire, under the guidance of Amy Gibans-McGlashan and Debby Scire, was instrumental in helping to facilitate the research project. The faculty who graciously agreed to allow us to visit their classes, interview them, their students and community partners, provided the Research Group with invaluable information. And, the Corporation for National Service, who continually supports the efforts of those engaged in service-learning.

The Research Group members should also be acknowledged as they spent countless hours preparing for the study, conducting the study, analyzing data, and reviewing the report. A special thanks should be extended to the preservice teachers, Tilea Warren, Angie Raymond, Debbie Shumway, and Kyra McIntyre, who provided the Research Group members with their insight, which was invaluable. And our community partners, Meeta Brown and Laurie Bryant, provided the rest of the Research Group with an educator's perspective, for which we are most grateful.

Lastly, New England College should be acknowledged for its support of this work. Many long hours were spent at the College developing the plan, analyzing data, and sharing our thoughts on service-learning. For those of us involved in the study, it has been a remarkable professional development opportunity.

Introduction

The Best Practices of Service-learning in Teacher Education Research Group (Research Group), has been working since August 1997 to determine the “Best Practices” of service-learning in teacher education in New Hampshire. The Research Group has been comprised of four teacher education faculty members, Dr. Debra Nitschke-Shaw, Associate Professor and Director of Teacher Education, New England College (coordinator of the research project), Dr. Dottie Bauer, Assistant Professor, Keene State College, Dr. Howard Muscott, Director of Special Education, Rivier College, and Dr. William Preble, Assistant Professor of Education, New England College, two K-12 educators, Meeta Brown, Weare Middle School, and Laurie Bryant, Con-Val Regional School District, two community members, Amy Gibans-McGlashan, Director of Campus Compact for New Hampshire, and Deborah Scire, Program Coordinator for Campus Compact for New Hampshire, and four preservice teacher education students, Kyra McIntyre, Keene State College, Angie Raymond, AmeriCorps Education Award Only, New England College, Debbie Shumway, Graduate Assistant for Service Learning, Keene State College, and Tilea Warren, AmeriCorps Education Award Only Member, New England College.

Eight courses were studied, which involved eight faculty members, their students, and community partners who were interviewed. The eight faculty members were from five colleges in New Hampshire ranging from small, private institutions: Colby Sawyer (Dr. Georgia McMahon), New England College (Dr. Debra Nitschke-Shaw, Dr. William Preble, and Dr. Kathe Simons) and Rivier College (Dr. Howard Muscott), to larger, public institutions: Keene State College (Dr. Debbie Black and Dr. Dottie Bauer), and Plymouth State College (Dr. Gary

Ritchie and Dr. Leo Sandy). The courses ranged from introductory courses in teacher education to foundations courses and courses in special education. Incorporating service-learning into teacher education in New Hampshire is relatively new, hence, there were no students who were student teaching who could be interviewed for this study.

Definition of Key Terms

The first step the Research Group took was to determine a definition of service-learning to guide their work. This was accomplished by reviewing a variety of definitions including those authored by the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (1991), Timothy Stanton (1990), Robert Shumer (1993), the Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990's (1991), the Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform (1993), and the Corporation for National Service. In addition, the Research Group reviewed many articles and appropriate publications such as Standards of Quality for School-Based and Community-Based Service-Learning, the Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform (1995), Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning: A Wingspread Special Report (1989), and Standards of Quality for School-Based Service-Learning from the Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform (1993).

As a result of this review, the Research Group created a definition which they shared with various stakeholder groups: teacher education faculty members, preservice teachers, K-12 teachers, and community members. After many iterations and reviews by many stakeholders, the Research Group decided to create separate definitions for each stakeholder group to help explain service-learning to each group and to guide the Research Group's work. The definitions are as follows:

Service-learning may best be defined as both a philosophy and a pedagogical approach to effectively teach diverse learners. It is designed to meet specific community needs through collaborative, planful experiences and frequent, substantive, and creative reflection aimed at meeting intentional social and academic goals. Service-learning in teacher education requires effective collaboration among teacher educators in higher education, preservice teachers, professional educators, and community members.

Community Members:

Service-learning is an educational approach which provides thoughtfully organized experiences which integrate students' academic learning with service that meets actual community needs. Through service-learning, partnerships are formed between students and community members and organizations. It is through these partnerships that community needs are identified and plans for meeting the needs are formulated. Students utilize and expand on knowledge they have gained in the classroom and apply the knowledge to help solve community issues and/or provide needed service to a community.

K-12 Educators:

Service-learning is a teaching/learning method that connects meaningful community service experiences with academic learning, personal growth, and civic responsibility. In its essence, service-learning requires three basic interconnected components – an identified community need, a delineated set of learning outcomes to be mastered, and planned opportunities for reflection.

Faculty in Teacher Education:

As a philosophy of education, service-learning reflects the belief that education must develop social responsibility and prepare students to be active participants in democratic life. The most effective learning is active and connected to experience in some meaningful way. As a pedagogical approach, service-learning is a method by which young people learn and develop through active participation in thoughtful organized service experiences:

- that meet actual community need in a respectful and mutually beneficial way.
- that are defined, planned, implemented, and coordinated in collaboration with the students, schools, and the community.
- that are integrated into the academic curriculum.
- that provide structured time for frequent, substantive, and creative reflection.
- that provide opportunities for students to develop critical thinking and use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real life situations.
- that enhances and extends learning for all participants.
- that helps to foster the development of caring, civic responsibility, and global stewardship.
- that include ongoing assessment using appropriate strategies.
- that recognizes the individual and collective efforts of all participants.

(Adapted from definitions supplied by National and Community Service Act of 1990, the Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s, and the Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform.)

Preservice Teachers:

Service-learning is a method of instruction in which students learn the content of the curriculum while actively participating in and reflecting on experiences that benefit the community and the students. Service-learning involves identifying the community need and academic content to be learned, choosing experiences that connect the content of the course to the challenges that exist in the community, participating in the service, and reflecting on how the service experience connects to the course content and the lives of both the participants and the recipients. In its essence, service-learning requires three basic and interconnected components – an identified community need, a delineated set of learning outcomes to be mastered, and planned opportunity for reflection.

Rationale for Service-learning

To some, service-learning is an educational philosophy, a “belief that education must be linked to social responsibility and that the most effective learning is active and connected to experiences in some meaningful way” (Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s). To others, it is a strategy which applies core course concepts through significant service to the community. This integration of academic and experiential learning requires guided reflection to clarify academic, personal, and civic learning. Service-learning teaches that education does not come in isolation, it involves the whole community. Boyer (1987, p. 9) supports this when he states that “the goal [of service-learning] is to help students consider the connection between what they learn and how they live” (National Youth Leadership Council, 1991, p. 19).

