Winter 2000

Issues Involved in Faculty Implementation of Community Service-Learning in Teacher Education

Rahima C. Wade
University of Iowa

Eric Vanden Berk
University of Iowa

Stephanie K. Siddens

®

N•S•E•E® Quarterly

Issues Involved in Faculty Implementation of Community Service-Learning in Teacher Education[1]

by Rahima Wade, Eric Vanden Berk, and Stephanie Siddens

This study examined how teacher education faculty from 21 institutions attempted to implement the curricular innovation of community service-learning. Faculty's biggest successes were implementation of program/course changes, increased collaborations on campus or in the community, and perceived positive impact on pre-service teachers. Barriers to implementation included time, resistance, or inertia on the part of colleagues, limited finances, and other reform efforts and commitments that demanded immediate attention. The study highlights several key factors that contributed to faculty success: faculty ownership and involvement in decision making, site-specific professional development opportunities, resources to support faculty's efforts, and written plans for implementation.

NSLC
c/o ETR Associates
4 Carbonero Way
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

Introduction

CURRICULUM REFORM is ever present in higher education. Currently, service-learning initiatives compete with efforts to enhance technology, diversity, curriculum standards, and the like. All of these initiatives thrive or die, depending on funding, faculty resistance, administrative support, and other personal and organizational factors. Research studies that focus on understanding the complexity and interaction of these factors can contribute to greater success and longevity of service-learning.

The objectives of this study were to explore factors associated with teacher education faculty's efforts to implement a specific curricular innovation — community service-learning. Clarke et al (1996) noted that most of the literature on change and innovation in higher education is suppositional and descriptive in nature; only a few studies have involved the systematic collection of data. The researchers involved with this study sought to address this concern through collecting both qualitative and quantitative data as part of a grant program evaluation.

The grant program, the National Service-Learning in Teacher Education Partnership (NSLTEP), was organized to support 21 teacher education programs in the

United States in developing and implementing service-learning activities. Service-learning — the integration of community service activities with academic learning and structured reflection on the service experience — is increasingly prevalent in elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States. The growth of service-learning in K–12 classrooms points to the importance of preparing new teachers to understand and implement service-learning as a teaching strategy (Donahue, 1999; Erickson & Anderson, 1997). A recent survey of teacher education programs in the U.S. revealed that approximately one fourth already integrate service-learning and another fourth are interested in developing such opportunities for preservice teachers (NSLTEP, 1998).

The National Service-Learning in Teacher Education Partnership (NSLTEP), a three-year program funded by the federal Corporation for National Service, is organized on a regional basis. During the first

year of the program (1997–98), each of the seven NSLTEP regional coordinators worked with faculty in three teacher education programs in their region. Coordinators conducted a minimum of one site visit to each program to meet with faculty and share information about service-learning. Coordinators also provided journal articles, curriculum materials, and sample syllabi to the faculty members. In the summer of 1998, each coordinator facilitated a two-day institute that was attended by the faculty participants and other interested teacher educators. Each site also received a $4,000 stipend and was required to develop an action plan for how they would implement service-learning in their teacher education programs during the following school year.

The purpose of this study was to determine how these professional development experiences — combined with the personal and contextual aspects of each teacher education program site — affected teacher educators' successes or difficulties with implementing service-learning. The questions framing this study are: a) What factors appear to facilitate teacher educators' implementation of service-learning? and b) What factors present barriers to the implementation of service-learning in teacher education? The results of the study in relation to these two questions point to several strategies for faculty professional development that are likely to contribute to greater success in faculty implementation of service-learning in teacher education, and possibly in other disciplines as well.

Adoption and Implementation of Curricular Innovations in Higher Education: A Literature Review

This study is grounded in the literature on higher education faculty's adoption and implementation of curricular innovations. Several researchers have focused on understanding why some faculty choose to get involved in curricular reform. Adoption of new ideas and practices are affected by the type of decision involved in the adoption, perceived attributes of the innovation, communication channels used, nature of the client system, and extent of the

faculty's efforts (Lamble, 1984). Rogers (1983) asserted that the most important factors affecting the adoption of a new idea are its compatibility with an individual's existing values and beliefs and their past experience with change in the social system. Bok (1986) noted that it is important that innovations do not threaten faculty's professional values and interests. In general, the individuals most comfortable with the change will be the ones proposing it (Hall, 1991; Rogers, 1983; Seymour, 1988) and success is enhanced by faculty-initiated vs. top-down types of efforts (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Hord et al 1987; Steeples, 1990). Thus, ownership of the curriculum reform effort is critical to success (Astin, 1985; Turner, 1990; Weimer, 1990). Kirkpatrick (1985) echoed this point when he maintained that the most significant factor influencing individuals' acceptance of or resistance to change is the amount of participation they have in the decision-making process.

