

Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Issues and Strategies for Chief Academic Officers

Andrew Furco, University of California at Berkeley
Barbara Holland, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

The institutionalization of service-learning in higher education is predicated on the presence of a number of interdependent factors, many of which are cultivated through the leadership and support of the campus's chief academic administrator. In this chapter, the authors identify these factors and present some of the potential pitfalls in institutionalizing service-learning. The authors conclude that service-learning is best sustained when it is not institutionalized for its own sake, but rather is used as a strategy to achieve other important institutional goals.

Each year, institutions of higher education adopt numerous educational programs, practices, and policies designed to assist, improve, and/or transform the academy. While some of these practices (e.g. grading systems, faculty tenure, academic calendars) are fully adopted and remain in place over many years, other practices (e.g. total quality management) are trends that fade away quickly, leaving behind few if any valuable vestiges. While interest in service-learning throughout the K-16 educational system has grown rapidly during the last decade, questions remain about whether service-learning will be a sustained practice or just another educational trend with limited impact.

Many institutions of diverse types are implementing service-learning, often in different ways, with different intentions and with different levels of interest and commitment. Recent research is revealing the potential transforming effect of service-learning on academic organizations, and the conditions that must be present for its longevity and institutionalization. Like most educational initiatives, service-learning achieves institutionalization when it becomes an ongoing, expected, valued and legitimate part of the institution's intellectual core and organizational culture. However,

in comparison to other educational initiatives, service-learning presents some unique features that challenge traditional conceptions of what “institutionalization” means. Specifically, service-learning’s multifaceted structure, multi-disciplinary philosophical framework, and broad organizational impacts require institutional leaders to think differently about why and how to institutionalize this educational initiative.

These differences fall in two categories: 1) the institutionalization of service-learning is about much more than the acquisition of sustained funding; it is about defining academic culture and curricular philosophy; and 2) service-learning is not implemented with the goal of being a separate, distinctive program initiative and in fact cannot survive as such because it inspires and requires a complex web of internal and external relationships. As we will discuss, service-learning can be an effective strategy for accomplishing a variety of broader institutional goals. Because institutions have different missions, cultures, histories, and community contexts, the role, meaning, and value of service-learning varies from campus to campus. However, there are clear patterns across institutions that illustrate the impacts of service-learning and the components that are necessary to ensure its success and institutionalization (Furco, 2002a; Holland, 2000).

This chapter explains the distinctive nature of institutionalization of service-learning, key organizational factors and strategies, and the role of chief academic officers in monitoring and promoting its progress. It is written with the assumption that the reader has an interest in institutionalizing service-learning at some level deemed appropriate to the institution. We will argue that academic administrators must consider how the universality of service-learning makes it an effective strategy for achieving

institutional goals within their institution's mission, and the degree to which that requires institutionalization of service-learning as a core element of the organization and culture.

A Different Conceptualization of Institutionalization

The stereotypical response to an identified campus concern is to create a separate, distinct program that is charged with addressing the issue. For example, to address a concern over faculty or student retention, a task force might be established to develop a plan on how to address this issue or a special program might be put in place to support higher rates retention. This strategy works well when the issue at hand has clear programmatic demarcations. However, service-learning is less a *program* and more an *integrative strategy* that addresses multiple objectives and brings together a number of disparate units, structures, and programs on campus. Service-learning can often serve as a unifying agent that provides opportunities for faculty to work across disciplines, brings together the campus and community, promotes strong working relationships between students and their professors, and encourages student collaborations (Furco, 2002b).

Unlike many other educational programs and initiatives (e.g., freshman seminars, senior capstones, etc.) that target particular parts of the academy or serve a prescribed set of purposes, service-learning is a universal approach that is adaptable to the environment and needs of a particular campus. For example, service-learning can be adapted for all students regardless of their area of study or educational level. Service-learning can be integrated in any discipline and can engage students in a variety of service activities (tutoring, planting trees, water testing) that occur in all types of communities (e.g., urban, suburban, rural). The universality of service-learning gives it broad applicability to variety of institutional intentions and can thus be used to achieve a variety of educational

goals. This universality allows service-learning to be shaped in ways that best serve the objectives of the institution.

