Chapter Two

Early Connections Between Service and Education

Seth S. Pollack

Like beauty, service is a many-splendored thing. Its value is in the eye of the beholder. In this chapter, we examine the varied and conflicting views postsecondary education has of its relationship to service, because these views form the turbulent terrain on which service-learning’s pioneers set out. As we shall learn in later chapters, the pioneers also had multiple, and sometimes conflicting, motivations and intentions, which both influenced and mirrored the contexts in which they worked.

The Meaning of Service in Postsecondary Education

Postsecondary education’s relationship to social problems is fraught with conflict over the social function of teaching and research. These debates represent clashes between competing concepts, such as objective science versus social advocacy, classical versus utilitarian education, and critical thinking versus critical action.

In his seminal work on the emergence of the American university, Vesey (1965) recognizes practical public service, or “utility,” as one of the three academic aims of the modern university.

But he also recognizes that the definition of service remains highly disputed: “One could serve society either by offering training for success within the existing order . . . or by agitating for new arrangements. At stake was the definition of the public interest to be served, and this question lurked behind the more general notion of the worth of public service. . . . The mere conception of a useful university offered no answer to this problem, so long as there remained divisions of opinion among Americans over what it meant to be useful. An academic aim had run up squarely against one of its intrinsic limitations” (pp. 74–75).

Two specific examples, one historical and one contemporary, may help clarify this conflict. In 1834, Lane Seminary had an active abolitionist society composed of faculty and students. To put their abolitionist views into action, the society organized an educational program for the blacks in their community. But soon after they began, the trustees of the seminary closed the program on the grounds that these activities were “noneducational.” The students and their professors eventually left the seminary and transferred to Oberlin College (Ellis and Noyes, 1990). Clearly, the members of the abolition society and the seminary administration held competing definitions of the term educational.

More recently, the social unrest of the 1960s placed demands on universities to be more socially relevant and responsive to the needs of the poor. Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard at that time, spoke of the need for higher education to “reassess, re-examine, and redefine” its central mission (Harvard, 1969). This process of reassessment went on at institutions around the country and produced a variety of programmatic responses intended to reconnect postsecondary education with the needs of the poor. However, this redefinition of higher education’s service mission was not universally applauded. This attitude is exemplified in the following passage: “We cannot believe that the mission of the university is to lead mankind to a new Jerusalem. Any attempt to do so would destroy among other things, the university’s role to serve as an intellectual sanctuary when the winds of popular passion blow . . . The goal of the university is not the quest for power or virtue, but the quest for significant truth” (Faimen and Olivier, 1972, p. 35). And Charles Muscattine said, “If the road to hell is paved with good intentions in education as elsewhere, then there is nowhere better paving.
material than in the concept of Public Service. In the sixteen years since I joined this faculty [the University of California] I have heard more bad educational policy justified in the name of Public Service than by any other invocation, human or divine" (quoted in Farmer, Sheates, and Deshler, 1972, p. 65).

Embedded in these responses are strong disagreements over what public service means and how higher education should contribute. Over the years, these debates crystallized into distinct rival positions: “Positions so disparate that on one end of the spectrum are those who see service as the raison d’être of higher education and on the other are those would reject it altogether as inappropriate or even inimical to the enterprise” (Crosson, 1983, p. 9).

As the stories of the service-learning pioneers in this book make clear, practitioners came to be involved in this turbulent intersection of service and learning from a variety of directions with differing motivations and goals. Before introducing the pioneers, we present two perspectives on the source of the turbulence. First, we look at the differentiated types of institutions in higher education and how each evolved distinct definitions of service. Second, we examine the “contested terms” (Connolly, 1993) at the heart of service-learning, which reveal fundamental social policy debates inherent in postsecondary education’s attempt to respond to social problems.