There are several other factors that can influence both ownership and the overall success of an innovation. In examining twelve case studies of innovation, Huberman and Miles (1984) credited the amount and quality of assistance as being the most critical element of innovation implementation. Other supports cited in the literature include: professional development and training, funding, adequate resources, administrative support, released time, faculty leadership, common faculty vision, concrete planning tools, and rewards for faculty (Curry, 1992; Dean, Acker-Hocevar, & Laible, 1997; Hall, 1991; Hommes, 1997; Levine, 1980; Martin, 1994; Miles, 1983; Turner, 1990; Wolfson, 1996). Rogers (1983) noted that most individuals adopt a change based upon a subjective evaluation of the innovation that has been communicated to them by people like themselves. Cousins and Earl (1992) agreed, asserting that ownership and adoption of program innovations are enhanced to the extent that faculty members participate in the decisions and to which they place similar weight on information about the innovation.

Faculty resistance to change, however, is well-documented (Curry, 1992; Levine, 1980; Hall, 1991; Kozma, 1985; Rogers, 1983) and is attributed to both individual and organizational variables (Firestone & Corbett, 1988; Huberman &

Miles, 1984; Rogers, 1983; Waugh & Punch, 1987). Most faculty can be seen as conservative resistors to change, especially if the innovation involves learning new skills, changing their teaching, or becoming involved in new activities (Martin, 1994). Change that requires a major paradigm shift in thinking is also likely to be resisted (Fischetti, Dittmer & Kyle, 1996; Simsek & Louis, 1994). Additional barriers to faculty adoption of innovations referred to in the literature include: faculty indifference, faculty assumptions of autonomy, tenure and promotion expectations, the tension between teaching and research, ineffective professional development, lack of time, and administrative or organizational problems (Astin, 1985; Curry, 1992; Edwards, 1992; Halpern, 1994; Levine & Weingart, 1973; Miles, 1983; Silver, Hannan, & English, 1999; Todd, 1993).

While there are many common findings in studies related to faculty adoption of curricular innovations, Lattuca and Stark (1994, 1995) have noted that faculty members' disciplines and educational beliefs play an important role in their responses to curricular change. Thus, for this study, it is important to also consider the nature of teacher educators in concert with the innovation of service-learning.

A recent study of great import for this research focused on challenges and strategies for success among pre-service teacher educators involved with service-learning (Anderson & Pickeral, 2000). The authors surveyed 94 teacher educators, most of whom were involved in service-learning, and 29 other associated education professionals. They also interviewed 30 of the service-learning teacher educators. Anderson and Pickeral (2000) found that time was the biggest challenge faced by the educators (i.e., lack of time to implement service-learning, lack of time in pre-service curriculum, and lack of time to plan). The second largest set of challenges revolved around faculty involvement (i.e., lack of alignment between service-learning and institutional faculty roles and rewards, faculty unprepared to use service-learning as a teaching method, other faculty not interested in service-learning, and faculty unprepared to develop long-term partnerships). These and many other findings from Anderson and Pickeral's (2000) research echo findings in the literature on

faculty adoption of an innovation and response to change.

Methods

Sample

Faculty participants in the study were 30 teacher educators from 21 colleges and universities throughout the United States. Approximately half of the colleges were urban and the other half were in suburban or rural locations. Size of the teacher education departments ranged from four to 30 faculty members (mean=10.58). The faculty sample included 15 men and 15 women with a mean age of 49.12; two are African-American and the rest are white. Years in teacher education ranged from two to 30 (mean = 12.8). Mean age for the group was 49 years old. Faculty identified themselves as one of the following: Full Professor (n=2), Assistant or Associate Professor (n=16), Department Chair (n=6), Instructor (n=2) or Executive Director (n=4).

The other study participants are the seven NSLTEP regional coordinators. These individuals, three men and four women, are all white, with a mean age of 52. They are all experienced service-learning professionals working in higher education; four of the seven are teacher educators themselves.