Service-learning has been described as a pedagogical approach that combines authentic community service, addressing a need or problem in the community, with integrated academic outcomes, and curriculum-based learning (Erickson & Anderson, 1997; Wade, 1997). Service-learning provides students with opportunities to develop skills and knowledge in “real world” settings. Myers (1995) states that “service-learning is a dynamic process that stretches the mind, opens the heart and makes connections between what kids need to learn and what life is all about beyond the fortress walls of the classroom” (p. 1). Anderson and Guest (1995) state that “service-learning offers opportunities for academic and social development through active engagement with the environment, in this case through actions directed toward the welfare of others (Dewey, 1938)” (p. 13).

Service-learning brings together two continua, community service and learning. Community service engages people in service to their community as a means to develop pro-social skills and positive moral attitudes. Service-learning attempts to make academic learning more authentic and thereby, more effective for more and diverse groups of learners. Thus, service-learning brings together the two continua into one set of pedagogical principles and behaviors (Michigan Community Service Commission, p. 15).

What distinguishes service-learning from community service is that service is deliberately integrated with learning objectives (Root, 1997) and reflection is planned and purposeful. According to Hill and Pope (1997), “experience alone is not enough; students need help making the link between service and learning, and reflection is the key to this link” (p. 107). Halperin (1996) states that individuals

do not learn solely from experience. . . . What we do learn from is reflection on our experience, that is integration of the new information with our previous learning, our

personal values, and our life situations. When experience ‘fits’ what is perceived to be important, useful, and valuable (that is, relevant), this is true learning. (National Association of Partners in Education Inc., p. 2)

Service-learning is founded on a number of theories of pedagogy including experiential learning, transformation theory, comprehensive multicultural educational theory, critical reflection theory, and education as preparation for civic responsibility (Anderson & Guest, 1995; Erickson & Anderson, 1997). Anderson and Guest (1995) state that the

experiential approach to learning holds that knowledge is generated by approaches that engage students in performing actions in a particular situation, observing the effects of that action, then understanding the general principles of operation because of the understanding of a particular experience, and finally applying the principles in operation in new situations. (p. 13)

The transformational (or social reconstructivist theory) concentrates on personal and social change. Service-learning “engages students in critical examination of their own lives and of the society around them” (Anderson & Guest, 1995, p. 14). The multicultural education approach focuses on human relations, among other things. Service-learning “[empowers] students with the knowledge and skills to make changes in their own lives and in their communities” (Anderson & Guest, 1995, p. 14).

The emphasis on critical reflection supports the development of critical thinking skills which will prepare preservice teachers to be thoughtful professionals. Service-learning also prepares students for civic responsibility, preparing them for their roles as citizens in a democracy. Halperin (1996) states that education is about “helping to produce ethical and socially responsible individuals who can actualize their individual potentials as effective

workers, family members, neighbors and citizens in a democracy” (National Association of Partners in Education Inc., p. 1).

In a democratic classroom, teacher and students strive to create a participatory learning community (Wade, 1997), a community where the voices and needs of all are respected and valued by the members of that community. Democratic education involves connecting with the larger community through meaningful, hands-on involvement. According to John Dewey, “schools should be democratic laboratories of learning closely linked to community need” (National Youth Leadership Council, 1991, p. 4). Therefore, the focus of a democratic classroom should be on responsible participation from all members of the classroom community. According to Halperin (1996), the goal of service-learning is to have “the ability and the personal commitment to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings and to keep growing, keep learning, keep contributing throughout life” (National Association of Partners in Education Inc., p. 2).

Service-learning follows a democratic model by giving students opportunities for choice (Wade, 1997).

It has the capacity to restructure and reform the ways we go about teaching and learning. By providing a new context for the learning environment, service-learning reshapes and balances the roles and relationships between teacher and learner, and context and the curriculum. (National Youth Leadership Council, 1991, p. 24)

As a result, the curriculum is broadened and deepened to create a richer context for learning and students gain responsibility for their learning while teachers gain new responsibilities as mentors and guides as well as presenters of information (National Youth Leadership Council, 1991, p. 25). Halperin (1996) states, the learner who is involved in service-learning “is not an object, a passive vessel, but rather a resource responsible for helping to shape her own learning, as well as

a valuable contributor to the work of the community” (National Association of Partners in Education Inc., p. 2).

Four Building Blocks for Exemplary Service-learning

Service-learning is derived from the application of four basic elements that serve as building blocks for exemplary service-learning programs. The four elements are:

1) Community and Individual Voice

Any service-learning project should include the input of all the potential stakeholders (partners) in the identification of need and the design and implementation of the program. This ensures that a valid need is met in the community and maximizes the potential of the partners to be resources. The partners enter into a dynamic relationship in which the community is a place for teaching and learning (Michigan Community Service Commission, pp. 10-11).

Collaboration needs to happen among teachers, staff, students, and community partners during planning, goal setting, implementation and evaluation and involves maintaining communication, service, curriculum integration, reflection, and celebration (Wade, 1997).

2) Planning and Preparation

Planning and preparation are important first steps for any service-learning experience. Partners should gather and have access to information about the community and issues. Planning should include information about the tasks to be performed, skills needed, expected outcomes,

the service site, and social/contextual issues related to the service. It should also take into consideration how the service and academic content can support each other (Michigan Community Service Commission, pp. 10-11).

Preparation should include assessing/identifying the needs and assets, choosing a project and assets to meet the need, developing an overall plan, reaching out to others, orienting students and the community, handling logistics, and planning for evaluation.

Planning should include integrating service into the curriculum and developing specific service-learning learner outcomes, implementation and project monitoring, including ongoing assessment.

3) Service

Service must be a valuable and meaningful experience for the partners, students, faculty, and community partners. The service experience should meet a genuine need and should provide positive learning and growth opportunities for the individuals involved. Thoughtful action builds a positive and mutually beneficial relationship between the partners (Michigan Community Service Commission, pp. 10-11).

4) Reflection, Assessment, and Celebration

Assessment is a process that should be incorporated into any service-learning experience from the beginning and continue throughout the project. Assessment measures the impact of the student's learning experience and the effectiveness of the service in the community. The partners should take part in the design and implementation of the evaluation process (Michigan

Community Service Commission, pp. 10-11).

Assessment provides direction for improvement, growth, and change. Reflection is critical to service-learning, since this is where the true learning takes place. Through interaction with others and individual reflection on ethical questions and relevant issues, participants can develop a better sense of social responsibility, advocacy, and active citizenship (Michigan Community Service Commission, pp. 10-11).