Diverse Expressions of the Service Mission

Postsecondary education institutions have resolved the “standing antagonisms” or “persistent dilemmas” embodied in their tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service by emphasizing one over the other two. Thus, liberal arts colleges tend to emphasize teaching, professional schools and community colleges emphasize training, and large universities emphasize research (Koopplin and Wilson, 1985; Rudolph, 1962; Bok, 1986).

Amid this differentiation, service has come to be defined through the primary goal of the institution and is expressed in ways consistent with that primary educational mission. As a result, liberal arts colleges, research universities, professional schools, and community colleges have developed varied interpretations of their service missions based on their primary identity as character form-
ers, researchers, teachers of specific skills, or expanders of educational opportunity. Service is subsumed as either “liberal arts education,” “research,” or “professional education” (Veysey, 1965), or in the case of the community college, making all three perspectives on the social benefits of education available to formerly underserved populations (Crosson, 1983).

Liberal Arts Colleges

Classical liberal arts colleges have traditionally seen themselves as fulfilling their service mission by emphasizing citizenship training and cultivating higher-order thinking skills necessary for citizen participation in a democratic society (Crosson, 1983; Koepplin and Wilson, 1985). They carry on the tradition of the medieval university, which was disassociated from the quotidian issues of daily life and concerned with more universal quests of ethics, morals, universal laws, and God. In this respect, “education and the pursuit of truth” is seen as service in and of itself. The service function of the liberal arts college is building moral character in students irrespective of its connection to day-to-day concerns (Rudolph, 1962; Crosson, 1983).

Research Universities

In contrast, research universities have traditionally defined their service mission through their primary role in the creation and application of knowledge. This aspect of the modern American research university evolved from the German model of university-based scientific research (Rudolph, 1962) and led to the development of both pure and applied sciences. The land grant college movement and the development of its agricultural extension service is an example of this applied science definition of service.

Professional Schools

A third institutional type is the professional school. American higher education in the colonial period, designed to provide the elite with education in the fields of law and religion, was firmly rooted in this model. These “professions” were seen as essential for the elite citizens to fulfill their public service mission. In this era,
all other professional training was based on the apprenticeship model and took place in the workplace rather than in institutions of higher learning (Rudolph, 1962). Over time, the training of educators, physicians, nurses, social workers, city planners, architects, and business and public administrators was formalized within the professional school model, incorporating a formalized clinical or internship training component in place of the more informal system of apprenticeship or on-the-job training. Professional schools see the development and application of professional skills (pro bono work by lawyers, medical internships in hospitals) as the basis of their service to the community.

Community Colleges
The primary mission of the community college, a distinctly American invention of the post–World War II era, is to make higher learning accessible to populations who were formerly excluded from traditional institutions. As a result, it combines all three of the other models, emphasizing to some extent character formation, applied science, and the acquisition of professional skills. The distinguishing factor is that these distinct missions are modified to fit the needs of the local community and its disenfranchised population. For community colleges, filling unmet needs for higher learning and professional training is considered service.

Table 2.1 presents a typology of institutional responses to service that summarizes these positions. The service orientations of universities, liberal arts colleges, professional schools, and community colleges are distinct. Each has developed a definition of service and related organizational capacities that is appropriate to the way in which it has resolved the “persistent dilemma” or “standing antagonism” between developing knowledge (research), passing on knowledge (teaching), and being of benefit to society (service).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Primary Educational Mission</th>
<th>Definition of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts college</td>
<td>Citizenship training for democracy</td>
<td>Engaging with ideas of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Character formation</td>
<td>Training citizens for public life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research university</td>
<td>Expanding the knowledge base</td>
<td>Applying knowledge to solve social problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional school</td>
<td>Teaching applied, concrete skills</td>
<td>Training professionals to perform needed social functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Providing access to nontraditional populations</td>
<td>Access to educational opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to employment opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflict, rooted in the debate over how education is most beneficial to society. As we have seen, there are distinct rival positions concerning higher education’s service mission. Such rival positions are viewed by political theorist William Connolly (1993) as expressions of fundamentally “contested terms,” or concepts whose “definition is never neutral but always entangled in competing moral and political commitments.” As such, these definitions are subject to continuous reinterpretation and negotiation in response to political, socioeconomic, and cultural forces. From this perspective, the degree of tension, debate, and outright conflict around higher education’s service role can be attributed not just to institutional type but also to the fundamentally contested nature of the concepts of service and education. More important, embedded in the debates around the social function of education is a third struggle over the definition of democracy itself.

