Diversity Work and Service-Learning: Understanding Campus Dynamics

Lori J. Vogelgesang
University of California, Los Angeles

This paper examines the challenges faced as higher education institutions consider integrating their commitment to service with their commitment to diversity efforts. Findings from four case studies of small- and medium-size private institutions explore the connections and divergences among institutional mission, campus leadership, curriculum integration, and organizational structure as contexts within which integration efforts emerge.[1]

In many service-learning situations, students work in communities composed of people socioeconomically or racially different from themselves. As the prevalence of service-learning grows on college campuses, attention to the issues around training students to participate meaningfully in such communities needs to expand. Participating in service-learning is one of many potential situations in which students deal with diversity while in college, but it has important implications for college and community relationships in general, and warrants special attention.

Beyond undergraduate service-learning, there is well-documented evidence that many higher education institutions are striving to become more meaningfully engaged in local communities, through concerted efforts that bring university resources to a community partnership. These partnerships inevitably must address diversity issues, as there are many significant differences between academic and community cultures.

There is a significant and growing body of research on college diversity issues in general, but we lack studies that address *how* institutions are integrating diversity and commitments to partner with local communities. There are also numerous examples of single institution-community partnerships described in the literature, and such descriptions are enormously helpful for other institutions facing similar issues. This particular study takes several individual institution models, examining them broadly from an organizational perspective.

Additionally, this research explores the connections between campus-community partnerships (specifically looking at service-learning) and other diversity-related campus efforts. This study complements knowledge gained from individual models by examining the broader organizational forces that support or hinder diversity and service-learning collaborations.

History of Service-Learning and Multicultural Education Movements

Both the service-learning and diversity movements challenge the traditional curriculum and practices in higher education. Both are potentially transformative approaches because they call for radical changes in the way we think about learning, teaching, curriculum, and research. Yet this potential has not been reached at many institutions; instead, both service-learning and multiculturalism are often marginalized on campus. Furthermore, though service-learning and multiculturalism share the experience of marginalization, this has not drawn them closer to each other. There is still a strong tendency to separate and compartmentalize these two efforts on college campuses. A brief look at the movements' histories sheds light on this division.

Multiculturalism emerges from the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s (Beckham, 1999; O'Grady, 2000). Banks (2001) traces multiculturalism's intellectual roots back to the early ethnic studies movement of the late 19th century. Service-learning, by comparison, draws from education theorist John Dewey's work, experiential education, and the community action programs of the 1960s and 1970s (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999). Neither movement is monolithic, but both have some roots in social justice issues. Indeed, as is discussed in this study, social justice concerns might be the focus when diversity and service-learning efforts are coordinated.

Among service-learning practitioners, however, there is not agreement that social justice or moral values ought to be the primary outcome (Zlotkowski, 1996; Marullo & Edwards, 2000). Rather, there is much evidence that enhanced learning for students has been (or should be) the aim of mainstream practitioners. Large studies have informed the student learning focus (Eyler & Giles,

1999; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). Likewise, some proponents of diversity work focus on how diversity enhances learning for all students, while others place more emphasis on social justice issues of equity in educational access and outcomes for all students.

Although both the diversity and service-learning movements have roots in the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, service-learning currently enjoys a great deal of visible federal support—both financial and verbal—and has grown dramatically in the last decade. By contrast, notes O'Grady (2000), multicultural education, with its focus on oppression, has received less support and is viewed by many as "too radical or as divisive" (p. 13). This uneven support has implications for collaborations between the two fields, and some of this study's findings can be better understood in light of this recent history.

Current Challenges

In addition to varying degrees of support, the proponents of these two movements use quite different languages to describe their work (Beckham, 1999). A Wingspread conference brought to light just how difficult it may be for advocates of these two movements to work together. Beckham writes, "a number of [Wingspread] conference participants noted that the supporters of each reform movement tend to discount the complexities of the other" (p. 5). He further asks, "What prevents these reformers (all of them well-meaning and all of them well-versed in the subtleties of academic leadership) from engaging fully in both reform agendas?" (p. 5). Beckham's thoughts on why this has happened helped to shape this inquiry. Among the reasons he describes are that each group: (1) is strongly committed to its own cause, and they prefer using language they have worked hard to conceptualize; (2) feels a sense of urgency about their work, and "may be reluctant to slow down and bring others up to speed" (p. 6); and (3) "may fear that an additional agenda item may dilute their efforts and their control, distract them from their work, and compete for scarce human and financial resources" (p. 6).

