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Abstract
This article describes the development of a service-learning project and analysis of student pharmacists’ participation therein. Using a mixed-methods approach, this study analyzed student pharmacists’ knowledge and attitudes after volunteering in the inaugural Medicare Outreach Program, a collaboration between the School of Pharmacy and State Health Insurance Assistance Program (SHIP) in which certified student pharmacists assisted Medicare beneficiaries with Part D plan evaluation and selection. Although results did not show a statistically significant difference in knowledge gained by students who volunteered \((n = 71)\) compared to those who did not \((n = 72; p = 0.57)\), thematic analysis of volunteering students’ reflections did reveal that they found their volunteering efforts to be meaningful learning experiences. Six major themes were identified overall showing that the program, which was designed to benefit SHIP and the community, also had a positive impact on students’ attitudes. Accordingly, the program’s sustainability plan is also discussed.

Introduction
Service to society has been the core value of land-grant institutions in the United States, which have a historical mandate for openness, accessibility, and service to people dating back to the 1960s (Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, 2012). One way higher education institutions can continue the tradition of public service is through service-learning. Service-learning is a pedagogical method linking community service and instructional activities (Ehrlich, 1996). Felten and Clayton (2011) stated that the collaboration between community (external constituents) and university creates a strong connection between academic context and public concerns. It is important that organized service activities are developed to address community needs.

Reflection is a key component of service-learning. It provides opportunities for students to consolidate learning and to identify unresolved issues in the community (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Eyler, 2002). Students engaged in a service-learning activity should reflect on the experience to gain a further understanding of course con-
tent, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995).

Past research has demonstrated benefits of service-learning in terms of students’ performance, critical thinking skills, communication skills, and awareness of societal problems. Markus, Howard, and King (1993) found that students in an undergraduate political science course that incorporated service-learning had significantly higher academic achievement than their non-service-learning counterparts. Service-learning students were also significantly more likely to self-report performing up to their potential, learning to apply principles taught in the course to new situations, and developing a greater awareness of societal problems (Markus et al., 1993). DeLuca, Andrews, and Hale (2004) found that incorporating elderly-focused service-learning into nursing courses helped students develop sensitivity to issues of aging and improve their communication skills when dealing with the elderly. Other studies have also found that enhanced communication skills result from service-learning (Cohen, Johnson, Nelson, & Peterson, 1998; Hales, 1997). Finally, when service-learning was used, there was a significant enhancement in students’ motivation, civic skills, problem-solving abilities, and appreciation of diversity (Levesque-Bristol, Knapp, & Fisher, 2010).

**Purpose**

Despite a recent increased level of interest in service-learning among health professions students (Curtin, Martins, & Schwartz-Barcott, 2014; Leung et al., 2012; Nuffer & Duke, 2014), additional research is needed to evaluate the impact of service-learning on this cohort. Our research sought to evaluate student pharmacists’ knowledge and attitudes after participating in the Medicare Outreach Program described below. Specifically, the study had two objectives: (a) to assess differences in knowledge between students who participated and those who did not participate in the program, as measured by test scores, and (b) to describe themes that emerged from participating students’ reflections on their experience.

**Medicare Outreach Program**

The Medicare Outreach Program was designed to assist beneficiaries in selecting Medicare Part D prescription drug plans. Medicare beneficiaries include people 65 years of age and older as well as younger adults with permanent disabilities or medical conditions. Under Medicare Part D, private insurance providers offer
a wide range of prescription drug plans that vary in terms of costs and benefits. The typical beneficiary must choose among nearly 40 plans and is encouraged to reevaluate plan options annually to ensure that their plan best meets their medication and financial needs.

Studies have found that many beneficiaries pay unnecessarily high out-of-pocket Part D costs for various reasons. For one, knowledge deficits can lead to difficulties selecting plans (Polinski, Bhandari, Saya, Schneeweiss, & Shrank, 2010). Further, many beneficiaries neglect to reevaluate their plans annually due to the complex plan selection process. As a result, beneficiaries spend an average of $368 more per year than if they had purchased the least expensive plan (Jackson & Axelsen, 2008; Walberg & Patel, 2009; Zhou & Zhang, 2012). Additionally, low computer literacy and lack of access to computers or the Internet may prevent beneficiaries from choosing plans that best fit their needs (Wright & Hill, 2009). Therefore, one-on-one assistance to help beneficiaries choose appropriate Medicare Part D plans is needed.

**Program description and collaborator.** The Medicare Outreach Program was developed to assist Medicare beneficiaries with Part D plan selection, a needed service in which student pharmacists can play an integral role (Cutler, Stebbins, Smith, Patel, & Lipton, 2011; Patel et al., 2009). Auburn University Outreach Office provided funding to support the first-year implementation of the program. The specific aim of the program was to have student pharmacists apply concepts learned through coursework and additional training in order to assist beneficiaries in Part D plan evaluation and selection at events held in the community. The program was a collaboration between the School of Pharmacy and the Alabama State Health Insurance Assistance Program (SHIP). Located in the Southeast, the School of Pharmacy offers a 4-year doctor of pharmacy (PharmD) degree, with approximately 150 students enrolled in each year of the program. The curriculum includes a service-learning component made up of 1,800 hours of pharmacy practice experience, giving students experience with patient care in various settings. The Medicare Outreach Program described herein, however, was voluntary, was not part of the compulsory practice experience, and was not meant to meet any curriculum requirements.

Alabama SHIP, which is a partnership between the Administration for Community Living (ACL), the Alabama Department of Senior Services, and the Area Agencies on Aging, is the key public organization that offers free and unbiased assistance to Medicare beneficiaries throughout the year. During the Part D
open enrollment period, SHIP coordinators experience increased service demands and rely heavily on volunteers. Volunteers must complete a training program to become certified SHIP counselors prior to assisting Medicare beneficiaries. Before the start of the Medicare Outreach Program, the research team met with SHIP personnel to discuss event logistics, mutual goals, the certification process for student pharmacists, and the expectations for students at open enrollment events. An expedited review by the Internal Review Board (IRB) was secured under federal regulation 45 CFR 46.110(5). An additional meeting was held after the last event to discuss project outcomes, areas for improvement, and plans for sustainability.

**Students’ training and their roles.** Although first- through fourth-year student pharmacists were encouraged to volunteer, this service-learning project was primarily incorporated into the Pharmacy Practice Development, Management, and Evaluation I course taken by second-year student pharmacists. In this required course, students learn about Medicare and use the online Medicare Plan Finder tool through didactic and case-based strategies. Additional training required for SHIP certification consisted of three training modules and corresponding quizzes offered online via Canvas, the learning management software used by the School of Pharmacy. The modules and quizzes were developed by participating SHIP coordinators and complement the Medicare information covered in the Pharmacy Practice course. Second- through fourth-year student pharmacists could enroll in the training modules, while first-year students were limited to conducting beneficiary intake and assisting with a beneficiary satisfaction survey. To become certified SHIP counselors, students had to complete the modules and earn 80% or higher on the quizzes.

At the enrollment events, second- through fourth-year students who were SHIP certified worked alone or in pairs; they sat with one beneficiary at a time and entered the information from the intake form into the Medicare Plan Finder tool. A plan search was then executed, and the students helped the beneficiary interpret the costs and benefits of the available prescription drug plans. It was up to the beneficiary whether they wanted to keep their current plan or enroll in a new plan. Student pharmacists could also print plan summary information for the beneficiary to take home for further consideration. Students spent 15 to 45 minutes interacting with each beneficiary. At least one program staff member from the School of Pharmacy and one regional SHIP coordinator
were present at each enrollment event to answer students’ questions and handle complex questions from beneficiaries.

**Program evaluation and outputs.** A total of 17 events across 10 counties in Alabama were delivered in October–November 2013. Four of these communities are in rural and traditionally underserved regions of Alabama. In total, 86 certified student counselors served 147 beneficiaries. In addition to students’ knowledge and attitudes reported in this article, an evaluation of the program in terms of beneficiaries’ satisfaction, cost savings, and total number of beneficiaries served was conducted. These findings informed the funder of the success of the initial launch and identified areas for improvement for the School of Pharmacy and SHIP.

**Methods**

We utilized a mixed-methods design consisting of a quasi-experimental design (nonequivalent control groups posttest only) to evaluate differences in test scores (Objective A) and a cross-sectional design to describe students’ attitudes (Objective B). The study utilized both qualitative and quantitative data (*Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004*). For the first objective, an independent *t*-test was used to determine differences in knowledge as assessed by test scores on the Pharmacy Practice course final exam between second-year students who volunteered and those who did not. The five questions analyzed were related to Medicare, Medicare Advantage plans, the online Plan Finder Tool, and interpretation of plan search results. To describe student attitudes (Objective B), student volunteers were asked to provide anonymous reflective feedback about their experience at the end of each enrollment event. Each student was given a sheet of paper with the following prompt:

> In a paragraph, please reflect on your experience participating in the Medicare Outreach Program. For example, how useful was the project to your own learning? What surprised you the most from patient encounter(s)? What was the major takeaway? Do you see yourself doing a similar activity in the future? Etc.

Reflections were collected from students before they left the event and were transcribed verbatim. Following the guidelines laid out by *Braun and Clarke (2006)*, a realist thematic analysis of the dataset was conducted as described below.

First, two researchers independently read over the entire dataset, noting initial thoughts and ideas for codes. Next, utilizing a
data-driven approach, each researcher independently open-coded half of the dataset to generate initial codes. The researchers then met to compare and identify codes for the next phase of analysis. Using the agreed-upon codes, the researchers independently recoded the entire dataset. Another meeting was then held to address any major discrepancies and to collate codes into potential themes using an inductive approach. The identified themes were reviewed to verify their consistency with corresponding codes and with the dataset overall. Finally, the themes were refined to ensure that each theme had a clear, distinct name and definition. All coding was performed in Atlas.Ti, a qualitative data analysis and research software program. Krippendorff’s alpha was calculated using the Coding Analysis Toolkit to determine the interrater reliability between coders.

Results

Students’ Knowledge

On average, second-year student pharmacists who volunteered at an enrollment event ($n = 71$) correctly answered $3.28 \pm 1.00$ of the 5 questions pertaining to Medicare Part D on the Pharmacy Practice course final exam, whereas those who did not volunteer ($n = 72$) answered $3.18 \pm 1.13$ of these questions correctly. This difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.57$).

Student Attitudes After Volunteering

Seventy-nine students who participated in the program also provided a reflection. A total of 6,792 words, or 27.17 pages of text, were coded and analyzed. The two researchers identified six overarching themes in the data with good interrater reliability overall (Krippendorff’s $\alpha = 0.795$) and for each theme individually (Krippendorff’s $\alpha$ ranged from 0.733 to 0.880). Excerpts demonstrating these themes are found in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Excerpt Demonstrating Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aspirations for Future Participation | “I would really like to volunteer at future enrollment events.”  
“I will absolutely do this again in the future.”  
“I will definitely continue this in the future and offer this service at whatever pharmacy I work at.” |
## Self-Reported Learning Experience

“Despite the lectures on the various Medicare plans, I believe I learned the most working with this project.”  
“I feel a little guilty because I learned more than I was able to help!”  
“I found that participating in the event was one of the better ways to learn about these programs.”

## Ability to Help Patients

“I was able to see first-hand how beneficial the event was to people seeking help with their insurance.”  
“The major takeaway for me was to be able to help out someone in the community.”  
“The project reminded me of the real reason I do pharmacy; personal interactions with patients in hope to help them.”

## Rewarding Experience

“It was an amazing feeling to help people save money and educate them on what determines the cost of insurance plans.”  
“It was very rewarding to show people different ways to save money and how to apply for extra help benefits.”  
“Participating in the Medicare Outreach Project has been extremely rewarding.”

## Realization of Community Need

“I was surprised to know how little the patients know about their current insurance coverage and even their medications. I think these projects are extremely helpful to educate patients on their current coverage as well as other options available to them.”  
“The patient encounters were an eye-opening experience. So many people wouldn’t know where to begin if this project didn’t exist.”  
“What surprised me the most was how much help the patients needed.”

## Real-World Application of Class Material

“It was great taking what I learned in class and actually applying it to real-life situations.”  
“It is one thing to learn this stuff in class but to see it in action with real people and real outcomes gives it a whole new perspective.”  
“I was able to apply my knowledge from the classroom in a meaningful way to help a patient save >$5000 on prescription medications.”