Data Collection and Analysis

Several types of data were collected over the course of the study. They included site action plans and coordinator and faculty surveys for all participants (see Appendix for survey questions). Also, e-mail updates from some faculty and coordinators, feedback via a face-to-face meeting with all coordinators in September 1999, and assorted papers submitted by faculty or coordinators (e.g. coordinators' site visit notes, course syllabi) assisted with forming a realistic understanding of faculty efforts related to service-learning at each site.

Following the year of site visits, institute attendance, and reading of professional materials on service-learning, faculty at each site developed an action plan for integrating service-learning in their teacher education programs for the 1998–99 school year. Action plans specified strategies for integrating service-learning in the program, a timeline for implementation, and who would be responsible for proposed tasks. Faculty members were empowered to create their own format for the action plans, so they varied considerably. They ranged from broad goals set down in a few pages to extensive lists of specific actions that would be completed by key dates. Most action plans, though, included goals focused on developing or adapting courses or practica to include new service-learning activities. Many plans also included objectives to train new faculty or collaborate with local or regional educators on service-learning activities.

Coordinators completed standardized e-mail surveys (Appendix A) following the submission of the action plans to the project director. The coordinators responded to 17 open-ended questions developed by the evaluation team for the grant. Questions addressed coordinators' experiences working with faculty, their views on faculty satisfaction and success, and assessment of the institutes.

Faculty surveys were mailed out by the NSLTEP evaluation team and completed anonymously during the spring 1999 semester to follow up on progress and barriers related to the proposed action plans. Thirty of 32 faculty contacts completed the survey (94% return rate). The 26 question survey included both open-ended questions as well as Likert scale items related to various aspects of the collaboration (Appendix B). Following the 1998–99 school year, both coordinators and faculty provided e-mail updates. These updates, while less standardized than the surveys, provided a check on which aspects of the action plans were actually implemented as well as which factors impeded or enhanced implementation.

Depending on the type of question, analysis of the faculty survey items involved computation of mean scores, standard deviations, frequencies, and/or compilation of written comments. Qualitative data analysis methods were used for the open-ended survey items as well as the action plans, coordinator surveys, and e-mail updates. Patterns and categories emerged from the data through inductive analysis (Patton, 1980) and reduction of data (Miles & Huberman, 1994) into charts and summaries assisted with developing an accurate understanding of the key issues and events in faculty's service-learning experiences. Using themes developed through several readings of the data, both the first author and a graduate research assistant independently coded the open-ended items on the faculty survey to discern the prevalence of certain types of activities and issues among the faculty participants. Interrater level of agreement was 83% overall; differences were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached.

Results

In this part of the paper, we will address several issues related to the original research questions for the study. First, how successful were faculty in implementing service-learning practice in their teacher education programs and what factors appear to have enhanced their success? Second, what factors presented barriers to implementing the innovation?

Faculty Success

Both faculty and coordinator surveys revealed high satisfaction with most aspects of the collaboration (i.e., recruitment to be included in the program, contacts between faculty and coordinator, resources provided by the grant). On a scale of 0 (not at all useful) to 5 (very useful), mean scores for these items on the faculty survey ranged from 4.19 to 4.62. Faculty indicated their personal initiative and interest in the innovation of service-learning through their participation in a wide range of learning opportunities beyond the NSLTEP collaboration (i.e., workshops, meetings, conferences, personal readings, web searches, and professional conversations). Frequencies for these activities ranged from 17 to 24 (N=30). When asked, "How do you feel about your service-learning activities so far?", 25 of the 30 respondents wrote a very positive response, one felt "okay," and four cited some feelings of frustration, for example, with "minimal" progress or "the lack of long-term support/commitment from the college." A few respondents indicated both positive and negative feelings. These are three examples of data that contribute to a profile of the faculty participants as largely positive and enthusiastic about their efforts with service-learning.

In addition, faculty action plans were ambitious; almost all included multiple activities for implementing service-learning (e.g., student experiences in practica and courses, curriculum development, faculty retreats and workshops, research

projects). However, follow-up e-mails and conversations with both faculty and coordinators revealed that not all of these plans were accomplished. However, 17 of the 21 sites made either substantial progress or accomplished all of their goals; only four were deemed largely "unsuccessful" by the authors.

An analysis of the factors contributing to faculty success, consistent with the innovation literature, point to both personal and contextual variables. On the personal side, half of the faculty indicated that service-learning fit with their personal life activities or values. One wrote, "I do service-learning activities outside of work as well as in work," and another shared, "This is my 27th year doing service-learning — it is at the heart of my educational values and commitments."

