St. John's University
St. John's Scholar

Faculty Publications | Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Spring 2014

Navigating Service in Untenured Waters: What it Means to be a Service-Learning Mentor

Mary Beth Schaefer
St. John's University, schaefm1@stjohns.edu

Tracy J. Cannova

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.stjohns.edu/curriculum_instruction_facpubs

Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons

Recommended Citation

Schaefer, M., & Cannova, T. J. (2014). Navigating Service in Untenured Waters: What it Means to be a Service-Learning Mentor. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement, 5* (1) Retrieved from https://scholar.stjohns.edu/curriculum_instruction_facpubs/15

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at St. John's Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of St. John's Scholar. For more information, please contact fazzinol@stjohns.edu.

Navigating Service in Untenured Waters: What it Means to be a Service-Learning Mentor

Mary Beth Schaefer and Tracy J. Cannova

Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement
Vol. 5, No. 1, Spring 2014

This article describes how a university's community service initiative helped facilitate a mentoring opportunity between a pharmacy student and an education professor. The professor takes up Boyer's (1990) call to reconsider the priorities of the professoriate and addresses his question "What does it mean to be a scholar"? She explores her emerging identity as a scholar amid the competing obligations of the tenure track and applies a narrative form to relate and describe the service-learning study she undertook with the pharmacy student. She found that with institutional and collegial support, "service" can become personally and professionally transformative, offering benefits to the self and the community and figuring deeply in one's emerging identity as an engaged scholar.

Keywords: service-learning; student-professor mentoring; engaged scholarship

When the Associate Dean in the School of Education at St. John's University asked me to take on a student and mentor her through one of the university's initiatives designed to address issues of social justice, I wanted to say no. I was already deeply involved in two community-based research projects and writing a proposal for another. My colleagues in other universities urged me to focus on research and writing. Publishing, they contended, was the straightest, strongest path to tenure. Service to the community was already part of my research. I did not need nor did I want another project. Yet, I was asked by the Associate Dean, who I liked and respected. Also, I knew that at St. John's University, a large Catholic institution located in the heart of the diversity of New York City, service was purported to be as important as research and teaching. I doubted that this mentoring project was going to be rewarding and important, but I also was not sure that as a new faculty member I could say no. So inwardly gritting my teeth, I said yes along with a smile and a silent prayer that the student would never materialize. I was not feeling the call of charity. I was feeling the bite, pinch and stress of tenure.

In his special report, Boyer (1990) asked, "What does it mean to be a scholar?" (p. 2). He called for a more dynamic understanding of the rigid categories of teaching, research and service and offered a model of scholarship where research and practice serve to improve lives. Service to the community seemed to fit that definition, and in my first year as an assistant professor, I thought my work exemplified the kind of "dynamic understanding" of scholarship that Boyer advocated. Teaching, research and service were comfortably intertwined in my schools-based research. I was actively engaged in helping a school with an underserved population to achieve college and career readiness. My research enhanced my pedagogy and helped me create more relevant and engaging lessons for my own students, all pre- and in-service teachers.

The Ozanam Scholars Program, the university's community service initiative, seemed skewed to me. I was unable to see how mentoring a student as she developed an independent study around a social justice issue would go further than the one rather rigid category of "service." For me, it seemed disconnected from teaching and research, a kind of "service on the side." I was also concerned with a practical question—the perennial query uttered by untenured faculty everywhere: Does this kind of service "count" towards tenure?

This article is the story of personal and professional transformation that was realized through mentoring an Ozanam Scholar with her service project. Far from a rigid category of "service," this work engaged me in a kind of service-learning experience that enhanced my personal and civic development and gave me an understanding of service as work with others, rather than service for others. This difference helped me reposition my other civic work—and the value of working with others became something I valued and examined. In short, this mentoring activity with Tracy helped me understand Boyer's model of scholarship as one that is engaged with others for the purpose of improving lives. This point refines the idea of "service" as it relates to Boyer's conception of scholarship, and in this article, service relates directly to the local community. When I use the word "service" to signal a more narrow definition, (i.e. service to academia) I describe it as such.

I began my work with Tracey, the Ozanam Scholar, 4 years ago. What started out as service on the side evolved into a project that helped me understand what it means to engage in scholarship that matters. Although Boyer asked us to consider "what it means to be a scholar" back in 1990, the question remains germane today. It helps us imagine not only a more dynamic understanding of the "three-legged stool" (Kennedy, Gubbins, Luer, Reddy & Light, 2003) of teaching, research and service, but a picture of what can happen when service, particularly engaged community service, becomes the linchpin of this stool. As will be noted in review of literature, there is a lack of research on mentorship and service-learning; perhaps the gap is related to what is valued in the tenure process. In this article, I describe how I worked with my mentee in a small-scale research study and engaged in scholarship for personal and professional growth. As we will see, more research stories on mentorship and service-learning are needed.

To tease out what that personal and professional growth looks like, I offer an inside look at how competing forces and obligations of the professoriate play out in within one university that purports to hold the "service" aspect of the three-legged stool on par with research and teaching. Specifically, at St. John's University, service to the community was part of its Vincentian Mission "inspired by St. Vincent de Paul's compassion and zeal for service" (http://www.stjohns.edu/about/general/mission). The story of my growth and understanding is important because it gives an intimate perspective on issues that beset many beginning tenure track professors and helps locate a community outreach idea of service within that struggle.