Beckham also alludes to a misfit between the two movements' approaches, with civic engagement proponents talking about history that needs to be 'recovered.' In contrast, those in the diversity movement think about unfulfilled dreams, and have a more future-oriented view of a different time. In fact, to those in the diversity movement, "the rhetoric of civic renewal can sound dangerous, threatening to smooth over the gross injustices of the past..." (1999, p. 7). Beckham sets the stage for this study in that he illuminates some of the challenges faced by those interested in closer alliances

between those on campus responsible for diversity issues and those working in service-learning or community-based work.

Framework for this Study

The history and current philosophical differences between service-learning and multicultural movements impact the relationship they share, but the movements' work happens within organizational contexts that are this paper's subject. This study was undertaken with a specific and practical purpose in mind: exploring how service-learning and diversity work might be more closely connected within higher education institutions. Indeed, the study was a precursor to intensive workshops during which administrators, faculty, and students came together to strategize about deepening connections on their individual campuses. It is intended to complement the research literature on intersections between multiculturalism and service-learning focused on student learning, i.e., supporting students' intellectual and social development as they engage in service-learning (O'Grady, 2000). Understanding this work's pedagogical implications is essential, but also needed is an organizational perspective on *how* one might integrate the two bodies of work.

To understand these organizational contexts, a look at some structures that influence organizational cultures is informative (Clark & Trow, cited in Kuh & Whitt, 2000). This allows us to explore the challenges and opportunities for service-learning and diversity proponents to collaborate on college campuses. Understanding cultural influences is particularly relevant in this study of small- and medium-size institutions of higher education, since culture tends to be stronger in smaller organizations than in larger ones (Clark, cited in Masland, 2000).

We were specifically interested in discerning how organizational factors such as administrative structure, leadership, academic culture, and institutional mission/values work to shape the environment in which both diversity and service-learning work happens. These factors represent significant aspects of higher education's formal structures, and in some cases reflect more deeply embedded institutional beliefs. Indeed, these dimensions are explored in other research on institutionalizing service-learning (Holland, 1997, 2000; Ward, 1996).

Method

To frame the issues from an organizational perspective, this study employs a case study method of inquiry. The institutions that participated were all private and in California because the larger project of which this is a part targeted private institutions

in California. Three of the institutions are universities, one is a four-year college; one is not religiously affiliated, and three are affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church.

The institutions were chosen because they represent different state geographic regions, and were known to have service-learning and diversity programs. All participating schools are located in racially, socioeconomically, and otherwise diverse urban communities. The larger project also drove choosing urban schools. In many ways, the issues urban institutions face differ from those of their rural and suburban counterparts, and this study focuses on urban issues. Because I do not identify campuses, I refer to all institutions as universities.

Consistent with a case study approach (Merriam, 1997), researchers[2] conducted interviews with individuals and groups who were engaged in the work of service-learning, multicultural education, or both. We also collected and reviewed relevant documents. By interviewing multiple constituents on each campus, examining documents, and discussing and agreeing upon themes in the data collected, we were able to triangulate the data and more accurately analyze what was happening on each campus.

In November and December 2001, three researchers visited two higher education institutions each in southern and northern California. The California Campus Compact executive director recommended the initial contact at each university. In turn, the contact suggested the people with whom the researchers should meet. At two universities the contact was the administrator responsible for the service-learning office, at another it was a vice-president for external affairs, and at the remaining institution it was the academic dean. The number of people interviewed on each campus varied, depending on the nature of the programs. In two cases there was significant overlap between those doing diversity work and those doing service-learning work, and we met with four and six people, respectively. At the other two institutions, we met with more faculty teaching courses, and thus spoke with 10 and 16 people, respectively. Thus, this paper examines issues from the perspectives of highly involved faculty and administrators.

Defining Service-Learning and Diversity

Before sharing the study's findings, I want to address a definitional issue. As previously noted, language is a potential barrier to collaborations between service-learning and diversity practitioners, and some readers will be interested to know how we approached defining terms for this study.

