

CASE STUDY

INSTRUCTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON SERVICE-LEARNING'S SUSTAINABILITY AT BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY

ALLISON ALDEN, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

KRISTINA LAMBRIGHT, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY

BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK

JANUARY 2010

Study Funded by:

Pennsylvania/New York Campus Compact Consortium

Building on Our Strengths 2009 Award with funds from

The Corporation for National and Community Service's Learn and Serve America—

Higher Education Program (CFDA# 94.005)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Definition of Terms	4
Factors Influencing Faculty Efforts to Sustain Service-Learning	5
Research Design	6
Findings	9
Discussion	17
References	19
Appendix A: Survey Results	21
Tables:	
1) Perceptions of Current Supports for Service-Learning	9
2) Survey Results Regarding Perceptions of Current Supports and the Impact of Future Support for Service-Learning	12

Executive Summary

This case study examines how instructors view service-learning and the level of support for this methodology at Binghamton University. It also explores the degree to which individual instructors at Binghamton University have been able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students. Several different data sources were used in this case study, including: (1) a survey of instructors, (2) interviews with campus administrators, staff, and instructors, and (3) printed and electronic documents.

According to this study's findings, there have been minimal financial incentives and opportunities for course releases for instructors interested in service-learning. Perceptions regarding the level of support from other instructors, administrative support, and campus support services available to instructors interested in service-learning, however, were a bit more positive. The value of service-learning in personnel review processes was perceived as mostly neutral or negative. Although only a small percentage of instructors at Binghamton University are currently involved in service-learning activities, the survey results indicate that the individual instructors who have taught service-learning courses have demonstrated a sustained commitment to this pedagogical approach over time.

In addition, survey results suggest funding, release time, support from departmental colleagues, administrative support, campus support services and consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes are important factors encouraging instructors to sustain their service-learning activities. On the other hand, support from colleagues outside of their department appears to be less critical in encouraging instructors to continue to use service-learning. In the future, Binghamton University may want to consider the following strategies to promote service-learning sustainability: (1) more effectively disseminating information regarding institutional support for service-learning, (2) encouraging mentoring relationships to provide support to instructors new to service-learning, and (3) helping faculty integrate community-based work and service-learning teaching with their research agenda.

Every semester, hundreds of Binghamton University students and faculty from a variety of disciplines participate in service-learning projects. As a result of these efforts, new relationships have been created between the university and the organizations and individuals in the immediate area that have altered how each perceives and connects with the other. A growing number of colleges and universities (like Binghamton) have considered a shift away from short-term to more enduring engagement and have begun to institutionalize their service-learning programs (Reardon, 1997; Rubin, 1996). Reflecting this trend, over 1,100 colleges and universities, including Binghamton University, now belong to Campus Compact—“a national coalition...dedicated to promoting community service, civic engagement, and service-learning in higher education” (College Compact, 2009).

Several scholars have highlighted the key role that faculty play in implementing and sustaining service-learning at colleges and universities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, 1996; Driscoll, 2000; Furco, 2002a; Holland, 1999). Because the implementation of service-learning involves curricular reform, the overall success of efforts to sustain service-learning largely depends on the roles individual instructors play in the development and teaching of courses (Billig, 2002; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997). In fact, a key measure used to determine the degree of institutionalization of service-learning within a college or university is whether a critical number of faculty choose to integrate service-learning into their courses (Furco, 2002b; Gelmon, Seifer, Kauper-Brown, & Mikkelsen, 2005; Holland, 2006).

This case study offers insights into the faculty perspective on service-learning’s sustainability at Binghamton University. It examines how faculty members view service-learning and the level of support for this methodology. It also explores the degree to which individual instructors at Binghamton University have been able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students. It concludes by considering the implications of the findings for efforts to sustain service-learning at both the institutional and faculty levels.