Before sharing the narrative, I situate my experience in the literature on engaged scholarship and mentoring. This situating of self in the literature may be seen as the preamble. The next section tells the story of Tracey's service research project, which was to deliver SAT coaching services to an underserved community. The paper concludes with a discussion of how the Ozanam Scholar's service project influenced my understanding of what it means to be a professor who engages in research that matters.

Situating the Story: Engaged Scholarship

Before becoming mentor to an Ozanam Scholar, my perception of community engagement was selfishly oriented. My attraction to the service aspect of my role as a new professor was framed as good for personal advancement and beneficial for the community. I did not consider the idea that service might also be good for my own personal and civic development, nor was this a feature of the literature on engaged scholarship.

When Boyer (1990) first called for scholarship to harken back to its roots and become more intimately connected to solving pressing problems in society, he framed the call by appealing to reason. "Theory," he posited, "surely leads to practice. But practice also leads to theory. And teaching, at its best, shapes both research and practice" (p. 16). Regarded this way, he argued, the rigid categories of teaching, research and service are "broadened and more flexibly defined" (p. 16) into a kind of scholarship emanating from service. In other words, community-engaged scholarship just made sense and should be a priority.

His call did not go unheard. While researchers began to acknowledge that the idea of university service was historically integral to the mission of higher education (Kennedy et al., 2003; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008) there was also a growing interest in scholarship that produced the kinds of research that could be applied to social problems (O'Connor, 2006; Small & Uttal, 2005; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000; Wade & Demb, 2009). Increased institutional support for community-engaged scholarship initiatives was thought to encourage an uptick in faculty engagement (Vogelgesang, Denson & Jayakumar, 2010). A civic-engaged movement seemed to be spreading across American college campuses (O'Connor, 2006), and this movement may be seen in the kinds of research on community-engaged scholarship, such as Wade and Demb's (2009) development of a Faculty Engagement Model that helped define and describe "how faculty contribute to the public mission of their institutions" (p. 5). The rationale

for developing the model signaled what the literature seemed to be showing: that there was an increase in faculty engaged scholarship that needed to be understood.

Research that focused on the benefits of service-learning for college students was older and more prevalent. It was found that undergraduate students who engaged in service-learning were more socially aware (Hughes, Welsh, Mayer, Bolay & Southard, 2009; Yeh, 2010) and had better academic outcomes in areas such as critical thinking, GPA, and writing skills (Vogelgesang & Austin, 2000). Service-learning had also been associated with greater retention rates (Bringle, Hatcher & Muthiah, 2010). Perhaps most compelling of all was evidence that service-learning enhanced students' personal and civic development (Bringle et al., 2010; Hughes et al., 2009; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). As we learn more about the benefits of community-engaged scholarship for professors and acknowledge the growing literature on the benefits of service-learning for students, one might assume that the movement has been fully embraced by institutions of higher learning. One would be wrong. Barriers persist.

The competing obligations of professors can be daunting for new faculty, and many find it necessary to align their obligations with the priorities of the university. Sadly, service does not often top the list. As Boyer (1996) lamented, "Almost every college catalog in this country still lists teaching, research, and service as the priorities of the professoriate; yet, at tenure and promotion time the harsh truth is that service is hardly mentioned" (p. 13). This sentiment was echoed elsewhere in the literature, with "community work" going unrewarded (Boyer, 1990) or even seen as detrimental to promotion, especially at research universities (Vogelgesang et al., 2010). University structures and bureaucracies further complicated matters. The culture of most institutions tended to favor individual benefits over the larger good (Fellner & Siry, 2010) or their internal processes were so "unwieldy" that collaboration and cooperation with the community was limited (Vogelgesang et al., 2010).

Other barriers included lack of institutional resources, including financial support and access to information on community needs (Lambright & Alden, 2012). Furthermore, most university faculty did not receive the kind of training that might enable them to connect to practitioners or policymakers or tailor their research to the needs of the public (Small & Uttal, 2005). A more insidious and persistent idea about community-engaged scholarship was that in a desire to appear more prestigious, even other faculty might resist rewarding colleagues for their service (Vogelgesang et al., 2010). These barriers speak to a need to promote community work as critical, valuable and honored. Producing and sharing research that showcases the reciprocal benefits of community-engaged scholarship can be one way to begin to penetrate institutional barriers.

There are several examples of engaged scholarship that honor reciprocal benefits and reject the traditional "one-way" approach to delivering knowledge and service to local communities. The idea of "engagement" signals a new "two-way" approach—a collaborative model of service that emphasizes scholars and partners sharing and creating knowledge (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008), and illustrating the affordances of researching in, with and among communities. For

example, Dyrness (2008) and her participatory research team use feminist perspectives to illuminate the ways that Latina immigrant mothers organized in their community to effect educational change. Campbell and Lassiter (2010) engage with participants to facilitate positive change and transformation. In the engagement model of research, scholars seek a partnership among researcher and researched.