### Aspirations for future participation.

**Aspirations for future participation** was defined as a student pharmacist stating interest in participating in the program in the future. Students repeatedly mentioned interest in participating in future enrollment events or implementing a similar activity in their future practice. Many students indicated that they enjoyed the interaction with patients, and this influenced their aspirations for future participation. This theme was mentioned most frequently, with coder A identifying 63 mentions and coder B identifying 64.
**Self-reported learning experience.** This theme was defined as a student pharmacist stating that participation in the program enhanced his or her learning. A majority of students who participated in the enrollment events mentioned that they felt they learned a lot as a result. Many specifically mentioned that participating increased their understanding of the complexities of Medicare Part D. Students also frequently stated that they gained knowledge participating that was above and beyond what they gained from course lectures. Self-reported learning experience was identified 53 times by coder A and 44 times by coder B.

**Ability to help patients.** This theme was defined as a student pharmacist stating that he or she was able to help patients. Through participation in the events, students realized the extent to which their knowledge helped patients evaluate and select Medicare Part D plans. Many mentioned that the events reminded them of the underlying reason that they are interested in becoming pharmacists: to help people. Additionally, students mentioned realization of the impact a pharmacist can have on an individual’s life just by taking the time to talk with them. Coder A identified 57 statements and coder B 51 statements for this theme.

**Rewarding experience.** *Rewarding experience* was defined as a student pharmacist stating that he or she enjoyed participating in the enrollment event and that the experience was a positive one. Many students noted how good it felt to help patients. Not only did the program help patients choose a Medicare Part D plan, it also resulted in students feeling good about what they were doing in the community. This theme was identified 49 and 42 times by coders A and B, respectively.

**Realization of community need.** *Realization of community need* was coded when a student pharmacist mentioned that many individuals were uneducated on their Part D plan options or that the community could benefit from enrollment events. Students were surprised to find out how little patients knew about the enrollment process. Additionally, student pharmacists questioned what these patients would do if not for the enrollment events. Students credited participation in the enrollment events to their realization of the community need for education on Medicare Part D. Coder A coded 41 instances of this theme, and coder B coded 37.

**Real-world application of class material.** This theme was defined as a student pharmacist mentioning his or her experience applying what was learned in the classroom during the enrollment events. Students felt participation in the program was a great way to
apply what they learned in the Pharmacy Practice course in a real-world setting. Students mentioned that no amount of change to the course assignments could fully prepare them for the complexities of real patients. Additionally, students felt volunteering was helpful to reinforce the basic principles of the enrollment process learned in class while also getting an in-depth experience that could be gained only through participation in the events. Coder A coded this theme 40 times and coder B 35 times.

**Discussion**

**Students’ Knowledge**

There was no significant difference in the number of correctly answered exam questions between students who volunteered and those who did not. One possible reason for this result is that in-class instruction may have provided the knowledge necessary to correctly use the Plan Finder Tool and accurately interpret the results. Although this may be true, additional knowledge beyond what was taught in class may have been gained by volunteering students that was not captured by the exam. For example, one student described in their reflection that they learned how to help a beneficiary apply for the Low-Income Subsidy but, because this was not taught in class, it would not have been fair to ask a question about this process on the exam. Additionally, valuable knowledge was gained as illustrated through students’ recognition that programs like this are needed in the community. Volunteers gained counseling experience that nonvolunteers did not, and analysis of the reflections suggests that their knowledge related to patient counseling on Medicare Part D may have also increased. Future studies will attempt to measure the knowledge gained as a result of participation in more innovative ways. One possibility is the use of a standardized patient or student role-play activity. This process would require that students assist patients through the Medicare Part D enrollment process. The interaction could be videorecorded and subsequently graded for completeness of information provided to the patient about their options, correct interpretation and explanation of the Plan Finder results, and comfort in counseling the patient. This type of evaluation would be more likely than simple multiple-choice questions to show knowledge gained as a result of volunteering in the enrollment events.
Student Attitudes After Volunteering

The themes identified in students’ reflections are consistent with the findings from previous service-learning projects. The themes “realization of community need” and “ability to help patients” indicate a greater awareness of societal problems, which has been cited as a benefit of service-learning (DeLuca et al., 2004; Markus et al., 1993). Another benefit often cited is that students learn to apply principles taught in the classroom to new situations. This was observed in our study, captured by the themes “real-world application of class material” and “self-reported learning experience” (DeLuca et al., 2004; Markus et al., 1993). Deluca et al. (2004) also found that feeling personal satisfaction was an important benefit of service-learning, which we coded as a rewarding experience.

The six themes identified in our study can be divided into two broad groups. Themes that have an internal focus can be classified as “benefits to self,” and those with an external focus can be classified as “benefits to others/the community.” Three of the six themes (“self-reported learning experience,” “rewarding experience,” and “real-world application of class material”) clearly focus on the internal benefits that student pharmacists themselves received from their volunteer efforts. The theme “aspirations for future participation,” which suggests that students found enough utility in their experience volunteering that they aspire to do it again in the future, can also be placed in the “benefits to self” group. The remaining two themes (“realization of community need” and “ability to help patients”) focus on the usefulness of the program to the beneficiaries and communities served and therefore belong to the “benefits to others/the community” group.

A potential limitation of the thematic analysis performed is that both the “aspirations for future participation” and the “self-reported learning experience” themes may have come about due to the wording of the paragraph used to prompt the reflection. However, students were aware that their reflections would be anonymous and would not impact their grade. Given this, students could have easily indicated the opposite (i.e., that they had no aspiration for future participation or that they did not learn anything), if this were the case.

The Importance of Collaboration

Consistent with the findings of Felten and Clayton (2011) regarding the importance of collaboration with external constituents, collaboration with Alabama SHIP was crucial to the suc-
cess of the program. The partnership began in the planning phase and brought about multiple benefits. First, because SHIP is a state agency and is known to provide unbiased information to the target clients, the partnership legitimized the program and increased the program’s credibility. Second, the collaboration introduced students to the real-world problems of seniors in the community. Assisting real Medicare beneficiaries in the program provided a memorable experience, which is evident from students’ reflections. We found that students had meaningful learning experiences and a sense of civic engagement. We feel our results are generalizable to schools of pharmacy that want to implement a similar program. In fact, the Medicare Outreach Program was highlighted in the SHIP national newsletters as a success, and these newsletters urged other state SHIP programs to reach out to schools in various health disciplines to create similar partnerships.

What’s Next?

Several lessons were learned from the first year of the program and can be classified into event logistics, students’ preparation, and student assessment. For one, the distance that students must travel to an event has an impact on their willingness to volunteer. This led to an overabundance of student volunteers for events close to the school but too few volunteers for the more distant events. In the future, events will be held no more than 50 miles from the School of Pharmacy. Also, the number of student volunteers per event will be limited to four per 2-hour block to ensure that all students get to interact with beneficiaries. Regarding students’ preparation, we recognized that students had limited knowledge of the Low-Income Subsidy programs. Therefore, a 1-hour lecture was added to the Pharmacy Practice course to introduce students to these programs. We also noticed that some students were overwhelmed initially and became more comfortable the longer they volunteered. This was mainly due to the significant amount of paperwork in addition to assisting beneficiaries. To address this issue, we plan to revise and streamline the workflow that students will engage in at events, including the paperwork. We also plan to add an online video to the training module detailing the workflow and paperwork, which should give students more familiarity with the process prior to an event. Finally, in terms of student assessment, multiple-choice exams may not capture the benefits gained from volunteering. In the future, assessment of students’ confidence and skills will be added to determine outcomes of the program. Students’ confidence level can be captured through a validated questionnaire, and skills
can be captured through assessment using standardized patients or role-play activities.

**Program Sustainability**

The Office of the Vice President for University Outreach at Auburn University funded the first year of the program. Moving forward, a long-term plan for sustainability has been established. Both Alabama SHIP and the School of Pharmacy recognize the value of the program, and the program will therefore be continued with shared resources from both partners. During the second year of implementation, Alabama SHIP funded one graduate project assistant and travel costs, and the School of Pharmacy provided faculty to oversee the program and students to participate. Due to limited resources for students’ travel reimbursement and the complexity of students’ and SHIP coordinators’ schedules, it is not feasible at this time to provide volunteer opportunities for all students. Therefore, student participation will continue on a voluntary basis. Additionally, we have identified and secured a source of funding to support the program for the next 3 years. We will continue to measure both the short- and long-term outcomes of the program and communicate with all stakeholders, as this is a critical component of sustainability. Short-term (annual) outcomes include students’ confidence, skills, and experiences through participation; Medicare beneficiary satisfaction and cost savings; and number of beneficiaries assisted by student volunteers. Long-term outcomes include students’ continued service activities with SHIP, number of beneficiaries who are repeat clients and new clients, and expansion of the original program. SHIP and the School of Pharmacy are planning to expand the program into new regions by utilizing fourth-year students on clinical rotations as well as licensed pharmacists throughout the state of Alabama.

**Conclusion**

Healthcare educators have recently shown an increased interest in service-learning opportunities for their students. Our study illustrates the benefits of service-learning in pharmacy education. Although our analysis did not show a statistically significant difference in the knowledge gained by student pharmacists who volunteered in the Medicare Outreach Program compared to those who did not, volunteering students did report that their efforts were meaningful and worthwhile. Students’ reflections revealed that they gained a deeper understanding of beneficiaries’ needs as well
as the complexity of Medicare Part D plan selection and increased their ability to help patients with this process. Students also felt that volunteering was a rewarding and meaningful learning experience. In order to more accurately analyze knowledge and skills gained by volunteering students, future plans may utilize innovative methods to measure these constructs, such as videorecording and critiquing students as they assist a standardized patient with Part D plan selection. The Medicare Outreach Program has a viable plan for sustainability, with both SHIP and the School of Pharmacy committing resources for future implementation.

References


**About the Authors**

**Joshua C. Hollingsworth** is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Health Outcomes Research and Policy at Auburn University Harrison School of Pharmacy. Josh earned his PharmD from AUHSOP and is currently working on his dissertation, *The Development and Testing of Two Novel Patient Medication Information Formats*.

**Benjamin S. Teeter** is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Health Outcomes Research and Policy at Auburn University Harrison School of Pharmacy. Benjamin earned his M.S. from Auburn University and is currently working on his dissertation, *Quality Performance in Community Pharmacies: An Exploration of Pharmacists’ Perceptions and Predictors*. 
Salisa C. Westrick is an associate professor in the Department of Health Outcomes Research and Policy at Auburn University Harrison School of Pharmacy. Her research interests include program evaluation and pharmacists’ role in public health. She earned her Ph.D. in social and administrative sciences in pharmacy from the University of Wisconsin–Madison.
PRACTICE STORIES
Reshaping the Boundaries of Community Engagement in Design Education: Global and Local Explorations

Travis L. Hicks and Rebekah Ison Radtke

Abstract

Community-driven design is a current movement in the forefront of many designers’ practices and on university campuses in design programs. The authors examine work from their respective public state universities’ design programs as examples of best practices. In these case studies, the authors share experiences using community-based design processes, local or global, with their design students. Goals of these two case studies include understanding the varying context and the cultural implications provided by diverse academic and geographic landscapes. In one case, students traveled thousands of miles to experience a different culture; in the other, students traveled across the tracks and down the street for cultural diversity. The comparison of the two suggests that although the site conditions were divergent, the boundary-spanning methodologies provided similar outcomes among students, faculty, and community partners.

Introduction

This Practice Story From the Field examines the community-engaged boundary-spanning work of two architecture and design faculty members in public land-grant institutions. By comparing and reflecting on case studies from these two different universities, the authors highlight the importance of reciprocal university–community partnerships; illustrate the challenges that community-engaged work presents for faculty, students, and community partners; and propose design pedagogy as a model for teaching and learning for community engagement. This article illustrates how the contexts and conditions of community engagement can differ widely while still immersing students in opportunities to explore cultural diversity. The methodologies explored in boundary-spanning teaching provide comparable results from students, faculty, and community partners.

