The following dialogue considers the future of service-learning in two-year colleges given the issues raised by Kassia Krzus-Shaw, Jennifer Maloy, and Nancy Pine, based on their experiences in two-year college classrooms and contributions to TETYC. Recent general service-learning scholarship has taken up the issue of how classroom initiatives interact with institutional supports, given social agendas and power relationships. In some ways, two-year colleges are able to work outside of these frameworks by virtue of their unique organization and community-based connections—which can be both a good and bad thing depending on the school and its context. (For example, Campus Compact’s “Indicators of Engagement Revised for Community Colleges” calls for an established institutional support network, which would greatly help many faculty lacking such resources, but it might also limit the innovative flexibility that is the hallmark of two-year colleges.)

Some of the questions that we attempt to answer in this symposium are how two-year colleges could alter their traditionally rigid curriculum for increased service-learning innovation; who do we envision teaching these classes; how can our professional organizations better support service-learning practices; and how can we better tailor our assessment practices to respond to our institutions’ increased financial and state-mandated assessment pressures.

We recognize that service-learning practices vary greatly between colleges. However, if they are done in a way that incorporates all faculty voices, they stand to highlight the unique positioning that two-year colleges enjoy in their communities, and how this creates a potential for lesser researched, but anecdotally significant, student and community benefits.

Amplifying Our Voices: Service-Learning Practices across Two-Year Colleges
Kassia Krzus-Shaw
University of Wisconsin–Madison

In September 2002, in a “TYCA to You” feature, Gill Creel et al. noted that within two-year colleges, “service learning has experienced a mixed reception” (94). The authors then describe the range of service-learning practices at two-year colleges.
across the nation, including regional adoption, varying levels of institutional and departmental support, and specific community challenges. Although it seems that some things have changed, for example, one contributor notes the challenge of adoption due to lack of faculty and student enthusiasm (95), many other observations remain the same. Notably, many of the authors point to the benefits of faculty and student development as concrete service-learning outcomes that will continue to propel the movement and inspire pedagogical innovation. However, there remains a large variance in adoption and support across institutions.

Indeed, after talking to my coauthors, I am struck by how the themes of this report still resonate fifteen years later. The three of us come from widely different service-learning experiences, in part shaped by institutional and departmental expectations. My community college in particular was entangled in shrinking state budgets, while struggling to serve some economically challenging communities within its boundaries. The administration verbally supported community engagement and service-learning initiatives, but the lack of funding affected the school’s ability to support service-learning in terms of formalized support structures. Therefore, service-learning experiences (including planning, mitigating risks, professional development, and continuing education) fell to individual faculty to navigate.

To further complicate the picture, my role at the school up until last year was as an adjunct, which carried unique programmatic support and professional risk issues that go largely unrecognized in service-learning literature but play a significant role in how service-learning experiences are shaped, evaluated, and supported. My discussions with other contingent instructors in the surrounding area and in neighboring states indicate that many schools exclude contingent instructors from service-learning opportunities because they cannot afford to pay for the additional class-prep time that would put them over hourly labor limits and qualify them for health insurance. This is due to the common interpretation of hourly workload limits as currently defined by the Affordable Care Act (Dunn; “Affordable”). Further, many schools primarily hire contingent instructors to teach introductory composition courses, which are not always designated to be service-learning appropriate (or friendly, due to curriculum restraints) leaving uncertainties around issues related to academic freedom. Many other contingent instructors are not willing to financially risk the possibility of a canceled class due to low enrollment (a notorious challenge of service-learning classes), or the possibility of a “failed” service-learning experience that might impact their future employment at that school.

This is important to point out because contingent instructors teach a significant percentage of introductory composition courses (Schell and Stock 8), which for many is a natural place to include such pedagogy. Brock Haussamen explains in the context of Raritan Valley Community College, “service learning in first year composition [. . .] has rich potential to affect many college students” and might be the only exposure they have to such a life-changing, community-based classroom experience (415, 420). Audrey Williams June, in The Chronicle of Higher Education, notes that, “community colleges have traditionally relied heavily on non-tenure track faculty, with 85 percent of their instructors in 2010 not eligible for
tenure.” Given that non-tenure-track (and especially contingent) faculty are less likely to employ such teaching strategies given the above concerns, in addition to a lack of training and other support resources, it is clear that two-year colleges are missing out on an important opportunity to bring the pedagogical and innovative benefits of service-learning to many students (Moser; Wilson; “Contingent”).