The crux of the debate is whether education should provide students with the skills and knowledge base necessary to fit into the
existing social structure or prepare them to engage in social transformation. An aspect of this debate is conflict over access to and ownership of the knowledge base comprising education.

Service is also much contested. Service can be understood as charity, with the goal of addressing immediate needs, or it can focus on resolving deeply embedded social problems and bringing about structural changes in both social and economic relations.

Debates over the concept of democracy can be traced back to the eighteenth century and the drafting of the Federalist Papers and the Constitutional Convention. The authors of the Constitution tried to find a balance between the virtues of citizen participation and the anarchic risks posed by a highly mobilized mass population. These two perspectives represent competing definitions of democracy: the more participatory model of Jeffersonian democracy and the more elite model of Madisonian democracy (Boyte, 1989). The fundamental contrast is that more participatory definitions seek to develop full-fledged citizen participants, active in the process of ruling, while more elite definitions require knowledgeable, law-following citizens who are justly represented by an elite group of enlightened, citizen lawmakers.

The way a college or university interprets “education,” “service,” and “democracy” will have a significant impact on how it understands its service mission and the types of activities it organizes to carry it out. There will be differing views as to the purposes and priorities of education and its relationship to the social, political, and economic order. Those differing views will then determine whether service is an element in the process of social reproduction or social transformation.

Service-learning efforts, like all other efforts by higher education to address social problems, must, and do, come to terms with these three contested terms. This reconciliation is depicted in Figure 2.1. The model links the three contested terms together in the form of a triangle, emphasizing that struggles over definitions do not occur in isolation. Rather, they mutually influence and are influenced by each other. The key, then, is the interplay among the three concepts along the three axes of the triangle, with each axis associated with a fundamental social policy debate, summarized as follows:

**Education ↔ Service: How does education serve society?**

**Service ↔ Democracy: What is the relationship between service and social change?**

**Democracy ↔ Education: What is the purpose of education in a democracy?**

These debates represent the spectrum of issues that service-learning programs encounter as they attempt to educate students about and in response to suffering and injustice. They represent as well the turbulence that the service-learning pioneers encountered as they designed, established, and sought to institutionalize these programs.

### Paths of the Pioneers

We introduce the service-learning pioneers in the context of these debates, identifying their original motivations for combining community action and structured learning. Some were more focused on educational questions; others on issues of social justice; and still others were most interested in preparing students for effective, democratic engagement (see Figure 2.2). Readers may wish to consult these profiles as a means of connecting the stories that follow with the individuals who tell them.

---

**Figure 2.1. Debates Along the Axes.**
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Figure 2.2. Placing the Pioneers.
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The majority of our pioneers entered the field along this axis. Whether they worked from a campus or community base, or focused on preparation of students for effective social engagement or more narrowly on students as service resources for communities, they came to discover service-learning with a motivation to make education serve social needs.

Judy Sorum Brown joined the volunteer program at Michigan State University (MSU) in 1968 as assistant director, an assignment that stimulated her lifelong interest in the “capacities and interests of people for high responsibility and leadership.” In 1973 she moved from MSU to the University of Maryland, where she became director of community service programs, and then founder and director of the Center for Experiential Learning at the University of Maryland. In 1978 she accepted a White House fellowship, where she stayed for three years. Since then, she has worked as a private consultant in organization behavior and leadership, “seeking to organize a variety of strands of intellectual and artistic work to understand learning broadly and particularly in the workplace.” Brown earned her Ph.D. from MSU in comparative literature.