As Fellner and Siry (2010) explain in their essay on community-engaged scholarship, "Part of the reconceptualization of service involves infusing it with polysemia and polyphonia, of negotiating terms that reflect and mediate collaborative practices" (p. 779). The idea of reciprocity informs the nature of the new way to think about service and research, including a reflective inward measure of one's own transformation. Fellner and Siry show,

> *within these experiences my identity was transformed…just how I thought of myself…in short, my identity was mediated through these experiences of working with others, and my 'service' provided an immeasurable benefit to myself, as a person, as a scholar, and as a teacher. (p. 780).*

Tilley-Lubbs' (2009) autoethnography takes a similar inward turn as she takes a look back, sometimes painfully, at an experience of community-engaged scholarship in order to engage, even six years later, in a "transformative journey" (p. 61). Ayala's (2009) research offers an example of the affordances of using Participatory Action Research (PAR) as a methodology where the researcher strives to look at the "in-between spaces of different social worlds" (p. 73) in order to gain full community participation. She problematizes the power dynamics of research, sensitive to positioning informants as "receptacles holding information for academic researchers to uncover, harvest and interpret" (p. 75). The self-conscious reciprocity informed by a critical orientation holds promise for a mutually informative kind of research that rejects the one-way models and remains open to personal and professional transformation.

The literature on faculty mentoring offers another lens on understanding the challenges and benefits of cultivating relationships that offer opportunities for transformation. Unfortunately there are few studies of service-learning mentoring programs at universities (Hughes et al., 2009). Existing articles tend to describe the roles and responsibilities for the university mentor (Lechuga, 2011). Few focus on professors' lived and felt experiences in the mentoring process and even fewer examine faculty's perceptions of mentoring in the context of community outreach (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007) and recent forays into online service-learning mentoring (Waldner, McGorry & Widener, 2012). This lack of research makes it difficult to understand the ways that mentoring students in their service-learning impacts both professors and students.

The work of Baxter Magolda (2004; 2012) although not directly related to community outreach mentoring, offers insights into the complex, powerful forces that take shape when scholars and students work closely together. She (2004) describes educators and learners as "collaborative partners" in a construction of a personal epistemology that may lead both researcher and learner to mutual enrichment: "…they used these experiences to assist in self-authoring their lives; I used these experiences to self-author the construct of personal epistemology" (p. 41).

This "learning partnerships model" affords transformative experiences that are constructivist in nature and ever evolving.

The interplay of ideas involved in a learning partnership is further described as Baxter Magolda (2012) closely examines her own role in the transformative experience, explaining that she had to "listen carefully" to her student-research participants' ideas and relinquish traditional notions of authority: "Enabling learners to develop their personal authority requires me to trust their capabilities, draw out their voices, and link my knowledge to theirs rather than imposing mine on them" (p. 35).

While Baxter Magolda's work looks closely at the generative opportunities available for self transformation in relationships, when we reposition this work in the context of engaged scholarship, we realize that the work must go further. Engaged scholarship, embedded in service, asks that we extend these transformations beyond university offices and look at the larger effect of our work in the world. What does it mean to have transformative experiences in a mentoring relationship directly related to service-learning? And why is there a dearth of research examining and explicating the impact of service-learning experiences on faculty themselves? The silence is both curious and troubling.

The capacity for transformation and renewal through community-engaged scholarship is only beginning to be explored. There is need for continued research that discusses parity in research and strives to examine the affordances of this kind of scholarship still in its nascent stage. While we are beginning to see models of research that focus on service-based scholarship, questions remain. What are some of the personal and professional struggles that figure into engaging in this type of research? How do the values of the institution align with professional and personal aspirations? How important is this alignment in helping to realize the potential of community-engaged scholarship? And as Feller and Siry (2010) ask, how do we turn our stories into action?

Telling the Story

As we have seen, there are few examples of university faculty articulating in depth and in detail their experiences with students and service-learning. One notable exception is Tilley-Lubb's (2009) retrospective autoethnographic study in which she presents a re-exploration of her experience of service-learning with students and explores her transformations in understanding and knowledge 6 years later. Though scarce, accounts of personal transformation in relation to service-learning provide windows into the real and messy art of integrating the pieces of scholarship articulated by Boyer (1996).

In my story, I focus on relating the instances and occasions that elicited particular sensations and then explore those experiences to gain insights into the culture under study (O'Byrne, 2007). This reflective, reflexive way of conveying knowledge and experiences derives from an epistemological stance that holds that creation of knowledge is both subjective and

transactional—a stance that is especially poignant and generative when we consider the dearth of literature around individual experiences of engaged scholarship. It is important to note these kinds of reciprocal research, as described above, demand a reflective/reflexive stance on the part of the researcher that may not be valued in most traditional research methodologies. Such work, therefore, calls us to consider using autoethnography as a method. By locating this work in autoethnographical methods and in a critical theory paradigm, I aim to both critique and transform (O'Byrne, 2007) the idea of what it means to be a scholar, untenured professor, and mentor.

Informing this story are over 70 email communications with my mentee and her team, notes from weekly meetings with my mentee that spanned more than 4 years, and data collected and analyzed from her service work with students. This story draws the pieces of the service-learning mentoring experience together to reveal what Schaafsma & Vinz (2011) describe as "what has remained unsaid, what has been unspeakable" (p. 1). A reflexive autoethnography necessarily calls out the inner voice and demands it speak its mind. Furthermore, this form affords a representation and accounting of service-learning that reflects its participatory stance: Recent emphasis on the participatory nature of service-learning calls for new ways to represent our work. A reflexive autoethnography, framed as a narrative, invites and gives voice to service-learning participants. In doing so, we model the reciprocal nature of the very service work that we do. The reader also becomes a participant in the service-learning, as stories have the potential to give the reader what Schaafsma and Vinz (2007) describe as "a door to open and walk through" (p. 277), so that "stories lived and told educate the self and others" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. xxvi).