This missed opportunity is especially heightened given the well-documented vulnerabilities contingent faculty share with their students (in terms of tenuous employment conditions and low economically situated positions within their community). The UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education released a report in April 2015 that noted, “fully one-quarter of part-time college faculty and their families are enrolled in at least one [. . .] public assistance program” (Jacobs et al.) This report doesn’t distinguish between four-year and two-year college faculty, but given that the average salary of contingent faculty in public two-year colleges is somewhere between $1,500 per course (Wilson) and $2,342 per course (“Submitted”), it’s easy to guess that the number of two-year contingent instructors needing government assistance is potentially higher. Richard Moser, in a commentary for The Chronicle of Higher Education, frames it this way:

What lessons are being taught to aspiring young academics when they realize that all of their foundational courses are being delivered by people who earn what they did at their summer jobs? What values are being learned when those who teach and research—who esteem the intellect and hold high the values of citizenship—are apparently held in low regard by society and by the university community itself? (Moser)

In the case of contingent instructors teaching at two-year colleges, I found that my colleagues and I were in many ways closer to our students in terms of economic status and community cultural contexts than one might imagine. For me, it meant that our shared community experiences and resources created a pedagogical context of urgency and relevance. It enhanced my ability to bring meaningful service-learning experiences to my students, given that I saw my work as contributing to larger community-based social justice needs to which I was also personally connected. Further, my connections with the service sites and my students created the possibility of continued service after the semester had ended, and had an expanding community impact in ways I could never have imagined.

Unfortunately, there is little research available that addresses the creativity and intellectual contributions in the field from contingent instructors in service-learning contexts. Consider that leading organizations such as Campus Compact
and the Conference on College Composition and Communication refer to “faculty” generally when establishing guidelines for conversations and classroom experiences in their guiding documents (“Indicators”; “CCCC”). I would argue that contingent instructors offer flexibility, creativity, community connections, and innovative thinking in ways that are uniquely community- and student-connected. Finding ways to invite their voices in the conversation could bring new ideas and energy into service-learning practices. If service-learning courses already “demonstrate the innovative teaching and variety of instruction that can be found at the two-year college,” imagine how the inclusion of these voices could shape future scholarship to reflect the unique richness and depth of understanding that shapes two-year colleges (Paddison as qtd. in Creel 103).

Creating a more supportive environment for contingent instructors in service-learning conversations would ultimately benefit everyone. The above referenced “CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects” points out that “engagement is a critical aspect of community responsibility, and that, when done well, community-based work blends traditional divisions of academic labor: namely teaching, research, and service [. . .] those divisions are in constant interaction and reinforcement.” In this spirit, then, more equal access to faculty development (such as funding for conferences and development grants) and more input in shaping curricular guidelines and required curriculum (for example, through textbook selection or writing and genre requirements) could expand service-learning conversations departmentally, leading to innovation. Further, based on observations of colleges where service-learning works (my coauthor Jennifer offers an excellent example of her experience), colleges need to provide administrative support offices and coordinators who can facilitate community and interdisciplinary connections and conversations and to offer training and other pedagogical support services in a way that is supportive rather than restrictive. I envision services and guidelines offered as best practices, not as regulatory mandates. As my coauthor Jennifer also points out, institutional support can be a controversial topic. Paula Mathieu, in Tactics of Hope, rightly cautions against the potential of institutionalism to work contrary to the realities of tactical service-learning practices given their emphasis on assessment and replicability (98). And yet, while leaving service-learning solely up to individual faculty or departments may offer flexibility, the lack of these supports creates a prohibitive environment for those considering new or experimental service-learning practices, especially when it comes to more vulnerable, nontenured faculty. Mathieu challenges us to ask, “What values are we institutionalizing? What needs are we prioritizing?” (98). I believe these guiding questions could best balance the development of resources within the community-based two-year college setting.