After a stint in the Peace Corps and several years teaching in high schools, Dick Cone came to service-learning as a curriculum developer for the University of Southern California’s (USC) Joint Education Program (JEP), where he has served as director for over two decades. Through JEP, students engage in academically based service-learning in Los Angeles schools adjacent to the USC campus. He has a doctorate in education from the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA).

John Dudley’s first experiences with service-learning came as a college student in a Quaker work camp for conscientious objectors during World War II. This experience led him to Union Theological Seminary and a lifetime of faith-based ministry and service, mostly in higher education. For twenty years he served as chaplain, faculty member at Justin Morrill College, and instructional development consultant in the Office of Learning and Evaluation, all at Michigan State University (MSU). Many service-learning practitioners, noting his work with students and faculty at MSU, his numerous publications, and his national leadership, refer to John as the “grandfather of the field.” Dudley served on the board of directors and as president of the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE).

After teaching middle school in the early 1970s, Mary Edens moved to MSU, where she pursued doctoral studies in counseling psychology. In 1975 she joined what is now known as the Service-Learning Center at MSU, which she has directed for more than twenty years.

In the 1960s, Jim Feeney was teaching sociology and coordinating off-campus learning opportunities at New College, a small liberal arts institution that opened in 1964 in Sarasota, Florida. While searching for and developing relationships with study abroad, field study, and urban internship programs, he discovered that people
running these programs were dealing with similar issues, but in isolation. This stimulated him to bring them together in 1971 to form the Society for Field Experience Education (SFEE), one of two organizations that later merged to become the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE), service-learning practitioners’ primary professional support group.

Determined “to bring together the city and its young people,” Michael Goldstein founded Urban Corps in New York City in 1966. The Urban Corps model of summer internships in municipal departments, compensated with Work-Study funds, spread rapidly across the United States. In 1971 Goldstein accepted a position as associate vice chairman of urban and governmental affairs at the University of Illinois, Chicago, “to link this campus, built after the Chicago riots, with the community.” In 1978 he joined a law firm in Washington, D.C., to establish its higher education practice. He continues his involvement in experiential learning as pro bono legal counsel to NSEE, and consultant and trainer in the legal consequences of administering experiential and service-learning programs.

In 1960 Garry Hesser and fellow students at Phillips University (Enid, Oklahoma) founded the First Mile Club to volunteer in nursing homes. This action, combined with once-a-week reflection at morning Bible study, formed a model of service-learning that Hesser has followed throughout his career. Hesser’s first professional service-learning role came as an assistant professor at the College of Wooster, where he developed, taught, and lived in a community service house in which “everyone initiated a community service project to involve other students, and we all collaborated in the design and execution of a course on community.” Since 1977, Hesser has been professor of sociology and urban studies and director of cooperative education at Augsburg College. He has a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Notre Dame and is a past president of NSEE.

Jim Keith identifies his early inspiration for service-learning as coming from “an imaginative, self-taught sociology professor who brought a philosophical and applied approach to the field that would make empiricists’ tails curl.” In 1967 he embarked on his service-learning career as an instructor at a Georgia community college, determined that his teaching “was not going to be con-

issued solely in the classroom.” In 1973 he went to San Francisco to direct Westmont College’s off-campus urban program, which “made the city as text.” From 1981 to 1991, Keith was an administrator at Guilford College, in charge of career and experiential education. More recently he has developed an ecumenical Servant Leadership School in Greensboro, North Carolina, which links theological reflection with engagement with poor and marginalized persons in the community.