The two case studies illustrated in this article come from fully accredited professional programs in interior design that prepare students to become licensed professional designers. The practices of most professional architects and designers are ones of collaboration and teamwork. Even for the smallest projects, teams of archi-
tects, designers, engineers, builders, and consultants are common in current professional practice. Design is a collaborative process that, at minimum, includes the voices of diverse trained professionals and, at its best, rallies divergent voices—both professionals and laypeople—around goals and objectives agreed upon through consensus building. This process, referred to as community-based design, participatory design, or public interest design, is pivotal in creating critical interventions that can transform spaces, places, and communities.

American design education has not always prepared students for community engagement or participatory design (Ockman, 2012). For centuries, design pedagogy was based on the master–apprentice relationship. The design studio master, as keeper of knowledge and process, would put apprentices through a series of design problems to be executed in the vacuum of the studio or atelier. Although many such problems called for designs of large public buildings, the general public was not consulted in the design process. The integration of the social sciences, behavioral studies, and environmental psychology into architecture and design research through the social movement of the 1960s introduced theories that have taken time to gain a prominent foothold in design education.

Many community-engaged design-build programs in architecture programs began in the 1990s (Schuman, 2012). This shift in the university training of architects and designers, with national models such as Auburn’s Rural Studio and Mississippi State’s Gulf Coast Community Design Studio in Biloxi, Mississippi, is toward developing the skills of consensus building, community engagement, and collaboration in institutions of higher education. By engaging stakeholders and students, design faculty can identify opportunities to rethink design as a catalyst for social activism in our university, state, and global environment. Building on the common threads of place making and cultural identity, the work explored here strives to span boundaries through design partnerships both globally and locally.

A case study from the University of Kentucky (UK) demonstrates how design faculty and students designed and built a sustainable community project in a geographically and culturally foreign land. From the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) comes a case study of local collaboration and community engagement in a neighboring community that is equally foreign to the students. The authors, faculty leaders of these two initiatives, describe leading students through processes of discovery and understanding other cultures and communities through commu-
nity partnerships and participation. It should be noted that both authors are tenure-track faculty members in interiors programs within public state universities. In this article, both similarities and differences between the two universities and the two community-engaged projects will be explored.

**Literature Review**

Over the past several decades, universities have sought to connect education and research with the responsibility of service. Commitment to engage with communities is fundamental to the mission of higher education institutions. This emergent need has developed the practice of engaged scholarship. Boyer (1996) defined community engagement as a “special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other” (p. 20). Similarly, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defined community engagement as “collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015, “How Is ‘Community Engagement’ Defined?,” para. 1). This civic engagement in the classroom is recognized by scholars to have value that extends beyond teaching to outreach and applied research (Barker, 2004).

Community engagement in design education has enabled professional work and social change to dramatically impact the way design is instructed (Angotti, Doble, & Horrigan, 2011). The intersection of design practice and community engagement provides students with new opportunities to interact with people who will be users of the designs. The ability to empathize with users is an essential skill that designers utilize in practice. By seeing the world through other perspectives, innovative designs can meet users’ explicit or latent needs (Brown, 2008).

Design education is founded in teaching students a process of critical thinking to execute a project addressing the needs of users. The initial challenge of addressing the needs of users is to understand “the other” (Angotti et al., 2011). Outreach projects enable discoveries of relationships and collaborations outside the academic environment that integrate scholarship and service. Zollinger, Guerin, and Hadjiyanni (2009) stated that in interior design education, “service-learning involves the purposeful integration of thought and practice, that is, the application of theory to real-life problems” (p. 32). Community involvement in academia
is enhanced when students become vocal advocates and can influence institutional commitment (Angotti et al., 2011).

Holland encouraged developing evidence through assessment and monitoring as a means to make the case for engagement. By collecting data for institutional purposes, the value added by community engagement can be illustrated (Holland, 2009). It is essential to look beyond student surveys and monitor the impact on the faculty, partners, and institution. Important skills students develop from community engagement include the ability to collaborate and cooperate.

Weerts and Sandmann (2010) described differential roles in boundary spanning within public research universities—based on task orientation and social closeness—including community-based problem solvers, technical experts, internal advocates, and engagement champions. As an initial investigation into a selection of public research universities, their study proposed the need for additional studies of more universities and of more boundary spanners. The case studies presented in this essay explore two additional universities and two boundary spanners who conform to Weerts and Sandmann’s definition of technical experts.

In recent years, architecture and design education in universities across the country has promoted the advancement of student engagement in community-based research, design, and design-build projects. Pearson (2002) revealed the wide range of design programs in college and university settings, and Bell (2004) called for pedagogy to instill in students the need for architects and designers to address underserved populations. The work illustrated in this essay fits into the paradigm of designing for the other 98% (Bell, 2004) by leveraging the power of teaching and learning to affect the future of design.

**Overview of UNCG—Department of Interior Architecture**

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro is a public land-grant research institution in a medium-sized city with a population of approximately 275,000. This university is also a community-engaged university as designated by the Carnegie Foundation. This elective, voluntary classification defines community engagement’s purpose as

the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors
to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015, “How Is ‘Community Engagement’ Defined?,” para. 2)

At UNCG, this classification dates back to 2008, although the university has been engaged in community-based research, teaching, and service for many decades.

UNCG has several administrative offices, in the form of a service-learning office and a community and economic engagement institute, to support engaged scholarship, and it has codified community engagement through its promotion and tenure guidelines. At a time when public universities are faced with ever-shrinking budgets and a need for differentiation, UNCG has leveraged its community engagement for a high return on investment. This university is a member of several national consortia, including Campus Compact and Imagining America, further solidifying its commitment to being a leader in the national conversation around community-engaged scholarship. Within this broader campus context, the Department of Interior Architecture is a signature program for community engagement on this campus.

**Description**

The case study from UNCG is a long-term partnership between the interior architecture department of this university and the local public library system. This relationship began approximately six years ago with student projects tied to design studios, the central curricular focus. The projects examined herein coincided with a departmental re-visioning around the central focus of community engagement and with the library’s capital improvement plan (CIP) update that included renovations or additions to the first racially integrated branch library in the system, renamed after a neighborhood civil rights leader. Author Hicks began working with the library system in Fall 2010 on this historically significant branch library and has continued this working relationship since then.

Students in a fourth-year design studio were challenged to engage a historically African American community near campus. In a community whose citizens played a central role in the civil rights movement, students from UNCG were clearly outsiders. For
some students, this was their first time visiting this neighborhood, even though it is only a few miles from UNCG’s campus. At least one student in this cohort lived in the neighborhood; however, this student lived in a gated community disconnected from the neighborhood. Following the semester-long studio project, work with the library extended into a summer research project supported by the university’s Office of Undergraduate Research, involving the first author and an undergraduate student from the aforementioned design studio. The project was extended further by a year-long research project involving the same faculty member with a graduate research assistant. These research projects relied on mixed methods to assess the technological needs of the library and the utilization of library spaces by community groups.

Between the design studio work, undergraduate research project, and graduate research project, the faculty and students at UNCG generated design proposals for a new branch library; conducted mixed-methods research through interviews, surveys, focus groups, and observations; and collaborated with the city’s library system to produce a vision for the future of this important branch library. Through this work, the first author represented the university while spanning the university–community boundary as a technical expert (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010), residing closer to the university while still collaborating with community partners.

**Boundaries and Partnerships**

Although UNCG has a history of community engagement, there are clear boundaries that separate the campus from the community that was engaged in this reciprocal project. A historically African American neighborhood, this community has stronger connections to the historically black college and university (HBCU) located nearer to the library. Students from the HBCU lead after-school study groups and tutor students from this neighborhood; students from UNCG perceive a clear boundary between themselves and this neighborhood, which they rarely venture into. Thus, although geographically close to campus, this neighborhood is culturally distant as well as demographically different.

Although diverse cultural backgrounds and identities tend to separate UNCG from this particular community, other forces played into creating an ideal alignment of university and community. In a department with themed design studios, this particular studio covers “institutional” design, for which libraries are appropriate subjects. Finding a library to use as a site for the studio work
required perfect timing, coinciding with the library system’s design work on two other branch libraries and with its placing this historically significant branch library on its CIP.

Success of the partnership required close communication between the first author and the library administration prior to and during the semester. During the semester, students attended public meetings and events related to the design of these other branches. Students from UNCG attended multiple meetings and events during the semester in which architects presented design concepts to community leaders. One branch held a ribbon-cutting ceremony and grand opening early in the semester; another branch held a series of community planning meetings. Students gained an understanding of the community-engaged design process from start to finish. In addition, students and faculty extended their engagement into at least two other neighborhoods in the city. This greater level of engagement into multiple branch libraries in multiple neighborhoods required a close partnership between the first author and library administrators.

Figure 1. Focus group, community leaders.
Execution

Author Hicks led well-prepared interior design students to engage the community through staff interviews, library patron surveys, archival research, and natural observations. The most fruitful tool for community engagement was a pair of focus group sessions inspired by the Deep Dive approach to design implemented by IDEO, an innovative design firm, the hallmark of which is an open-ended, creative exchange of ideas with clear rules and expectations (Kelley & Littman, 2001). One focus group consisted of senior leaders from the community and from the library advisory board. The other focus group consisted of youth from the community who regularly use the library facility for after-school activities. The students led both groups through an overview description about trends in library design and the main topics covered in the course, such as community identity, sustainability, and integrated design. The students led the senior group through a visioning activity to identify types of spaces that the group deemed important to the success of the library. The students led the youth group through a more open forum discussion about their vision for a community library.

Evaluation

The university students synthesized all the information gleaned from community input and collaborated to design a scheme for the future library building and site. Students were able to generate a design that met the vision of community leaders, balanced the wishes of diverse voices and user groups, and honored the history and heritage of the library. Feeling that they were doing important
work for the community, the studio assumed an attitude of excellence beyond the norms for studios in the Department of Interior Architecture. Collaborative, fast-paced design workshops—charrettes—were the basis of all group work on the project. The charrette (from the French word charrette, or cart) is a technique from architecture and design. The history of design competitions in the French beaux-arts tradition suggests that students who worked very quickly near a deadline would jump onto the cart (en charrette) that instructors used to collect the work. The word charrette has come to mean a short period when participants engage in intense and active productivity with clearly stated goals.

In addition to working with the community off campus, students developed community-based working methods within the design studio setting. Students first honed their techniques used to interact with community partners in a safe environment on campus. Building consensus, understanding others’ needs, and respecting the ideas of others are soft skills that students developed both on and off campus. The entire group of 18 students arrived at a unified scheme for the new library, while smaller groups of students hammered out different aspects of this single scheme.

Members of the library board who attended the final review of design work commented on how excited they were to see the students’ scheme and how they would like to build the project as designed by the students. Funding for such a project, however, is still several years away, and all involved in the project recognize that a long-term relationship is required to maintain the initial success of the work. One way to ruin a perfectly good relationship with a community partner is failing to continue the relationship outside the particular project at hand. The first author continued the project with an undergraduate research assistant in Summer 2011 and with a graduate research assistant in 2011–2012. In Fall 2012, another class of students worked on the project from a different perspective, that of renovating the existing building in lieu of new construction. The relationship continues, relying on the faculty member to act as a campus boundary spanner and the library director to act as a community boundary spanner.

**Overview of UK—School of Interiors**

The University of Kentucky is a large public university located in the downtown of a city with over 300,000 people. With nearly 29,000 students, it is the largest in the state. UK is a Carnegie-designated Tier One public land-grant research institution fully
engaged in community engagement from a state level to a global perspective. A Carnegie Community Engagement Institution since 2006, it also maintains curricular engagement, outreach, and partnerships classifications.

The College of Design at UK provides many opportunities for students to engage in boundary-spanning work at both the state and global levels. Many courses use real-life project scenarios that activate communities and provide experiences for students to work hands-on with community members. This foundation of engagement prepares future designers to be leaders in the profession. The College of Design seeks to bridge community partners with the design practice to enhance the quality of life of those it serves. It has supported many socially minded community outreach projects since its inception.

Interior design education seeks to provide students the ability to create spaces that protect the health, safety, and welfare of all people. Zollinger et al. (2009) stated that “service learning involves the purposeful integration of thought and practice, that is the application of theory to real-life problems” (p. 32). Community-engaged service-learning is essential to creating meaningful applications of interior design issues in the classroom. The project described in this article was designed to offer students experiences that would enhance their understanding of the built environment within a world context, expand their understanding of sustainability, and broaden their understanding of different cultures. In addition, the second author, a university faculty member, sought to foster existing relationships within a community in rural Brazil and the surrounding coffee farms and to develop new connections within the village social groups.