Definition of Terms

While the term “service-learning” has been interpreted in a variety of ways, the working definition used throughout the study is a modified version of the definition developed by Abes et al. (2002):

Service-learning is defined as a form of experiential education characterized by all of the following conditions: student participation in an organized service activity that meets identified off-campus community needs and is connected to

course content and specific learning outcomes with structured reflection during class time.

Also central to this study, the term “sustainability” has been used extensively within the literature on service-learning and community engagement, taking on a number of meanings and nuances. This study adopts the definition offered by Billig (2002):

Sustainability is similar to institutionalization and typically refers to an innovation that endures over time. Sustainability often involves the ability to maintain or increase program efforts by building constituencies; creating strong, enduring partnerships; generating and leveraging resources; and identifying and securing funding sources that are available over time. (p. 247)

In the most recent literature on service-learning, sustainability has become nearly synonymous with institutionalization (Billig, 2002). When distinctions are made in the literature between institutionalization and sustainability, the former is associated with formal organizational structure and the later is not (Billig, 2002). Based on this distinction, this study uses the term sustainability to refer to the continuation of service-learning efforts by faculty, because such efforts may not be associated with any formal organizational structures or initiatives.

Factors Influencing Faculty Efforts to Sustain Service-Learning

Researchers have identified a number of factors that support service-learning efforts. Several scholars have highlighted the importance of having a centralized office for coordinating service-learning activities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, 2000; Bringle et al., 1997). According to Bringle and Hatcher (2000), colleges have made greater progress institutionalizing service-learning if: (1) they have a centralized office to coordinate service-learning, (2) this office has been in existence for two or more years, (3) this office reports to an academic officer, and (4) this office is supported by internal funds.

Other important sources of support include the encouragement faculty members receive from other faculty both inside and outside of their departments, as well as encouragement faculty members receive from campus administrators. The first generation of faculty adopting service-learning ideally should be actively involved in the recruitment of the second generation of faculty by participating in faculty development activities, writing about their experiences in a disciplinary monograph or journal, and making service-learning one of the foci for their research (Bringle et al., 1997). In addition, support from campus administrators has been identified as playing a key role in encouraging faculty members to engage in service-learning activities. In

their survey of Campus Compact members, Hinck and Brandell (2000) find that the value campus administrators place on service-learning is positively associated with the value faculty place on service-learning.

Researchers have also identified several factors hindering service-learning efforts. One of the most widely identified barriers in the service-learning literature is a lack of rewards and recognition for service-learning within personnel review processes (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Gelmon, 2007; Holland, 1999, Stanton, 1994; Ward, 1996). In addition, concerns relating to time, logistics, and funding can hamper service-learning efforts (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Holland, 1999; Stanton, 1994; Ward, 1996). Funding is needed to effectively administer a service-learning office, as well as to pay for the direct costs of service-learning projects, such as travel and preparation of professional materials (Ward, 1996). Moreover, service-learning requires faculty to spend considerable time forming community partnerships, recruiting students, and managing course curricula. Providing release time to develop service-learning courses offers one mechanism for addressing these concerns (Abes et al., 2002). Given the intense demands on faculty time, Bloomgarden and O'Meara (2007) astutely observe that the extent to which faculty are able to link community-based projects with their existing research and teaching roles will impact the extent of their involvement in these projects.

Research Design

In an effort to triangulate the data, this study relied on several different data sources, including: (1) an electronic survey of instructors, (2) interviews with campus administrators, staff, and instructors, and (3) printed and electronic documents.

Survey: An electronic survey was emailed to Binghamton University instructors who were identified as using service-learning, as well as to instructors who were not known to have used this methodology. Key administrators, staff, and faculty familiar with service-learning policy and practices were asked to identify others who they knew were using service-learning or had used service-learning in the past. In total, 31 service-learning instructors were identified. In the first survey wave, instructors in the service-learning sample were asked to provide the names of others they knew were currently teaching or had taught service-learning courses. An additional seven instructors were identified as using service-learning through this snowball

sampling technique, and they were also sent surveys. As part of the study, 62 randomly selected instructors who were not identified as using service-learning were also surveyed.