Challenging experiences as a volunteer tutor while an undergraduate at the University of North Carolina in the early 1970s motivated Jane Kendall to devote herself to creating programs that would be mutually beneficial for students and communities and to supporting the people who would run them. In 1978 she joined the National Center for Public Service Internships (NCPSI) to develop a Southern Regional Economic Development internship program. That year NCPSI merged with the Society for Field Experience Education (SFEE), which ultimately became NSEE. Kendall’s quiet, thoughtful leadership of NSEE as executive director from 1983 to 1990 is viewed by many service-learning pioneers as a critical element in their ability to sustain their work during the field’s difficult early years.

J. Robert Newbrough came to Peabody College at Vanderbilt University in 1966 to direct the Center of Community Studies, a research service and training enterprise. Prior to his arrival at Peabody, Newbrough completed a postdoctoral program at Harvard and six years’ work at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), where he investigated the community’s role in mental health, an interest he has sustained throughout his career. Newbrough became a senior faculty member at Peabody in 1980 and added undergraduate service-learning instruction to his participatory action research work with graduate students.

Jane Permaul was “attracted to service-learning because its essence is team. It’s collaborative as opposed to egocentric and individual.” She has expressed these values through thirty years’ work at UCLA as a student advisor, dean of experimental programs, director of field studies development, and, since 1990, assistant vice chancellor for student affairs. Permaul describes her interest in service as coming directly from her immigration to the United States from China in 1949, “going from a very privileged, well-provided
youngster to being a recipient of service. I felt there were a lot of missing pieces, in both the educational and social service systems, to help people adjust to this country.” She provided national leadership to the field through numerous publications, consultation, and as a board member and president of NSEE. Permaul holds an Ed.D. in higher education from UCLA.

In 1955 Bill Ramsay joined the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies (ORINS) as administrative assistant in the University Relations Division. Ramsay helped coordinate fellowships, internships, and seminars for graduate students and research opportunities for faculty as he looked for ways to involve higher education with the region’s social and community problems. In 1966 he recruited service-learning pioneer Bob Sigmon to help administer and expand Manpower for Development, an intern program that required students to publish useful and academically sound research papers on area social and economic problems. They described it as “service-learning,” the first articulation of this term. In 1970 Ramsay moved to Berea College in Kentucky, where he served for many years as dean of labor, vice president for labor and student life, and vice president for policy and planning.

Greg Ricks’s commitment to education came after his graduate studies in city planning at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), when he realized that “there won’t be any people who can buy housing and begin to control their destiny without jobs and education.” His commitment arose from lessons he learned as a Boy Scout in the 1950s and an intense sense of responsibility he feels toward his African American heritage. Ricks has devoted his career to advocating and sparking in students a “loving idealism,” as project consultant for the National Center for Service Learning (NCSL); as a student affairs administrator at Northeastern, Dartmouth, and Stanford universities; as vice president and dean of City Year; and as board member and advisor to Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL).

As a young assistant professor of English at San Francisco State University (SFSU) in 1970, Cib Robinson developed a service-learning approach to the teaching of Shakespeare and two campuswide programs focused on tutoring and community service. His innovative, student-led service-learning programs trained volunteers, who in turn trained other volunteers to work in San Francisco schools and community organizations. Now as associate director of SFSU’s Urban Institute, Robinson focuses on economic development, defense conversion, and employment training. He holds a Ph.D. in English from the University of California, Berkeley.

Prior experience as a volunteer, which included experience in the Peace Corps, influenced Nick Royal’s pioneering work in international field studies at Merrill College at the University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC) for more than twenty years. Royal drew on his international experiences to create an innovative, interdisciplinary program that enabled students to prepare for and participate in field studies domestically and overseas. He provided national leadership for international, cross-cultural service-learning through writing, organizing, and presentations on behalf of NSEE.

Sharon Rubin developed, coordinated, and instructed service-learning courses and programs as director of experiential learning programs and assistant dean for undergraduate studies at the University of Maryland, as dean of the Charles and Martha Fulton School of Liberal Arts at Salisbury State University, and currently as vice president for academic affairs at Ramapo College of New Jersey. She has served nationally through numerous publications and workshop training, and as a consultant, board member, and president of NSEE. She holds a Ph.D. in American studies from the University of Minnesota.