To be successful, service-learning requires the intentional integration of teaching, service, and research priorities within the context of each institution's mission and organizational goals; its quality and sustainability depends on such integration (Holland, 2001). Thus, service-learning permeates all three components of the academy's core mission, and its institutionalization is predicated on its connection to a wide-variety of organizational components and academic objectives, many of which fall within the purview of the chief academic officer's responsibilities.

This connection to wider institutional agendas means that institutionalization of service-learning is not just about sustainable funding. Higher education has wide-spread traditions and stereotypes surrounding the introduction and sustainability of new academic endeavors that may lead academic administrators to overlook the programmatic elements that are essential to institutionalizing service-learning as an organizational strategy. Grants are a familiar method for supporting innovations in educational settings; they lend prestige and legitimacy. Grants are a mark of achievement and excellence, and give proponents of a new idea the time and resources to develop and implement their strategies, always with a hopeful eye toward institutionalization.

Therein lies the rub. Cultural and financial traditions in academia reinforce the notion that when the grant ends, the program ends unless it can raise more "soft dollars." This tradition rises largely from the dominant model of sponsored research projects, which the institution has no expectation of moving to internal support after external funding ends. However, when the intent of a grant is to implement and institutionalize an

organizational change initiative such as service-learning, public and private funders clearly expect that their investment will lead to an institutionalized program. Whether continued support is internal or external, the object of the initial investment was to support the startup of service-learning at an institution that professes commitment.

Funders are increasingly assertive about their expectation of sustainability and have learned what to look for from the research literature. Full institutionalization of service-learning is about commitment of faculty and academic leaders, the level of student and community involvement and the strength of campus-community partnerships, and the responsive involvement of key aspects of campus infrastructure and policy that ensures the connection of service-learning to key academic objectives of the institution. It is about capitalizing on its inherent, unifying nature and its potential to assist the academy in achieving important educational and institutional goals; it can be a force for promoting institutional change and collaboration on a wide variety of academic issues. Thus, the goal of institutionalization of service-learning is not just sustainability of the activity; it is also about creating conditions where service-learning thrives and its potential for organizational impact is realized.

Connecting Service-Learning with Important Institutional Intentions

Service-learning, speaking broadly, is an academic strategy that seeks to engage students in activities that enhance academic learning, civic responsibility and the skills of citizenship while also enhancing community capacity through service. This requires the development of campus-community partnerships that engage faculty, students, and community members in interactive dialogue and action. Certainly, individual faculty can and do set up service-learning activities without any institutional involvement or support.

However, as interest in service-learning grows many institutions are realizing that faculty and students in the community are seen as representatives of the institution and attention to quality, consistency and reciprocity must be addressed. Even more importantly, institutional leaders are recognizing the potential power of service-learning to address many institutional objectives and are beginning to organize more intentional and well-coordinated programs. As we have argued above, service-learning does not stand alone in isolation from institutional and community context; it is a reflection of the interests and needs of the campus and community working together for mutual benefit.

Service-learning has the potential to create a ripple effect that inspires change and reform in response to new internal and external relationships and collaborative activities. Academic leaders can capitalize on these ripple effects by focusing attention and support on the link between service-learning and key organizational concerns and goals. The link exists because service-learning requires broad institutional involvement as well as collaborative values that are illustrated by the design and conduct of service-learning. Table 1 offers some examples of ways that service-learning can contribute to other critical goals of the academic organization and the community.

Table 1. The Role of Service-Learning in Meeting Institutional Intentions

Institutional Intention	Role of Service-Learning
Improve town/gown relationships	Service-learning provides an opportunity for the institution to give back to the community by engaging students in activities that directly benefit the community. Because service-learning is tied to the academic curriculum, the service activities directly link the community not just to students, but also to faculty, increasing familiarity and trust.
Realize the civic mission of the institution	In addition to their academic missions, many colleges and universities seek to prepare students to become active and productive members of a civil society.