Evaluation and reporting should include process and product development, qualitative and quantitative data collection, and formative and summative evaluation, all integral aspects of exemplary service-learning initiatives (Swick, Winecoff, Kemper, Rowls, Freeman, Somerindyke, Mason, & Williams, 1998, pp. 10-13).

These elements are interrelated. An effective service-learning program includes each of these elements in some form.

Quality Standards

Service-learning researchers have identified quality standards that serve as a measure of performance in order to assess the effectiveness of service-learning programs. These standards of quality are:

- I Effective service-learning efforts strengthen service and academic learning.
- II Model service-learning provides concrete opportunities for youth to learn new skills, to think critically, and to test new roles in an environment which encourages risk-taking and rewards competence.
- III Preparation and reflection are essential elements in service-learning.
- IV Students' efforts are recognized by those served, including their peers, the school, and the community.
- V Students are involved in the planning and implementation.

- VI The service students perform makes a meaningful contribution to the community.
 - VII Effective service-learning integrates systematic formative and summative evaluation.
 - VIII Service-learning connects the school and its community in new and positive ways.
 - IX Service-learning is understood and supported as an integral element in a school and its community.
 - X Skilled guidance and supervision are essential to the success of service-learning.
 - XI Pre-service training, orientation, and staff development . . . ensures program quality and continuity.
- (Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform, 1995)

Rationale for Including Service-learning into Teacher Education

Faculty who engage in service-learning take on the role of facilitator or guide, “helping students to investigate, hypothesize, experiment, and evaluate results and draw conclusions so that answers are discovered together and students become motivated to learn” (Myers, 1995, p.

2). Responsibility for teaching and learning is shared.

Faculty who are engaged in service-learning believe service-learning should be included in the teacher education curriculum because it:

- can “be a means for overcoming limitations of the traditional teacher education curriculum” (Root, Moon, & Kromer, 1995, p. 31);
- can “encourage teaching candidates to examine their assumptions about classroom practice, and thus begin habits of professional reflection” (Root, et. al., 1995, p. 31);
- “helps teachers prepare students for membership in a participatory democracy” (Root, et. al., 1995, p. 31);
- helps preservice teachers acquire skills which will enable them to “act as moral

agents to improve the lives of their students and the well-being of the school and community” (Wade, 1995, p. 41);

- is “an avenue for [preservice teachers] to develop concern for their students’ social and emotional growth in both school and community settings and to value the results of community/school collaboration” (Wade, 1995, p. 41).
- can “challenge future teachers to question the relationship between the dominant culture and those who are in need and to rethink the role of the teacher in the contemporary classroom” (Wade, 1995, p. 41);
- increase students’ understanding of community and family influences on children and young people” (Erickson & Anderson, 1997);
- strengthen preservice teachers’ teaching skills in terms of actually experiencing tutorial, mentoring, and instructional situations (Erickson & Anderson, 1997);
- broadens their understanding of teaching as a career - particularly in relation to gaining a more realistic understanding of the needed skills, attitudes, and commitments (Erickson & Anderson, 1997);
- increases their self-confidence in working and relating to people from different cultures (Erickson & Anderson, 1997); and
- enhances their interest in doing future service work in the community, especially in helping children and young people (Erickson & Anderson, 1997).

Impact of Service-learning on Preservice Teachers

Service-learning is consistent with other practices such as mastery learning, authentic

assessment, and integrated teaching which are used in education reform (Root, Moon, & Kromer, 1995, p. 31). Service-learning provides students with diverse learning styles and cultural backgrounds opportunities for success. Also, service-learning is interrelated with at least three of the national standards for GOALS 2000: school completion, student achievement and citizenship, and teacher education and professional development. It also helps to achieve school to work efforts by allowing individuals to “try on” various roles and is aligned with character education as it helps to develop in preservice teachers the qualities of good citizens.

Students who engage in service-learning

- 1) ultimately gain much more in understanding than they give in serving.
 - 2) learn not only from the experience of service but from reflection on and creating meaning from that experience.
 - 3) grow from the natural dependence and egocentrism of childhood into mature personal interdependence and engagement in community.
 - 4) learn holistically. All functions of personality contribute to development of the self.
 - 5) learn and grow as they feel and think about service experiences Because learning begins with behavior, students gain efficacy and self-direction.
 - 6) are empowered to become service-oriented citizens and youth leaders.
- (National Youth Leadership Council, 1991, p. 20)

Service-learning provides constructive activities, activities that are linked to the curriculum that augment both social and academic development and provide students with a foundation of knowledge, dispositions, and skills that make them more successful as adults. Practicing what one learns in school in a “real world setting” is a powerful way to instill and reinforce learning.

Methodology

In the fall of 1997, the Research Group agreed to a definition of service-learning which they could use to guide their work and one that they could share with various stakeholder groups. While the definition was being created and reviewed by various stakeholders, a list of all the teacher education faculty in the State of New Hampshire was compiled. This list was used to invite individuals to an October Roundtable at which the definition was reviewed, suggestions for revisions were obtained, and possible service-learning research sites and individuals to contact for participation in the study were identified.

In November, the Research Group identified the methodology they would use to collect data. First, a set of questions was developed using the ASLER Standards as a guide. A similar set of questions were designed for K-12 educators or community partners, teacher education faculty members, and preservice teachers, triangulating data collection so as to ensure reliability and validity. (Please refer to Appendix A for a copy of the interview questions.) In addition, a set of telephone interview questions were developed to determine which undergraduate teacher educators were using service-learning and would be interested in allowing a research team to visit them, their students, and the community members with whom they work. (Please refer to Appendix B for a copy of the telephone questions.) It should be noted that not every undergraduate teacher education faculty member in the state was contacted, but at least one or more teachers in every teacher education program in the state was contacted. We believe that the individuals who agreed to participate in the study represent those who have integrated service-learning into their curriculum to various degrees. We are also aware of other teacher education faculty who are using service-learning as a pedagogy, but they either did not want to participate at this time or did not feel they had enough experience with service-learning to participate.

After calling the undergraduate teacher education faculty members on the list, it was determined that there were 6 sites and 10 individuals who were willing to have a research team come meet with them. These sites included Colby Sawyer College (Dr. Georgia McMahon), Keene State College (Dr. Debbie Black and Dr. Dottie Bauer), New England College (Dr. Debra Nitschke-Shaw, Dr. William Preble, and Dr. Kathe Simon), Notre Dame College (Dr. Denise Marchianda), Plymouth State College (Dr. Gary Ritchie and Dr. Leo Sandy), and Rivier College (Dr. Howard Muscott).