Because this study set out to explore—from the participants' perspectives—what was happening on campus, we let them use the vocabulary they were most comfortable with around issues of diversity and service-learning. A good deal of the work around campus diversity issues is understood in the context of multicultural education, and offices of multicultural education are commonly the administrative home for diversity programs. Although the words "diversity" and "multiculturalism" are not synonymous, they are used somewhat interchangeably when discussing learning outcomes and campus climate. Similarly, we use them interchangeably in this paper.

The term "service-learning" likewise holds different meanings for people, and some resist even using the word "service." Some would prefer the term "community-based learning," others argue for a broader language such as "civic engagement." Here I mostly use the term "service-learning" to refer to academically-based student community work.

Results and Discussion

Faculty and staff discussed issues that appeared to be common across all four institutions. These issues have to do with challenges facing those attempting to facilitate organizational change in general, and include barriers such as resistance to change and limited resources. Other more specific issues address the fields of service and diversity, such as language and politics around the appropriateness and efficacy of investing in such efforts in higher education. But we also heard numerous examples of collaborations and barriers to collaborations that seem to result from the specific institutional culture or individuals on a particular campus.

From an organizational perspective, the Catholic schools were distinct from one another, and the non-Catholic institution shared traits in common with at least one school on various levels. Indeed, it turns out that the four universities offer distinct organizational models of service-learning and diversity offices to examine, and have various approaches to community partnerships. As discussed below, participants at the Catholic institutions as well as the non-Catholic institution ranged in the degree to which they perceived that their institutional mission explicitly supported their work. So on this level the diversity amongst the Catholic institutions was as great as that between them and the non-religious institution. Therefore, all four institutions' work is described without identifying whether or not an institution is Catholic.

Not surprisingly, combining service and diversity work happens outside of collaborations between

the offices that coordinate such work. This commonsense notion was confirmed during site visits. For instance, one service-learning center has always had a social justice focus, and included training and other reflections incorporating diversity issues, but this work has not historically involved the diversity office on that campus. Similarly, a significant number of faculty we spoke with either incorporate service and diversity into their courses without direct support of either office, or have been doing this work well before such offices existed on campus. It is worthwhile, then, to consider how strengthening the formal collaborations might benefit the work already happening outside the auspices of the service-learning and diversity offices.

In this results and discussion section, diversity and service work on these four campuses are examined from an organizational perspective, evaluating the influence on collaborations of institutional mission, leadership, academic culture, and structural organization. A discussion follows on issues of community collaborations and partnerships, external funding, and assessment, before presenting some recommendations.

Institutional Mission

In general, study participants at each institution drew from their institutional mission and history to support their work. The missions used language such as working for a socially just world, cultivating responsible citizens, or educating students to provide leadership in a more interdependent world. There were varying degrees to which the mission statements spoke to community and diversity issues.

At one institution, the mission statement was revised just prior to our visit. The changes were crafted under a new president's direction. The new mission statement notes that the University aims to be a "diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor..." It also includes the university value: "a culture of service that respects and promotes the dignity of every person." It is too early to tell if a change in mission statement will lead to perceived changes at the institution, but this is an example of leadership (the new president) using mission to try to emphasize both diversity and service.

In comparison, another institution's mission statement—also recently revised—does not address diversity and curricular service directly. Indeed, one person noted that the mission statement of that University actually *does not* employ vocabulary supporting community work for social justice. Nonetheless, the participant noted that faculty engaged in community-based work seem to assume the mission includes a social justice goal,

because it is a Catholic institution and social justice is part of that church's teachings. Zlotkowski (1998) reminds us that successful (service-learning) programs "draw upon the institution's own understanding of its fundamental mission" (p. 9). In this case, then, faculty understanding of the fundamental mission appeared to go beyond the actual words written.

At a third institution, faculty and staff alike said community involvement was a University cornerstone. In fact, several faculty members indicated that they were attracted to the institution because of its reputation as a place where the faculty was expected to do community work. The reputation of an institution to the 'outside' (in this case, potential faculty members) can often be at least as accurate at reflecting how the institution understands and practices its mission as any written statement. As Holland (1997) suggests, it is not so much whether service is included in a mission statement, but rather how an institution's actions are perceived as compatible with how service is defined that appears to determine whether faculty, staff, and students might experience support for their work (1997).