In total, 100 electronic surveys were distributed and 55 usable surveys were received (29 from the service-learning sample and 26 from the non-service-learning sample), representing an overall response rate of 55%. Somewhat unexpectedly, seven respondents in the non-service-learning sample indicated that they had taught at least one course with a service-learning component. Because this study focuses on the experiences of those who use service-learning, the responses of these seven instructors were added to the service-learning sample in the analysis, while the responses of the others from the non-service-learning sample have been excluded. This study's quantitative analysis is based on data provided by 36 survey respondents.

Key characteristics of the individuals in our survey sample who indicated they had taught at least one service-learning course include:

- 67% were female;
- three-quarters were Caucasian;
- 53% were tenured, 16% were untenured and on a tenure track, and the remaining 31% were untenured and not on a tenure track; and
- 25% belonged to a department within the social and behavioral sciences, while the remaining 75% taught in a wide variety of other disciplines.

This group of faculty had been teaching at the college and/or university level for an average of 17 years.

The survey was primarily composed of close-ended questions. Instructors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements relating to:

- the value of service-learning as a pedagogical tool;
- the importance of student participation in service-learning;
- the importance of higher education institutions working with communities to solve problems;
- the extent to which instructors in their departments, instructors outside of their departments, and campus administrators are supportive of service-learning;
- the availability of support services and funding for service-learning; and
- the value placed on service-learning in personnel review processes.

In addition, participants answered questions about their implementation of service-learning:

- the number of times they had taught a semester-long class with a service-learning component,
- the type of service-learning courses they have taught,

- the number of service-learning projects that they have been involved with that lasted two or more semesters,
- the number of community organizations they had partnered with and the roles that their community partners had played in their service-learning projects,
- the receipt of release time and/or funding to support their service-learning activities,
- the relevance of service-learning to their research agenda, and
- the factors that would encourage them to continue to use service-learning.

Interviews: Two sets of interviews were also conducted as part of the data collection process. First, key individuals who had administrative responsibilities and were familiar with service-learning structures, practices, and policies at Binghamton University were interviewed. Participants in these interviews were asked about faculty implementation of service-learning; faculty incentives for engaging in service-learning; centralized support capacity; the strategic plan and goals for advancing service-learning; service-learning's relationship to other campus-wide efforts; and the institutionalization of service-learning on their campus. Interview questions were based on Furco's rubric (2002b) for assessing the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. In total, six individuals participated in this interview phase. In addition to having administrative responsibilities, two of the six interviewees also instructed service-learning courses.

As a follow-up to the survey, a second set of interviews was conducted with four faculty members at Binghamton University. They were drawn from different disciplines and included individuals who taught at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Participants in these interviews were asked about faculty implementation of service-learning; faculty incentives for engaging in service-learning; the extent to which instructors in their department, instructors outside of their department, and campus administrators were supportive of service-learning; the relevance of service-learning to their research agenda; the role of their community partners in their service-learning projects; and their plans to use service-learning in the future.

Document Analysis: As a final information source, a document analysis was conducted. Documents were collected through searches of the university website. We also asked participants in the first set of interviews to identify any documents or websites that provide information about service-learning and other forms of experiential education on campus. Examples of documents reviewed included: strategic plans, mission statements, annual reports, committee descriptions and minutes, tenure and promotion and/or performance review guidelines, and personnel procedures.