Description

In 2012, the Summer Study Abroad Program to Brazil began because of the second author’s previous collaborations in Igarai, a small rural village 300 km from Sao Paulo. The preexisting relationships in the village allowed partnerships to emerge quickly between the students and the community members, offering students an international experience grounded in community engagement.

The village of Igarai is a small yet vibrant community of mostly farmers who work the surrounding farms, which primarily produce coffee and sugar cane. The community lacked financial and community support to provide its early childhood day care center with the necessary tools and supplies to execute its educational
models. The students at Institution B analyzed the existing facilities and interviewed the teachers and administrators, then designed and built new educational tools and furniture to create experiences and spaces within the school that support the vision of the school and its educational model.

While working in the small village school, the class resided at an organic coffee farm, which reinforced the principles of sustainability from an agricultural systems perspective. Cultural knowledge to complete the projects came from interviewing the school principal, playing with the children, and visiting local businesses to obtain donations.

**Boundaries and Partnerships**

Before instructing at UK, the program director of the Brazil Summer Study Abroad Program worked in the village of Igarai to design and build social infrastructure. With the active participation of the community, local architects, artists, and designers, many projects were identified that the community needed: a park, bocce ball courts, a bus stop, and a playground. These projects were completed throughout the course of Summer 2011. This work was foundational in building trust and cooperation with the community that supported development of the program for the undergraduate students at UK.

The program has operated the past two consecutive summers, with eight students in the first year and nine students in the second year. The students were all undergraduates in architecture and interior design, ranging from sophomore to senior level. Students were interested in participating in the program because they desired to apply the skills and knowledge obtained in the classroom and engage with communities that can utilize design thinking as an activator for community participatory interventions. Collaboration and cooperation are core values of the program and inspired two students to participate in the program both times it was offered.

International experiences with community engagement provide students the ability to experience the global context of design outside the classroom and better understand how it informs contemporary design practice. According to Asojo (2007), “students have to understand the cultural, social, economic and political circumstances of the people they are designing for” (p. 24). This discourse necessitates providing opportunities for practice beyond the campus to encapsulate community-engaged design abroad.
Execution

In the course of 3 weeks, students must adapt, explore, and investigate to design and build educational environments that support the theories and practices of the Brazilian culture. The students engage with the people, culture, and community to create interventions that respond to real-life design issues of the village. Through this process, they begin to understand principles of sustainability from a whole systems perspective as they apply to human environments.

The program began with initial site visits to neighboring coffee farms to foster an appreciation of the community and generate insights into their methodology of construction and material resources. The need to rely on minimal supplies and funding encourages ingenuity and resourcefulness that is lost in a studio setting where materials are readily available. Even learning how to communicate effectively during construction when one isn’t sure what the Portuguese word for “nails” is can be trying.

Implementation

The program required students to complete exploratory sketching, responsive writing, and an independent research project to chart learning based on the Council of Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) standards for global understanding and collaboration. This data was analyzed to assess how well students met learning objectives for the course and how they were impacted both
personally and professionally by the international experience. The students’ written responses to Brazil were used to assess how they were transformed by the community-engaged international experience. This assessment of student learning outcomes was informative, yet not conclusive because of the small population of the study. The methodology used in this pilot study could be applied to any engaged scholarship as a means for recording the impact of working with varying perspectives. This study received exemption certification from the Institutional Review Board because it met federal criteria of anonymity, and the data collected did not contain any sensitive information.

**Evaluation**

Systematic assessment of the data collected revealed how education abroad can enrich the learning experience and provide boundary-spanning experiences. Students exhibited understanding of working with multiple stakeholders and a whole-systems approach to sustainability by participating in design processes abroad. The students showed evidence of awareness of varying socioeconomic conditions within other cultures through active engagement with community members. This uncovered the value of community-engaged international projects and demonstrated how universities can assess the value of designing within a world context.

**Findings**

The course required that each student keep a sketchbook to document their observations, take field notes, and record their responses to critical questions based on the required readings and learning requirements set forth in the syllabus. The intention was to provide a structure for recording daily reflections and cataloguing experiences so that the students would develop a habit they could continue once they returned home. One student responded to questions of what community is and its implications on design by saying,

> Becoming community is a long process with many factors that determine which direction it will go next. Communication is crucial…. When designing for community, it is important to remember that this is a long process with many details to foster a community’s need for communication to keep a sustaining balance.
In addition, students were able to articulate an understanding for engaging in communities within a global context. One student stated,

Practicing design in other parts of the world forces you to think in a different way than you would in the context of ideas, materials, and uses for things. Designing on a global scale means learning about the culture of the place (or places) you are designing for and fitting the design into that. It makes us be more analytical thinkers and notice more about our own culture.

Students were also directed to develop a research question. Their response could take any form and use any medium, but it had to fit in the school gallery for an exhibition. Having the rest of the summer to work on the research enabled students to reflect on what they had learned and contextualize it within their own cultural background at home. Ranging from nature’s influences on the built environment to the cultural effects of graffiti, the research projects were as varied as the participants. The boundary-spanning work of community engagement was well stated in one student’s response:

After traveling [to] Brazil now for the second time, my knowledge of the world has really been transformed…. I have a broader understanding of how the world works. I have realized that “Design is not about the end product, but about the process.” I have begun to realize that the issues I see in the U.S. are much smaller than those in other countries. I have really begun to become interested in educational and community design. I would not have this perspective if it had not been for my two experiences in Brazil.
Conclusions

Community engagement opens doors for new programs and initiatives on university campuses. The relationships between the authors and various community partners have opened doors for new initiatives to enhance student learning and develop applied research on engaged scholarship. Community-driven design projects in academia allow for boundary spanning across discipline, community, and the global context. These two case studies illustrate the opportunities that exist for integrating real-life projects into curriculum. The evidence of the student learning outcomes reinforces the notion that engaged work benefits the student as a scholar and as an individual.

Engaged design pedagogy enables students to experience being active citizens who work collectively to respond to a specific community need. Ultimately, the challenges that face a small village in Brazil aren’t that different from the challenges of a historic inner-city neighborhood. Boundary-spanning work has a way of connecting the faculty as well. It cannot be successful without support from the collective whole. By connecting the faculty to a common cause, the group performance is enhanced, and the networks between university and community become much richer. One student stated,

I think that my most successful collaborations have been when everyone wants to participate (i.e., design program). When collaboration is forced, it is always unsuccessful. Working in [UK instructor’s] studio last year was challenging, but so rewarding working in a group, in a class with real client and students.

The work highlighted here extends the university outward to serve communities and students by providing real design solutions to those who are in need of them. Leveraging community engagement can function powerfully to advance an institution’s mission. It removes the silos of thinking about teaching, research, and service as independent entities, enabling integration of the three that produces much richer results. Furthermore, the authors have adopted pedagogical approaches that bring notions of community into the university. Ultimately, these authors are piloting a new pedagogy that allows for a multidisciplinary, design-focused community of learning that addresses the needs of communities near and far.

Academia must evolve to provide flexible structures to support the diverse needs of those we are trying to serve. The diversity
allows for innovative thinking and offers the students entrepreneurial experience that provides not only networking experiences but critical life skills. This is the mission of the university; however, how can we navigate a path in the future that allows us to press forward in this work that provides economic growth, civic responsibility, engaged stakeholders, and a sense of place for citizens? We offer community-engaged design pedagogy as one response to this vital question.
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Abstract
As a requirement for a federal neighborhood revitalization grant, the authors trained resident interviewers and coordinated the conduct of more than 1000 door-to-door interviews of a stratified random sample. The targeted area was a multiethnic, lower income neighborhood that continues to experience the effects of past segregation. Monitoring and pivots to the training procedures are described within the context of community development and capacity-building theory. Including local participation in the interview process yielded enhanced collaborative participation in decision making on the part of interviewers and interviewees. Resident contribution to community development is described within the framework of advocacy and consultative participation.

Introduction
In 2012, Texas Tech University received a Promise Neighborhoods grant from the U.S. Department of Education and became one of 12 implementation award recipients. According to the Department of Education (Applications for New Awards, 2012), a Promise Neighborhood is both a place and a strategy: It is a physical community, and it is a strategy that mobilizes active participation of community members in coordinating neighborhood and external resources for the purpose of community revitalization. In the present context, community revitalization is defined as “the strategic process of transforming neighborhoods and communities (or sub-areas within them) that lack vitality into places of choice through collaborations of residents, organizations and other stakeholders” (Holland, 2014, p. 1). Holland further elaborated on this process, indicating that it is an integrated, coordinated effort to increase the quality of a neighborhood’s (1) educational and developmental, (2) commercial, (3) recreational, (4) physical and (5) social assets, sustained by local leadership over an extended period, to improve resident well-being and the community quality of life. (Holland, 2014, p. 3)
Targeted services for improvement and coordination included education for prekindergarten through post–high school graduation; children's health, recreational, and nutritional services; family services; parent education starting before birth; and college preparatory activities for students and parents.

Promise Neighborhood grantees are required to conduct neighborhood surveys at the initiation of the grant to establish baseline data. Subsequent surveys are required in Years 3 and 5. In this article, we describe lessons learned while training residents to collect the required baseline data. Prior to the formal surveys, however, the grant proposal process itself required that applicants gather and submit preliminary baseline data. Due to time and fiscal constraints during proposal preparation, it was not possible for Texas Tech to devise a sampling plan and conduct a survey of a scientific sample of the neighborhood. As an alternative, the present article’s senior author coordinated a team effort to identify data from existing sources such as the U.S. Census Bureau; county, state, and national health records for the area; and housing, crime, and school data. These data provided the background information used for proposal submission. Upon receipt of the award, a door-to-door survey of the neighborhood was conducted.

With this article, the authors present a rationale for the active participation of neighborhood residents in conducting the one-on-one interviews as well as the previous background information on the setting for the survey. Also included is a description of the scientific survey that was conducted. Training procedures are described, as well as difficulties encountered along the way, the types of interventions offered to ensure survey consistency, and lessons learned from both the training and survey processes that may be of use for others wishing to involve stakeholders in neighborhood research.

**Literature Review**

As noted above, a major purpose of a Promise Neighborhood grant is to involve community members in a process of active engagement in community revitalization that includes improvement of education, health, and social services in coordination with nonprofit groups and individual volunteers. Stagner and Duran (2014) highlighted the importance of encouraging active participation by community residents in planning, designing, and implementing initiatives. This approach achieves success through “the strengthening of the capacity of neighborhood residents” (p. 135).
Mills (2005) pointed out that residents of low-income inner-city communities often feel disenfranchised, and the process of community revitalization should empower them to take a stronger role in sustainable revitalization efforts. Roth (2011) noted that collaborative revitalization efforts should involve multiple stakeholder levels, including the involvement of residents in dialogue and identification of specific areas of focus.

Beyond enhancing community capacity-building, involving residents in a community survey as both interviewers and interviewees contributes to the validity of the data collected. Wallace and Teixeira (2014) found that cooperating with resident team members led to enhanced data collection in a neighborhood survey. King and Cruickshank (2012) pointed to the value of a systematic approach to problem identification and solution development and the need to gather information in a culturally sensitive manner.

A further benefit of the data collection method chosen for the survey is its role in community advocacy. Crocker (2007) made a distinction between passive and consultative participation. He defines passive participation as being a member of a group and attending events such as meetings. Consultative participation is more active in that individuals provide information and give their opinions to those in a position to make a difference. Lopez-Baez and Paylo (2009) found that having residents contribute to community development is itself a component of advocacy. Likewise, they cite effective listening and identifying strengths and weaknesses as also contributing to advocacy.

**Community Description**

Lubbock, Texas, population 233,740, is located in a rural section of northwest Texas that is one of the world’s leading cotton-growing areas. The area’s colleges and universities also contribute to a robust economy. Nevertheless, one area, East Lubbock, does not benefit from the surrounding economic vitality. With the mechanization of the cotton industry, many area African Americans moved to the city, where they were confined by city ordinance to the eastern end of town (Amin, 1989). Although the geographic barrier for residency was eventually lifted, schools remained segregated long after the U.S. Supreme Court 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education* desegregation decision.