Of course, I recognize that these suggestions necessitate additional funding. Service-learning initiatives often receive enthusiastic verbal support from two-year colleges, given their potential to support larger institutional community engagement missions and student retention and success measures. However, Robert W. Franco, writing for Campus Compact, accurately points out: “Because the community colleges are a movement, a work in progress, we are susceptible to shifts in the winds of local,
state, and federal funding and economic growth and recession. Our adaptability is a strength, but it can also be a source of ambiguity and tension” (2). Indeed, according to research compiled by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, based on the 2014–15 school year, forty-seven states are “spending less per student . . . than they did at the start of the recession” and receiving about “20 percent [. . .] less per student than it did in the 2007-08 school year” (Mitchell and Leachman). In a 2007 study on funding concerns in community colleges, the American Association of Community Colleges found that, repeatedly, higher education was both the “largest discretionary item in the state budget” and “typically the last item decided in the state budgeting process” (Katsinas et al. 3). Some states never receive their full budgets (Illinois, where I was teaching, is constantly plagued by this issue), impacting their ability to address critically needed student services (Katsinas et al. 4–6). Additionally, according to the American Association of Community Colleges, funding trends in community colleges reflect a priority on career and college readiness assessment standards (Merisotas and Wolanin). I agree with Franco, who argues that “service-learning is the leading pedagogy that community colleges can employ to achieve these missions and truly become civically engaged campuses in the communities they serve” (1). Given service-learning’s established benefits for students and their practical community experiences, it should be easy for faculty to connect for administrators how service-learning aligns with these priorities.

Further research making these connections in the context of two-year colleges could tremendously shape the resources service-learning programs are allocated, never mind the well-documented benefits to students, faculty, and communities. Our institutions must accept the variability of the data collected and diversity of its researchers and then consider how these factors provide unique insight on two-year college students and their communities. Mathieu reminds us:

Adopting a tactical orientation in a university setting means letting go of comfortable claims of certainty and accepting the contingent and vexed nature of our actions. A tactical orientation needs to be grounded in hope [. . .] as a critical, active, dialectical engagement between the insufficient present and possible, alternative futures—a dialogue composed of many voices. (xv, emphasis mine)

Similarly, my coauthor Nancy describes the “messy” and “unintended consequences” of service-learning when trying to assess the benefits. Within my experience, I think back on students who have told me that their lives were fundamentally impacted by service-learning as a semester ended but, upon follow-up years later, who didn’t demonstrate all of the touted benefits I had hoped my class would provide. I suspect this is largely because those researched benefits are based on four-year students who aren’t facing the multitude of variables that many two-year college students struggle with daily, such as having to juggle multiple jobs, family commitments, homelessness, incarceration, military service, all while attending school. These variables operate on a survival level that I believe shapes less quantifiable but equally important service-learning benefits that go beyond binary measurements. These are the metrics that will be most valuable to our institutions.
when both making a case to support service-learning initiatives and creating sustainable and effective programs.

In an ideal world, Mathieu’s description of service learning as not “replicable or generalizable [. . .] unpopular or risky” (134), but of great value to the local community, would be strengthened by research that values its inherent flexibility through its diverse and nuanced student and community benefits. However, we live in a world where our home institutions are financially overburdened and held to assessment standards that impact our ability to advocate their value. It is on us, and through the support of our professional organizations such as the CCCC and TYCA, to find common ground. We must seek to amplify the professional development and voices of all of our faculty in order to establish the longer-term research lacking in two-year colleges. Creel’s “TYCA to You” report reflects how attitudes toward adoption have improved over the last fifteen years, but we still have a long way to go in terms of operating on the same page across our departments and our institutions.

When “Institutionalization” Isn’t a Dirty Word
Jennifer Maloy
Queensborough Community College

My community college has a strong commitment to campus-wide service-learning as part of our High Impact Practice (HIP) initiatives. HIPs are defined by George D. Kuh in *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter* and are identified by the Association of American College and Universities as supporting effective learning for a twenty-first-century liberal education (“High-Impact”). My college provides professional development and administrative support to promote a variety of HIPs—service-learning as well as collaborative learning, common intellectual experiences such as the Common Read, undergraduate research, writing-intensive courses, and global and diversity learning. In my initial conversations with my coauthors, I was struck by how unique this type of institutional support is.