Study Findings

According to our data sources, there have been minimal financial incentives and opportunities for course releases for instructors interested in service-learning. Perceptions regarding the level of support from other faculty, administrative support, and campus support services available to instructors interested in service-learning, however, were a bit more positive.¹ The value of service-learning in personnel review processes was perceived as mostly negative or neutral. This section begins by describing the institutional context for service-learning. Following this, the level of support for service-learning activities at Binghamton University is detailed in the following areas: incentives for using service-learning, instructor support, administrative support, availability of support services, and the value of service-learning in personnel review processes. This section concludes by discussing the extent to which individual instructors have been able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students. The key findings presented in this section are summarized in Table 1. Both the survey responses and interview comments were considered when making the rating determinations.

Table 1. Perceptions of Current Supports for Service-Learning

Availability of Financial Incentives	Limited (supported primarily by external funding)
Availability of Course Releases	Limited (supported by external funding)
Level of Instructor Support	Moderately positive within departments/neutral outside departments
Level of Administrative Support	Moderately positive
Availability of Support Services	Moderate
Value of Service-Learning in Personnel Review Processes	Valued negatively/neutral

¹ Since people act on what they believe to be the case, rather than what may in fact be true, becoming aware of their views helps in understanding their behaviors. By collecting data on faculty perceptions of institutional factors that may have contributed to their decisions regarding the use and sustainability of service-learning, we have a more accurate understanding of their beliefs, but not necessarily actual institutional sources of support.

The Institutional Context: As a publicly-funded doctoral research university with approximately 11,500 undergraduate and 3,000 graduate students, Binghamton University has considerable research expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Binghamton University has been engaged in an ongoing collaboration on project grants funded by Campus Compact. The purpose of these projects has been to increase the number of faculty teaching service-learning courses, increase the number of students engaged in community-based learning, and build capacity to support these efforts on the campus. A small number of instructors at this institution have used service-learning over several years. At least 5% of instructors at Binghamton University have taught a service-learning course.² In a few departments, several instructors use service-learning, while in most departments, its use has been more limited.

A handful of campus staff is tasked with some activities related to supporting instructor service-learning efforts, in addition to their other responsibilities. These staff work for different programs in various locations around the campus, and there is little coordination among these programs. Several interviewees indicated that a significant percentage of campus service-learning activities are not filtered through any of the campus programs tasked with supporting instructor service-learning efforts. As evidence supporting this, a number of survey respondents who were not identified by administrators, staff, and faculty as being involved with service-learning, reported teaching a course with a service learning component. Interviewees also indicated service-learning staff has very little, if any, authority to influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning on the campus. According to one interviewee, staff lacks this authority because their efforts have only minimal connections with instructors. This interviewee believed that if there was greater instructor involvement in efforts to support and coordinate service-learning activities, these efforts might be more successful.

Several interviewees indicated that while there were two campus-wide committees associated with service-learning in the past, neither of the committees continue to function. Although one interviewee indicated that they ceased their meetings because of a lack of leadership, others seemed less clear regarding the reason(s) for why the meetings were discontinued. Committee membership was composed of university staff with a few faculty

² Based on the size of the sample for this study's survey, approximately 5% of instructors are involved in service-learning. However, the percentage of instructors who are involved in service-learning may likely be much higher given that 7 out of the 26 respondents in our non-service-learning sample indicated that they had taught at least one semester-long course with a service-learning component.

members (who joined in small but increasing numbers later in the history of these groups). Analysis of the minutes of these committees indicate that both were engaged in some activities and had functions related to service-learning. However, the committees did not appear to have clear missions, and there seemed to be some overlap in functions.

Based on the document analysis, there are no formal policies specific to service-learning or formalized plans for achieving campus-wide goals related to service-learning at Binghamton University. Also as evidenced by interviews and document analysis, there are no campus-wide mechanisms for monitoring the quality of service-learning activities.