In the workplace context, 20 of the 30 faculty participants indicated that service-learning fit well or "okay" with other reform initiatives in their programs. This is key, given the number of reform efforts the faculty were involved in at the time they completed the survey (mean 2.75, range 1–10). These reform efforts and curricular initiatives included restructuring the teacher education program (n=8), diversity reforms (n=7), responses to new certification rules or standards (n=7), and technology initiatives (n=4), among others. Two-thirds of the faculty in this study found that their service-learning work contributed in some way to these other reforms.

Faculty "buy-in" to service-learning was also enhanced through the role each individual had in decision making as part of the NSLTEP collaboration. Faculty first decided if they wanted to be part of the program. They specified to their regional coordinator what types of activities and assistance they desired at the site visit and designed their own action plan and timetable for carrying out their plans. This played an important role in contributing to the design and conduct of the regional institute. The emphasis on "tryability" — the ability to experiment with service-learning — also enhanced faculty decision-making and ownership. Coordinators responded to faculty needs and requests, encouraged experimentation, and provided many options rather than dictating one specific way of implementing the innovation.

While faculty were the major initiators of the innovations in their programs, sup-port from others on their campuses contributed to their success. On a scale of 0 (not at all supported) to 5 (very much supported), faculty respondents indicated the support of their department faculty (mean=4.3), department administration (mean=3.9), and college administration (mean=3.75).

Finally, faculty perceived many benefits as a result of their service-learning efforts. Their "biggest successes" were program/course changes (n=14), increased collaborations on campus and/or in the community (n=11), positive impact on preservice teachers (n=9), and new resources such as funds and curriculum materials (n=5).

Several survey questions focused specifically on new or enhanced collaborations. Eighteen of the 30 faculty indicated that their partnerships with campus, school, or community members had been positively enhanced through their service-learning collaboration. New collaborations as a result of service-learning activities included: local schools (n=20), campus colleagues (n=20), national level professionals (n=14), community members (n=13), state-level professionals (n=13), and regional level professionals (n=8). Clearly, many faculty in this study developed new or existing collaborations in concert with their service-learning efforts. One faculty member wrote, "It is always an enhancement of relationships with schools when personal contacts take place. We are finding receptive groups for service-learning," and another stated, "We have fluid and flexible partnerships which emphasize frequent and thoughtful communication."

Barriers to Implementation

Faculty also pointed out several barriers to their adopting the innovation, many of which are cited frequently in the innovation literature. They include time, resistance and "inertia" on the part of colleagues, limited finances, and other reform efforts and commitments that demand immediate attention.

In response to a question regarding the biggest obstacles so far with implementing service-learning, faculty wrote about time (n=16), program constraints (n=8), involving other faculty (n=7), finding collaborative school and community partners (n=6), funding (n=6), lack of administrative support (n=3), student transportation difficul-ties (n=3), personnel changes (n=1), and no problems (n=2). Clearly time is the biggest issue for these faculty in implementing service-learning. Responses referred to time in regard to providing in-service training, coordinating service activities, making connections with others on campus and in the community, conducting follow-up on service activities, and grading reflection journals, as well as student time constraints.

Another issue mentioned by several faculty was administrative and faculty turnover. However, such changes in the department seemed to be as often an advantage as a problem. Sometimes the key service-learning supporter in the department moved on to another job and his/her replacement was not an advocate of service-learning. In other cases, new hires emerged as additional supporters of faculty's service-learning efforts.

When asked, "What changes, events, or crises have occurred in your teacher education program that have influenced the development of your service-learning activities and in what ways?," faculty respondents indicated more positive changes and results (n=14) than problems or limiting events (n=8).

Also, eight faculty indicated there were no such events, or they left this survey item blank. In sum, it appears that time is a pervasive problem for the faculty respondents and that overall the faculty in this study experienced more positive than negative situations associated with their service-learning efforts.

Coordinators' surveys and e-mails revealed several additional problems in their efforts to assist faculty in developing service-learning components of their programs. In three cases, faculty dropped out of the project before their work truly began, and in several others, bureaucratic hassles (such as difficulty getting approval from all faculty in a department to adopt a new service-learning course or increased needs for service-learning training for new faculty) limited the efforts of faculty to accomplish as much as they had originally intended. Dropouts were due to faculty/administrative turnover, and in one case, a tornado that ravaged the town and college shortly before the collaboration began. While not applicable to all the sites in this study, in many cases, smaller teacher education departments were more effective in

bringing about changes in their programs. While these faculty sometimes felt overwhelmed with all there was to do, they also were able to make decisions more quickly and move ahead with their plans more efficiently than some of the larger departments.