Bob Sigmon describes his service-learning career as an expression of “thinking about what it means to be cared for, what it means to care, and what it means to learn in service settings.” This path includes missionary and research experiences in Pakistan and India, graduate study at Union Theological Seminary, and the pioneering service-learning work with Bill Ramsay at ORINS. After his work with Ramsay, Sigmon went on to direct a state internship program and service-learning-oriented health education programs in North and South Carolina. He is a founding father of SPSE and has provided national leadership to the service-learning field through numerous publications, training and consulting, and service on NSEE’s board of directors. For the past several years, he has worked in Raleigh, North Carolina, as a consultant to colleges and universities and national education associations.
Tim Stanton's service and activism experience in the late 1960s led him to establish in 1971 a youth community action program in Marin County, California, which he directed until 1976. In 1977 he became director of Cornell University's Human Ecology Field Study Program, where he worked with service-learning pioneers Dwight Giles, Ken Reardon, and Michele Whitham to develop a highly structured, interdisciplinary service-based curriculum in human ecology. In 1985 Stanton went to Stanford to help develop the Haas Center for Public Service, which he has directed since 1991. Stanton has been a national leader in service-learning through numerous publications, presentations, and consultation, and as a board member and president of NSEE. He holds a Ph.D. in human and organizational systems from The Fielding Institute.

Jon Wagner's interest in the complexity of service, developed during his undergraduate years in the mid-1960s, led to a concern “of how you could be engaged as an intellectual—how you could be actively involved in society as a complement to your intellectual work, not just as something else you do.” Wagner pursued this interest in doctoral studies in sociology at the University of Chicago, in teaching “social problems” and “social action research” at Columbia College, and as director of the field studies program at the University of California at Berkeley from 1978 to 1985. In 1988 Wagner moved to the University of California, Davis, where he served as dean of the Division of Education and helped establish a center for cooperative university-school research, where there is “no service without research and no research without service.”

Hal Woods attended Northwestern University, where he majored in history and literature of religions. Through his major, he began reading Reinhold Niebuhr, which stimulated him to consider “linking theology to social concerns and action.” In 1969 Woods went to the University of Vermont to take a position as fraternity affairs coordinator, where he soon was asked to direct a student-organized volunteer program. Woods directed what became known as the Center for Service-Learning for twenty-one years, doing pioneering work with University Year for Action. He became a trainer for the National Center for Service-Learning (NCSL) and a board member of NSEE. In 1990 Woods returned to the church as rector of All Saint's Episcopal Church in Burlington, Vermont.

Service ↔ Democracy

Other pioneers, while certainly concerned with the relationship between education and service, were more directly motivated to enter this field by issues related to the relationship between service and social justice in a democracy.

J. Herman Blake founded the Extramural Education and Community Service Program in 1968 at UCSC. Through this program, UCSC students engaged in full-time, residential service-learning assignments in Beaufort and Charleston counties in South Carolina, Tierra Amarillo in northern New Mexico, and in Alameda and Stanislaus counties and Fresno, California. Blake grew up in Mount Vernon, New York, where he was inspired by his mother's resistance to tenant evictions. He earned his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of California at Berkeley. His career is marked by a continuing commitment to grassroots communities expressed through his service-learning work and through research and writing on urban black militants, including a book, Revolutionary Suicide, which he coauthored with Huey P. Newton (1973). Blake is currently director of the African American Studies Program at Iowa State University.

Dick Couto taught high school in the Bronx and then earned a Ph.D. in political science at the University of Kentucky, where he focused on issues of poverty in Appalachia. In 1975 he became director of the Center for Health Services at Vanderbilt University, where he engaged students with grassroots community leaders who were working on health and environmental issues. In 1991 he moved to the University of Richmond as a founding faculty member of the Jepson School of Leadership, which focuses on leadership, community organizations, and public service.