	Service-learning provides the opportunity for students to apply their academic learning to address an authentic social need in the local and broader community and inspire life-long commitment to service.
Build learning communities and encourage interaction among the disciplines	Many colleges seek to foster collaboration among faculty members and students across departments. Through its focus on complex social issues that require the application of expertise from many disciplines, service-learning can be an authentic, academically-based vehicle to build learning communities that promote interdisciplinary work, and link teaching to research.
Improve instruction	There is a growing emphasis on the delivery of instruction and ways to improve student learning. As a constructivist and experiential approach to teaching, service-learning helps students to explore more deeply the dimensions of academic content by providing them the opportunity to apply the course content to an authentic community setting.
Fulfill service and outreach mission of the institution	Along with research and teaching, most institutions also see service as a part of its mission. At some institutions (e.g., faith-based institutions) the service mission of the institution is especially well-supported and emphasized. Service-learning can provide an academic-based approach to fulfilling the service mission of the institution and promotes integration of the research, teaching, and service missions of the institution.
Ensure completion of programmatic requirements and acquisition of learning attributes	A growing number of campuses are facilitating capstone experiences for their seniors. These experiences usually engage students in a series of connected courses through which they develop multiple perspectives that students apply to a community-based research project. Service-learning provides a means to connect the interdisciplinary community-based research project to the series of courses students take.

Key Factors in Service-Learning Institutionalization

The literature is helpful in understanding how academic organizations react to new innovations such as service-learning. In his book, *Why Innovation Fails*:

Institutionalization and Termination of Innovation in Higher Education, Arthur Levine (1980) investigated organizational responses to innovations in higher education. According to Levine, organizational members, as groups and individuals, assess innovations for their apparent fit with existing organizational norms and myths. Depending on the organizational response, innovations will be diffused across the organization, marginalized and encapsulated, “resocialized” or revised so as to diminish their impact, or terminated. Most educational innovations fail because they are implemented as separate programs, are poorly supported politically and/or financially, are not prominent on the campus or seen as close to core issues, or are overly compartmentalized. Educational innovations succeed when integrating mechanisms are put in place that allow the members of the institution to see how innovative programs and ideas fit together with existing activities in ways that seem “profitable and compatible.” As Levine (1980) suggests, cross-cutting, universally adaptable initiatives that are seen as complementing existing norms and concerns stand a better chance of transforming the institution and becoming institutionalized. This reinforces the argument that an effective approach to institutionalizing service-learning is for academic leaders to highlight and promote the connections between service-learning and key organizational challenges, as illustrated in Table 1. Where little attention is given to the link between service-learning and other campus concerns and priorities, service-learning is often spoken of as an extra activity, an add-on, or a luxury for those who have the time or special funding. Those conditions do not promote sustainability or institutionalization.

According to Michael Kramer (2000), an *institutionalized* educational practice is one that is “routine, widespread, legitimized, expected, supported, permanent, and

resilient” (p. 6). Making service-learning a practice that possesses these characteristics requires careful, strategic planning. The institutionalization of service-learning does not happen automatically, nor does it happen overnight. According to the findings of a recent UC Berkeley study of service-learning institutionalization, none of the 43 institutions participating in the study showed a statistically significant increase in their level of institutionalization over a three-year period (Furco, 2002a). The researchers concluded that the full institutionalization of service-learning on a college campus requires a five–to seven–year concerted effort.

To ensure the sustainability of a high quality service-learning initiative, a number of critical organizational factors that impact the institutionalization of service-learning require attention from the earliest stages of implementation. Most of these factors require the support and oversight of the chief academic officer in partnership with other academic administrators and faculty leaders. Recently, a body of literature has emerged that has helped identify the dimensions on which the institutionalization of service-learning rests. Work conducted by Bell et al. (2000), Furco (2002), Gray et al. (1998), Holland (2000; 1999;1997), Holland and Gelmon (1998), Kramer (2000), and others have identified a set of common, cross-cutting components that facilitate a campus’s service-learning institutionalization effort. The components can be categorized into five broad, inter-dependent overarching dimensions, each of which helps service-learning take hold (See Table 2) in ways that maximize impact on overall institutional objectives.