The fourth institution's mission statement was also a force in shaping diversity and service-learning work. But as noteworthy as the mission itself was the strategic reorganization the leadership had undertaken to align the work of the university with its stated mission and values. This university is discussed in more detail in the following section on leadership.

Leadership

At all four universities, we heard some faculty members, and even more administrators, discuss formal leaders' critical role in supporting the development of diversity and service-learning programs. Whether this support came in the form of verbal recognition, financial support for grant initiatives as the grant[1] closed out, or a president or provost being a source of inspiration and passion for these efforts, participants in this study articulated the importance of the institution's formal leadership in making a place for their work in the surrounding community.

Where there are separate offices for service-learning and diversity, the importance of support from "the top" was expressed more directly by those in service-learning than diversity work. It is not so much that the diversity work experienced less support (though some did). Rather, remarks were tempered with comments about how much work still remains to be done, and how very difficult it is for the campus community to have open dialogue—much less visible action—around diversity initiatives. As one participant wryly remarked about the campus, "Diversity is separate from *everything*." This supports O'Grady's (2000) obser-

vation that diversity issues may be more contested and thus more politically sensitive than service-learning issues.

Although there seemed to be complete agreement that more needs to be done, there were also examples where institutional leaders strived to incorporate diversity into service experiences and make diversity meaningful across the curriculum and institution. At one institution (mentioned above), this was done in part through revising the mission statement. At another there was a strategic reorganization of the institution to align its resources and programs with the institution's key values. Here the service-learning and diversity offices both fall under the supervision of a high ranking academic administrator who has inspired and supported the staff in both offices, and been a critical force in increasing the number of faculty members who include a community-based opportunity for students in their classes. The importance of having a respected institutional leader advocating "for diversity but also building the culture or climate of diversity" was summed up well by one person: "...he has a lot of clout across the university and upwards. So he can mobilize people upwards and also horizontally."

Recognizing that deep change comes slowly if at all, one participant in the study noted a certain "plateau" at his institution; the diversity initiatives so far are seen as successful, but he believes university administrators have not been trained to lead deeper cultural change. Since there was widespread agreement on the importance of top administrators supporting this work, this raises some important issues about the possibilities for deep cultural changes at the university. How do proponents of these change efforts push the boundaries of institutional culture when leaders may not have the skills to facilitate these difficult discussions and indeed, lead institutional "soul-searching?" Might there be fundamental differences when the change effort is conceived of by individuals in "the middle"—the service-learning director, diversity director, or both—and supported by top administrators, versus a top administrator—such as the provost or president—envisioning the change?

The findings here suggest the importance of top leadership taking an active interest in aligning the institution's diversity and service work. Strong and respected leaders can effectively influence structures and policies, for example. Yet, despite enthusiasm around the possibilities, there were sobering comments about the work remaining. An important part of the challenge is working within academic culture, which tends to be very slow to change.

Academic Culture: Curriculum Integration and Faculty Rewards

While it is imperative that administrative leaders demonstrate support for integrating service and diversity work on campus, it is equally critical that faculty support the work, as they are responsible for the curriculum. Though we heard examples of courses being developed, we did not hear of dramatic change in the area of curriculum. We asked questions about the faculty reward process as well, on the premise that understanding the reward process would shed light on the possibilities for transforming the curriculum.

As evidenced by the tenure and promotion processes, these four institutions' academic cultures vary in the degree of support offered to faculty engaged in multicultural and community-based work. Listening to faculty members discuss their experiences, several issues emerged, including the need for more training and resources. The issue of the reward process seemed to steer conversations toward community-based work, and how diversity issues are understood in that specific context.

At one institution, we heard several faculty members say they came to the institution specifically because of that school's reputation for expecting and rewarding faculty involvement in community-based work with students. An upper level administrator told us that recently her institution's

> promotion and tenure committee voted to make service to the community one of the four main constructs. We always had service to the community, but it had always meant service to the [university] community...but they specifically rearticulated that to signify doing work with the community.

This was not an institution that recently underwent a mission revision, but its mission had been parleyed into a critical mass of faculty (the administrator estimated about one-third of faculty members) doing service-learning and other community-based work, with an emphasis on understanding and respecting diverse cultures in the community.