I now open the door to a story of how a junior faculty member experienced a service-learning project through mentoring. In this story, the research does not frame the transformation. The transformation frames the research.

The Plot

After accepting the role of mentor for an Ozanam Scholar, I found out more about the program. The Ozanam Scholars program was named after one of the founders of The Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, a group dedicated to the service of the needy. The university established the Ozanam Scholars Program to address issues of global poverty and injustice. Scholars can come from any school across the university. They are required to minor in Social Justice, complete an independent study in their junior year, and participate in a capstone project in their senior year, while spending several hours each semester serving at local service sites to help fight poverty, homelessness and hunger.

The program's glossy brochure featured Scholars with lots of straight white teeth and upright thumbs. The whole thing irritated me mightily. It made me cranky to think of undergraduates, many children of privilege, working in communities of high need, doing real work in the world and looking way too happy about it. Part of me did not think this was a good idea. I worried,

as Tilley-Lubbs (2009) did, about service-learning reinforcing hierarchical perceptions. Another part of me admitted to envy. I had to work my way through college in order to afford it. These kids got to do real work in the world. That was a sort of privilege too. Still, these were feelings that I tamped down and I met Tracey with good will and curiosity.

Tracey charmed me right away. Smart, dedicated, and enrolled in one of the most competitive colleges in the country for her field, she was committed to creating an independent study that would be conducted in her senior year. She sat down in my office and perched at the edge of her seat, her long hair pulled back. She was so earnest. I leaned forward to match her perch.

"What are you thinking of doing?" I asked.

"I've been spending a lot of time in the schools," Tracey explained, "and I've noticed that there are a lot of high school students who want to go to college but don't have a lot of money. I was in that situation too—but I had enough money to get help preparing for my SATs. The first time I took the test I didn't do so well, but then I took a course that really helped me, and my scores went up really high. I want to give those high school students the chance to get the same kind of preparation for the SAT that I did, because it helped, and because I don't think they can afford it."

Later I found out that Tracey had done so well on her SATs that she actually went to work for a very well-known SAT prep program, working Saturdays to coach students who could afford it. So Tracey was experienced in coaching students for the different sections of the SATs. She just didn't know how to translate this idea and desire into a service project.

"That is a fabulous idea," I told her. Not only did I think it was a great idea, but through some strange twist of fate, I had gotten matched to a Scholar whose interest intersected with my own. I had been working with students in a high-need high school to help prepare them for college though developing and researching a career and college readiness program. Although I think I would have been an enthusiastic mentor simply through Tracey's ebullience, it didn't hurt that I too was passionate about helping to create parity in college access. I was, in a word, "in."

"When can we meet again?" Tracey asked, a question that would become familiar as the weeks went on. A quick look at my calendar was daunting: faculty meetings, a scheduled meeting for undergraduate policies, a session in the library to explore grant writing options, and oh yes, I needed to set aside time to work on a tenure packet was due by November, a packet that would determine my promotion for the following year. No matter that I had only been there two months: The university wanted to know what I'd been up to, and the different sections of the tenure packet required intensive thinking and planning.

"Uh," I tensed, flipping rapidly through my planner. I was unsure how to explain that although it looked like I had a lot of time on the calendar, I was actually crunched.

"If next week isn't good, we can meet the week after," Tracey offered, correctly reading the consternation on my face.

I re-examined my planner: Pick up my six-year old from school and drive her to dance. A Parent-Teacher conference at my daughter's new high school. A sixth grade math bee that my son was in. I tried focusing on my office hours. What if I just extended them an hour and kept that every week for Tracey? We settled on a time and day and resolved to meet weekly. I stared at the wall when she left, torn by twin feelings of dread for taking on what looked like a really big project, and elation for working with someone who shared my passion.

We met pretty much every week over the next 2 years. That first year, when Tracey was a junior, we focused on setting up the research study. Tracey read the literature on SAT prep programs. I helped her search for research articles and showed her how to synthesize findings into a coherent literature review. I explained how to organize the literature review in order to show a gap in the research—a gap that her study would fill. To our surprise and chagrin, the gap was more like an abyss. With the exception of seven studies conducted prior to 1965 that were summarized by the College Entrance Examination Board in 1969, we found very little independent research that studied the effects of SAT coaching. Exceptions were the big commercial coaching programs. According to Peltier (1989), for example, in 1983 Kaplan, the most popular commercial coaching school, claimed that students who took their course would gain an average 120 to 180 points on the SAT. One unambiguous and somewhat troubling claim that the commercial companies could make was that coaching programs for standardized tests were incredibly popular. A recent article by the Wall Street Journal reported that about two million students spend $2.5 billion a year on test preparation and tutoring (Hechinger, 2009).