Table 2. Dimensions of Service-Learning Institutionalization

DIMENSION	COMPONENTS
Mission and Philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •establishing campus-wide definition for service-learning •completing a campus-wide strategic plan for advancing service-learning •aligning service-learning with the institution’s mission

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •aligning service-learning with other education reform and civic engagement efforts
Faculty Support For and Involvement in Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •enhancing faculty knowledge and awareness of service-learning through faculty development •cultivating faculty interest in service-learning and providing opportunities for faculty to tie service-learning to their scholarly work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating adequate infrastructure to support faculty in managing the logistics of service learning • providing faculty with incentives and rewards to engage in service-learning •encouraging influential faculty members to assume leadership roles in advancing service-learning on the campus and partnerships in the community
Institutional Support for Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •establishing a coordinating agency that facilitates the advancement of service-learning and community partnerships •establishing a policy-making entity for service-learning which establishes standards of quality and criteria for evaluation •supporting an appropriate number of staff members to work on advancing and institutionalizing service-learning • providing adequate funding resources for service-learning activities using both internal and external resources •ensuring campus leaders support and understand the goals and purposes of service-learning •ensuring that departments support and encourage faculty who engage in service-learning •establishing an ongoing monitoring system that tracks service-learning activities, participation, and partnerships •implementing an assessment plan for measuring impacts and identifying areas for improvement
Student Support and Involvement in Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •establishing coordinated mechanisms that foster students' awareness of campus service-learning opportunities •establishing formal incentives and rewards that encourage students to participate in service-learning •welcoming and encouraging student representatives to participate fully in official activities designed to advance service-learning on campus •maximizing opportunities for student to participate in service-learning
Community Participation and Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •building awareness among community partners of the full range of service-learning opportunities and possibilities •cultivating mutual understanding of needs and purposes between the campus and the community partners •welcoming and encouraging community agency

	representatives to participate fully in official activities designed to advance service-learning on campus assessing and monitoring impacts of service-learning on partners
--	--

The components within each dimension are the activities, factors, and structures that have been found to be essential for the advancement and sustainability of service-learning in higher education (Bell et al., 2000; Furco, 2002a; Gray et al., 1998; Holland, 1997, 2000). Even though individual campuses adopt service-learning to serve different institutional and academic purposes, the institutionalization components are common across institutional type (e.g. two-year community college, four-year public, four-year private), type of community (e.g., urban, suburban, rural), and institutional intention for service-learning implementation. The balance needed among these components will vary from campus to campus depending on the campus's history of community engagement, current and envisioned levels of service-learning institutionalization, and the overarching intentions of the service-learning initiative (Bell et al, 2000; Holland, 1997).

For example, at the University of Pennsylvania, service-learning is used as a strategy to advance the broader campus effort to improve town/gown relationships and strengthen the campus's partnerships with West Philadelphia. The campus created a Center for Community Partnerships as the unit to facilitate the service-learning initiative and appointed a faculty member to serve as academic administrator (associate vice president) and director of the center. In contrast, at Saint Joseph's College, a faith-based liberal arts college in Maine, service-learning is a strategy to advance the campus's Catholic service mission. The college partners with local food pantries, agencies that serve senior citizens, and local middle schools to provide much needed service. At Saint

Joseph's College, service-learning is facilitated through the college's campus ministry program and is led by a service-learning faculty liaison. Thus, we see that the larger institutional goals and purposes that service-learning serves will determine how the overall mission and philosophy of service-learning is defined, the types of faculty and institutional support that will be garnered, the nature and extent of student involvement and participation, and the kinds of community partnerships that will be formed.