Discussion

The results of this study, in regard to both successes and barriers to faculty adoption of the curricular innovation of community service-learning, point to several issues consistent with the literature.

First, faculty ownership and decision making were core components of the NSLTEP collaboration and strong contributors to faculty success in this study. Faculty often noted that the "fit" between service-learning and their personal values and professional lives was a good one. Thus, the service-learning initiative did not threaten their existing activities, rather it enhanced their current efforts to teach required courses, supervise practica in the schools, and/or engage in ongoing reforms in their departments. While most faculty recognized costs associated with their service-learning involvement (largely in terms of time), faculty judged the perceived benefits as well the worth of the invested effort.

In addition, the types and quality of assistance provided to faculty by the NSLTEP coordinators appears to have been instrumental. Tailor-making professional development experiences for each site was important, as was providing other types of support (e.g., funding, curricular resources and publications, opportunities to attend a conference or regional institute). Again, the role of faculty ownership and decision making in shaping these forms of assistance cannot be overlooked.

While faculty in this study were largely successful in furthering the practice of service-learning on their campuses, most did encounter some of the barriers to implementation cited in the higher education literature. Time was the greatest challenge faced by all the faculty in this study, but some also encountered faculty resistance or indifference, lack of administrative support, limited finances, and other commitments that demanded their immediate attention. Given the array of challenges, it is striking that almost all faculty developed multiple service-learning initiatives in their programs,

more than the NSLTEP coordinators had anticipated they would. This fact reinforces our prior assertion of the faculty's ownership of and valuing of service-learning.

Limitations

It is important to note that a potential limitation of this study is its reliance on self-reported data. Both faculty and coordinators may have been inclined to portray a more positive view of their service-learning efforts than was actually the case. However, several procedures were employed in an attempt to counteract this potential bias. First, faculty completed surveys anonymously and mailed them to the NSLTEP evaluation team rather than their regional coordinator. Second, triangulation of data through comparing faculty surveys, coordinator surveys, action plans, and e-mail messages from both faculty and coordinators allowed a more complex picture to emerge.

Any attempts to generalize the findings of this study to other adoptions of service-learning in other disciplines or other curricular innovations in higher education must take into account several facts about the faculty participants in this study. First, faculty elected to be involved in the NSLTEP program. Second, all were teacher educators involved with service-learning. As Lattuca and Stark (1994, 1995) have asserted, educational purposes vary among different fields. Thus, faculty will be receptive to some curricular reforms but perhaps not to others. Service-learning has a particular salience within teacher education, given its involvement as a service profession in P–12 schools.

Despite these limitations, this study points to some broad findings that will likely apply to the adoption of service-learning in many disciplines in higher education. The following discussion of these issues is framed within a set of recommendations to those who endeavor to provide effective service-learning professional development experiences for higher education faculty.

Recommendations

1. Work with willing, interested faculty initially.

Faculty in this study indicated a high degree of satisfaction in terms of how they were recruited to be involved in the NSLTEP program. In most cases, coordi-

nators contacted potential faculty collaborators based on responses to a nationwide survey of departments of teacher education. Coordinators e-mailed or phoned those faculty who responded "yes" to several questions about additional opportunities to learn about service-learning, and through a brief phone interview process, identified the sites to support.

It is important to note that several of the faculty in this study had already had some experience with community service or service-learning. In most cases, service-learning fit with their values and experiences outside of teaching, and they saw connections between service-learning and their other workplace activities. Thus, faculty "buy-in" to the NSLTEP collaboration was high from the start. While faculty resistance was present in some departments, many faculty were successful in generating additional faculty and administrative support for service-learning on their campuses. Thus, at many sites, the numbers of faculty involved in the adoption increased over the course of the NSLTEP collaboration.

2. Provide site-specific professional development opportunities.

The NSLTEP coordinators realized early on that supporting faculty at the 21 program sites would not be successful with a "one size fits all" approach. Throughout the collaboration, and especially in regard to both the site visit and the regional institutes, coordinators constantly asked faculty questions such as "How can I help? What resources, activities, and experiences would be most useful to you?" Having assembled a large collection of materials, coordinators were able to provide resources specifically geared toward faculty's needs. Site visit activities also varied depending on faculty desire; coordinators met with administrators and community partners, taught class sessions on service-learning, met with individual or small groups of faculty to work on action plans, and/or provided workshops for the entire teacher education department.