But how effective were these popular programs? A special report for the National Association for College Admission Counseling (Briggs, 2009) acknowledged the paucity of studies on the effectiveness of SAT coaching before concluding that, "test preparation efforts yield a positive but small effect on standardized admission test scores" (p. 3). This finding supported what Tracey found in the research. She discovered that improvements in test scores could be achieved by test familiarity and test taking techniques (Peltier, 1989). She also found that although there were some differences in the achievement test scores of coached and uncoached students, coached students were more likely to use a variety of ways to prepare for the SATs (Powers & Rock, 1999), thus making measures of test improvements due to coaching unreliable.

Tracey noticed the quality of the coaching was not analyzed except in terms of teacher-pupil ratio and instructional time (Alderman & Powers, 1980). Tracey wondered if the coach took time to understand her students and their needs, perhaps their fears about the SAT and their hopes for the future. Could addressing students' affective dispositions towards the SAT while addressing their cognitive needs have an impact on their achievement? This wondering became Tracey's overarching research question, and the fact that she could help bring

expensive college prep experiences to underserved students excited her. Together we designed a study that would address the SAT preparation needs of underserved students in high school.

At this point we were unsure if Tracey would be able to carry out the proposed service project. The Scholars program decided it would select the top proposals from the junior-level cohort, and the selected proposals would be the capstone project not only for Tracey, but for other Scholars whose projects did not get selected. Our study focused on wooing high school students into engaging in the SAT prep and providing time to tutor and talk with them about their college and career aspirations. The talking component was essential to me. From my own research I knew how important it was for students to have some idea of a college major or a general career interest, and this was included in our Ozanam Scholar's research proposal.

In April we went to a Scholars Reception and Luncheon where we found out that Tracey's project was selected. We were happy, but a little scared, too. Now the responsibility for recruiting students, writing an IRB and mentoring other Scholars fell on our shoulders. April was also the time I had another report due to the university. This was a yearly report on service and research. Every professor in the university, by contract, had to complete this report, and while not as expansive as the yearly fall tenure packet, it was still quite extensive. After reviewing the service projects undertaken by faculty, department heads determined monetary awards. I was still in the throes of my first year and unsure what kind of monetary award one might hope for. I was stressed and felt odd about suggesting that my interaction with Tracey and the capstone project was something that deserved financial recognition. I had other service projects to write about, but the community-engaged scholarship with Tracey was different because it seemed to be so separate from my other projects. Although ambivalent, I went ahead and described my work with Tracey, and that May, not only did I receive a bonus for my service, but in accordance with university policy, it was added onto my base salary. Although still ambivalent, I began to see the tangible ways that the university supported and celebrated service.

That summer Tracey and I worked on writing a small grant to support her study. She needed a tape-recorder for interviews and a pizza-soda fund. We had decided that the best way to entice and keep high school students for three hours a week over a semester was to feed them. Our method would be a qualitative case study where the researcher (Tracey) also participated in the program. Tracey trained three other Scholars in SAT coaching techniques, and in the fall of 2010, she and the other Scholars recruited 15 junior and senior high school students at a high-need urban school for an after-school SAT prep class. During the sessions, Tracey not only coached students, but she and the other Scholars ate dinner with the SAT students and talked with them about college and their future.

Five students came for all of the sessions, others came to most. Students were given a sample SAT test before the coaching sessions began and were given another sample SAT test when the semester ended. This enabled Tracey to diagnose areas of need and measure progress.

Open-ended surveys were given before and after the SAT prep to determine students' evolving thoughts and feelings about taking the SAT. They were also interviewed.

My participation was vicarious: All of the SAT classes were held on a day that conflicted with my evening class. For the first time I was involved in a service-learning project with none of the immediate satisfaction of interacting and engaging with the participants. Tracey and I continued to meet and she would regale me with stories, and while I yearned to be in the classroom with her, I began to feel that it was enough to know that she and the three other Scholars were doing real and rewarding work. I didn't always have to be in the middle of the learning. I was learning the rewards of the periphery.

After the study ended, we needed to sift through the survey and interview data. Tracey gathered her team and we met in an office on campus. Tracey and I were perky and anxious to dig into the data. The other three Scholars looked a little tired. One kept up a side conversation via texts while I explained what we would do.

"Ok team," I said, perhaps too cheerfully, "I've made five copies of your interviews and the survey responses—one for each of us. Let's see what the students said. Read through the packet and just describe what you see. Try not to preconceive. Just listen to the data and sensitize yourself to the words being spoken. Ask yourself, what are the issues, problems, concerns and ideas? For example, here a student says, 'I enjoyed the circle talk.' What can we call that? Let's give it a code."

I saw Tracey wanting to speak, but she held back, hoping for someone else to chime in. Andrew spoke first. "A social thing?"

"Great! Let's write 'social' next to the circle talk. What else can we write?"

I had Ellen's attention. "How about just 'talk,' because that's also what it looks like she was emphasizing."

"Wonderful! Let's put it down."

"Wait," Andrew sounded annoyed. "I thought it was social?"

"You can name things twice or even more," I explained. We went through a few more pages together, and when I was sure they understood, we coded alone.

When we met again the following week, everyone was alert and ready to share what they thought were the categories that spoke to them from the data. The conversation was lively; the Scholars were excited to share their ideas. When I asked about the SAT scores themselves, the Scholars told me almost matter-of-factly that the five students who had attended every session had increased their scores by an average of 300 points. Astounded and entranced by the sheer numbers, it took me a few minutes to realize that Tracey and the other Scholars considered the

scores almost beside the point. They were far more interested in comparing the categories that they found emerging from the surveys and interviews.