But even at this institution, where community-based work was explicitly in the reward criteria, there is a perception that more work remains. Here, faculty members largely have been responsible for their own partnerships with community agencies. Professors acknowledge that this entails a significant burden, but they also feel closely connected with their community colleagues/partners. And they came to this university precisely to do community work. They did not speak of wishing for an administrative unit to facilitate the logistics of their work, but rather spoke about desiring more rewards

(in the tenure and review process) and increased resources (such as money for student transportation) for this work. Their concern about the reward process reflected deeper questions of what *kinds* of service and what *kinds* of scholarship are recognized. So even when institutions put in place a structure that rewards community work, important issues remain.

Two junior faculty members at another institution said they were brought on board with the expectation of working with their students in the community, and are confident their work is valued in the department. In other cases, however, faculty were more cautious, noting that their work in the community reflected their passion—they would be doing it regardless of the reward system, and indeed most felt the University's faculty reward system needed to be changed to recognize the importance of this work. At the same time, however, some of these faculty members noted the importance of institutional support mechanisms such as small grants to redesign syllabi and administrative assistance from the service-learning office to facilitate community partnerships, provide information to students about service opportunities, coordinate placements, etc.

Several professors gave credit to their service-learning office for communicating the potential of community-based experiences. These faculty members were already aware of the importance of creating a learning environment that supported diverse learners, but as one of them articulated, many faculty members need training. Faculty need support to deal with diverse perspectives in general, and specific training to facilitate the conversations around diversity that arise when students are working in the community and bringing their reflections on those experiences to the classroom.

In sum, it seems that there were various combinations of two related issues concerning faculty efforts to incorporate service and diversity vis-a-vis community-based work: on one hand, faculty members need support so that their community-based work is done well, does not consume a disproportionate amount of their time, and so they are still able to accomplish what it takes to be recognized in the RTP process. On the other hand, some institutions need to change the RTP process itself so that it more accurately recognizes community-based work. But even changing the RTP process does not mean that the challenges for faculty doing this work disappear. In addition to being potentially labor-intensive, there are also issues about what kinds of scholarship get recognized. Though we heard faculty express this in relationship to their own institutional review, there are clearly larger disciplinary cultures reflected as well. If community-based work is indeed nontraditional for a discipline, an additional challenge is embedded in the reward system.

University Structures

Mission, leadership, and faculty culture can each potentially support or deter the integration of service-learning and diversity work. This section looks at how these dimensions are operationalized. What are the organizational structures in place and how do they constrict or encourage collaborations between offices, or between faculty members and staff members interested in integrating these agendas?

As noted early in this paper, no two institutions had the same organizational structure model for multicultural and community-based work. At one institution both offices reported to the vice-provost; at another the multicultural affairs office reports through student affairs and the service-learning office was housed in a different administrative entity. At a third the multicultural office was on the academic side, and the director of service-learning had a dual-reporting relationship to student and academic affairs. At the fourth school, there were no formal offices for diversity or service-learning, but some of the community-based learning work was coordinated through grant-funded centers, and the rest done directly by faculty. In all cases the staff of centers reported to high-ranking personnel at these small- and medium-size institutions.

At the three schools with formal offices, a number of people we spoke with remarked that faculty on their campuses perceived programs and funding coming through service-learning and diversity as "add-on" instead of part of the "way we do things." For instance, it was noted that faculty members feel they must choose between initiatives in which to get involved. Should they choose the workshop to help them incorporate diversity or service-learning into their courses? Such divisions, noted one professor, make it difficult to see the institution's priorities clearly, and can set up a competition for resources and faculty attention.

Notably, this 'add-on' perception was not communicated to us at the school without formal offices. There are other issues for the faculty, such as lack of resources and perceiving that their scholarship is not valued, but there is no service-learning or diversity office, so the work is very closely connected with curriculum.[3]

At several institutions, the key diversity and service-learning people have a history of working together that transcends their current roles, and participants shared that these relationships mitigated some of the structural challenges. The structural

challenges at two schools were not that they reported through different channels, but rather that the structure in some ways had separated them from at least some faculty—they were perceived as add-ons. These are the two universities where the two offices report to the same person.