One of the questions that emerged from our observation of programmatic differences across our campuses is the extent to which institutional support for service-learning and community-based learning actually supports instructors, students, and community partners through collaborative projects. As Kassia demonstrates, the need for support of service-learning, particularly for contingent faculty, is real if
service-learning is to be successful. However, not all institutional support is created equally, as Michael Donnelly discusses in “Hope and Despair, Risk and Struggle: (j)WPA Work, Service-Learning, and the Case for Baby Steps”:

Institutionalizing service-learning (and/or civic engagement) from the top down carries great risk and offers little reward; such efforts are as likely (perhaps more) to become empty and meaningless requirements, or to become twisted versions of community engagement that function to support rather than question a business model of social organization and, further, of education itself. (115)

This point is vital in envisioning best practices for large-scale service-learning initiatives at any college. As Donnelly goes on to state, the threats proposed above require service-learning practitioners “to ask some difficult questions about how, when, and where the institutionalization of service-learning can or should be effected” (115). Community-campus partnerships require careful cultivation among a group of dedicated individuals from both parties in order to be meaningful: they cannot be imposed upon groups (composed of community members, faculty, or students) and won’t work if individuals involved perceive an imposition. On my campus this may be the case for faculty members who commit to service-learning because they feel pressure from their chair to do so or because they believe that participating in a High-Impact Practice will be good for tenure and promotion. This also may be the case among students who don’t see the value in service-learning or don’t believe that what they are doing in a given project connects to their academic or career goals.

I do believe, however, that in the case of my community college, the advantages of our campus’s institutionalization of service-learning far outweigh the disadvantages faculty members may feel as we work with our Office of Academic Service Learning (OASL) on community-based learning and projects. The OASL on my campus has been both valued by our administration and supported through consistent grant funding, making it possible for faculty across the disciplines to incorporate service-learning into their classes and to collaborate with community partners as well as other faculty members with few bureaucratic obstacles. I think our numbers alone show the effectiveness of this institutionalization: ten years ago, 3 faculty members and 42 students participated in service-learning. In the 2015–16 academic year, those numbers rose to 62 faculty members and 1,541 students (“By the Numbers”). The office also boasts an active partnership with over fifty community organizations.

When I have incorporated service-learning projects into my courses, I have very rarely felt that the office was intrusive; instead, it merely helped me along as I devised my plans. For example, when I initially expressed interest in service-learning, I was able to attend an annual breakfast for faculty and community partners and easily made contacts with numerous individuals who were interested in projects that worked for my student population and their organization’s members. In addition, OASL staff provided workshops on how to incorporate service-learning into course curriculum and also met one-on-one with instructors. This by no means ensures that
all service-learning projects are successes: in my case, there have been times when OASL staff suggested projects that I didn’t feel were right for my curriculum and students, when communication between my community partner and me devolved, when deadlines and expectations were not met on various sides of the project, and when individuals were frustrated. Overall, though, the OASL has made me feel like I was never going it alone in my projects, which I believe supports the collaborative and communal mission of service-learning. Even without administrative support, faculty interested in service-learning can and should try to band together as much as possible to create their own structures of sharing and collaborating. While this generates ideas for new projects, it also lessens the logistical burdens often encountered in planning and implementing service-learning projects: those who have succeeded with service-learning projects know whom to contact—both on campus and in community organizations—to secure resources, complete forms, plan events, and troubleshoot potential problems.

“Institutionalized” service-learning may create—yet also facilitate—bureaucratic hurdles, but there can be real advantages to being able to identify outcomes for a project and show they have been met. One essential benefit of having a service-learning office on my campus is the built-in assessment that the OASL has provided. It is a requirement that all faculty members include an IRB-approved pre- and post-survey of all students who participate in service-learning projects, and the surveys do provide OASL with data to validate its work and effectiveness on our campus. However, this survey also has often provided a basis for faculty members not only to evaluate the effectiveness of individual projects but also to encourage their students to reflect critically on the projects they complete. Adding reflective assessment, whether formally or informally, can help instructors to articulate—to themselves and to other faculty and administrators—how service-learning projects connect to larger learning goals in the classroom. It also can provide instructors with a foundation for writing about and presenting on their projects at conferences or in academic articles.

To draw upon one issue that Kassia raises in the description of her college’s service-learning program, I believe that it is essential for community college campuses to make service-learning available to all faculty as well as all students. Because our OASL established structures and protocol to support service-learning across the curriculum, many of our contingent faculty have been able to participate in service-learning without adding too much time or work. Our adjunct faculty, particularly those teaching developmental writing and reading and ESL courses, often participate in service-learning because they have been able to easily meet community partners, adopt models of past service-learning projects, or collaborate
with other faculty members on initiatives, all of which have eased the burden that service-learning can put on all faculty members, particularly those with obligations at multiple colleges. Again, even on campuses without administrative support for service-learning, the sharing of project models and community organization contacts as well as collaborating among faculty members can help junior and contingent faculty who may not have a great deal of experiences with such projects.