I listened to the four of them negotiate and arrive at three major themes from the data: social interaction, focus, and commitment. For the first time, I really heard the high school students' voices. As the Scholars spoke warmly about the students, emulating their voices and talking about their relationships, I realized that at some point during this project, I had become the coach, not a player, and it was from this vantage that I observed.

I watched the Scholars enlivened by the data that showed that their efforts had been valued, appreciated and effective. I saw how powerful community-engaged scholarship can be—not just for the served, but for the servers. I shared their joy in finding common themes and understood their gratitude at having made a difference. Tracey was especially touched and personally transformed by the experience (see Appendix).

What I've Learned

This reflexive autoethnographic piece encompasses a story with many threads. As mentioned earlier, using this stance to relay a mentoring experience draws in the messiness—the essence of which would be difficult to capture on a quantitative scale. In this service project, I did not just mentor Tracey. My mentoring role impacted other Scholars and a group of high school students whose voices and thoughts I heard only in transcripts and hearsay conversations. This kind of distance mentoring could have remained a service on the side—but through a combination of luck, shared passions, and a mutual desire to effect real change in the world, I found myself embracing the mentoring and service in a way that was personally transformative.

The aspects of service-learning and mentoring that figured most deeply in this experience speak directly to the potential of engaged scholarship. Following the learning partnerships model (Baxter Magolda, 2012) that strives to understand and describe the evolving transformative experiences that are constructivist in nature and ever-evolving, I examine two pieces of the mentoring experience that stood out as personally and professional transformative: Benefits to Self and Community and my Emerging Identity as an Engaged Scholar.

Benefits to Self and Community

In this service-learning experience, Tracey and I benefited differently and experienced growth differently. For example, Tracey experienced personal and professional benefit. She gained an understanding of the "value of listening" (see Appendix) and the importance of the idea of dependability in building relationships. Professionally, she obtained a publication (Cannova & Schaefer, 2012). This achievement led her to seek out collaborations within her own field. Today she is writing and researching with a pharmacy professor. The students who received

SAT coaching increased their achievement levels and subsequent opportunities for college admission. They also gained a space to share their fears and thoughts about the future.

When I look back over my own story, I am struck by the depth of the benefits afforded me. Professionally I deepened my understanding of college readiness as relates to SAT coaching—an aspect of college and career readiness that I had not previously considered—and personally I gained a powerful sense of deep satisfaction at having helped improve the life chances of high school juniors and seniors. As I wrote in the autoethnography, I saw "how powerful service-learning can be—not just for the served, but for the servers." I include myself as a server.

In all aspects of this service-learning project, we benefited from decisions that were made collaboratively. Tracey and I shared decisions about setting up the framework for research, but we both recognized our different strengths. As an experienced SAT coach, Tracey knew which materials we needed to buy for students. She knew how to run the class and teach the test-taking strategies. My experience with adolescents helped us realize that students would be more likely to attend a 3-hour after school course on a consistent basis if food and conversation were involved. I also worked with Tracey to help guide decisions concerning how to organize the research itself—the pre- and post-SAT tests, the interviews, transcribing interviews and coding data.

Although Tracey and I formed the core of this mentoring relationship, the university helped to support this project in different ways. First, they provided funds for the course materials, food, and research tools. They helped facilitate recruitment of students in the high-need urban school and assigned other Ozanam Scholars to help. My service with Tracey was written into my yearly report of service to the university, and I received a monetary award that was added to my base salary. In tangible ways, the university demonstrated its commitment.

Emerging Identity as an Engaged Scholar

As tantalizing as it is to position the entire mentoring experience as beneficial, I was still an untenured professor expected to provide service to the university as well as the community. I belonged to 10 committees. I attended departmental meetings for issues such as "undergraduate polices" and participated in sessions on grant writing. I was elected a "senator" for my school and attended senate meetings. I was also continuing to provide service to the community by organizing and researching two community-based research projects.

I initially perceived the entire Scholars Program service initiative as "service on the side" -- something to be nibbled on at my own convenience so that I could keep my limited time focused on what I understood mattered: Scholarship, Teaching and Service, in that order. Looking back, I can see that while the external conflicts remained, I repositioned not only the project, but my sense of what it means to be a scholar. In Moore & Ward's (2010) study of faculty who integrate teaching, research and community-focused service, they found that "Participants in this study have been able to build an active scholarly agenda integrating all

three roles which allows them to meet the expectations of the academy in ways that also reflect their personal passions" (p. 50).

I submit that there can be a danger to the seamlessness of that integration. Mentoring Tracey did not fit well into my integrated whole, and working with her, at least initially, was not a personal passion. Yet with support from the university and by expanding my own research agenda to include Tracey's study, and by struggling with the idea that not all of my research had to be directly participatory, I realized that being a scholar sometimes means teasing apart that which had been integrated and accepting pieces that might not seem to fit into a neat integration of research, teaching and service.

Although the competing obligations of the professoriate (Boyer, 1990) converged in ways that sometimes left me feeling stressed and overwhelmed, after four years of engaged scholarship, the categories of service, teaching, and research have become braided, albeit messily, into a professorial identity. I no longer think of service "for." It is service "with." And this has implications for helping us re-examine definitions of scholarship that is engaged.