Research teams, which included a teacher education faculty member (each team's research coordinator), a K-12 educator or community member, and a preservice teacher, were established. The research coordinator called the individual identified as using service-learning in his/her course and explained the project in more detail. If the individual who was called was still interested in participating in the study, a time to meet with the teacher education faculty member, his/her students, and community members was determined. Only one individual indicated that her project was not directly linked to the teacher education program in her college so she was eliminated from the study.

Each research team then visited the sites and conducted focused interviews with those individuals who were willing to participate. Informed Consent forms were distributed to all potential participants. (See Appendix C.) Those who did not wish to participate were free to leave. For the most part, focused interview sessions for each group, preservice teachers, teacher education faculty members, and community members, happened simultaneously at the site.

The results of each interview were then compiled using a webbing or concept mapping strategy. The ASLER Standards, which helped to guide the writing of the interview questions,

were listed at the top of the page with each interview question listed in the center. Each research member put notes from his/her interviews on these webbing/mapping sheets and brought them to a Research Group meeting where all research members transferred their notes to large webbing/mapping sheets. These large webbing/mapping sheets became the impetus for discussion about what was observed and next steps.

The initial review of the data led the research team to make the following assumptions:

- Teacher education faculty need information and support to understand service-learning and use it effectively in their courses.
- There are some good service-learning initiatives in the state. There is, however, a continuum of endeavors which range from community service to service-learning.
- If the desired goal of the initiative in service-learning in teacher education is to prepare future teachers to use service-learning as a pedagogy in their classrooms, it would appear that much work still needs to be done.

Limitations of Study

This study was done on a relatively small sample, eight courses representing five colleges. The sample was representative of large and small, public and private institutions. While the Research Group believes that the results can be generalized to other teacher education programs, it would be advisable to take the resulting Guiding Principles and conduct case studies on a broader sample of courses, institutions, and teacher education faculty to see if adjustments need to be made. In addition, the results should be shared with others doing similar research throughout the country, enabling the researchers to determine to a greater extent the reliability

and validity of the results.

It is important to understand that the Research Group made a conscious decision not to look for the “Best Practices” at this time because that meant that they were making a value judgment concerning the work of their colleagues. This work, the researchers believe, is too new in the State of New Hampshire, and therefore, it would be more appropriate to

- (1) determine where we are in the process of integrating service-learning into teacher education,
- (2) make suggestions as to where we should proceed, and
- (3) suggest possible “Best Practices” as goals for our colleagues and ourselves.

The researchers recognize that each individual who agreed to participate in this research project is at a different level of understanding and readiness in regard to integrating service-learning into his/her course and each institution and partner is also at a different place on the community service-service-learning developmental continuum. The researchers hope that all who are integrating service-learning into their courses adopt a model that will help them to move more toward the full integration of service-learning into their curriculum, giving students the ownership for need identification, project planning, implementation, evaluation, reflection, and celebration.

Results

For preservice teachers to feel connected to a project, to develop goals and objectives and evaluation tools to assess performance, and to be able to plan effectively to implement their project they need a clear understanding of what the need is. A common need which emerged was

helping K-12 children learn, either in or out of the classroom. However, more specific needs were not well defined, communicated, or understood by all partners. Thus, all partners need to communicate clearly the need so that more meaningful learning experiences can be developed. In addition, each partner has needs which must overlap so as to enable all participants in the project to feel successful.

All courses, whether they used what might be viewed as more community service than service-learning, or those that used service-learning were attempting to have students apply course content to a “real-world” experience. This created an authentic learning experience for students. The goals of the course and project helped to “drive” the experience. For some, there was a clear link between the goals and the service. This appears to be more readily apparent for those who used planned, purposeful reflection which was clearly linked to course and student goals.

Goal setting, it would appear, needs to be a formalized process which should be accompanied by a written document, clearly communicating the goals to all partners and providing for continual evaluation and refinement of the goals throughout the project. Goals need to be clearly communicated by and to all partners. Without clearly communicated goals, assessment of progress toward meeting those goals and the need is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Planning needs to be a collaborative process, one which should happen throughout the project. Ongoing planning should be informed by evaluation, which is linked to goals. This type of process requires a dynamic stakeholder model, one in which key partners can move in and out of the process depending on where the project is. In addition, the needs, goals, and planning

should evolve as the project progresses. The degree of involvement of stakeholders will vary depending on the stage of the project.

Planning requires clear communication. If all partners aren't clear about the need and goals, developing a plan to meet the need is extremely difficult. And, if the needs are competing and the goals not agreed to by all, the project may never have a chance of succeeding. Planning can be seen as a challenge, how can you plan to meet a specific need? Planning is cyclical, an on-going process that incorporates feedback which leads to many revisions.

It is evident that healthy partnerships foster effective communication, which supports the work of all partners. It is also clear that sufficient time and resources need to be available for effective goal setting and planning to occur. In addition, recognition by stakeholders, including administrators, is crucial. Administrators, college and K-12, must sanction this work by including it in their mission statements, policy statements, and budget.

Future collaborations depend on the various individuals involved and where these individuals are on the community service-service-learning developmental continuum. Future collaborations also depend on the training of all partners. If the goal is to have preservice teachers prepared to use service-learning as a pedagogy in their classrooms, then we must provide ample models for them to be exposed to and adequate support from administrators, school board members, etc. This requires a great deal of training of all partners in K-H.

In some cases, the higher education institutions are clearly supporting the work of their faculty, staff, and students by including service-learning in their mission statements, publicizing the efforts of their participants in publications, and supporting their search for grants or other funds. In other cases, while service-learning is condoned, service-learning is not considered an

important factor in the reward or contractual system for faculty members.

Needs evolve as the “partnership” develops. Continual reflection and ongoing formative evaluation need to occur to ensure that the need is indeed being met and adjustments to plans can be made as necessary. The degree to which reflection was used relates to where the faculty member fell on the community service-service-learning continuum. The more service-learning was integrated into the course, the more planned, purposeful reflection was used.

Training of community partners in regard to service-learning and working with preservice teachers is essential if all partners are to benefit from the service-learning experience. In addition, frequent communication, which includes but is not limited to supervision, with partners and preservice teachers must be planned for and carried out.

These service-learning experiences, as diverse as they are, enabled the preservice teachers involved in the study to decide whether they wanted to teach and at which level. It also enabled the preservice teachers to appreciate the complexity of teaching. In addition, the confidence level of the preservice teachers who had ownership for their projects grew.

We have learned that the teacher education programs in New Hampshire are just beginning to integrate service-learning into their curriculum. Most use service-learning as a teaching strategy rather than teaching service-learning as a pedagogy. It is too early to know if the preservice teachers who have been exposed to service-learning will use service-learning in their student teaching and first teaching experiences.