East Lubbock is no longer primarily African American: 49.2% of residents are now Hispanic, and only 28.5% African American. The effects of previous segregation remain, as reflected in a median
family income of only $25,355. The area has high rates of unemployment, crime, poverty, and ill health, and schools demonstrate low academic achievement. In 2011, Lubbock was classified as having the sixth highest crime rate per capita in the United States, primarily due to youth becoming involved with drugs and gangs (Giuffo, 2011). East Lubbock youth account for more than 80% of juveniles in Lubbock County detention facilities (McKenzie, Johnson, Vasquez, & Nelson, 2010).

The state’s child abuse fatality rate exceeds that of any other state (Austin Children’s Shelter, 2014). Within Texas, the Lubbock area has the highest rates of child abuse and neglect (United Way, 2014). Some of the highest rates of teen pregnancy in Texas occur in zip codes corresponding to East Lubbock; Lubbock ranks eighth of 254 Texas counties in sexually transmitted diseases (Gonzalez, 2013).

According to the U.S. Health Resources and Services Administration (2012), Texas has the highest rate of uninsured individuals in the United States, and East Lubbock is a “Designated Health Professional Shortage Area.” Childhood and adolescent obesity rates in Texas are the sixth highest in the United States, and East Lubbock is considered to have significantly limited access to healthy foods (County Health Rankings, 2014).

**Requirements for Promise Neighborhoods Grantees**

In accord with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, each agency within the federal government must produce performance plans and indicators of progress. The GPRA indicators for the Promise Neighborhoods initiative include the following, which must be measured in Years 1, 3, and 5 of the grant period:

- Number and percentage of children, from birth to kindergarten entry, who have a place where they usually go, other than an emergency room, when they are sick or in need of advice about their health.

- Number and percentage of children, from birth to kindergarten entry, participating in center-based or formal home-based early learning settings or programs, which may include Early Head Start, Head Start, child care, or publicly funded preschool.
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- Number and percentage of school-age children who participate in at least 60 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity daily.
- For children birth to kindergarten entry, the number and percentage of parents or family members who report reading to their children three or more times a week.
- For children in kindergarten through eighth grade, the number and percentage of parents or family members who report encouraging their children to read books outside school.
- For children in the ninth to 12th grades, the number and percentage of parents or family members who report talking with their child about the importance of college and career.

The U.S. Department of Education provided previously validated survey questions that grantees could use to collect baseline data on the above GPRA measures. The Data Resource Center and the National Center for Education Statistics had validated specific items drawn from the previous studies. These previous surveys included the National Survey of Children’s Health (Data Resource Center, 2010), the Early Childhood Longitudinal National Nine-Month Parent Questionnaire (NCES, 2002), and the National Center for Education Statistics’ Educational Longitudinal Study (NCES, 2002). In addition to the required questions, the authors added one question at the end of the interview in which respondents were asked if there was anything they would like to see change in their neighborhood.

Survey Method

Desiring a high participation rate for purposes of validity of results, the present team chose to conduct door-to-door interviews rather than conduct the interviews by telephone. Furthermore, we decided to hire and train neighborhood residents to conduct the survey. The rationale for this decision was based on several factors: (a) resident interviewers were familiar with the neighborhood, (b) they had a high likelihood of being accepted by residents, and (c) a major purpose of the project was to facilitate active engagement of the residents in the community revitalization effort. Crocker (2007) asserted that only those who are within a context understand it.
By employing neighborhood residents, the authors were utilizing the strategy noted by King and Cruickshank (2012) of involving community members in creating their future in a manner that is culturally and linguistically sensitive. Actively involving the community in systematic identification of problems and solutions has been noted by King and Cruickshank (2012) as an effective means of community engagement and creation of shared meaning. The senior author of this article served as survey director and oversaw all aspects of recruitment and hiring of interviewers, as well as the conduct of the survey.

Grantees were instructed by the U.S. Department of Education to gather the data in a survey of a stratified random sample of households with children. The authors hired a statistician who constructed the sampling plan. Due to the size and stratification of the neighborhood, it was necessary to complete 10 interviews for each of the 93 blocks included in the stratification. Thus, the goal was to complete 930 interviews. The sample was derived from 2010 U.S. Census data and took into consideration the number of single-family dwellings and apartment buildings in the target area. The sampling strategy consisted of random selection of 93 city blocks, followed by convenience sampling of 10 interviews per block. Interviewers were to knock on doors and determine whether there were children in the household. If the resident declined to participate or if there was no answer, the interviewer would go to the next house. This would continue until 10 interviews were completed.

The university Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the project as an anonymous data-gathering project. In addition, the IRB approved the statement that was read and handed to all residents explaining the confidentiality of their responses, noting that they could terminate the interview at any time, and providing a telephone number for them to call if they had questions or comments. In order to ensure confidentiality, names and addresses were not recorded on the questionnaires. Instead, a record was kept of addresses contacted on a separate form. This record made it possible for us to return to the block to complete a total of 10 interviews without going to households previously interviewed, those without children, or those which had declined to participate. The address record forms were stored in a locked file cabinet separate from the completed questionnaires.
Recruitment and Training Method

The process of recruitment of interviewers started with the senior author consulting with the university Human Resources Department about hiring part-time, temporary interviewers from the target neighborhood. The department advised that to advertise and hire these positions through the university would take considerable time. Unfortunately, time was of the essence since it was necessary to collect the baseline data prior to initiation of the project. Human Resources recommended an employment agency as the more expeditious choice. Simultaneously, the authors had identified several residents who were thought to be good interviewers.

The senior author contacted an employment agency and negotiated an agreement whereby the project paid the agency $15.14 per hour for work performed. The agency handled all payroll responsibilities and paid interviewers $11 per hour. The authors arranged for a 1-day group hiring session at the agency to which the authors referred candidates. In addition to these candidates, the employment agency identified several other candidates. The agency conducted an orientation on its ethical principles and time sheet requirements, had the candidates complete an application package, and conducted the necessary background checks according to agency procedures.

As a result of this process, the project hired 28 interviewers. In addition, two full-time university employees and two graduate research assistants were assigned to work on the project 20 hours per week as coordinators to assist with training, coordinating data collection, and reviewing completed questionnaires for compliance with the research protocol.

Initial training. The project negotiated a contract with a local community center to use its facility to conduct a 1-day interview training session, beginning at 8:00 a.m. and ending at 4:30 p.m. Arrangements were made for both breakfast and lunch to be served. The presence of food and coffee, together with get-acquainted activities, generated a warm and hospitable atmosphere.

After breakfast, the new hires’ first activity was pairing up with someone they did not know and “interviewing” that person. Next, each person had to “introduce” his/her partner to the group. It was pointed out that this was an exercise in the importance of listening during an interview. Because the interviewers would eventually work with partners as a small team, it was useful for them to become familiar with one another as soon as possible.
The survey director showed slides that began with the overall context of the study, including the nationwide Promise Neighborhood objectives and how the local project was part of a much larger program. She emphasized the need to collect data from the community and indicated that it would ultimately be combined with data from other communities. This was done to communicate to the interviewers a sense of their importance in a national program. Topics covered in the slide presentation, in question-and-answer format, appear in Table 1.

Table 1. Training Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is a survey?</td>
<td>An instrument to collect information on specific characteristics of a population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the population we are studying?</td>
<td>We are interested in the population of adults with children 0-18 years of age residing in East Lubbock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will we be collecting information from all adults in the community with children 0-18 years of age?</td>
<td>No. We will be collecting information from a randomly selected, representative sample of blocks in the community. Certain U.S. Census blocks have been chosen as representative of the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many households will we be studying?</td>
<td>In order for us to be sure we have a truly representative sample of the neighborhood, we will need to conduct surveys at 930 households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long will this take?</td>
<td>It will take approximately 10 minutes to actually ask the list of required questions at each household. However, we are allowing time for you to introduce yourselves and explain the purpose of the survey. We will provide you with a copy of the introduction you will use at each household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have to ask all the questions in exactly the way they appear in the questionnaire?</td>
<td>Yes. This is because all the other Promise Neighborhood grantees around the country will be conducting the same exact survey in their neighborhoods and the federal government wants to take all the responses from all over the country and combine them into a report which will be presented to the U.S. Congress. So we cannot deviate in any way from the questionnaire. The questions must be asked using the wording on the questionnaire and in the order that appears on the questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training Neighborhood Residents to Conduct a Survey

Do we have copies of the questionnaire in Spanish?

Yes, those of you who are fluent in Spanish will administer the questions in Spanish. We will send out teams to each census block. Some teams will have at least one fluent Spanish speaker.

How will we know what households to interview?

Each day, you will be given the census blocks assigned to your team. Basically, you will attempt to interview a certain number of households on each block. You will start with one household and if there is no answer there or if someone refuses to be interviewed, you will go to the next house and the next. Once your team has completed the required number of interviews on that block, you will proceed to the next block.

All interviewers were given a handout containing these questions and answers. Another handout contained tips on what to do if residents did not want to respond. During the session, participants who had served as telephone solicitors in the past suggested methods of coercing people into participating in the survey. The survey director provided corrective guidance, indicating that the project did not want to use any type of coercion and that this was not a sales pitch. However, it was acceptable to remind residents that the survey was for a worthwhile cause and that responses would be kept confidential and reported only in the aggregate. Should interviewers be unable to overcome a resident’s objections to participate, they were to accept the refusal as courteously as possible and thank the person for his or her time.

Review of survey questionnaires. For the next step in the training, the survey director went over the introduction procedures at the beginning of an interview, which included brief statements about the project and the purpose of the interview. These items had been approved by the university’s Institutional Review Board. The survey director then went over the questionnaire, reading each question and explaining that it had to be asked with that exact wording. The importance of maintaining confidentiality was also covered.

Both English and Spanish versions of questionnaires were presented at the training session. The trainees who could commu-
nicate in fluent Spanish would be assigned to the Spanish census blocks in order to achieve valid responses to questions.

During a break, each person’s picture was taken in order to make name tags that they would wear during the interviews. All the interviewers and coordinators were required to sign a confidentiality agreement and to maintain the confidentiality of those participating.

The trainees were given 2 hours to practice introduction procedures and administer questionnaires to each other. Thus, the trainees experienced both administering the survey and responding to it. One of the trainees had previously worked as a U.S. Census interviewer and offered helpful interview techniques such as being courteous and thorough.

**Survey rehearsal.** Once trainees had interviewed each other several times, they were then required to “interview” one of the regular staff members on the project. This quality control step was useful in identifying trainee errors and providing correction. Project staff reported back to the director on types of errors, which included the following:

- Using language other than that provided in the questionnaire.
- Asking all questions, not just those for the ages of children in the household. For example, if the oldest child in the household was 6 years old, interviewers were to skip the questions pertaining to middle school and high school youth. Several trainees asked all the questions in the survey, including those for specific ages that were not represented in the household. Several questions involved decision trees, indicating that if the respondent answered “no” to a question, the interviewer was supposed to skip the following two questions. However, some trainees asked all the questions on the questionnaire.
- In a question that required a response of either *Often*, *Sometimes*, or *Never*, the interviewer would sometimes write in *Yes* or *No*.

Without identifying those making errors, the survey director went over these examples and explained the proper procedures once again. An additional component of the intensive training session was a rehearsal of the complete procedures as they would be practiced in the field. This step included practicing sign-in, receiving
the assignment of blocks to interview, picking up a clipboard and large manila envelope with all necessary supplies, and returning to the facility to sign out. The rehearsal of these procedures during the intensive training helped prepare for a streamlined sign-in and sign-out process once the survey actually began.

**Survey implementation and ongoing training.** Thereafter, each weekday at 5:00 p.m., the interviewers and the coordinators were required to gather in a local community center that acted as a staging area for the interview neighborhood and sign in. Interviews were conducted 3 hours per day, from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m. On those days when the intense Texas heat prohibited going door-to-door until it was later, the authors had the interviewers go over the previous day’s questionnaires, checking for errors. This process took place under the supervision and in full view of project staff. In addition, the time was spent on plotting future routes that would maximize the number of blocks covered in an evening.

Usually, however, each interviewer was given a clipboard with blank survey questionnaires, copies of introductory statements and thank you cards to distribute to residents, maps identifying the specific blocks assigned for that evening, blank Block Forms (see Table 2) for each city block assigned, and a Master Completion Form (see Table 3). In addition, the coordinators distributed bottled water and granola bars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Interviewer</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Block Form was used to determine which households were not to be revisited. In addition, teams completed Master Completion Forms to help keep a running count of up to 10 completed interviews per block. Questionnaires were randomly assigned code numbers, which enabled coordinators to review questionnaires the day after the interviews to determine if there were mistakes in coding or number of questions answered. If so, the project arranged for someone to return to the correct address to complete a survey if necessary. To ensure confidentiality at the end of each evening, completed questionnaires were stored in a locked file cabinet at the university, separated from the forms that contained addresses.