Incentives for Using Service-Learning: The incentives for instructors to engage in service-learning activities at Binghamton University were primarily intrinsic rather than extrinsic. Only 42% of the instructors surveyed had received any funding to support their service-learning activities, and just 17% had received release time. Consistent with this, only 17% of survey respondents agreed with the statement that campus funding for service-learning activities is available, as illustrated in Table 2.³ Table 2 details the level of agreement survey respondents expressed in response to statements regarding: (1) current levels of campus support for service-learning and (2) the likelihood that future support would influence their continued use of service-learning. While the funding and release time that has been available was limited, more than three-fifths of the survey respondents indicated that both release time and financial incentives would encourage them to continue to use service-learning, also shown in Table 2.

³ There was confusion among interviewees regarding the sources of funding for service-learning activities. But, most was actually provided by external sources.

Table 2. Survey Results Regarding Perceptions of Current Supports and the Impact of Future Support for Service-Learning

Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed with corresponding statements.

	Currently Exists	Would Encourage Continued SL Efforts
Campus funding for service-learning activities % (number) disagree/strongly disagree % (number) neither agree nor disagree % (number) agree/strongly agree	31.4% (11) 51.4% (18) 17.1% (6)	5.6% (2) 16.7% (6) 77.8% (28)
Release time to support service-learning activities % (number) disagree/strongly disagree % (number) neither agree nor disagree % (number) agree/strongly agree		8.3% (3) 30.6% (11) 61.1% (22)
Support of service-learning by other instructors in my department % (number) disagree/strongly disagree % (number) neither agree nor disagree % (number) agree/strongly agree	11.1% (4) 27.8% (10) 61.1% (22)	5.6% (2) 33.3% (12) 61.1% (22)
Support of service-learning by other instructors outside my department % (number) disagree/strongly disagree % (number) neither agree nor disagree % (number) agree/strongly agree	5.6% (2) 55.6% (20) 38.9% (14)	8.3% (3) 55.6% (20) 36.1% (13)
Support of service-learning by campus administrators % (number) disagree/strongly disagree % (number) neither agree nor disagree % (number) agree/strongly agree	8.3% (3) 30.6% (11) 61.1% (22)	5.7% (2) 25.7% (9) 68.5% (24)
Campus support services for instructors interested in service-learning % (number) disagree/strongly disagree % (number) neither agree nor disagree % (number) agree/strongly agree	20.0% (7) 40.0% (14) 40.0% (14)	5.7% (2) 31.4% (11) 62.9% (22)
Service-learning valued in performance reviews and/or the tenure and promotion process % (number) disagree/strongly disagree % (number) neither agree nor disagree % (number) agree/strongly agree	47.2% (17) 41.7% (15) 11.1% (4)	8.6% (3) 31.4% (11) 60% (21)

Instead of initially being motivated by financial incentives or release time, four interviewees reported that instructors become involved in service-learning because of the educational value it provides to their students. Instructors believe that their students benefit from

the opportunity to apply course knowledge in a real-life setting. As described by one interviewee:

“I am completely committed that this [service-learning] is the best thing for their [student] development, that it is a safe way to grow and develop. Because all team interactions happen in front of me, conflicts, we are safe. And if I can help you make mistakes and learn from them, I’m so committed to that. I don’t want you to make the same mistake in front of your boss. ..Outrageous things get said in team meetings and we learn from them. And nowhere else could you say that and still have a job. So those are the comments I need to say to people. I understand your frustration but you’d be fired right now. And it’s a great safe place for them to learn, and I don’t feel confident sending them out without the service learning.”

Three interviewees also reported that instructors become engaged in service-learning activities in order to benefit the community. Consistent with these interview reports, survey findings indicate that:

- 97% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that service-learning is a valuable pedagogical tool;
- 92% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it is important for students on this campus to participate in service-learning;
- 75% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it is important for students in their discipline to participate in service-learning; and
- 97% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed it is important for colleges and universities to work with communities to help them solve problems.