Institutionalization and the Academic Administrator– Avoiding Potential Pitfalls

Because many of the key factors relevant to the institutionalization of service-learning are centered on the academic structures and purposes of the institution, the chief academic officer has a critical role in leading the campus toward a consensus on the level of commitment to service-learning and civic engagement, as well as articulating the role of service-learning in advancing progress on specific core goals and objectives of the institution. In essence, the primary role of the chief academic officer in institutionalizing service-learning is to help shepherd service-learning's transition "from the margins to the mainstream" of the academy (Pickeral & Peters 1996, 2) through rhetoric and action that affirms the value of service-learning as an institutional strategy and as a hallmark of campus-community relationships. Without the chief academic officer's support of service-learning as a core academic activity, a campus's effort to institutionalize service-learning is sure to face many challenges. Absent executive leadership, continuation of service-learning will depend on the efforts of faculty advocates. Diffusion and institutionalization of service-learning are unlikely to occur without a strong and explicit partnership and shared vision between academic administrators and faculty.

Because the institutionalization of service-learning requires a sustained, carefully planned effort that develops over a five- to seven-year period, a period that often outlasts the tenure of a chief academic officer, assurances need to be put in place that allow the institutionalization effort to continue smoothly as the campus leadership changes. The presence of a formal strategic plan for the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning has been found to be an essential element for maintaining the institutionalization momentum through transitional periods, such as those that occur during staff and administration turnover (Bell et al., 2000).

According to the findings of the UC Berkeley service-learning institutionalization study, institutional buy-in and support for service-learning was the second strongest predictor (after faculty buy-in and support) for institutionalizing service-learning at the participating colleges and universities. As Bell et al. (2000) report, faculty buy-in and support for service-learning are influenced by the overall support and buy-in service-learning receives from leaders of the institution. Institutions with leaders that demonstrate value for service-learning programs are more likely to create the conditions that promote faculty buy-in, support for, and active participation.

In addition to identifying the conditions that promote the institutionalization of service-learning, the emerging literature on service-learning has also shed light on some of the reasons why service-learning fails on some campuses. The chief academic officer and other key administrators, such as deans and chairs, play a critical role in avoiding the pitfalls and barriers to advancing service-learning initiatives. Many of the pitfalls reflect Levine's insights on why educational innovations fail (1980). Isolating service-learning

as a distinct and separate program, for example, is likely to give rise to several common pitfalls that undermine institutionalization.

Pitfalls include: a lack of faculty buy-in or acceptance of service-learning as a legitimate, academic pursuit (Ward, 1998); the misalignment and misappropriation of service-learning structures and activities (Gray et al., 1998; Zlotkowski, 2000); the nature and extent of individual involvement in the initiative (Bell et al., 2000); and inadequate support for the initiative (Gray et al., 2000). These are major obstacles and deserve further explanation to highlight the key types of academic decisions and actions that can hinder or facilitate institutionalization.

Service-Learning as a Separate Program. Perhaps one of the most serious pitfalls in the institutionalization of service-learning is the establishment of service-learning as an independent, separate program. In this scenario, the service-learning “program” receives much support and legitimization from some administrators and faculty members, has adequate funding and staffing for a period of time, has built strong partnerships with the community, and engages students and faculty in interesting and vibrant service-learning activities. However, this “program” operates on its own and is not integrated with other important initiatives and goals of the campus. To institutionalize service-learning effectively, service-learning must be viewed not as a discrete “program” but as a means to accomplish other important goals of the campus. As is suggested in Table 2, academic leaders and faculty must articulate their primary goals for their campus, develop consensus, and then explore the ways in which service-learning can be used to help meet the objectives of those goals. The ultimate goal is to institutionalize service-learning to achieve overarching institutional intentions.

The Degree of Faculty Acceptance. Without a faculty's acceptance of service-learning as an educationally valid pedagogy, service-learning cannot be institutionalized in higher education. Research has found that while most faculty who eagerly embrace service-learning do so for largely intrinsic reasons, others are motivated by forces such as relevance to their discipline, evidence that service-learning has positive impacts on students and/or the community, or the availability of support and other forms of recognition, incentives and rewards (Holland, 1999). Because faculty buy-in and support for service-learning is the strongest predictor for institutionalizing service-learning in higher education (Bell et al., 2000), institutional incentive and reward mechanisms (promotion and tenure policies as well as other methods of reward and recognition) that genuinely encourage faculty involvement in service-learning must be established.