When the service-learning and multicultural office report through different channels, there are fewer opportunities to interact and creatively think about collaborations. As one administrator acknowledged, representatives from each group just "weren't at the table" when the issues of one another's office were being discussed. This can be construed as the historical challenge of collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs in higher education (Kezar, Hirsch, & Burack, 2001; Knefelkamp, 1992), but also points to fundamental differences in how the work of each office is defined. An office viewed as the point-place for diversity issues may have neither mandate nor resources to provide training and advice to faculty on syllabi development and course instruction. The diversity/multicultural office in several cases were more oriented toward campus dialogues and issues of structural diversity on campus. This might also explain why some faculty said they received training or mentoring on incorporating diversity issues into their courses from the service-learning office.

One institution we visited had a typical structure in higher education. The service-learning officer there serves as an information broker for faculty and students, and coordinator for faculty workshops. The language in this case appears to be based on providing resources to faculty and students to enhance their work. A service-learning office acting as coordinator and facilitator of campus service-learning (compared to a departmental-level office, for instance) is associated with greater institutionalization of service-learning (Holland, 1997). When it comes to strengthening connections between diversity and service work, these findings reveal that focusing on meaningful community partnerships is useful.

Framing Diversity and Service-Learning Around Forming Community Partnerships

So far this paper has addressed how organizational factors can support or impede the potential collaborative efforts of diversity and service-learning offices. We saw the most promising signs of collaboration when campuses or offices approached their work focusing on community partnerships. Focusing on community partnerships also reflected the importance of social justice issues to participants (whether or not the institutional mission statement included social justice language). Thus, this particular issue merits further attention.

Framing the work of the service-learning office around community partnerships provides a vehicle for incorporating diversity issues and service-learning, but does not ensure that the diversity office engages in the partnership efforts. Although several institutions' *service-learning* centers combine diversity and service by framing their work around campus and/or community partnerships, we only saw one *diversity* office framing its vision around partnerships—and this office was the most closely tied, of all the diversity offices we visited, with the service-learning office on its campus.

There is, in several cases, a core set of community partners with whom the service-learning office has formed partnerships. These offices have a group of community representatives who function as part of an advisory board, facilitating a commitment to long-term partnerships with these agencies. According to administrators, these types of relationships formed between the institution and the community are more authentically reciprocal. At the same time, moreover, the community partners are committed to working with the university to see that diversity issues are addressed in appropriate ways, through giving feedback on course materials, providing orientations or training, or working with the service-learning center to make longterm plans. Issues of social justice and multiculturalism are important when focusing on partnerships, because there are diverse cultural perspectives brought to the table. In this sense, one can address the different cultures of higher education and the community, and issues of race and social class, for example, to define diversity more broadly.

One service-learning office identified the neighborhood adjacent to campus as a place where the institution should have a visible presence. By having a clear goal of cultivating the relationships there, the office has created a "niche" and is able to speak to what is working and what are the future goals of the partnership. The community task force, initiated with external funding several years ago, continues to be a critical part of planning. At another institution, the geographic area served is more broadly defined, but the service-learning office maintains a set of core partnerships, reflecting long-term commitments. In both cases, community representatives play important roles in the service-learning office decision-making processes.

Why are diversity offices not always a part of these community partnership efforts? As mentioned earlier regarding training and mentoring, this likely has to do with the historical and current purpose of such offices. If the diversity office's work is focused on recruiting and supporting students and faculty of

color, and facilitating campus dialogues around diversity issues, it may simply lack resources and support to be deeply engaged in the university's relationship with the larger community.

In the one case where the diversity office included community service in its vision statements, there was a formal connection to the service-learning office and community as partners in addressing multiculturalism issues. One of the functions of the partnership is to disperse grant monies associated with a campus-wide initiative to enhance multiculturalism, and here yet another issue is raised. The self-evaluation of this model was positive, but there was concern expressed that the campus community views the committee primarily as a source of funding for programs, and not an integrated part of the academic work. Nonetheless, this was an example of a diversity office creating an organizational link to a service-learning office.

Non-Organizational Factors

In addition to organizational dimensions of leadership, mission, culture, and structure, several other issues emerged that informed the collaborations between diversity and service work. Here we briefly discuss the roles external funding and assessment play on these campuses.

External Funding. External funding can support projects and programs that lay groundwork for collaborations, which in turn can become institutionalized. Such funding has served an important role in the work of several universities we visited. Although it might seem that the risk of being perceived as temporary or peripheral could increase if a program is grant-funded, the grant activities we saw had clear components of encouraging faculty involvement (course development, funding community work, etc.) which might embed the work into the curriculum.