Discussion

To “set the stage” for the discussion of results, it is important to understand that a faculty

member's integration of service-learning into the teacher education program falls on a developmental continuum from community service to fully integrated service-learning.

The Community Service, Service-learning Developmental Continuum

At one end of the continuum there are faculty who have incorporated community service into their courses. At this end very little formal need identification is done, the link to the academic content of the course is clear to the faculty member, however there is minimal planning and ongoing reflection being done. For the most part, reflection happens as a result of a student talking to another student, sharing information with a mentor, connecting with a community partner, or writing a final paper for the course. Most of the ownership for the service-learning project is the faculty member's, as working at a site is a requirement for the course and the student does very little, if any, planning, evaluation, and/or reflection.

Toward the middle of the continuum are those who have linked the service the students are doing to the course content. The identification of the need, which is usually done informally, goal setting, planning, developing evaluation tools etc. are usually not done by the student. Instead, the partner or the faculty member does most of this, in isolation of the student. Students have a choice of sites and usually match their interests to the location they select. Reflection, however, happens throughout the course, usually in the form of journal writing, and is linked to course goals and outcomes. However, this connection of "real-world" experience to classroom learning is not made explicit. In some instances, the faculty member uses class discussion as a means of reflection, allowing the student to explore the relationship between theory and the real-world experience he/she is involved in.

Further along the continuum there are those who have linked the service the students are doing to the course goals and objectives. Service sites have, for the most part, been identified by the faculty member in consultation with the service site partner. A variety of service options, each linked to the course goals, are provided to students so as to increase the likelihood of an appropriate student-site match. The need is reviewed with the student and the partner and is refined throughout the service-learning project as appropriate. Some training of all partners has been done to increase the likelihood that everyone is aware of the expectations and understands service-learning. The goals the student wishes to achieve through his/her work at the site, goals and objectives for the project, a project plan, its implementation, the development and use of appropriate evaluation tools, and the creation of a means to recognize all partners is established by the student. Continual, purposeful reflection happens throughout the course. A formal agreement between all partners with roles and responsibilities clearly delineated is made. There is ample supervision of the student at the placement site. Usually the faculty member, or his/her designee, visits the site a number of times during the project. In addition, there is less faculty ownership for the work at the site and more student ownership.

At the far end of the continuum there are those who have linked the service the students are doing to the course content, goals, and objectives, those who see service-learning as a strategy to implement curriculum frameworks. Students identify the community need themselves, using some formal assessment instrument. These students have received ample training, and the partners with whom they work have been trained in using service-learning as a pedagogy. The student identifies learning goals for himself/herself, those things he/she plans to learn as a result of his/her work. In addition, the student plans the project, determines how to

formatively and summatively evaluate it, implements it, taking ownership for the entire process. The faculty member becomes a facilitator, guiding the student's learning process and acting as a resource. Ideally, the student has involved the K-12 students with whom he/she is working in the need identification, project planning, implementation, and creation and implementation of the evaluation tools. Reflection is continual and purposeful, helping the student link course content and personal learning goals to what he/she is doing, and vice versa.

The ASLER Standards (the Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform, 1995) are what has guided the Research Group in generating interview questions. The results will be shared using these standards as a guide.

Standard I: The service students perform makes a meaningful contribution to the community.

Interview Questions:

How was the community need identified?

What was the community need?

What was the project?

The needs which were met by the individuals involved in these courses were as diverse as the individuals themselves. Some needs were clearly articulated to all partners. For others, the need became evident only after working at the site for a while. Still others were unclear of why they were at a site, understanding only that being there was a requirement of the course.

How the needs were identified depended on the individuals. In some cases, the faculty

member identified a need. In other cases, a student(s) identified the need. In still other cases, a faculty member and or student(s), after meeting with a community partner, identified the need. Yet in other cases, the institution located sites that identified their needs and an Office of Community Service-Learning became the “clearinghouse,” helping to match site, need, and student interest. In one case the partnership helped to identify the need.

It should be noted that there is no definitive process for identifying needs. An institution or partnership determined its own process for need identification. This emphasizes the fact that all institutions and their stakeholders have a different developmental understanding of service-learning and readiness for integrating service-learning into their program.

In almost all cases, no formal needs assessment was done. Informal conversations with partners helped to identify needs and refine them as appropriate. And, partnerships, as they evolved, also led to the identification and clarification of needs. To visualize this, consider the need as the focal point of many concentric circles, which represent who identified the need - the college student (individual or group), the classroom teacher (faculty or K-12), or the community partner (stakeholder).

The range of needs was as diverse as the individuals involved in the projects. There was, however, a common theme which emerged, helping K-12 children learn, either in or out of the classroom. Again, the need was rarely clearly understood by all partners. Some preservice teachers knew the need they were meeting, while others did not. Some partners were clear as to what their need was but were unclear why the students were there or what the learning goals were. In some cases, the teacher education faculty member clearly communicated the need, in other cases the need was to spend time “working” in the community, with the term “working” having an array of definitions.

In some cases the needs were linked to learner outcomes and course content. It was clear, however, that all partners needed to communicate clearly the need so that a more meaningful learning experience could be developed. It is also clear that each partner has needs which must overlap so as to enable all participants in the project to feel successful.

Standard II: Effective service-learning efforts strengthen service and academic learning.

Interview Questions:

What were the course goals met by the service-learning project?

How was service-learning used in the course?

What were the goals?

How were the goals communicated?

The goals for the various service-learning projects were as diverse as the projects.

No goals stated	goals communicated	goals communicated	goals co-developed
<hr/>			
	and understood	by faculty, student,	and partner

For some individuals there was a broad understanding, an awareness that there were goals, and a “general,” cursory understanding of them. For example, one student remarked that her goal was to do something in the community because it was required for the course. For other individuals the course goals were specific, clearly articulated in course materials. Usually these included goals in knowledge/understanding, dispositions, and critical skills development. In one case, the students were required to identify personal goals which they hoped to achieve through their work. These personal goals were contracted with the faculty member to ensure that they were realistic

and blended well with course goals. Those students who identified personal goals appeared to have more ownership in their projects.

It is clear that the goals need to be clearly communicated by and to all. Without clearly communicated goals, assessment of progress toward meeting those goals and the need is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Standard III: Students are involved in the planning and implementation.

Interview Questions:

Describe the planning process?

Who was involved in the planning process?

What role did people play in the planning process?

What obstacles to implementation were experienced?

What strategies were used to overcome the obstacles?

Again, there was a range of the degree to which students were involved in the planning and implementation of the project and a variety of people who were involved. For some, the project was already set up. All the student had to do was “show up.” In other cases, the student was required to develop a plan to meet the need and implement the plan.