Regional institute activities also varied depending on faculty's needs and desires. Each institute involved faculty and student presentations, opportunities for networking, team work activities, and shared leadership. Faculty appreciated the opportunities for ownership and decision

making; evaluations of the institutes were consistently high.

3. Provide resources to support faculty's efforts.

In addition to the consultation with a service-learning professional provided by NSLTEP, faculty also benefited from several other resources. Early on coordinators assembled a large collection of service-learning syllabi, resource lists, journal articles, research studies, and curriculum materials on service-learning. Some coordinators provided all site faculty with these materials; others provided faculty with some of the materials based on their specific needs. Faculty indicated high satisfaction with these resources on the survey (mean = 4.36 on a scale of 0 to 5 where 5 = very useful).

The financial assistance provided by NSLTEP was also critical to faculty success. While $4,000 is not a large grant, at many smaller institutions this was a meaningful sum of money to use for program planning or operation costs. While coordinators had to approve faculty budgets, faculty were given a great deal of freedom in terms of how to spend their funds. Many budgets included costs for attending a conference (n=9) or the service-learning institute (n=21), purchase of curriculum materials (n=21) and some faculty released time (n=15), thus helping to alleviate some of the time problems in modifying existing courses or starting new projects. Some budgets included funding for work study or graduate students (n=4), project supplies (n=13), or student transportation (n=5).

4. Encourage faculty to write down specific plans for implementation.

Analysis of the action plans written by faculty at the 21 sites revealed that in most cases, those who were more specific about what they were going to accomplish, and by when, were by and large more successful in achieving their goals. The coordinators did not provide a specific format for the action plans, but rather left it up to faculty as to what to include. Based on the results of the first year, the coordinators have modified the action plan component of the collaboration so that every teacher education program site provides similar information (e.g., number of faculty and teacher education students involved, community partners involved, a description of

the program's service-learning activities prior to NSLTEP collaboration, a description of the service-learning activities that will take place during the time period of the action plan). With this standard format, not only will faculty be more specific in their plans, but also future evaluation of activities at each site will be facilitated.

Conclusion

This study examined how teacher education faculty from 21 institutions attempted to adopt the curricular innovation of community service-learning. Results of this research highlight several issues discussed in the literature, including the importance of faculty ownership and decision making as well as quality professional development experiences to support faculty efforts. While departments attempting to adopt curricular innovations are likely to face some challenges to implementation, such as time, faculty resistance, competing demands, and limited resources, the collaboration fostered by the National Service-Learning in Teacher Education Partnership (NSLTEP) points to some promising practices for professional development in higher education. Providing site-specific assistance and resources to willing and interested faculty and insisting that faculty specify in writing how they will use these resources to implement the innovation can lead to success.

References

Anderson, J.B. & Pickeral, T. (2000). Challenges and strategies for success with service-learning in pre-service teacher education. *National Society for Experiential Education Quarterly*, 25 (3), 7–22.

Astin, A.W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (1986). *Higher learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clarke, J. S., Ellett, C. D., Bateman, J. M., & Rugutt, J. K. (1996). *Faculty receptivity/resistance to change, personal and organizational efficacy, decision deprivation and effectiveness in research 1 universities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Study of Higher Education, Memphis, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 402 846).

Cousins, J. B. & Earl, L. M. (1992). The case for participatory evaluation. *Educational Policy and Analysis*, 14 (4), 397–418.

Curry, B.K. (1992). *Instituting enduring inno-

vations: Achieving continuity of change in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Dean, C.D., Acker-Hocevar, M., & Laible, J.C. (1997, November). *A systematic approach to creating and implementing curricular innovation*. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration, Orlando, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 418 065).

Donahue, D. (1999). Service-learning for preservice teachers: Ethical dilemmas for practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 685–695.

Edwards, D.M. (1992, April). *Overcoming institutional impediments to rewarding teaching*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 677).

Erickson, J. & Anderson, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Firestone, W. A. & Corbett, H. D. (1988). Planned organizational change. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*. (pp. 321–340). New York: Longman.

Fischetti, J., Dittmer, A., & Kyle, D. W. (1996). Shifting paradigms: Emerging issues for educational policy and practice. *Teacher Educator*, 31, 189–201.