One aspect of external funding that appears to be important is when a foundation is willing to fund successive efforts at the same institution, because it allows for a learning curve at the institutional level. Not surprisingly, the second or third grants that institutions implement focus on institutional change. At one University, for instance, the process of writing the second-stage proposal to the foundation changed dramatically after the first grant. Several people we spoke with noted the process went from a rather "patchwork" approach of funding a variety of institutional programs to a clear plan of how each initiative proposed across campus fit with an overall goal. The subsequent funding, then, enabled the University to reflect on what worked and where the institution was headed, and then secure funding to implement the next steps.

In addition to growing new programs and collaborations, external funding can add a dimension of security and longevity to a program. One service-learning program we visited is funded by an endowment, allowing the office to make long-term plans and commitments. Other grant and institutional resources are supporting the collaborations this office has with the diversity office. Although no one indicated they felt they had "enough" money to do the work they wanted to do, offices that were now institutionally funded or secured by an endowment did not express uncertainty about persisting, much less worrying about the continuation of specific programs.

One person we spoke with in a grant-funded program raised interesting questions about the "agenda" that gets defined by an external funding agency. To what extent, he wondered, does the money drive how the institution defines these partnerships, or diversity? Is it just racial/ethnic diversity? Or is there space for broader conceptualizations and programs to meet a variety of needs? Thus, in addition to internal organizational structures playing a role, external forces can shape how diversity and service-learning become integrated in higher education institutions.

Assessment of Diversity and Service-Learning. No one with whom we spoke appeared satisfied with the amount and quality of assessment efforts regarding student learning or programs. Discussing assessment brings up numerous issues. It highlights the lack of consensus around what "diversity" and "service" mean and whether they are appropriate terms. In other words, how do you decide what to measure? Assessment also highlights the ways in which education is contested in general by asking such questions as: What *should* students be learning? *How* should they be learning (what methods work best)? What ought to be the role of higher education in social change? The participants in this study were passionate and eloquent when discussing their hopes for education as a vehicle for social change and why they do what they do. They know these viewpoints are not representative of mainstream faculty perspectives, and their approach to learning is not engaged in by most of their colleagues. Several people told us that assessment was what needed most attention, in large part to document the efficacy of these marginalized teaching methods.

One faculty member we spoke with explored the dilemma of the risk faculty take to teach a course dealing with service and diversity, when faculty rewards are based on evaluation of their teaching. How can an institution make it safe to try this sometimes challenging approach? What happens when a faculty member tries something and it does not work well?

Assessment of a partnership—from an organizational perspective—was apparent only in one insti-

tution, where an external source was funding the diversity office's work. Here the diversity office undertook some partnership evaluation, albeit fairly informally, and reported these findings as part of the grant report. Assessment of these partnership efforts is clearly an area that needs to be addressed (Gelmon, 2000; Giles & Cruz, 2000).

Recommendations

Each institution we visited has some promising practices which are a function of that individual institution, but also have elements that might be informative for other institutions, including those in the public sector. In this section we make recommendations for institutions engaged in integrating diversity work with service-learning.

- Create an organizational structure so that the directors of diversity and service-learning report to (the same) high ranking academic officer, centering the collaborations around the curriculum, and deepening faculty commitment to this issue. Alternatively, one might create an opportunity or program that brings together the diversity and service-learning offices, which might in turn lead to more formal partnerships.

- Use more community-centered partnership language to more readily pull in a multicultural perspective. When the *partnership* is the center, it is easier to "make sense of" the necessity to understand community needs, which must address socioeconomic and cultural differences.

- Develop a diversity office that has a mandate to influence curricular aspects of diversity—broadly defined—and structural aspects, such as recruitment and retention of students and faculty of color.

- Connect the work of both the service-learning and diversity offices closely and clearly with institutional mission. Support from high-level administrators can come most strongly when initiatives are clearly seen as doing the work the university sees as central to its mission.

- Address the issue of faculty promotion by defining community service as service to the larger community (not just the campus community). Keep in mind there may remain questions about what kind of community-based work is valued, both by the campus and the academic disciplines.