Connections between service-learning and the quality of teaching and research responsibilities must also be demonstrated and rewarded. Without these incentives and promotion policies in place, faculty are less likely to participate in service-learning since the reward policies set the standards by which faculty work is judged (Ward, 1998). Indeed, faculty participation in service-learning is high at institutions (Portland State University, California State University-Monterey Bay, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis) that have established tenure and promotion guidelines that explicitly encourage faculty members to participate in service-learning.

Structural Alignment in the Organization. Service-learning cannot be institutionalized if its structures and activities are misaligned and misappropriated. For example, in their national study of service-learning implementation, Gray et al. (1998) found that the advancement of service-learning fared better when a campus had a

coordinating entity (e.g. a center) that facilitated service-learning activities for the campus. The findings of this study, as well as compelling arguments made by Zlotkowski (2000), suggest that such centers are most effective in garnering academic legitimacy, faculty participation, and sustained institutional support and interest when they are housed in academic affairs rather than in student affairs. Although this is not necessarily true in every case, the current and fairly widespread trend of moving existing service-learning centers in student affairs to academic units seems to support the perspective of Zlotkowski, Gray, and others who see the academic arena as the organizational alignment most strongly associated with institutionalization. Misappropriating service-learning as merely another *service* program rather than seeing it as a vehicle to accomplish a broad range of educational goals on the campus can hinder an institution's ability to institutionalize service-learning.

The Symbolism of Individuals Leading Service-Learning. A related issue of alignment in institutionalizing service-learning has to do with individual involvement in the initiative. Sometimes, to get the initiative off the ground, campuses will assign the responsibility of managing or overseeing the service-learning initiative to a unit or individual that has expressed interest in playing a leadership role. However, if this unit or individual is perceived by campus faculty to be an inappropriate entity to oversee the initiative (e.g., the individual is not well-respected on the campus, the unit is notorious for not following through on programs, etc.), then the nature of the individual involvement might actually hinder the advancement of service-learning on the campus (Bell et al., 2000). In other cases, service-learning may be too closely aligned with particular departments or units on campus, giving the impression that service-learning is

not a campus-wide effort, but rather is one that targets or is restricted to particular departments or units. Clearly, how and where support for service-learning is established sends serious signals to both proponents and skeptics of service-learning.

The Role of a Supportive Infrastructure. There is no question that a powerful tool for expansion and institutionalization is the creation of infrastructure that acknowledges the complexity and labor-intensive nature of service-learning work for faculty (and for community partners as well). However, the creation of a center, the selection of individuals to lead the center, and the placement in the organization can all send signals that can be misunderstood. Poorly considered decisions about center design, staffing, and positioning can have dramatic effects on expanding faculty and community interest, or it can be interpreted as a “closed shop” where only certain people and partners are welcome. The chief academic officer’s voice must be heard as influencing and affirming these choices, as well as in the creation of appropriate new or revised policies that support service-learning, and in the coaching of other academic administrators (deans and chairs) to ensure their understanding of the role of service-learning in the larger institutional academic agenda.

Sources of Financial Support. A final major pitfall to institutionalizing service-learning has to do with the nature and amount of funding that is provided to support the long-term growth and sustainability of service-learning. While external grants can help get campus activities started in implementing important and key service-learning activities, they provide no security for long-term funding. Programs that rely too heavily on soft money might have a more difficult time developing long-range plans for service-learning because the uncertainty of funding makes it impossible to develop long-range

plans and implement a long-term vision for service-learning (Bell et al., 2000). So long as the administration expects the center or service-learning advocates to support activities from external funds, skeptics among the faculty (and community partners who are questioning the institution's sincerity and commitment) can assume the administration is not sufficiently committed to service-learning to invest base funding resources. As in Levine's analysis (1980), the message is that the innovation is temporary. Allocating and applying an adequate amount of funds for basic or partial support of service-learning not only signals that the administration supports the initiative, but it helps place the initiative on a more promising track toward service-learning institutionalization.