Student activism in the Philippines in the 1960s swept Nidianne Cruz into service and social change. “It was a baptism by fire,” she has said, “plunging right into support work for peasant and migrant farmer labor groups and insistence on analyzing the actions that we took in relation to our objective of transforming society.” Fleeing martial law, Cruz carried her political activism into higher education in the United States. She earned an M.A. in political science at Marquette University and pursued Ph.D. studies at
the University of Minnesota. As director for twelve years of the Twin Cities’ Higher Education Consortium for Urban Affairs, Cruz taught for City Arts, a comprehensive semester arts service-learning program, focusing on the role of arts in community development. She also directed community-based learning programs in Latin America, Scandinavia, and the United States, focusing on the multicultural politics of inequality and social change. Cruz is now at Stanford University serving as associate director of the Haas Center for Public Service.

After divinity school in Boston, Jack Hasegawa spent ten years in Japan, “half as a missionary working with adults in community organizing projects” and half as a faculty member of Friends World College. In 1980 he became director of Yale University’s Dwight Hall, a hundred-year-old center for student volunteerism, where “we spent a lot of time debating the necessary linking of political advocacy, social action, and community service.” In 1993 Hasegawa joined the Connecticut State Department of Education to lead statewide planning on “integrated education” and diversity awareness training.

Mel King gained his social justice ethic from his father, a leader in a dockworkers’ union, and his mother, who led an active life serving her church community. In 1971 he petitioned the president of MIT to devote university resources to community development in its surrounding areas. As a result, King was appointed to MIT’s Department of Urban Studies and Planning to develop the Community Fellows Program, an academic service-learning program for community leaders. In addition, from 1973 to 1983, King served as a representative in the Massachusetts state legislature. Membership in both organizations enabled King to connect MIT faculty and students and community-based legal and business professionals to develop and support legislation and programs that promote community development. King retired from MIT in 1996 but remains active in Boston-based community development work.

Helen Lewis’s first experience with service-learning took place in 1943 through YWCA-sponsored labor and early civil rights projects. “I fought against segregation. I got arrested in 1948. This changed my life.” Lewis continued her activism as an instructor in colleges in the Appalachian region in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, where she involved students “in all the social movements of the region: strip mining, black lung, mine safety, union reform, coal tax, and welfare rights movements.” As a result, she lost two jobs for “nurturing radical students.” She spent two decades as an administrator and organizer at the Highlander Research and Education Center in Tennessee doing community education, community development, and adult education in rural mountain communities. She currently resides in North Carolina, where she is writing a book on Catholic sisters who are doing extraordinary community development work.

A Catholic priest challenged Ken Reardon to tutor at public housing projects in Paterson, New Jersey, and connect that “to what it meant to live a committed life.” This high school experience spurred Reardon to organize service-learning programs while studying at Rider College and the University of Massachusetts. In 1984 he joined the Cornell University Human Ecology Field Study Program to teach and manage its New York City program, where he pioneered a participatory action research approach to service-learning. In 1990 he became assistant professor of urban and regional planning at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, where he coordinates the East Saint Louis Action Research Project. The project integrates participatory action research, community organization, and popular education techniques in order to build the organizational capacity of neighborhood organizations representing the poorest sectors of this distressed urban community. Reardon earned a Ph.D. in city and regional planning at Cornell and was recently promoted to associate professor at the University of Illinois.

Joan Schine traces her introduction to service-learning to her school days in 1938, when every student participated in public service activities. Later, as a parent school volunteer, she became deeply involved in issues of poverty and civil rights. In 1967 she joined the National Commission on Resources for Youth to work with retired judge Mary Conway Kohler promoting Youth Participation, an important early service-learning concept. There Schine focused on urban adolescents, which led her to establish in 1982 the Early Adolescent Helper Program as part of the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York. In 1991, with fifteen Helper Programs established in New York, the organization expanded its mission and was renamed the National
Center for Service Learning in Early Adolescence to promote service-learning for middle school students nationally.