Implications

Since Boyer's (1990) initial call to reconsider the idea of scholarship, there has been increasing interest in generating ideas about what it means to be a scholar, including the problematic idea that while teaching and service, or "outreach" counts more, demands for scholarly accomplishments has not diminished (Huber, 2002). As the demands of the professoriate expand, it becomes increasingly important to gain a more precise definition of what outreach and service means (Neumann & Terosky, 2007), especially as these activities become a more integral part of how faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure (Huber, 2002). My story helps position the idea of service and outreach as not only good for the community and for students, but for professors themselves. The "goodness" articulated here includes and goes beyond "feeling good" about doing good. In this story of service, we gain insights into how one professor negotiated the demands of the professoriate and, by embracing a "service on the side" project, discovered personal and professional growth.

The obligations I continued to meet as a matter of course during these 4 years remained; my teaching was expected to be stellar, my research ongoing and frequent, and my service to university and community prominent. Often and still, I am overwhelmed by the sheer immensity of the expectations and frightened by the consequences of failing. Just last month I watched another colleague clean out her office. Professors who have earned tenure have learned balance and, from my perspective, a large measure of enviable equanimity. Most of them, too, count service among their most important obligations. Colleagues who share the same values are as important to me as having the institutional support. In my department where I continue to learn how to be faculty, there is a freedom that comes with the competing obligations. My experience with mentoring a service-learning project shows me that I can, with support from the university and my department colleagues, make the world a better place,

engage in research that matters, and make a difference in the lives of students. There is no greater privilege and no greater joy for me than finding space to engage in difference-making scholarship. Perhaps, seen through this lens, mine continues to be a selfish service-learning scholarship. But I don't think so.

Conclusion

Professors who mentor students in service-learning projects have the opportunity to experience transformation in multiple ways. By intentionally cultivating, improving and developing relationships related to service-learning mentoring, professors stand to gain professional knowledge and experience personal growth while making a difference in the world. Their personal and civic development may be enhanced through service-learning—a finding previously relegated to students (Bringle et al., 2010; Hughes et al., 2009; James & Iverson, 2009; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000; Yeh, 2010). When professors mentor students engaged in service-learning, they address Boyer's (1990) call to tie scholarship more directly to social issues and problems in society and enhance their experiences of service, teaching, and scholarship.

Professors have obligations to their university, and many of my colleagues from other institutions, out of concern for tenure and promotion, understandably tend to align their service requirements with the needs of the university. As we've seen here, service can be conceived of as larger than service to departments and university schools. When conceptualized more broadly and historically, service to the community can provide transformative experiences for all stakeholders, including the university. Many institutions struggle with the priorities described by Boyer, but when departments and universities encourage the kind of service and scholarship described here and acknowledge work that turns on local issues, problems and questions as important for tenure and promotion, they can reassert the relevance of the university as an institution that strives to work with communities to improve lives.

I end this article acknowledging those who engage in scholarship that matters even when the tangible rewards for such service remain unacknowledged and underappreciated in their institutions. I urge all of us to write about our service for research. Together, we can create a new line of scholarship that may be valued for its important questions and transformational possibilities.

References

Alderman, D. & Powers, D. (1980). The effects of special preparation on SAT-verbal scores. *American Educational Research Association, 17*(2), 239-251.

Ayala, J. (2009). Split scenes, converging visions: The ethical terrains where PAR and borderlands scholarship meet. *Urban Review, 41*, 66-84. doi:10.1007/s11256-008-0095-9.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2004). Evolution of a constructivist conceptualization of epistemological reflection. *Educational Psychologist, 39*(1), 31-42.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2012). Building learning partnerships. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning 44*(1), 32-38. DOI:10.1080/00091383.2012.636002

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20.

Briggs, D. C. (2009). *Preparation for college admission exams.* (Report for the National Association for College Admission Counseling). Retrieved from National Association for College Admission Counseling website: http://www.nacacnet.org/research/publicationsresources/marketplace/documents/testprepdiscussionpaper.pdf

Bringle, R.G., Clayton, P.H. & Price, M.F. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning & Civic Engagement, 1*(1), 1-20.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Muthiah, R. N. (2010). The role of service-learning on the retention of first-year students to second year. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(2), 38-49.

Campbell, E. & Lassiter, L. E. (2010). From collaborative ethnography to collaborative pedagogy: Reflections on the other side of Middletown project and community-university research partnerships. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 41*(4), 370-385.

Cannova, T. & Schaefer, M. B. (2012). SAT coaching in unlikely places: Offering achievement test preparation to students with academic and economic need. *Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences, 11.* Retrieved from http://www.kon.org/urc/v11/cannova.html

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clayton, P.H., Bringle, R.G., Senor, B., Huq, J. & Morrison, M. (2010). Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional or transformational. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(2), 5-22.

Dyrness, A. (2008). Research for change versus research as change: Lessons from a Mujerista participatory research team. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 39*(1), 23-44.

Fellner, G. & Siry, C. (2010). Reconceptualizing the relationship between universities and schools: A dialectic and polysemic approach. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5*, 775-785. doi: 10.1007/s11422-010-9285-3.

Hechinger, J. (2009, May 20). SAT coaching found to boost scores—Barely. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com.

Huber, M.T. (2002). Faculty evaluation and the development of academic careers. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2002*(114), 73-83.