Obstacles encountered by various individuals fell into the following themes, time, scheduling, match of placement (selection of good site), adequate supervision of students in the field, communication between partners, readiness of all stakeholders (students, faculty, and partner), commitment and motivation of preservice teachers, saturation of sites (availability), money, transportation/distance, resources, and training of partners and preservice teachers. Faculty, as they become more versed in integrating service-learning into their courses, identify strategies to overcome these obstacles.

Standard IV: Model service-learning provides concrete opportunities for youth to learn new skills, to think critically, and to test new roles in an environment which encourages risk-taking and rewards competence.

Interview Questions:

How has the service-learning project helped students to apply course content to practical situations?

Describe the settings for the service-learning projects.

Describe how the service-learning project helped students to develop skills which would be helpful to them as teachers.

Describe how the service-learning project helped students to develop skills in a) critical thinking, b) problem solving, and c) decision making.

The settings of the service-learning projects were often linked to the goals and/or content of the course. In one case, where the course required the students to look at various organizations and/or systems both in and out of school that effect students, some students worked in a homework club at a housing office, others tutored students with diverse needs, still others worked in a soup kitchen, while others worked in an after-school program. In two courses students were required to become more familiar with the needs of diverse learners, some students shadowed a special educator, worked in a self-contained classroom, or worked in a child-care setting attached to the institution, while others worked at a ski school or in residential programs.

In one course all students worked at one site preparing and implementing a developmental assessment for pre-schoolers and communicating their results to the teachers and

the parents of the students. In yet another course, students worked as reading or math mentors, became playground, lunch, and classroom buddies to children with ADD, helped kindergarten children with a school beautification project, developed an intergenerational project for middle school students who were not being academically successful and severely ill patients in an area hospital, and developed an environmental science program for first through third graders at a school's newly created nature trail.

The preservice teachers could see how the “real-world” experiences they had were linked to course goals. Their experiences helped some students create new goals for themselves. For many, their depth of understanding was increased. One student spoke of a time when she could share information about a topic with her placement site partners. This made her feel valued and helped to raise her self-confidence.

Standard V: Service-learning connects the school and its community in new and positive ways.

Standard VI: Service-learning is understood and supported as an integral element in school and its community.

Interview Questions:

What sources of support were received for the service-learning project?

What are the plans for future collaboration/partnerships?

Based on your experiences, what recommendations do you have for future service-learning projects?

Which of the following descriptions best describes the level of involvement of service-learning in your school? (see stages described below)

Dr. Howard Muscott has offered a model of the Stages of Service-learning, which the research group shared with participants. The model is as follows:

Stages of Service-learning

Stage	Name
-------	------

I	Tradition of Volunteer Service
----------	---------------------------------------

For K-12

This stage is characterized by a tradition of community service in K-12. The tradition is typically carried out through community service projects. The focus is on providing service to others.

For Higher Education

This stage is characterized by a tradition of community service in higher education. The tradition is typically carried out through community service projects that are spearheaded by student development offices, clubs, and/or campus ministries. The focus is on providing service to others.

II	Individual Service-Learning Initiatives
-----------	--

For K-12

This stage is characterized by an awareness of the connection between service and learning by individual teachers as part of specific classes. During this stage, it is the individual faculty member, rather than a department or school who initiates the service-learning experience.

For Higher Education

This stage is characterized by an awareness of the connection between service and learning by individual faculty members as part of specific courses. During this stage, it is the individual faculty member, rather than a department of school who initiates the service-learning experience.

III Institutional Awareness and Administrative Support for Individual Initiatives

For K-12

This stage is characterized by support from the administration for individual faculty and departmental service-learning initiatives. At this stage, the administration supports demonstration projects and the procurement of grants and other funding sources.

For Higher Education

This stage is characterized by support from the administration for individual faculty and departmental service-learning initiatives. At this stage, the administration supports demonstration projects and the procurement of grants and other funding sources.

IV Institutional Commitment and Adoption of Service-Learning

For K-12

This stage is characterized by a school-wide commitment to service-learning. The commitment is operationalized by 1) a mission or vision statement and strategic plan; 2) administrative, faculty, and staff support for the concept; 3) and necessary resources.

For Higher Education

This stage is characterized by an institutional commitment to service-learning. The

commitment is operationalized by 1) a mission or vision statement and strategic plan; 2) administrative, faculty, and staff support for the concept; 3) and necessary resources.

V Full Implementation and Integration

For K-12

This stage is characterized by full implementation and integration of service-learning at the school. At this stage, service-learning is a school-wide expectation that students, faculty, staff, and administrators are aware of and rewarded for participation in.

For Higher Education

This stage is characterized by full implementation and integration of service-learning at the institution. At this stage, service-learning is an institutional expectation that students, faculty, staff, and administrators are aware of and rewarded for participation in.

(Adapted by permission of Dr. Howard Muscott, research group member.)

The stage the individual identified as being the appropriate stage for his/her institution depended on where the individual was on the community service-service-learning developmental continuum and his/her past experiences, training, and awareness of service-learning.

Standard VII: Preparation and reflection are essential elements in service-learning.

Interview Questions:

Describe how you used reflection.

Reflection was an ongoing process in some courses, linked to course goals, while in others cases reflection happened at the end of the course. Those faculty members who planned

for meaningful reflection during course time, or other scheduled times, remarked about the learning they could see happen for their students. In one course the students were to link the New Hampshire Curriculum Frameworks to their project plans. At first, the preservice teachers thought “teachers just did whatever; they played with kids.” After they became familiar with the Frameworks and how service-learning could support student learning, they started to realize that what teachers did was planned, based on some curricular goals, and extremely complex.

The range of types of reflection used depended on the course and whether reflection was used as a formative evaluation tool or summative. Journals, written or tape recorded, seemed to be the most prevalent type of reflection used. Some students created portfolios of their work, others gave focused presentations or term presentations, still others made story boards, while others wrote reflective papers. Some faculty members asked questions in class which were linked to course goals and required students to use their “real-world” experiences as a basis for discussion. Some students routinely discussed their projects in class, others never spoke about them during class time.

Standard VIII: Effective service-learning integrates systematic formative and summative evaluation.

Interview Questions:

How was it determined whether the service-learning project met the identified community needs?

In what ways does your service-learning project address course goals?

How did you determine whether these goals were met?

What advice or recommendations would you give to your colleagues or peers who are interested in incorporating service-learning into their courses or creating service-learning projects to meet a community need?