Fullan, M.G. & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hall, J. W. (1991). *Access through innovation*. New York: American Council on Education and MacMillan.

Halpern, D.F. (1994). Rethinking college instruction for a changing world. In D. F. Halpern and Associates. (Eds.). *Changing college classrooms: New teaching and learning strategies for an increasingly complex world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hommes, J.A. (1997, March). *Management of instructional innovation: The case of problem-based education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 407 368).

Hord, S.M., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin,

L., & Hall, G. (1987). *Taking charge of change.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ED 282 876. 102 pp. MF–01; PC not available EDRS.

Huberman, M. & Miles, M. (1984). *Innovation up close.* New York: Plenum.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1985). *How to manage change effectively.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kozma, R. B. (1985). A grounded theory of instructional innovation in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56 (3), 300–319.

Lamble, W. (1984). Diffusion and adoption of innovations. In D. J. Blackburn (Ed.), *Extension handbook* (pp. 32–41). Ontario: University of Guelph.

Lattuca, L. R. & Stark, J. S. (1995). Modifying the major: Discretionary thoughts from ten disciplines. *The Review of Higher Education*, 18 (3), 315–344.

Lattuca, L.R. & Stark, J. S. (1994). Will disciplinary perspectives impede curricular reform? *Journal of Higher Education*, 65 (4), 401–426,

Levine, A. (1980). *Why innovation fails.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Levine, A. & Weingart, J. (1973). *Reform of undergraduate education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Martin, C. (1994). Faculty perceptions toward service learning within a large public university. Doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University. UMI Order No. 9424188.

Miles, M.B. (1983). Unraveling the mystery of institutionalization. *Educational Leadership*, 41(3), 14–19.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National service-learning in teacher education partnership (1998). *Survey of U.S. Teacher Education Programs.* College of Education, University of Iowa: unpublished paper.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods.* Berkeley, CA: Sage.

Rogers, E. M. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations.* New York: The Free Press, MacMillan.

Seymour, D.T. (1988). *Developing academic programs: The climate for innovation.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Silver, H., Hannan, A., & English, S. (1999). Innovations in teaching and learning in higher education: A summary of preliminary findings from the first phase. *Innovations in teaching and learning in higher education.* http://www.fae.plym.ac.uk/itlhe/summ.html

Simsek, H. & Louis, K.S. (1994). Organizational change as paradigm shift: Analysis of the change process in a large, public university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(6), 670–695.

Steeples, D.W. (Ed.). (1990). *Managing change in higher education.* New Directions for Higher Education No. 71. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Todd, N.I. (1993, January). *Faculty concerns as gateways to teacher competency with computer technologies.* Proceedings of selected research and development presentations at the convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology Sponsored by the Research and Theory Division, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 362 209).

Turner, C.M. (1990). *Responding to change: The need for flexible college structures and practices.* Mendip Papers 005. Bristol, England: The Further Education Staff College.

Waugh, R. F. & Punch, K. F. (1987). Teacher receptivity to system-wide change in the implementation stage. *Review of Educational Research, 57* (3), 237–254.

Weimer, M. (1990). *Improving college teaching: Strategies for developing instructional effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wolfson, G.K. (1996). *Prior learning assessment: A case study of acceptance of innovation and change.* A major applied research project, Nova Southeastern University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 410).

Appendix

A. Coordinator Survey Questions

1. How did you go about recruiting and selecting contacts?

2. What seemed to work well and not so well with regard to recruiting and selecting contacts? What needs to stay the same with regard to your recruiting and selection procedures and what improvements do you need to make?

3. How many contacts have you made and are you satisfied with the number?

4. Have you been able to meet the demands placed on your consultative time and resources by your contacts?

5. Please list the contacts you have made and for each summarize the most important technical assistance activities you have provided.

6. For each contact, please indicate how you would describe and evaluate their needs for technical assistance and how satisfied you are with what you have provided so far.

7. For each contact, please indicate how satisfied you think the contacts are with the level, quality, intensity, duration, etc. of the technical assistance you are providing.

8. Please tell us the most revealing, interesting, useful, illuminative, or otherwise worthwhile stories/anecdotes that best summarize, capture or could be useful to communicate what you are doing in the technical assistance component of the project.

9. What questions have we not asked about your contacts and technical assistance that you would like to answer? What else would you like to tell us?