Hughes, C., Welsh, M., Mayer, A., Bolay, J. & Southard, K. (2009). An innovative university-based mentoring program: Affecting college students' attitudes and engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16* (1), 69-78.

James, J. H. & Iverson, S. V. (2009). Striving for critical citizenship in a teacher education program: Problems and possibilities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(1), 33-46.

Kennedy, R. H., Gubbins, P. O., Luer, M., Reddy, I. K. & Light, K. E. (2003). Developing and sustaining a culture of scholarship. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 67*, 1-18.

Lechuga, V. (2011). Faculty-graduate student mentoring relationships: Mentors' perceived roles and responsibilities. *Higher Education 62*(6), 757-771.

Neumann, A. & LaPointe-Terosky, A. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(3), 282-310.

O'Byrne, P. (2007). The advantages and disadvantages of mixing methods: An analysis of combining traditional and autoethnographic approaches. *Qualitative Health Research, 17*(10), 1381-1391.

O'Connor, J. S. (2006). Civic engagement in higher education. *Change, 52*(5), 52-58.

Peltier, G. (1989). Empowering students to improve their college admission test scores. *The Clearing House, 63*(4), 163-166.

Powers, D. & Rock, D. (1999). Effects of coaching on SAT I: reasoning test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 36*(2), 93-118.

Schaafsma, D. & Vinz, R. (2007). Composing narratives for inquiry. *English Education, 39*(4), 277-281.

Schaafsma, D. & Vinz, R. (2011). *Narrative inquiry: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Small, S. A. & Uttal, L. (2005). Action-oriented research: Strategies for engaged scholarship. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(4), 936-938.

Tilley-Lubbs, G. A. (2009). Good intentions pave the way to hierarchy: A retrospective authoethnographic approach. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(1), 59-68.

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

Vogelgesang, L. J., Denson, N. & Jayakumar, U. M., (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *The Review of Higher Education 33*(4), 437-472.

Wade, A. & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(2), 5-16.

Weerts, D. J. & Sandmann, L. R. (2008). Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities. *The Review of Higher Education, 32*(1), 73-106.

Yeh, T. L (2010). Service-learning and persistence of low-income, first-generation college students: An exploratory study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(4), 50-65.

Appendix

Tracey's post-study reflection about the Ozanam Scholars and service-learning:
The people that I met through the Ozanam Scholars Program really inspire me. The love they have for service and their dedication to it on a daily basis is so different from anything I had experienced before college. I had done some community service in high school, but nothing that compared to this experience. I learned that everyone has a story to tell and that the story you hear is not usually the story you expect. When learning about poverty and the homeless population in New York City I was able to meet with former homeless people and when they told their story it sounded like any one of our stories--like they were in college and an emergency happened in the family that forced them to leave, and then they could not afford housing because of the family members' health care expenses, and so they went homeless. These stories were stories of things that could happen to anyone at any time and it just humbled me. For my own project, I wanted to look further into the literature about SAT prep and what other researchers thought about the effects of SAT prep. I then designed a pilot SAT research project in the hope that it would be implemented by the Ozanam Scholars Program. Luckily, it was chosen and I was able to start my very own free SAT class that was provided to low socioeconomic students at the high school.

Teaching this class helped me realize just how important it is for people to have someone who believes in them. I learned the value of listening. Many of the students just wanted someone they could talk to and tell about their fears of the SAT. It was great place for people to vent about their fears of the SAT and also have someone there who picked up their spirits and could reassure them that if they studied and worked hard, it would pay off. The class was also a great place to talk about hopes for the future. Many of the students had colleges that they really wanted to go to and it was great to talk about this during dinnertime. This conversation emphasized the value of doing well on the SAT and encouraged the class to study.

One of the things I learned from the SAT class was how important dependability is to building relationships. Every week I was at the high school ready to help the students help themselves get into college, and it was their dependability that also allowed that to happen. One of the students told me a story of how her last SAT teacher would come one week and not the next week and how there were different teachers every week. She explained that she could not learn in this way and did not like going to that class. She explained she was happy we were there every week. This made me realize that by being present and willing to help every week, the students were more likely to come and give their best effort too. In addition, I relied on the students just as much as they relied on me. Without them the class would not have happened, and even if one student was absent, they were missed because the dynamic of the class had changed.

I will be sure to take this value of dependability to my future pharmacy career. Patients need someone who is dependable to help them get better. Having this trust will allow patients to be

more comfortable in taking the pharmacist's advice. They will also feel more comfortable in talking about the things that bother them and any questions they have, much like the students did during class. If the trusting relationship is there, the working together becomes a lot easier.

Working with my mentor, Dr. Schaefer, has given me many things. I learned through her many technical skills like how to go through the IRB process and how to write a research paper. I also learned from her how much I like academia and how I would love to work for St. John's as a professor one day. Through this experience I also learned many life skills that I will keep with me for life. It was through my experience with her that I feel more comfortable talking and working with someone who I look up to. I had never worked with a professor as closely before, and in the beginning it was intimidating. But she helped me be more confident in the work that I do and be comfortable in having a voice and an opinion on certain things. I used to be relieved when I would say something about the literature review search I was conducting and she would say, "I was thinking the same thing." Overall, I gained a great friendship and someone who I know cares about me and wants me to succeed.