Instructor Support: Attitudes regarding instructor support of service-learning were mixed at Binghamton University, as shown in Table 2. While more than three-fifths of survey respondents believed that instructors within their departments were supportive of service-learning, less than 40% viewed instructors outside of their departments as supportive. According to one instructor, “I don’t think we have a real good infrastructure for faculty to really...share ideas about what works and what doesn’t work. So I haven’t had any formal contact or informal contact really, with other faculty about the service-learning projects outside of our college. Within the college, yes, but not beyond [to the university].” Over 60% of survey respondents indicated that support from other instructors in their department would encourage them to continue to use service learning, as shown in Table 2. On the other hand, less than 40% of respondents agreed that support from instructors outside of their department would encourage them to continue to use service-learning.

One interviewee indicated that having a mentor would be particularly valuable for instructors trying service-learning for the first time. When asked what advice she would give regarding service-learning to someone new to service-learning, she responded: “[My advice] to new faculty members just starting out, is find someone who does service learning who has learned over the years how you can streamline it and include it in your courses without that monumental amount of work that you make when you’re new and have nowhere to turn to.”

Administrative Support: More than 60% of survey respondents at Binghamton University agreed that campus administrators are supportive of service-learning, as illustrated in Table 2. Several interviewees reported that senior administrators have been publicly supportive of service-learning and have given recognition awards for service activities. In addition, a question on service-learning has recently been added to the Provost's annual faculty report. However, a number of interviewees also noted that sustaining service-learning efforts has not been a high priority for senior administrators. In the words of one interviewee, this reflects:

“...the ambivalence [senior administrators] feel about pulling faculty away from their primary research obligations. To the extent that we were using our resources to lure our faculty away from their research activities... if we were rewarding them financially or any other way, course reductions or whatever, for doing service-learning... [senior administrators] fear that they would then not get tenure or if they were already tenured that they would cease to be making the desired ... contribution to our mission as a research university.”

Nearly 70% of survey respondents indicated that support from campus administrators would encourage them to continue to use service-learning.

Support Services: A moderate level of support services has been available to instructors interested in service-learning at Binghamton University. According to survey results shown in Table 2, 40% of survey respondents indicated that support services for instructors interested in service-learning are available on campus. According to interviewees, a few instructors have received training as part of the Campus Compact projects. In addition, campus offices responsible for providing instructional support have occasionally sponsored workshops on service-learning. But as noted, the efforts of these staff persons were not well coordinated. Several interviewees indicated that instructors are often unaware of the support services that are available. When describing the current system of support services at Binghamton University, one interviewee reported:

“I think they [support services at Binghamton University] are fragmented plus there’s big gaps... For instance if you’re a student and you want to do a service-learning course... where do you go? If you’re a faculty and you want to do a service learning course... who do you go to? It’s not outlined in a scheduled manner where... people know exactly what steps they have to take so it’s very fragmented and ... a lot of pieces are missing.”

The support services available at Binghamton University, particularly those involving coordination of service-learning activities, could be expanded. Our survey results suggest that further investments in support services could help sustain service-learning efforts. Approximately 63% of survey respondents at Binghamton University indicated that availability of campus support services would encourage them to use service-learning in the future, as shown in Table 2.

Personnel Review Processes: Instructor attitudes regarding the value placed on service-learning in personnel review processes were generally negative or neutral and suggest that service ethics compete with research ethics on the campus. A little over two-fifths of the survey respondents were neutral regarding the value of service-learning in personnel review processes, while nearly 50% disagreed that service-learning activities were valued in these processes, as shown in Table 2. The negative attitudes that many survey respondents expressed may be related to the fact that Binghamton University has considerable research expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Several interviewees indicated that the use of service-learning results in faculty having less time to spend on research, which may discourage them from getting involved in service-learning activities. When asked if Binghamton University rewards faculty for engaging in service-learning activities, one interviewee replied, “I don’t think they’re rewarded at all. I think that you are disrewarded.” This interviewee continued:

“It takes a lot of time and energy to coordinate with community agencies, to know your community, to be out in your community. It takes a lot of time and energy to help students get the knowledge that they need to function effectively in the community. And I think that those skills are not rewarded by the university. The skills that are rewarded by the university would be any literature that you can publish based on that [service-learning], which is harder to do. They reward research...If you have a system where it’s [service-learning is] really well integrated then it would be easy to research it and publish it and fulfill university expectations. But unless you can figure out how to integrate that yourself, there’s nobody on the campus that’s helping you do that.”