Conclusion

Institutional experiences demonstrate that leadership for service-learning and civic engagement must come from both core faculty and top academic administrators. Academic administrators set the tone by what they say, what initiatives they talk about, what choices they make in funding, staffing, and promoting. What appears on the agenda of the deans' or chairs' meetings highlights issues assumed to be of importance to top administrators. The rhetorical and symbolic import of these messages is sometimes as important as practical actions on resource allocations or organizational placement.

The heart of institutionalization may be summarized in a few words: intentionality, coherence, and commitment. Choices about the support for and positioning of service-learning should be conspicuously intentional. The agenda for service-learning as a learning strategy must also be linked to a coherent institution-wide agenda in which service-learning is seen as vital to the achievement of multiple institutional objectives. And, the academic leadership of the college or university must

be clear with internal and external audiences about the level of institutional commitment to interactions between the campus and community, such as service-learning.

Service-learning also requires reciprocal and sustained interactions with the community and tying these interactions to the academic fabric of the institution. The investments an institution makes, and the decisions of academic leaders to support community partnerships are closely watched by both campus and community citizens who may hold some historic doubts about whether the institution is really ready to commit to service-learning for the long haul. Encouraging faculty and students to step into the complexity of community scholarship is not risk-free, but as with all things risky and challenging, service-learning offers the hope of rewards for advancements in institutional relationships, in instructional quality, in student outcomes, and other institutional goals outlined as examples of the impact of service-learning in Tables 1 and 2.

Attention to intentionality, coherence and commitment by academic administration can guide the organization to realize its vision for service-learning. In essence, it is the chief academic officer, dean, or department chair that clarifies the logic of the web of relationships among various curricula, programs, initiatives, and reforms that define academic environment and culture. The chief academic officer especially must guide the articulation of a vision for that environment and culture, within which service-learning may be found to be a useful strategy. The universality of service-learning can contribute to the achievement of an academic plan that unites campus and community in common cause through activities that are well-supported, well-organized, integrative and sustainable.

REFERENCES

- Bell, R., Furco, A., Ammon, M.S., Muller, P., and Sorgen, V. (2000). *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Findings from a Study of the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium*. Western Region Campus Compact Consortium. Bellingham WA: Western Washington University.
- Furco, A. (2002a). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 8, 32-47.
- Furco, A. (2002b). Is service-learning really better than community service. In Furco, A. and Billig, S.H. *Service-Learning: the Essence of the Pedagogy*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age, Inc.
- Gray, M.J., Ondaatje, E.H., Fricker, R.D., and Geschwind, S.A. (2000, March/April). Assessing service-learning. Results from a survey of Learn and Serve American, Higher Education. *Change*, 31-39.
- Gray, M.J., Ondaatje, E.H., Fricker, R.D., Geschwind, S.A., Goldman, C.A., Kaganoff, T., Robyn, A., Sundt, M., Vogelgesang, L, and Klein, S.P. (1998). *Coupling Service and Learning in Higher Education: The Final Report of the Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program*. Santa Monica: The RAND Corporation.
- Holland, B.A. (Fall, 2000). Institutional impacts and organizational issues related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue, 52-60.
- Holland, B.A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *The Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4(1), 37-43.
- Holland, B.A. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: a model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 30-41
- Holland, B.A. and Gelmon, S. (1998). The state of the engaged campus: What have we learned about building and sustaining university and community partnerships. *AAHE Bulletin*, American Association for Higher Education, 3-6.
- Levine, A. (1980). *Why innovation fails: Institutionalization and termination of innovation in higher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kramer, M. (2000). *Make It Last Forever: The Institutionalization of Service Learning in America*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

- Pickeral, T. and Peters, K. (1996). *From the Margins to the Mainstream: The Faculty Role for Advancing Service-Learning on Community Colleges*. Mesa: Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges.
- Ward, K. (1998). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations, and faculty work. In Rhoads, R.A. and Howard, J. (Eds.). *Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 73-80.
- Zlotkowski, E. (Fall, 2000). Service-learning research in the disciplines. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue, 61-67.