In most cases, evaluation was done more summatively than formatively. As stated previously, in some cases the goals were not clearly identified so the evaluation process became more difficult, if not impossible. In some cases, no evaluation was done of the service-learning project. In addition, faculty members were, for the most part, responsible for evaluation. In one course students were required to determine how they would evaluate whether they met their goals. They needed to design a means of evaluation as part of their plan to meet the need. In another course the students evaluated the success of their work by talking with the partners and parents of the children with whom they worked.

Standard IX: Skilled guidance and supervision are essential to the success of service-learning.

Standard X: Pre-service training, orientation, and staff development ensures program quality and continuity.

Standard XI: Students' efforts are recognized by those served, including their peers, the school, and the community.

Interview Questions:

In what ways were the participants recognized?

For some, there was no clear understanding of who the participants were. In other cases, the participants were recognized in some way. In one course, the faculty member had a reception for all the participants when the results of the developmental evaluation were shared. In another course, the students were asked, as part of their planning for the project, to determine how they would be recognizing the participants and to identify who those participants were. The faculty member in this case had a celebration where the students shared their work, to which the partners were invited. In addition, the work of the students was shared with members of the Board of Trustees of this institution to recognize the work of the students and to share with the trustees the impact service-learning has on the learning of the preservice teachers in this institution.

In many cases there was little or no training given to the partners in the service-learning initiative. This includes students, who were unclear as to why they were going to a site, except that it was required for the course. In some cases, students were prepared for their role at the site, but the partners were unclear what they should do to support the efforts of the students. In other cases, the partners were given some training and supplied with a document which detailed their role, the student's role, and the faculty member's role, but they still felt unclear about their role.

In almost all cases, there was little supervision of preservice teachers at their service-learning sites. In some cases, the faculty member or his/her designee spoke with the site partner once, maybe twice, and sometimes there were evaluation sheets completed by placement site partners. In one case, the faculty member met at least twice with the student, partner, and herself to conduct "triad" meetings. These meetings were a time to clarify the need, discuss the plan, and work collaboratively to move forward with the service-learning project.

Conclusions

Implications for Practice

Based on the data collected and the Research's Group analysis of this data, the following guiding principles for service-learning in teacher education are being offered for consideration:

Guiding Principles for Service-learning In Teacher Education

- 1) Actual community needs must be met in a respectful and mutually beneficial way.
 - Effective service-learning efforts in teacher education require teacher education programs to assess community need and link these identified, authentic needs to preservice teacher course work.
 - Effective service-learning efforts require teacher education faculty to identify the competencies that are needed by preservice teachers to conduct a needs/assets assessment and communicate these competencies to the student and service-learning site partner.
- 2) Service-learning must be integrated into the academic curriculum.
 - Effective service-learning is integrated systemically into the teacher education program.
 - In effective service-learning programs, preservice teachers are not merely involved in service-learning through their course work, but are taught service-learning as a pedagogy. Students need to understand the theory behind service-learning, the key elements of service-learning, how to conduct a needs/assets assessment, create goals and a plan to meet the need, develop evaluation tools to formatively and summatively

evaluate their progress, create purposeful reflection activities, and develop celebration activities that recognize the efforts of all participants, so they can use service-learning effectively in their classrooms.

3) Service-learning initiatives are defined, planned, implemented, and coordinated in collaboration with the student, schools, and the community.

- Community Connection
 - Recruitment of service-learning sites and preservice teachers to work at those sites needs to be done earlier. A breadth of choices needs to be available for preservice teachers.
 - Service-learning initiatives need to be sustainable. Mechanisms need to be built in, where appropriate, to safeguard the service-learning site participants from the schedule of college students, changing resources, etc.
- Training and Supervision
 - All partners must be trained in the key elements of service-learning and how to effectively work with preservice teachers.
 - Supervision must be ongoing. The preservice teachers and service-learning site partners must know how supervision will be done, how often, using what evaluation tool, etc. Opportunities to collaborate with each other should be provided throughout the service-learning project.
- Planning
 - Planning to meet authentic community needs must be ongoing and based on formative evaluation.

4) Service-learning provides opportunities for preservice teachers to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real life situations.

- Planning should be a collaborative process, taking the goals of all partners into consideration (the faculty member's goals, the student's goals, and the site partner's goals.)
- Communication between all partners must be maintained at all times. Faculty should act as facilitators, providing support, resources, and adequate supervision.
- All partners should collaboratively identify the needs, goals, and plan to meet the need, then work collaboratively on the project. The more ownership students can be given for their work the more learning that will occur.
- Faculty members must clearly articulate the academic, disposition, and critical skills goals they have for preservice teachers and communicate these to all partners. In addition, faculty members must help students and partners link the service-learning project to course content and goals.
- Preservice teachers should be helped to identify academic, personal, and skill goals for themselves which can be met through the service-learning project.

5) Service-learning initiatives should provide structured time for frequent, substantive, and creative reflection.

- Reflection needs to be planned, purposeful, and linked to course goals.
- A variety of types of reflective practices should be used so as to allow preservice teachers to use their diverse learning styles and to model for preservice teachers the creativity involved in reflection.

- Preservice teachers should be shown how reflection can be linked to formative evaluation, planning, etc.
- The faculty member needs to be clear regarding what he/she is having the students reflect on and why.

6) Service-learning initiatives include ongoing assessment using appropriate assessment strategies..

- Assessment tools and the assessment process need to be fully understood by all partners. Simply “doing” a service-learning project is not enough. For learning to occur, reflection and evaluation must be included. It is not enough to say “I know Suzie learned because she can now add.”
- Qualitative as well as quantitative data must be collected so as to determine the depth of understanding and help the partners plan more efficiently for future learning opportunities.
- Preservice teachers should be shown how to develop formative and summative assessment tools which help students to authentically assess student learning.

7) Effective service-learning initiatives recognize the individual and collective efforts of all participants.

- Recognition of the efforts of all participants can only be achieved by educating and supporting those faculty members and partners who are interested in doing this work.
- Preservice teachers must be helped to identify who the participants are and determine creative ways to recognize the efforts of all participants.
- Faculty members must identify creative ways to recognize the efforts of their students,

promoting their work to the community, the college campus, and others.

8) Service-learning should enhance and extend the learning for all participants.

- Ideally, preservice teachers should be working in collaboration with the youth in their placement site to identify the need, develop a plan, implement the plan, assess progress, and celebrate efforts. Throughout the entire service-learning project, ongoing, planned, purposeful reflection opportunities should be provided to help all participants attach meaning to their real world experiences.

9) Effective service-learning initiatives help to foster the development of caring, civic responsibility, and global stewardship.

- All participants should be helped to
 - identify their role in meeting the authentic community need.
 - see how their role in meeting the authentic community need leads to caring, civic responsibility, and global stewardship.
 - see how their work meeting an authentic community need will benefit and has benefitted the community.
 - identify the intrinsic rewards received from meeting the authentic community need.