Interviewers were separated into several teams, each of which contained one coordinator and two interviewers. Every day, the census blocks to be interviewed were assigned to the individual teams. The coordinator in each team was responsible for driving the interviewers to the section of East Lubbock where they would be conducting interviews that day. The coordinator also watched over the interviewers’ safety and contacted the staging area if, for example, the interviewers had completed the assigned blocks but still had time to cover others. One coordinator always remained at the community center (“Action Central”) to respond to these questions and make new assignments as needed.

**Review of completed questionnaires.** After the day’s interviews were finished, the survey director packed up all questionnaires and materials. The following afternoon, the director and coordinators reviewed all questionnaires and Block Forms to check...
for errors. For several weeks, numerous errors persisted. The categories of errors were noted in a project lab notebook. Several difficulties arose: The coordinators and the interviewers were sometimes confused about the census blocks and went to the wrong addresses, some interviewers would skip important questions, some made wrong marks on the response items, and some forgot to write down the visited addresses on the Block Form.

The project quickly fell behind in the process of reviewing questionnaires and eventually paid some of the better interviewers to join the coordinators in the project office at the university at 1:00 p.m. each day to help spot errors and keep track of which blocks needed to be revisited. When it was suspected that some addresses did not correspond to the assigned blocks, the coordinators used Google Maps to confirm the location of specific addresses. Whenever the locations shown on Google Maps were also confusing, the survey director drove to those blocks in person to make certain the coordinators and the interviewers were given accurate directions at the beginning of each day’s staging session. The discovered problems were pointed out, and instructions were clarified at the beginning of each survey evening so that the interviewers would not repeat previous mistakes. If any questionnaire was found to be incomplete due to interviewer error, the interviewers were asked to go back to the household and collect the missing information. If the interviewers went to the wrong addresses the first time, they were required to visit the correct addresses.

**Redirection.** In addition, each evening a mini training session was conducted, at which common errors and appropriate procedures were covered. Nevertheless, the same errors persisted for several weeks, and a few interviewers consistently did not note blocks and addresses on forms or did not ask the appropriate questions for an age group. Those who made the most serious errors were eventually terminated. One interviewer refused to adhere to the safety protocol of periodically calling in from the field. On the second evening of the study, he returned to the staging area 45 minutes after the community center closed, just as we were beginning to organize a search party. He was given one more chance to participate, with the stipulation that he adhere to the supervision of a coordinator. He refused this direction and quit on the spot.

In less serious cases, those in which the errors were sporadic, the survey director designed an intervention in which she asked a community pastor to make a compassionate presentation to interviewers about how he was sure they would be able to succeed. This was coupled with the survey director’s stern message that there
would have to be more attention paid to detail. Thereafter, a noticeable improvement in questionnaire completion and block coverage was noted.

**“Lessons Learned” Method**

The authors gradually developed an understanding of factors pertaining to the training and survey implementation methods through an iterative process of noting errors made by the interviewers and subsequent trial and error of interventions to maximize the validity of data collected. A variation of naturalistic design was employed to the extent that behavior of interviewers was observed and recorded by the trainers and coordinators who were present in the training sessions and in the field as they followed interviewers through the neighborhood. In the interest of ensuring that interviews complied with the interview protocol, the coordinators who were accompanying the interviewers in the field began to capture processes and note variations from the survey protocol.

At the end of each evening, the coordinators reported errors to the survey director. In addition, during each day after the evening interviews, the coordinators reviewed completed questionnaires for errors and omissions and brought these to the attention of the director, who used this information to plan introductory comments at the beginning of that evening’s meeting prior to assigning blocks to the interviewers. Thus, the team employed an inductive process of gradually identifying patterns of behavior that could be addressed in ongoing training and coaching.

These observations could not be classified as purely naturalistic, however, in that they were not detached from the data-gathering process (Bernard & Ryan, 2010). Subsequent intervention was meant to alter interviewer behavior. Therefore, the method employed closely paralleled that of the Chicago school: a social interactionist perspective in which the research approach is flexible, diverse, and inductive (Berg & Lune, 2012). The process was inductive in that meaning was derived from observations of interviewers and review of completed questionnaires, which in turn led to descriptions of patterns to be addressed; flexible in that the trainers and coordinators interacted with the interviewers in order to alter their behavior; and diverse in that several different interventions were tried and observed.

Another characteristic of the social interactionist method that emerged in our work was the development of author sensitivity to the viewpoint of the resident interviewers. This empathic under-
standing has been noted by several methodologists as a strength of the social interactionist approach in that it can result in deeper understanding of the meaning of the social behavior being observed (Berg & Lune, 2012).

**Results of Training**

Originally, it was anticipated that the survey would be completed within 4 weeks. In fact, it took 3 months and 1 week. Several factors contributed to the prolonged data collection: (a) numerous errors were made in the first few weeks, which resulted in unusable questionnaires; (b) revisits were made to blocks and addresses; and (c) time was spent each evening in retraining interviewers at the staging area just prior to data collection, and this further delayed actual field work.

Another factor that contributed to the extended time period was the length of time for each interview. Most residents were very pleased that someone was interested in their opinion and had much to say beyond what was asked in the questionnaire. It was not unusual for a resident to say, “Now you be sure to tell them this” or “Write this down.” Many interviews took more than half an hour.

Surprisingly, we had only two incidents in which a resident did not complete an interview after it was begun. In the first case, the individual had to finish making dinner and in another, time ran out and she had to take a child to football practice. No one terminated the interview because of objection to the questions asked.

It was not possible to obtain 10 interviews for all blocks. This was partly due to the blocks having been selected based on 2010 Census data for a study conducted in 2013. In the intervening 3 years, the neighborhood experienced high mobility, and in some blocks the number of households with children diminished significantly. Families had moved, or there were no longer children under 18 years of age in the home. In addition, interviewers noted a high rate of abandoned homes.

**Discussion**

The process of arriving at a conceptualization of lessons learned was not one in which theory about training interviewers preceded research, nor was it one in which research preceded theory. Rather, it was a process that has been described as the “spiraling research approach” (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 25), in which ideas precede theory and design but are reconceptualized as a result of data collection and analysis. In the present case, the authors’ ideas about how to
train interviewers and conduct a survey were continually reformulated as a result of field observations and review of the completed protocols. Original theory concerning the importance of resident involvement in the study expanded into a deeper understanding of the resident interviewers and the respondents, and this new information was used to alter the design of ongoing training. In retrospect, the authors underestimated the time it would take to train resident interviewers. At least two entire sessions should have been devoted to rehearsal of the survey process. Also, the authors should have anticipated that most of the trainees had never participated in either a community project or university study, and that ongoing training and encouragement would be a wise precaution. The resulting training strategy was an iterative process whereby the authors tried various methods, noted errors that continued, and then implemented new training practices based on that information. Although the process did take more time than originally planned, most trainees were truly attempting to adhere to the study protocol and did eventually attain proficiency in conducting the interviews and completing all paperwork.

In addition to increased interviewer proficiency, coordinators noted a gradual improvement in interviewers’ confidence. Whereas early in the study, the coordinators took responsibility for planning which city blocks were to be covered each evening, after the first month the interviewers spontaneously did this themselves. They would offer their own opinions on which blocks should be covered in what order so as to maximize the number of interviews that could be completed within the 3-hour time period.

Over the course of the study, the number of interviews completed each day increased. Interviews were taking less time, and fewer households declined to participate. The authors believe the increased confidence of the interviewers contributed to the willingness of residents to participate in the survey. King and Cruickshank (2012) outlined an approach to community involvement that included increasing the skills of community members in a manner that incorporates cultural and linguistic distinctions. They asserted that investing in community skills in engagement is the most expeditious strategy for change. Indeed, over the course of the study, several interviewers who had been unemployed applied for and obtained permanent employment in the community. In addition to the job training provided for the survey, the survey director assisted applicants with resume development and provided them with letters of reference. Thus, conducting the study was itself a strategy for increased employment.
Shaw (2008) noted that community development is most successful when coupled with people’s real interests and their active engagement with policy. It was clear to all involved with the study that respondents did perceive the survey to be relevant to their interests. Many expressed a desire for the neighborhood to reach its full potential. Cornwall (2008) asserted that being involved in a process in a passive manner does not equal having a voice. The very act of voicing their perceptions was itself a form of engagement. Those who provided information during the interviews were engaged in what Crocker (2007) described as development from a state of passive participation that involves being a member of a group such as a church or being a parent of a school-aged child, to a state of consultative participation. This latter level of involvement is characterized by providing information to those who are in a position to make changes. Many participants indicated that they had never been asked their opinion about matters pertaining to the neighborhood and were very pleased to participate. Thus, although the survey was designed primarily to collect information, it also served as a venue for community participation and advocacy.

The primary lesson learned from the project was that despite the increased number of weeks devoted to the survey and the challenges encountered along the way, the process was a rewarding one for all involved. The authors began to develop an understanding of the neighborhood through the eyes of the resident interviewers and the respondents. In debriefing with the interviewers, it became clear that some of the omissions and inconsistent notation on the survey instruments were due to the interviewers becoming deeply involved in conversation with the residents. In this respect, the survey process approached the symbolic interactionist model (Berg & Lune, 2012), in which meaning is derived from the process of persons interacting with each other. Thus, the process was a two-way learning experience for all involved.
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BOOK REVIEWS
In initiatives such as crowd-sourced research, citizen science, and service-learning courses at colleges and universities are part of a larger shift in how scholars, and specifically scientists, not only relate to the public, but collaborate with the public as well. Heavily influenced by the work of foundational figures in education and critical pedagogy such as John Dewey, Myles Horton, Paolo Freire, and bell hooks (all cited in this book with the exception of Dewey), teacher-scholars in higher education continue to shift toward a more democratic way of building knowledge in our society. In *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*, Sonya Atalay makes the case that this must happen in archaeology, but the points she makes apply well beyond this discipline.

*Sustainability* is a word used far too often today with little thought as to what it really means. However, Atalay begins Chapter 1 by effectively using this word and makes the case that archaeology cannot sustain itself without becoming an “archaeology that matters” (p. 5). For both philosophical and practical reasons, archaeology must benefit not just archaeologists, but communities as well. To do this, archaeological research must be performed *with* communities, not just *for* them. As Atalay indicates at various points in the book, the latter way of thinking about research is paternalistic and very much part of the colonial mentality out of which anthropology (and archaeology) was born—a history from which we struggle to break free. Atalay seeks to guide us in this effort by drawing upon a range of experiences with five archaeological community-based participatory research (CBPR) projects: the Çatalhöyük CBPR (Turkey), the Ziibiwing Repatriation Research Project and the Ziibiwing Sanilac Petroglyph Intellectual Property Project (both in Michigan), the Flint Stone Street Ancestral Recovery and Site Management Project (also in Michigan), and the Waapaahsiki Siipiwi Mound Project (Indiana).

Atalay’s book provides a historical review (Chapter 2) of CBPR in archaeology, identifying the broader contexts that helped shape this shift in the discipline, beginning with the Red Power Movement and civil rights activities of the 1960s. Within archaeology, indigenous archaeology and public archaeology developed out of this his-
historical context. As an indigenous archaeologist, Atalay understands very well the tensions that have existed between archaeologists and indigenous groups in the United States and around the world. But the missteps of past (and some current) archaeological research endeavors create tensions that may go unrecognized in all communities, indigenous or not. Communities impacted by archaeological research include those living near major cultural heritage sites such as Çatalhöyük. Atalay points out that there are differences between CBPR projects and other kinds of collaborative archaeology initiatives. Table 1 (p. 49–50) is very useful for enumerating the variety of approaches that have been pursued in order to make the distinctions clear. Atalay’s objective is not to dismiss other kinds of collaborative work, but rather to point out that CBPR involves a different approach from these other initiatives.

