

# Principles of Good Practice for Service-Learning Pedagogy

**T**his is an up-dated set of "Principles of Good Practice for Service-Learning Pedagogy."\*

## Principle 1: Academic Credit is for Learning, Not for Service

This first principle speaks to those who puzzle over how to assess students' service in the community, or what weight to assign community involvement in final grades.

In traditional courses, academic credit and grades are assigned based on students' demonstration of academic learning as measured by the instructor. It is no different in service-learning courses. While in traditional courses we assess students' learning from traditional course resources, e.g., textbooks, class discussions, library research, etc., in service-learning courses we evaluate students' learning from traditional resources, from the community service, and from the blending of the two.

So, academic credit is not awarded for doing service or for the quality of the service, but rather for the student's demonstration of academic and civic learning.

## Principle 2: Do Not Compromise Academic Rigor

Since there is a widespread perception in academic circles that community service is a "soft" learning resource, there may be a temptation to compromise the academic rigor in a service-learning course.

Labeling community service as a "soft" learning stimulus reflects a gross misperception. The perceived "soft" service component actually raises the learning challenge in a course. Service-learning students must not only master academic material as in traditional courses, but also learn how to learn from unstructured and ill-structured community experiences and merge that learning with the learning from other course resources. Furthermore, while in traditional courses students must satisfy only academic learning objectives, in service-learning courses students must satisfy both academic and civic learning objectives. All of this makes for challenging intellectual work, commensurate with rigorous academic standards.

## Principle 3: Establish Learning Objectives

It is a service-learning maxim that one cannot develop a quality service-learning course without first setting very explicit learning objectives. This principle is foundational to service-learning, and serves as the focus of sections four and five of this workbook.

While establishing learning objectives for students is a standard to which all courses are accountable, in fact, it is especially necessary and advantageous to establish learning objectives in service-learning courses. The addition of the community as a learning context multiplies the learning possibilities (see pp. 26-29). To sort out those of greatest priority, as well as to leverage the bounty of learning opportunities offered by community service experiences, deliberate planning of course academic *and* civic learning objectives is required.

\* Updated from the original: Howard, J. (1993). Community service learning in the curriculum. In J. Howard (Ed.), *Praxis I: A faculty casebook on community service learning* (pp. 3 - 12). Ann Arbor: OCSL Press.

## Section 2

### **Principle 7: Minimize the Distinction Between the Students' Community Learning Role and Classroom Learning Role**

Classrooms and communities are very different learning contexts. Each requires students to assume a different learner role. Generally, classrooms provide a high level of teacher direction, with students expected to assume mostly a passive learner role. In contrast, service communities usually provide a low level of teaching direction, with students expected to assume mostly an active learner role. Alternating between the passive learner role in the classroom and the active learner role in the community may challenge and even impede student learning. The solution is to shape the learning environments so that students assume similar learner roles in both contexts.

While one solution is to intervene so that the service community provides a high level of teaching direction, we recommend, for several reasons, re-norming the traditional classroom toward one that values students as active learners. First, active learning is consistent with active civic participation that service-learning seeks to foster. Second, students bring information from the community to the classroom that can be utilized on behalf of others' learning. Finally, we know from recent research in the field of cognitive science that students develop deeper understanding of course material if they have an opportunity to actively construct knowledge (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

### **Principle 8: Rethink the Faculty Instructional Role**

If faculty encourage students' active learning in the classroom, what would be a concomitant and consistent change in one's teaching role?

Commensurate with the preceding principle's recommendation for an active student learning posture, this principle advocates that service-learning teachers, too, rethink their roles. An instructor role that would be most compatible with an active student role shifts away from a singular reliance on transmission of knowledge and toward mixed pedagogical methods that include learning facilitation and guidance. Exclusive or even primary use of traditional instructional models, e.g., a banking model (Freire, 1970), interferes with the promise of learning in service-learning courses.

To re-shape one's classroom role to capitalize on the learning bounty in service-learning, faculty will find Howard's (1998) model of "Transforming the Classroom" helpful. This four-stage model begins with the traditional classroom in which students are passive, teachers are directive, and all conform to the learned rules of the classroom. In the second stage, the instructor begins to re-socialize herself toward a more facilitative role; but the students, socialized for many years to be passive learners, are slow to change to a more active mode. In the third stage, with the perseverance of the instructor, the students begin to develop and acquire the skills and propensities to be active in the classroom. Frequently, during this phase, faculty will become concerned that learning is not as rich and rigorous as when they are using the more popular lecture format, and may regress to a more directive posture. Over time homeostasis is established, and the instructor and the students achieve an environment in which mixed pedagogical methods lead to students who are active learners, instructors fluent in multiple teaching methods, and strong academic and civic learning outcomes.

### **Principle 9: Be Prepared for Variation in, and Some Loss of Control with, Student Learning Outcomes**

For those faculty who value homogeneity in student learning outcomes, as well as control of the learning environment, service-learning may not be a good fit.

In college courses, learning strategies largely determine student outcomes, and this is true in service-learning courses, too. However, in traditional courses, the learning strategies (i.e., lectures, labs, and readings) are constant for all enrolled students and under the watchful eye of the faculty member. In service-learning courses, given variability in service experiences and their influential role in student learning, one can anticipate greater heterogeneity in student learning outcomes and compromises to faculty control. Even when service-learning