Conclusion

These case studies shed light on various ways in which higher education institutions are trying to connect diversity and service-learning work. Specific organizational arrangements and histories mean different challenges and opportunities for collaboration, and differences in the goals and perspectives of the service-learning and diversity offices. While there is significant evidence that the agendas are coming together when the focus is community partnerships, there is less certainty that this means the work of traditional diversity offices has changed, or will change. In some cases, collaborations were clear; in others, it appears that diversity work is being integrated in service-learning by means other than formal collaborations. Additionally, diversity must be defined broadly, because there are very real challenges to authentic community-university partnerships presented by diverse organizational cultures. Dealing with this kind of cultural diversity may even pave the way to address issues of social and economic class differences and issues around race, which have historically been perceived as divisive.

This paper has briefly reviewed some historical dimensions of connecting diversity work and service-learning, and looked in-depth at how four private institutions are faring. Although the study is not representative of all institutional types, it does suggest some ways in which the diversity and service-learning agendas are currently defined in higher education. In large part, these agendas are coming together under the broader considerations of how institutions are engaging in their respective communities. Even if the offices that engage in such work face organizational challenges to their collaborations, the broader agendas get attention as institutions examine how they are seen in their community, and as there is increasing dialogue on many levels (nationally, in professional organizations, at the state and regional levels) about what it means to prepare students to be engaged in civic and community life after college. In the process of attending to these broader goals of civic engagement (at both the individual and institutional level), issues of service, community-based work, and diversity necessarily must be addressed.

Notes

[1] This study was undertaken as part of a larger project called Community/University IDEAS: Initiatives on Diversity, Equity and Service, which targets California private colleges and universities and their students, faculty, and communities. IDEAS is sponsored by the California Campus Compact and funded by the James Irvine Foundation. The goal of the IDEAS project is to support collaborative partnerships between diversity and service efforts in higher education. This article draws heavily from a report published on the Web site of the California Campus Compact (www.sfsu.edu/~cacc/downloads/ ideas.pdf).

[3] This is not to suggest that there was no administrative support for service-learning or diversity, but at this institution such support was provided through academic or other program centers, not service-learning or diversity offices per se.

References

Banks, J. A. (2001). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.) *The handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beckham, E. (1999). Civic learning and campus diversity: Bridging the language gap. *American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) Peer Review*, *Fall*, 4-7.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D.E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cruz, N. I. & Giles, D. E. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue, pp. 28-34.

Gelmon, S. B. (2000). Challenges in assessing service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue, pp. 84-90.

Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *4*, 30-41.

Holland, B. A. (2000). Institutional impacts and organizational issues related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue, pp. 52-60.

Kezar, A. J., Hirsch, D. J., & Burack, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knefelkamp, L. L. (1992). *Is this good for our students?* Two papers from the 1991 CIC Deans Institute (speech: available ERIC document #ED356720).

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (2000). Culture in American colleges and universities. In M.C. Brown III, (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education: ASHE reader series* (pp. 160-169). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing (Reprinted from *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1, 1988, Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education).

Masland, A. T. (2000). Organizational culture in the study of higher education. In M.C. Brown III, (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education: ASHE Reader Series* (pp. 145-159). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing. (Reprinted from *Review of Higher Education*, *8*(2), 1985).

Marullo, S., & Edwards, B. (2000). From charity to justice: The potential of university-community collaborations for social change. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *43*(5), 895-912.

Merriam, S. B. (1997). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Grady, C.R. (2000). *Integrating service learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Stanton, T.K., Giles, D.G., & Cruz, N. (1999). *Service learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice and future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vogelgesang, L.J., & Astin, A.W. (2000). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *7*, 25-34.

Ward, K. (1996). Service-learning and student volunteerism: Reflections on institutional commitment. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *3*, 55-65.

Zlotkowski, E. (1996). A new voice at the table? Linking service-learning and the academy. *Change*, *28*(1), 21-27.

Zlotkowski, E. (Ed.) (1998). *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence for higher education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

Author

LORI J. VOGELGESANG conducts research at The Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, and directs the Institute's Center for Service Learning Research & Dissemination. She is 'on loan' to UCLA's Center for Community Partnerships, collaborating with that office to evaluate funded community partnerships. She is co-author of a national study on how service-learning affects undergraduate students. Prior to becoming a researcher, Lori worked in student affairs and as an evaluation consultant for domestic and international educational programs.