CBPR is guided by five basic principles (Chapter 3) that serve as a compass when trying to navigate the sometimes challenging waters of CBPR in archaeology. These principles are more of a commitment and shift in mindset than rules, and Atalay identifies them by examining what has worked in a variety of successful CBPR projects. She responds to concerns and outright criticism that such projects lack scientific rigor or that they have done more harm than good (commonly documented in many development projects). In reviewing these critiques, Atalay concedes that participatory research presents, and will continue to present, challenges. Honest reflection about what has worked and what has not is necessary to move the endeavor forward.

The bulk of the book details ways of moving toward and executing a CBPR project, with abundant examples of effective strategies and pitfalls, with some treatment of outright failures. She observes that connecting with communities and how to define what constitutes a community is not a straightforward issue (Chapter 4). Most archaeologists are not trained in the kinds of skills, such as ethnography, that may be critical for effectively making these connections. Gaining consent and navigating both community and institutional levels of review can present challenges (Chapter 5). Atalay emphasizes the importance of “like-mindedness” (p. 143–145), which means that community members and researchers alike must be on the same page about goals and how to proceed in order to negotiate the research process.

Identifying research questions collaboratively, in fact, should ideally be part of a successful CBPR project (Chapter 6). This aspect of participatory research, however, is probably the most challenging for scholars to adopt. Conventional approaches to
research place the sole responsibility for specifying what questions to examine or pursue with the researcher. Involving communities not just in research, but in research design, is what fundamentally distinguishes CBPR from other common collaborative efforts. Communities should be involved at the inception of research projects and throughout stages at which data are gathered, analyzed, interpreted, and ultimately shared (Chapter 7). Practical and ethical dilemmas must be negotiated by communities and researchers alike, especially when it comes to knowledge building, and the path is not clearly laid out. Addressing this, Atalay offers an important concept that she calls “braiding knowledge” (p. 207–208). Communities and researchers sometimes have different ways of knowing the world. Finding ways to bring together and share those distinct forms of knowledge, rather than view them as mutually exclusive, is critical to the success of a CBPR project, as well as to the creation of a more inclusive and “multifaceted view of the past” (p. 207).

In her concluding chapter (Chapter 8), Atalay sums up nicely all that is at stake with moving toward more participatory research in archaeology. She returns to each of the five projects in which she was directly involved to identify some of the most lasting impacts. Benefits to the community are one result, but archaeology as a discipline also benefits by moving further beyond its colonial roots. It is not easy, and Atalay does not claim it to be. She reminds us of many challenges, from the difficulties with establishing community ties to the realities of securing funding for CBPR projects or securing tenure in a system of higher education that still does not fully recognize such projects as legitimate research. But Atalay rightly ends with the kind of activities that will ultimately change this situation within higher education: incorporating the teaching of these approaches as part of the archaeology curriculum and training our students (both undergraduate and graduate) to be engaged with communities from the beginning. Even if students do not go on to become professional archaeologists, the approaches of CBPR can be implemented by all students in various ways so that they may make contributions within their own communities.

Woven throughout the book are examples drawn from Atalay’s own work, in addition to other CBPR and collaborative projects and fields other than archaeology. Presenting relevant points and examples in this way, rather than with a case-by-case presentation of various projects, is very effective. It is clear that Atalay has a tremendous amount of firsthand experience with CBPR. She shares a great deal of this in the book.
To be honest, the first few chapters felt slow in some ways and difficult to get through. However, by the middle of the book, I no longer felt that way. Atalay’s book must be a slow read because there is no recipe for CBPR. Those hoping to thumb through the book to quickly pick up the latest lingo on community engagement, or quickly find ready-made strategies to put into a proposal, will be disappointed. As Atalay points out, good CBPR projects do not result from throwing some buzzwords or superficial engagement into the research mix. They require much more thought and much more work. They are more time-consuming, and still less rewarded by the academic system, than other forms of research. In today’s scholarly world, where there is never enough time to juggle academic responsibilities, and differential value is assigned to some activities over others, scholars may struggle with moving toward CBPR. Far more than rewards for individual scholars or institutional prestige, there are rewards for society. CBPR is about decolonizing scholarship and collapsing traditional barriers between scholars and the public that should no longer be maintained if scholarship is to truly be of broad significance (as most proposals to major granting agencies, especially in the United States, claim).

Many of us (including myself) are not there yet. But Atalay’s book provides abundant food for thought and concrete examples that serve as guides for making this paradigm shift happen in archaeology. Though the book is mainly about archaeology, teacher-scholars in many natural science, social science, and humanities fields, especially those who do any kind of fieldwork, should find this book useful. It dovetails nicely with, and indeed draws upon, the literature of efforts that have been afoot in education for decades. CBPR may be an approach that, at least for scholars, connects the realms of teaching, research, and service in meaningful ways.
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Review by Elizabeth A. Tryon

This volume on community-based research (CBR) from the University of Toronto Press is full of refreshing perspectives from a diverse group of scholar-practitioners in Canada, where CBR has been well established for decades and often works extensively in partnership with indigenous First Nations. Coeditor Hall, founding director of the Office of Community-Based Research at the University of Victoria (UVic), was one of the earliest adopters of community-based participatory research (CBPR; Ferreira & Gendron, 2011) and now holds a UNESCO cochair for civic responsibility in higher education. Dawson is the director of the Learning and Teaching Centre at UVic, and Etmanski has been closely associated with both centers, so all editors are extremely well-credentialed as arbiters of this subject matter.

Numerous scholars in Canada have embraced concepts such as knowledge mobilization that emerged from the European science shop model (Mulder & DeBok, 2006) and form the vocabulary of a growing global movement. CBR centers established at York University, Guelph University, and especially UVic connect to national CBR networks (e.g., Research Impact, Community-Based Research Canada), which are in turn closely aligned with international networks (e.g., Living Knowledge, the Global Alliance for Community-Engaged Research, the Global University Network for Innovation). This book is filled with examples of the concepts and terminology that inform this movement and stories that illustrate their meanings and relevance in practice.

An emphasis on validating indigenous knowledge is highlighted in many chapters. Provocative essays such as Corntassel and Gaudry’s “Insurgent Education and Indigenous-Centred Research” explore how terms like warrior-scholar denote the radical indigenous resurgence in educational settings. A Canadian practice of inviting a tribal elder to open conferences with a welcome blessing in the native tongue as an acknowledgment that White settlers are gathering on unceded territory is indicative of the level to which settler–indigenous relations have evolved at Canadian academic institutions. This cultural mindset is reflected in the descriptions of an equitable philosophy of community–university research partnerships throughout the book.
Following a context-setting introduction including history, terms, primary sources, and CBR “soft skills,” the book is divided into five sections. Section 1, “Learning by Doing,” is followed by sections on teaching in the community, innovations in CBR programming, classroom teaching to promote knowledge democracy, and a concluding section on productive tensions. The many practical ideas and strategies in the book are underpinned by an overall theme of moving from “servicing” communities to “engaging in creative change” (p. 123). The imbibed message is that for CBR to truly succeed, scholars must consider not merely what method to utilize in the research, but with what ethical frame of mind to approach it.

Chapter 1, “On Thin Ice,” details risks and tensions in the ethics of the community–university research dyad. Although research has been conducted in communities for years (e.g., education, engineering), the recent academic enthusiasm for civic engagement creates concerns: “Differences exist between communities and universities in the ways that knowledge and resources are organized, managed, and distributed” (p. 27), and this has impact on both student learning and community outcomes. The often-indeterminate results are a recipe for graduate student panic that must be anticipated and calmed. The best learning outcome of CBR is often a new comfort level with ambiguity, but this must be balanced with community benefit. The authors point to the value of negotiating memos of understanding to manage partnership expectations and ensure that community partners derive benefits from involvement in the research. The two other chapters in this section, written by UVic graduate students and community partners, illustrate how these partnerships worked to answer some of the tensions laid out in Chapter 1. There is a fascinating story of girl empowerment through documentary film and a case study about the struggle to bring back a needle-exchange program to the city of Victoria as community researchers informed the work of a student team.

Subsequent sections also contain valuable stories and lessons. Musoyett, DeFinney, Kundouq, Brown, and McCaffrey’s “Siem Smun’eem: A CBR Training Story” stresses the need to break down stereotypes of the “researcher” and the dynamic of “insider/outside.” The authors quote indigenous scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith: “[Research] is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary” (p. 105). Much work was needed to “re-story” the word to regain trust. The indigenous partners never considered themselves researchers until the project helped them correlate research to ways of knowing and teaching used in their community
for generations. They were then able to reclaim the word on their own terms.

Corbett and Lydon’s chapter describes a project of community mapping using a participatory framework as key to their success, as well as power-shifting to “re-present” the concept of physical and spatial relationships away from a Western bias. Mapping as an activity illustrated environmental justice/equity issues in stark visual relief. This clearly written chapter includes an appendix of mapping resources, useful “how to” guidelines for community mapping, and discussion of the tension in academe between the value placed on the accumulation of peer-reviewed papers and the choice to align with subordinated groups struggling to disrupt the status quo.

In a similar vein, recommending a focus on process rather than product, Clover’s chapter on arts-informed inquiry shows how by using fabric, glue, and magazines as tools, art can be more than self-expression or a therapeutic tool; it can serve as a way to foreground the voices of marginalized people and democratize knowledge. The author explains that the instructor need not be an artist—as she is not—to engage a professional community-based artist in capturing images of women’s power, serve as an important facilitator to lead the community members in the artwork, interpret the messages, and mobilize the work in public showings. Likewise, Etmanski’s chapter in a later section draws community art-making into the teaching and research realm, including a discussion of “what is art?” There’s a nice visual on page 276 of a spiral design model adapted from Arnold et al.’s (1991) version of Kolb’s (1984) experiential cycle that can be used in any discipline.

In his chapter “Learning to Listen,” Hall gives insights into his accidental discovery of CBR in the 1960s and 1970s through a circuitous journey from UCLA to Tanzania and ultimately British Columbia. The theme of values resurfaces, as echoed throughout this book: the belief in relationship as the heart of the CBR process and the question “If research has been a tool of colonial domination, how can we change it to be useful to community transformation and capacity-building?” (p. 160). He details a “Power Flower” exercise (p. 155) and offers examples of poetry he has used in teaching students how to learn to listen. This chapter is like having a beer with Budd and picking his brain for sources that have influenced him over the past 40 years, from Paolo Freire to the aforementioned Darlene Clover—priceless.
Marshall, Peterson, Coverdale, Etzel, and McFarland’s chapter describes a rationale for getting involved in CBR as an aboriginal: indigenous communities need to own the documentation of their knowledge so it can be seen and used by others. “If the research is based only in Western knowing, it is added to an already traumatically colonized people” (p. 213). This aboriginal scholar goes on to say,

Finding ways… to shift our thinking is going to be a challenge…. some of you who read this will struggle with my explanation… of taking research beyond the mind. Some may even go as far to say it is “unprofessional.” And to answer, I have no words to convince you until you have learned to see beyond your mind. (p. 213)

This and other densely worded chapters containing indigenous language can be challenging for readers accustomed to a Eurocentric lens: One must work to decode some phrases written in native tongues. It is worth it to devote the time, however, as these perspectives are not often given voice in academic literature. Many researchers in the Lower 48 do not have much opportunity to work with indigenous peoples, who were so greatly displaced or wiped out entirely. The use of their words illustrates how communication is but one manifestation of a cultural disconnect between majority academic institutions and marginalized communities, the larger message being respect for different ways of knowing, teaching, and doing. Author Marshall, a (White) “visitor” academic researcher, says it best: “[In facing the challenges of] the process of decolonizing a postsecondary graduate program… I am grateful to have been guided by wise and patient teachers… from both cultures” (p. 220). An additional point: Even in populations whose first language is English, the differences between “academic speak” and nonacademic communication styles can be stark. This volume provides a useful reminder of how all terminology must be translated or communicated in a way that can be received and comprehended by its target audience.