B. Faculty Survey Questions

1. How satisfied are you with how you were recruited to be part of the NSLTEP partnership? (from 0 not at all satisfied to 5 totally satisfied)

2. How satisfied are you with the contacts you have had with your NSLTEP regional coordinator? (from 0 not at all satisfied to 5 totally satisfied)

3. Below is a list of possible contact methods between you and your regional coordinator. For each method listed below, estimate the number of times this method of contact was used. (e-mail, phone, mail, site visit, other)

4. What is your favorite/preferred method(s) for being contacted by your NSLTEP regional coordinator? Check all that apply. (E-mail, phone, mail, no preference, other)

5. What types of technical assistance were provided by your regional coordinator? Check all that apply. (regional institute, e-mail, site visit, phone call, articles/handouts, other)

6. What types of resources were provided for you as a part of the NSLTEP program? Check all that apply. For each resource you check, circle the number below it that corresponds to how useful the

resource was to you (from 0 not at all useful to 5 very useful). (Items listed included: articles on service-learning in teacher education; information on state, regional or national service-learning activities; information on SL curriculum resources; and other).

7. One of the goals of NSLTEP is to establish a nationwide network of teacher educators involved in service-learning. To what extent do you feel that you a) are connected to this network and b) have access to this network?

8. How did you spend the $4000 financial support provided to your institution by NSLTEP?

9. What additional learning opportunities beyond those involved with the NSLTEP collaboration have you participated in relevant to service-learning in teacher education? Check all that apply. (workshops, meetings, conferences, personal reading, web searches, professional conversations, other)

10. What *new* collaborations have occurred as a result of your service-learning activities? Check all that apply. (with local schools, with the community, with state-level professionals, with regional-level professionals, with national-level professionals, with others on campus, other)

11. How much is service-learning supported by: department faculty, department administration, college administration? Circle the appropriate numbers. (from 0 not at all supported to 5 very much supported)

12. How important overall is service-learning to your teacher education program? Please circle the appropriate number. (from 0 not at all important to 5 very important)

13. Who else is involved in your department's service-learning activities? Check all that apply. (teacher education students, community agency members, public school teachers, faculty, other)

14. Estimate the percentage of your work time you spend on service-learning related activities in an average week.

15. Other than NSLTEP, in the past 5 years, how many new initiatives or reform efforts unrelated to service-learning have you been involved in?

16. What other initiatives or reform efforts is your teacher education program involved in now? How does service-learning fit with these efforts?

17. Describe your institution's biggest obstacles so far with implementing service-learning in your teacher education program.

18. Describe your institution's biggest successes so far with implementing service-learning in your teacher education program.

19. Have existing partnerships with campus, school, or community members been altered in any way due to your service-learning activities? If so, in what ways?

20. How have teacher education students been involved in planning or implementing your service-learning activities?

21. What changes, events, or crises have occurred in your teacher education program that have influenced the development of your service-learning activities and in what ways?

22. How do you feel about your service-learning activities so far?

23. How does your involvement in service-learning connect with other aspects of your life outside of work?

24. Please describe your gender, age, ethnicity, academic position, years in teacher education, years at present institute.

25. For your department, please list (or estimate) the number of faculty and students.

26. Is your school location rural, urban, or suburban?

Rahima C. Wade is associate professor at The University of Iowa, Eric J. Vanden Berk is a graduate research assistant at the Center for Evaluation and Assessment, The University of Iowa, and Stephanie K. Siddens is the research and program evaluation specialist at the Fairfax County Public Schools, Office of Planning, Testing, and Evaluation in Virginia.

N • S • E • E Membership

If you would like more information about membership in the National Society for Experiential Education, please call office at 703-933-0017 or write to NSEE, 1703 North Beauregard Street, Suite 400, Alexandria, VA 22311-1714. We look forward to welcoming you to NSEE's network.

NSEE's Mission

As a community of individuals, institutions, and organizations, NSEE is committed to fostering the effective use of experience as an integral part of education, in order to empower learners and promote the common good.

NSEE's Goals

- To advocate for the use of experiential learning throughout the educational system and the larger community.

- To enhance the professional growth and leadership development of our members.

- To disseminate information on principles of good practice and on innovations in the field.

- To encourage the development and dissemination of research and theory related to experiential learning.

NSEE is a voluntary association of institutions, organizations, and individuals. NSEE does not approve or accredit experiential education programs or services, and our name should not be used in a context that implies such a role.