Capturing the same sentiments, another interviewee reported:

“When I was serving on the university personnel committee, there were cases that would come up when a faculty member was really contributing a lot of time... to different kinds of service-learning activities. And the general discussion on those candidacies often focused on needing to shift their attention from that kind of work to more traditional teaching and research activity. So there was really a community sense on that committee that people who engage in service-learning in a big way were really taking away time from the activities that they should have been focusing on.”

Evidence suggests that tenure status may impact faculty decisions to utilize service-learning. Only 16% of survey respondents were untenured and on a tenure track, while the rest were already tenured (53%) or not on a tenure track (31%). When asked what advice she would give regarding service-learning to a new instructor just starting out, one interviewee bluntly replied that she would tell them to avoid service-learning if their goal was to become a tenured faculty member at Binghamton University. According to the interviews, faculty at Binghamton University have been known to take non-tenure track positions in order to continue to engage in time-consuming experiential educational practices and avoid the possibility of failing to meet the university's tenure-track research expectations.

The study findings suggest that consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes can influence whether faculty sustain their service-learning efforts. As shown in Table 2, 60% of those surveyed indicated that the valuing of service-learning during the tenure and promotion process would encourage them to continue to use service-learning.

Service-Learning Sustainability: Community partners play a vibrant role in service-learning projects at Binghamton University. Three-quarters of survey respondents indicated that community partners have had input in the development their service-learning projects, and approximately 85% of survey respondents reported that community partners were involved in project implementation. The majority of survey respondents reported that community partners have provided them with feedback about their service-learning projects and that they have maintained communication with their community partners following project completion.

Although only a small percentage of faculty at Binghamton University are currently involved in service-learning activities, the survey results indicate that the individual instructors who have taught service-learning courses have demonstrated a sustained commitment to this pedagogical approach over time. The majority of survey respondents had taught a semester-long

class with a service-learning component four or more times. Moreover, roughly 61% of survey respondents have been involved in service-learning projects that have lasted two or more semesters.

Discussion

The study findings have several important implications for institutions, such as Binghamton University, that are interested in the sustainability of their service-learning activities. Our survey results suggest funding, release time, support from departmental colleagues, administrative support, campus support services and consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes are important factors encouraging instructors to sustain their service-learning activities. On the other hand, support from colleagues outside of their department appears to be less critical in encouraging instructors to continue to use service-learning.

This study's findings also indicate that the *presence* of support services does not necessarily mean that faculty members are aware of the available services. While Binghamton University had campus staff supporting instructor service-learning efforts, many instructors appear to be unaware of these institutional supports. This suggests a need for more effective dissemination of information regarding institutional support for service-learning.

As a way of supplementing any formal support services available on campus, Binghamton University may also want to consider encouraging mentoring relationships as a strategy for providing support to instructors new to service-learning. While an effective campus-wide coordination mechanism does not currently exist at Binghamton University, informal mentoring networks among service-learning instructors could address some of the existing needs in this gap, as has been found to be helpful at other institutions (Lambright & Alden, under review). Mentors can serve as valuable information resources and help with problem-solving. Within the service-learning literature, scholars have emphasized the importance of having a centralized office for coordinating service-learning activities (Bingle & Hatcher, 1996, 2000; Bingle et al., 1997). However, supporting an effective centralized coordinating body requires a substantial institutional monetary investment. When institutional resources are not available for centralized coordination, informal support services, such as the development of mentoring relationships among faculty, may effectively fill some of the void left by a lack of formal support services.