In addition, our college has made a commitment to incorporating service-learning into developmental and ESL courses in meaningful ways. The students in these classes can often feel isolated from the student body at large and also feel that their placement into such courses designates them as somehow lacking in the knowledge or abilities it takes to succeed in college (Berman et al.). Service-learning, however, can support basic writing students’ development as college writers, as Nancy has described in a 2008 article (Pine), and can give such students a sense of agency (Gabor) and civic engagement (Minnix). Likewise, in a recent article, Perren et al. argue that service-learning provides the same benefits of agency and civic engagement to ESL students. For these groups of students who may feel marginalized within a larger campus community, service-learning allows them to dedicate time and knowledge to benefit community members—and to do so as representatives of their college. This experience not only expands possibilities for genuine writing and critical thinking throughout the semester; it also gives students a sense of what they can do as members of an academic community, even in the midst of the types of curricular and programmatic change that Nancy describes in her section.

I tout the accomplishments of my campus’s OASL here to show the positives of college-wide commitments to service-learning; however, I also do so in order to remind those dedicated to service-learning that programmatic structures evolve. While the past ten years on my campus have seen a boom in service-learning, as our grant funding has changed, the structure of our service-learning program is also in transition. As we undergo these changes, it is my hope that our service-learning program continues to provide robust support to contingent faculty and developmental and ESL students, who, as Kassia points out, are often the most vulnerable populations, particularly in moments of flux.

Resisting Efficiency and Rigidity and Freeing Faculty to Engage in Service-Learning
Nancy Pine
Columbus State Community College

It seems while administrators are coming to acknowledge the benefits of service-learning—as Jennifer explains as a High Impact Practice and as Kassia discusses “to support institutional community engagement missions and student retention and success measures”—the resources and academic freedom to realize service-learning’s innovative potential are being limited.

When it comes to faculty support, service-learning at my institution, Columbus State Community College, seems to be in between that of my coauthors.
Because there is no office for service-learning, a faculty committee is fulfilling that role. Five years ago, as part of a faculty governance restructuring endeavor, the vice president of academic affairs enabled the creation of a college faculty service-learning committee with the charge of developing a service-learning program. For decades, in pockets throughout the college, faculty had formed committees and had been teaching service-learning versions of courses; however, the new college committee would seek to institutionalize and expand service-learning. The two cochairs of the eight- to twelve-member faculty committee receive reassigned time (the equivalent of one course release), and the committee has a budget (which has been used to fund hosting and attending conferences, books and materials, events with community partners, etc.). The committee, which I cochaired, developed an S designation for service-learning versions of courses, included in the course section number. Any faculty member—full-time or part-time, tenure track or contingent—can complete an application to designate a course as S, and the application process includes mentoring by the faculty committee.

Like Jennifer’s belief, our view has been that the support from institutionalization would outweigh any negative consequences. As she points out, pedagogical reform movements like service-learning need to be institutionalized carefully. Both David A. Jolliffe and Tom Deans have pointed out that lessons can be learned from Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC). While Susan H. McLeod praises the success of WAC’s institutionalization, she warns against “rigidity,” which “could result in a homogenization, a blandness—taking a vital new idea and making [it] into something more like familiar structures and programs, and therefore less free for experimentation, less interesting, perhaps less effective” (342). Ellen Cushman claims that for service-learning programs to be institutionally viable, “professors” need to view “the community site as a place where their research, teaching, and service contribute to community needs and students’ learning” (41). Cushman locates service-learning with individual “professors,” although, as Kassia points out, at two-year colleges courses are taught predominantly by contingent faculty. I believe “[c]reating a more supportive environment for contingent instructors in service-learning conversations,” as Kassia points out, could be a catalyst for engaging contingent faculty in teaching, research, and service. Although seemingly contradictory, I believe the institutionalization of service-learning can better empower and free all faculty to engage with their students in this work.