The last section merges with the vein of aboriginal research, echoing the Lil’wat principles of teaching and learning, which are discussed holistically as “part of the relationships that are part of everyday living” (p. 295). Antone and Dawson’s chapter discussing tenure dossiers describes how instead of categorizing activities rigidly as teaching, research, or service, Antone was able to integrate them and achieve deep scholarship through a storytelling approach.
The book ends with a restatement by the editors of the main tensions, and the realization that CBR and CBPR, while moving toward acceptance, still have their detractors and that “marginal voices are often misunderstood, rebuked, undermined or blatantly ignored” (p. 310) by the powers that be. However, for those whose values direct them to embark on a path toward equity, this book is an extremely helpful and unique resource.
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The concept of creating boundary-spanning leadership is not new to the higher education community, and Ernst and Chrobot-Mason’s work has been widely reviewed and received for nearly 4 years. However, the conversation about this important approach to leadership needs to continue, and the lessons included in Boundary Spanning Leadership: Six Practices for Solving Problems, Driving Innovation, and Transforming Organizations are perhaps more relevant and urgent today than ever before. In the ever-evolving landscape of higher education, scholars and professionals are continuously challenged to traverse a variety of boundaries in order to create partnerships and possibilities that extend beyond the university. As they strive to connect communities and campuses through reciprocal partnerships, the insights and skills of boundary-spanning leadership offer a truly promising guide to collective action.

In her foreword, Marian Ruderman writes: “Today, the leadership advantage goes to the people who are most closely linked to others and can work with a great variety of people from differing positions, backgrounds and locations” (p. xvi). Ernst and Chrobot-Mason’s work supports this claim and provides a road map for getting there. Through their study of 25 different organizations, the authors identify and recommend practices for leading across differences and for developing asset-based partnerships. These partnerships can and should extend across departments and divisions and into larger communities, making the contributions of universities to society most meaningful and impactful.

The authors define and explore the concept of boundaries as two connected but differing notions: borders that limit human potential, and frontiers that house advanced thinking and breakthrough possibilities (p. 3). Both definitions are embraced and advanced through the work of boundary-spanning leadership, defined by the authors as “the ability to create direction, alignment and commitment across boundaries in service of a higher vision or goal” (p. 5). The authors recognize five primary boundaries that are encountered in organizations:
1. vertical boundaries: hierarchical boundaries where people are separated by title, rank, power, and privilege

2. horizontal boundaries: boundaries that exist because of “turf” or silos in our organizations

3. stakeholder boundaries: boundaries that exist where sources of value are kept distinct and separate between organizations and partners, vendors, and communities

4. demographic boundaries: boundaries found in the differences of identity in our communities and places of work

5. geographic boundaries: boundaries of space, distance, region, and location

Horizontal boundaries were found to be the most prevalent. The authors describe horizontal boundaries as “the walls that separate groups by areas of experience and expertise” (p. 23).

To navigate the complexities and challenges of aligning groups to achieve greatness while acknowledging and working across the five most prevalent boundaries, Ernst and Chrobot-Mason outline six critical practices for boundary-spanning leaders. The authors offer chapter-length discussions of these practices, which collectively make up more than half of the volume. The practices include the following:

1. buffering: creating intergroup safety through monitoring and protecting the passage of information and resources across groups (Chapter 4)

2. reflecting: fostering intergroup respect through the understanding of boundaries and the facilitation of the exchange of knowledge across groups (Chapter 5)

3. connection: building intergroup trust through the suspension of boundaries and the bridging of people and divided groups (Chapter 6)

4. mobilizing: reframing boundaries and developing intergroup community through the development of a common purpose and a shared identity across groups (Chapter 7)

5. weaving: advancing intergroup interdependence, “the state of mutual dependence and collective learning
that develops when intergroup boundaries are interlaced within a larger whole” (p. 195), by drawing out and integrating group differences within a larger whole (Chapter 8)

6. transforming: enabling intergroup reinvention through the partnership of multiple groups to create emergent, new directions that crosscut existing boundaries (Chapter 9)

The job of a boundary-spanning leader, Ernst and Chrobot-Mason observe, is to build bridges and provide the space for the six practices of boundary-spanning leadership to occur. They note: “The days of ‘I lead and you follow’ are over. Gone are the days when leaders work within an intact group in which leaders and followers share a culture, values and interests. Instead, today you must lead across groups” (p. 7).

Taken together and in the context of higher education, the six practices of boundary-spanning leadership suggest a potentially powerful approach for faculty and professional practitioners to employ in fostering synergistic university–community collaborations. As the authors state, “When safety, respect, trust, community, interdependence and reinvention characterize the interactions between groups, these groups will achieve something together above and beyond what they could achieve on their own” (p. 219). Such groups have the potential to achieve what the authors refer to as the Nexus Effect, characterized as the “limitless possibilities and inspiring results that groups can achieve together above and beyond what they could achieve on their own” (p. 223). The authors paint a picture of a synergistic community that we should all strive for; however, attempts at such synergy are often challenging and complex when operationalized within the framework of higher education.

*Boundary Spanning Leadership* should be viewed as less of a “how to” model and more of a call to action—a call to do more, to try harder, to be better, and, most importantly, to work together for a greater good and a better tomorrow. The authors remind readers to view partners, on campus and off, as valued members of our community who will help it to advance to new heights. They make a persuasive case for cultivating and honoring a particular set of talents, roles, and relationships that may be vital to the work of coconstructing effective, mutually beneficial university–community partnerships. “The pace of societal change and progress is breathtaking. Perhaps now we stand at the precipice of the last,
great final frontier: our relationships with one another. In a world that spans boundaries, so too must leadership” (p. 253).

Ernst and Chrobot-Mason have provided a compelling depiction of the challenges people face in organizations, businesses, and communities, but in the end, it is up to individuals to transform complex communities as boundary-spanning leaders. Readers who work in higher education will find themselves challenged to reimagine their relationships with peers, divisions, departments, and community partners. Cultivating and sustaining partnerships is not always as simple as Ernst and Chrobot-Mason posit, and the harsh reality is that the artful navigation of their six steps can often be met with competing demands, the least of which are often bound to politics, finances, time, and human resources. There is turf to navigate, egos to contend with, and time to be spent. Nonetheless, to truly engage with others, faculty and professional practitioners must seek to understand, respect, and connect in order to craft a common purpose, reframe boundaries, and weave their work and spaces together. Only then can there be hope of collectively transforming our communities, our universities, and the lives around us. Gone are the days of “us and them,” as we grapple with a new and exciting approach to leadership. I am up for the challenge, and I hope you will join me.
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Community–university partnerships are an essential component of higher education’s contribution to our society. These partnerships have the potential to create a context for public access to the knowledge created within our institutions. At a time when American public opinion of higher education continues to wane, reinvigorating and reestablishing our relationship with the public is critical to future support for our work. This may seem self-serving, that the motivation for establishing community–university partnerships is a public relations strategy. Rather, it ensures that the knowledge creation process has a conduit for application, and through our partnerships with community members we enrich our understanding of concepts and phenomena by learning from local practical knowledge and wisdom. This respectful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial relationship ensures that the knowledge creation and application process remains relevant.

Higher education must reclaim its public purpose, and our institutions must strive to be publicly-engaged colleges and universities. Institutions that are assisting in this endeavor embrace and implement a shift toward an engaged scholarship paradigm across the missions of teaching, research, and service. Engaged scholarship, with its roots in Ernest Boyer’s work, references the endeavors of scholars within the academy who partner with the public, across disciplinary lines, to engage in projects for the public good. These partnerships are grounded in the principles of mutual respect, reciprocity, and plurality, ensuring that they are not merely one-directional or university centric. Although some institutions and scholars are exemplars of engaged scholarship, others struggle with how to develop this approach to their work.

Service-learning is one approach that may be employed within the umbrella of engaged scholarship. The term service-learning refers to a teaching technique that bridges the classroom–community divide. Students engage with community-based issues through partnerships between the faculty member(s) and community. This teaching approach enhances student learning while simultaneously addressing critical, community-identified issues. Kronick, Cunningham, and Gourley help to bring greater nuance to our understanding of service-learning through their text *Experiencing Service-Learning.*
The target audience is explicitly students interested in service-learning and faculty members who hope to understand service-learning from the student perspective. This important detail is easily overlooked if one neglects to read the preface. This is not meant to be a “how to” for service-learning, but a tool to help students make meaning of their experiences in communities. The text is relevant not only for undergraduates but for graduate students, as it includes sections that reflect graduate student experiences. It will also be of interest to faculty who are new to establishing service-learning within their courses. It helps to contextualize the deep learning that can occur during student involvement in service-learning experiences. Additionally, it provides a rationale for the importance of integrating service-learning within teaching in higher education by explicating the outcomes for students. Finally, although those within higher education are clearly the book’s intended audience, it should be noted that utilizing student reflections to help community partners recognize their powerful role in service-learning may serve to catalyze and orient them during these experiences. I find that understanding the learning they provide students empowers community partners’ local knowledge, reinforcing the mutual respect and reciprocity in university–community partnerships.

I found the text was organized into three sections. The first, including the introduction, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, emphasizes theory. The second and largest section, Chapters 3–6, evidences the learning within the student service-learning experience through direct quotations of student reflections. Finally, the third section includes Chapter 7, the conclusion, and the appendices, and may be most helpful for faculty interested in implementing service-learning. It is worth noting that the book’s examples and reflections do not provide a comprehensive review of student experiences across service-learning or of service-learning experiences. Rather, they represent the experiences of students at one institution and examples of service-learning projects within this institution. This text is thus best understood as a case study, and may be best utilized in conjunction with other service-learning and engaged scholarship that can offer points of comparison enhancing the perspectives of the students and authors of this text.

In the first section of this book (the introduction, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2), the authors provide a brief overview of service-learning and related theoretical foundations. The first chapter helps to orient the student within the context for their service-learning experience, recognizing the importance of cultural competence
and sensitivity. This chapter could have been strengthened by integrating more fully the concept of reflexivity and acknowledging the need to deeply reflect upon the role a student plays within the context of a service-learning experience. Reflexivity is an important skill, not just in service-learning and engaged scholarship, but for being a responsible citizen in our world. Helping students to build this skill, to critically examine how they interface with, interact with, and impact individuals according to their values, beliefs, biases, and actions within a community, will ensure that the experience is not only beneficial to the student, but also respects the local community and its members. The second chapter provides an important section on experiential learning, breaking down the concept into three interrelated components: sensing, acting, and reflecting. This provides a critical guide for how students may make meaning of their experience, to ensure that the deeper learning of their service-learning experience is not lost. The authors bring this critical component to the scholarship of teaching and learning and to the scholarship of engagement, as this model for learning helps move the student’s activities from volunteerism to service-learning.

The next section of the text, Chapters 3–6, is the largest, providing student reflections and testimonials. The third chapter provides reflection and learning from a graduate student perspective, and would be best suited for that audience. The fourth chapter provides a lengthy account of undergraduate student reflections, broken into thematic sections, such as student background and its effects on the service-learning experience, student experiences in mentoring in service-learning, and impacts on students’ lives. The fifth chapter explores how service-learning may affect a student once they leave their institution, using one of the author’s reflections as a case study. Finally, Chapter 6 explores the transformational nature of service-learning and its effects on student learning. Although this section was quite comprehensive in its use of quotes to evidence the powerful learning students experience within service-learning, the presentation of the data could have been strengthened by utilizing a more dialogic approach, inviting reflection on these quotes and experiences. This would allow the student reading these chapters to more fluidly identify how their own experiences compare with the examples presented.

In the final section (Chapter 7, the conclusion, and the appendices), the authors provide several resources that may be of assistance to faculty. Chapter 7 identifies several challenges in implementing service-learning that a new faculty member may wish to be aware of. The conclusion provides a nice, albeit brief, sum-
mary of the main service-learning concepts and the rationale for service-learning initiatives within higher education. Finally, the appendices provide a rich description of the authors’ experiences in service-learning as well as examples of service-learning projects. It is important to reiterate that this text is not a “how to” on service-learning, but instead provides a brief overview of opportunities and challenges that faculty, as well as students, may want to consider when exploring and beginning to utilize service-learning in their classrooms. Such information is likely less important for seasoned faculty who may, however, find utilizing portions of the first two sections within their classroom helpful in orienting their students to service-learning.

*Experiencing Service-Learning* is a helpful text within the greater context of service-learning literature and within the umbrella of engaged scholarship. It adds to the understanding of the impact of service-learning on students, emphasizing the important role this teaching method and strategy may play in the context of university–community partnerships. Although explicitly student-centric, this text helps to elucidate how an engaged institution can assist in community matters as well as prepare students to be engaged, involved citizens of our society once they leave our institutions. It is through experiences such as this that higher education can begin to reclaim its public purpose, and rebuild our connection to the publics we serve.
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