Study findings reveal that many faculty do not believe service-learning is valued in personnel review processes. As stated earlier, this creates a perceived conflict between research and service ethics on campus. Given that Binghamton University is seeking more recognition as a research institution, one strategy to mitigate this conflict and sustain service-learning activities is to promote and support them within a research framework. As demonstrated in the literature, having instructors focus on service-learning and related experiences as part of their research agenda and writing about service-learning in a disciplinary monograph or journal helps increase the acceptance of service-learning by other faculty (Bringle et al., 1997). In addition, linking community-based projects with existing faculty research and teaching also increases the likelihood that faculty will sustain their involvement in their community activities (Bloomgarden and O'Meara, 2007). Binghamton University may want to consider providing university support and direct assistance to faculty to help them integrate community-based work and service-learning teaching with their research agenda, so that these activities ultimately lead to publication. This strategy could strengthen the cases of those faculty engaged in service-learning as they progress through personnel review processes at Binghamton University.

In conclusion, there is great potential at Binghamton University to expand service learning. Evidence suggests that at least 5% of instructors at Binghamton University have taught a service-learning course. According to this study's findings, support for service-learning could be strengthened in a variety of areas. Despite this, the vast majority of survey respondents believed that service-learning offers valuable educational benefits and that it is important for universities to work with communities to help them solve problems. Reflecting their ideological support for service-learning, many instructors among the small cadre of faculty who use service-learning have taught several service-learning courses and have been involved in service-learning projects that last multiple semesters. A number of instructors have also worked closely with community partners to design and implement service-learning projects. By strengthening institutional support for service-learning, Binghamton University will be able to build on the enthusiasm and accomplishments of the core group of faculty currently engaged in service-learning and make this practice more widespread across the campus.

References

- Abes, E.S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 5-17.
- Banerjee, M. & Hausafus, C.O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14, 32-45.
- Billig, S.H. (2002). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of k-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S.H. Billig (Eds.) *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245-267). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Bloomgarden, A.H., & O'Meara, K.A. (2007). Faculty role integration and community Engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13, 5-18.
- Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 112-22.
- Bringle, R. & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 221-239.
- Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 273-290.
- Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & Games, R. (1997). Engaging and supporting faculty in service learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 2, 43-51.
- College Compact (2009). *About College Compact*. Retrieved on September 28, 2009, from <http://www.compact.org/>
- Furco, A. (2002a). Institutionalizing service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Public Affairs*, 1, 39-68.
- Furco, A. (2002b). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education*. Berkley, CA: University of California.
- Gelmon, S.B. (2007). Engaged scholarship: Current context and future directions. In S. Gelmon & S. Billig (Eds.), *From passion to objectivity: International and cross-disciplinary perspectives on service-learning research* (pp. 241-254). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Gelmon, S.B., Seifer, S.D., Kauper-Brown, J. & Mikkelsen, M. (2005). *Building capacity for community engagement: Institutional self-assessment*. Seattle, WA: Community Campus Partnerships for Health. www.ccph.info

- Hinck, S.S., & Brandell, M.E. (2000). The relationship between institutional support and campus acceptance of academic service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 868-881.
- Holland, B.A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 47, 37-43.
- Holland, B.A. (2006). *Levels of commitment to community engagement, characterized by key organizational factors evidencing relevance to institutional mission [matrix]*. Retrieved on November 9, 2007, from <http://www.henceonline.org/resources/institutional>
- Lambright, K.T., & Alden, A.F. Voices from the trenches: Faculty perspectives on institutional support for sustaining service-learning. Under review at *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*.
- Reardon, K. (1997). Institutionalizing community service learning at a major research university: The case of the East St. Louis Action Research Project. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 130-136.
- Rubin, S. (1996). Institutionalizing service-learning. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp. 297-316). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ward, K. (1996). Service-learning and student volunteerism: Reflections on institutional commitment. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, 55-65.