I appreciate how inclusive and faculty-driven our service-learning program is. The S designation affords faculty priority scheduling, having the class offered at a day and time that works with community partners and ensuring the course is assigned to that S faculty member regardless of position or rank. It also allows for some flexibility with the curriculum such as textbook or reading selection and assignment variations. Through the application process and while the course is being taught, faculty are mentoring each other, getting together to examine teaching and learning in our classes. Data is also collected to help expand and support community partnerships and learning experiences for students. A host of professional development opportunities are available as well. The S designation and
work of the faculty committee is attempting to integrate service-learning into the culture of the institution. However, while the faculty committee developed the program, having a dozen faculty from across the college administer a program is not sustainable. The faculty committee coupled with an office for service-learning with a service-learning coordinator, as Jennifer has experienced, is really needed to best support and grow service-learning at two-year colleges, which seem to be under increased pressure to steer away from such an unpredictable, time-consuming, and messy pedagogy.

One trend affecting two-year colleges that can have a chilling effect on service-learning is the move toward efficiency over experimentation. As Scott Lloyd DeWitt describes for composition programs, “a model based on efficiency” is not based on “effectiveness,” but rather “on getting through a college degree as fast as possible, not on recognizing writing and composing as a way of learning and understanding.” Most recently at my institution our twenty-week, two-quarter composition course sequence, which had been condensed into a single-course sixteen-week semester, is now being converted into an eight-week online course offering to align with a new fast-track program. Among the benefits of service-learning pedagogy, I cannot list efficiency. On the contrary, service-learning, with its demand for action and reflection in community contexts, is rather inefficient, experimental, and messy. If institutions adopt a model of efficiency and there is barely enough time for composition courses, then is there going to be time for service-learning composition courses?

As the time allotted for students’ completing courses is compressed, course curricula may be further standardized to make the courses easier to manage. With two-year colleges increasingly serving as transferrable sources of general education credit for high school students through dual credit and for students enrolled in four-year colleges, another trend affecting service-learning is the pressure to standardize curricula using only outcomes-based materials. Most recently, Mary Soliday and Jennifer Seibel Trainor report on an “audit culture” in higher education with an “ever-increasing bureaucratization of literacy” (127). “Instruments” of audit culture are outcomes-based education (OE) and its tools—rubrics, evidence-based assessments, and statements of learning outcomes (SLOs)—which are contrary to composition’s view of learning as “a complex interaction between teachers, students, content, and setting” (127). Increased standardization can also lead to “formulaic acts” by composition instructors (Grego and Thompson qtd. in Soliday and Trainor 125), essentially regulating students’ literacy (126). Service-learning represents an antithesis to the regulation of students’ literacy; however, can it be incorporated in standardized curricula? Even if room can be made in a course for service-learning, faculty need to take care to be sure service-learning retains its messy, social justice, even radical edge rather than used merely to serve curricular ends. We need to save room for what Soliday and Trainor describe as “unintended consequences” (148) of composition.

As Soliday and Trainor write, rather than “becom[ing] swept up in the discourses of obligation . . . [w]e need to recoup the essential relationships between
skills and imagination, constraint and play. We need to examine why we would expect intended outcomes when theories of composition have always left room for unintended consequences” (148). It could be argued service-learning composition classes are always filled with unintended consequences; these are some of the best opportunities for students to compose in complex community rhetorical situations. DeWitt argues for the creation of “courses that do a more effective job of channeling students’ willingness to invest in composition instruction, their understanding that the best kind of instruction involves them in the difficult, challenging, sometimes messy and inefficient, work of composing and exchanging meaning, perhaps the hardest and most complicated work that humans ever undertake.” In that spirit, service-learning resists the pressures of efficiency and rigidity that two-year colleges face.

I believe students at the two-year college can most benefit from the opportunities of service-learning pedagogy; however, I fear fewer will experience it because it doesn’t fit into the rubric or template or formula—service-learning may clog up the machine. For the future of service-learning composition at two-year colleges, I wish for faculty-driven institutionalization with campus-wide administrative support. However, realistically, unless the climate for service-learning changes drastically, due to legislative and funding pressures on two-year colleges, faculty at most institutions will have to continue to engage in service-learning on their own, so to speak, without institutional support. However, departments can create a climate for service-learning. For example, recently in my department, a faculty committee restructured our first- and second-level composition courses to enable all course instructors flexibility in the types of assignments and an acceptable range of minimum word count requirements and grade weights. This flexibility empowers all instructors to develop course materials to bring what they do best to the courses they are teaching, whether that is service-learning or any other pedagogy they can employ to best reach their students. Faculty at the department level can work together to resist unnecessary rigidity and open up more possibilities for pedagogies like service-learning in the curriculum in which all faculty can engage with their students.
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