Recommendations

As a result of the work of the Research Group, the following recommendations are made:

1) The results of this study should be:

- a) shared with interested parties, to include teacher education faculty, preservice teachers, community partners, and others, at a roundtable in October 1998.
 - b) distributed as an executive summary throughout the state.
 - c) shared with Dr. Jeffrey Anderson and Dr. Jane Callahan for their consideration when developing their rubric of best practice of service-learning in teacher education.
- 2) A “Service-learning in Teacher Education Institute” should be designed to help teacher educators, preservice teacher, K-12 teachers, and community partners understand the pedagogy of service-learning and the essential elements of best practice of service-learning in teacher education.
- 3) The draft of the guiding principles of service-learning in teacher education should be shared with stakeholders for their input and revisions made as appropriate. Then, teacher education faculty should be given the principles to use as a guide. Several teacher education faculty in the state should be identified as case studies to determine the accuracy of these principles and make additional revisions as appropriate. This may require a research team to work with the faculty member to collect artifacts concerning their service-learning initiatives. Subsequently, the principles should be revised and distributed to stakeholders yet again to ensure that they are accurate and represent the best principles of service-learning in teacher education.
- 4) A mentoring/partnership program for those interested in integrating service-learning in their teacher education program to work with those who have had experience in using service-learning

should be designed and implemented. This New Hampshire Service-learning in Teacher Education Partnership Program (NHSLTEP) could be designed after the National Service-learning Teacher Education Initiative Partnership Model which has been developed by Dr. Jane Callahan, Providence College, Dr. Jeffrey Anderson, Seattle University, and Dr. Rahima Wade, University of Iowa. In this model, a teacher scholar/mentor, in our case individuals in the state who have demonstrated an understanding of service-learning, its elements, and how to effectively integrate service-learning into courses in the teacher education program become scholars/mentors to two or three faculty members who are interested in integrating service-learning into their curriculum. Appropriate scholars/mentors could be selected from those individuals who have demonstrated an understanding of service-learning as a pedagogy based on recommendations from the Research Group.

A letter detailing the NHSLTEP would be sent to all teacher education faculty in the state to determine who would be interested in on-site professional development regarding service-learning. A team of individuals, ideally the service-learning scholars/mentors, would review the responses and call interested individuals to determine what their needs are and whether they would be appropriate partners/mentees. Individuals who were selected to participate in the partnership would need to develop a contract which would detail how they would integrate service-learning more fully into their courses and/or program. Please note that funding would need to be made available to support the efforts of the scholars/mentors and partners/mentees. The partners/mentees would have to agree to serve as service-learning case studies and make themselves available to other service-learning study groups in the state, such as the Assessment Study Group.

In addition, the partners/mentees and scholars/mentors would be required to participate in a service-learning institute sponsored by the Department of Education and the Campus Compact for New Hampshire where their initiatives and lessons learned could be shared with other interested individuals. Ideally, each partner/mentee could become a scholar/mentor to someone else the following year, creating a cascading service-learning mentoring partnership thus developing the capacity for service-learning in teacher education in the state.

Taking this one step further, a similar initiative could be established with partner K-12 schools, or partners/mentees could be required to identify a K-12 partner(s) who would be willing to be involved in the NHSLTEP. Ideally, current teachers, teacher education faculty members, and preservice teachers should be co-learners at these institutes. This type of initiative would definitely take more financial and personnel support, but the benefits of such an initiative would lead to more systemic reform.

5) Preservice teachers who have been exposed to service-learning and those who have been taught service-learning as a pedagogy need to be followed to determine the degree to which they use service-learning in their classrooms. In addition, support systems need to be established so new teachers, those who have been taught and/or used service-learning as a pedagogy, will be more inclined to use it in their classrooms.

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

Bibliography

Anderson, Jeffrey & Guest, Kristin. (1995). In the Council of Chief State School Officers, Integrating Service Learning Into Teacher Education: Why and How? (pp. 11-30). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1995). Integrating Service Learning Into Teacher Education: Why and How? Improving Teacher Education Through Service Learning. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Erickson, Joseph A. & Anderson, Jeffrey B. (Eds.). (1997). Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-learning in Teacher Education. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Erickson, Joseph A. & Anderson, Jeffrey B. (1997). In J. Erickson & J. Anderson (Eds.) Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-learning in Teacher Education (pp. 1-12). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Halperin, Samuel. (1996). Service-learning and School-to Work: A Partnership Strategy for Education Renewal. Alexandria, VA: Wingspread Summit, National Association of Partners in Education, Inc.

Hill, Don & Pope, Clark. (1997). In J. Erickson & J. Anderson (Eds.) Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-learning in Teacher Education (pp. 90-112).

Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Indiana Campus Compact. Service Learning Tip Sheets: A Faculty Resource Guide. Universities As Citizens Higher Education Series. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Campus Compact.

Michigan Community Service Commission. Michigan Service-Learning Principles and Practices. Printed by the Michigan Community Service Commission through a grant from the Corporation for National Service.

Myers, Carol & Pickeral, Terry. (1997). In J. Erickson & J. Anderson (Eds.) Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-learning in Teacher Education (pp. 13-41).

Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Root, Susan C. (1997). In J. Erickson & J. Anderson (Eds.) Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-learning in Teacher Education (pp. 42-72). Washington, DC:

American Association for Higher Education.

Roots, Susan, Moon, Arden, & Kromer, Thomas. (1995). In the Council of Chief State School Officials, Integrating Service Learning Into Teacher Education: Why & How? (pp. 31-40).

Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officials.

Shumer, Robert. (1997). In J. Erickson & J. Anderson (Eds.) Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-learning in Teacher Education (pp. 73-89). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Shumer, Robert. (1997). In J. Erickson & J. Anderson (Eds.) Learning with the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-learning in Teacher Education (pp. 113-123). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Smink, Jay & Duckenfield, Marty (Eds.). (March, 1998). Making the Case for Service-Learning: Action Research and Evaluation Guidebook for Teachers. St. Paul, MN: National Youth Leadership Council.

Swick, Kevin, Winecoff, H. Larry, Kemper, Richard, Rowls, Michael, Freeman, Nancy, Somerindyke, Jennifer, Mason, Janet, & Williams, Terry. (1998). Service Learning and Teacher Education. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Education Office of Community Education.

Wade, Rahima (Ed.). (1997). Community Service-Learning: A guide to Including Service in the Public School Curriculum. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wade, Rahima. (1995). In the Council of Chief State School Officers, Integrating Service Learning Into Teacher Education: Why & How? (pp. 41-54). Washington, DC: The Council of Chief State School Officers.