*Michele Whitham’s* introduction to service-learning came through involvement with the radical religious left in the 1960s. After graduation from Cornell, she and friends remained in Ithaca, New York, and established an alternative middle school and a community-based apprenticeship program. From 1976 through 1988, she taught service-learning courses in Cornell’s Field Study Office, building an action-reflection curriculum in human ecology with pioneers Tim Stanton, Dwight Giles, Ken Reardon, and others. “By the mid-1980s, however, my activist soul was languishing. I saw myself as helping students accomplish work in the community that I longed to do. So I went back to school, picked up a J.D., and here I am in Boston as a practicing attorney.”

**Democracy ↔ Education**

Finally, a small group of pioneers found themselves most drawn to this field by fundamental questions of democratic participation and the role of education in fostering a more engaged, effective citizenry.

In 1970 *Dwight Giles* was drawn to graduate work at the Union Theological Seminary because it espoused a commitment to “doing theology in the city.” During his time in New York, he was inspired by the work of John Dewey and “hired by a group of unrepentant Deweyans to be an adjunct faculty member supervising students’ fieldwork in inner-city neighborhoods.” In 1980 Giles moved to Cornell’s Human Ecology Field Study Program, “the shaping experience of my professional life, to organize community projects that involved students, community partners, and other faculty.” Since 1992 Giles has been professor of human and organization development and director of internships at Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, a base from which he has become a leading researcher on student learning outcomes and the practice of reflection. “I span boundaries between universities and communities. I think of myself as a teacher, but also an organizer.” Giles earned his Ph.D. in community development from Pennsylvania State University.

*Ira Harkavy* has been “engaged in work with the West Philadelphia community on a regular basis since the late 1960s, working to change the university’s callous and shortsighted policies toward its neighbors” as a University of Pennsylvania undergraduate and graduate student, a community worker, and since 1985 Penn’s director of the Center for Community Partnerships and vice president. Through his efforts to establish and develop the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps, Harkavy has become a nationally recognized advocate for what he terms “university-assisted community schools,” and for community-university partnerships generally. Creating these community-campus connections honors the civil rights tradition in his family and fuels his conviction to “transform the University of Pennsylvania into an institution that fulfills [Benjamin] Franklin’s vision of the cosmopolitan, civic university.”

In 1968, as a high school student, Rob Shumer discovered that participating in the Key Club helped him “begin to understand that students could begin to take charge of delivering service to the community on their own.” His professional and scholarly contributions to service-learning have been motivated by a desire to give all students this same sense of effective civic engagement: as a high school teacher, as developer of a community school, as director of Field Studies Development at UCLA (following pioneer Jane Permaul), and since 1992 as director of a national research center and clearinghouse on service-learning at the University of Minnesota. Shumer has a Ph.D. in education from UCLA.

In 1974 after several tumultuous years in student affairs and social service work, Marty Tillman entered the School for International Training in Brattleboro, Vermont, where he engaged in an internship focused on democratic community development and peacemaking with the Gandhi Peace Foundation in New Delhi, India. “Everything flows from that moment in terms of crystallizing my personal and professional ideas,” he says. Upon returning to the United States in 1976, Tillman joined the Lisle Fellowship, an intergenerational, cross-cultural, participatory service-learning program established in 1936. He focused on expanding the number of participants, especially from colleges and universities, and the settings in which they would serve, including India. Since his
time with Lisle, Tillman has worked on international education issues with the YMCA and the Citizen's Network for Foreign Affairs in Washington, D.C. He helped establish NSEE's special interest group on cross-cultural, international experiential education and served on the board of the Partnership for Service-Learning.

In the next chapter we shall learn more about the service-learning pioneers' early motivations.