

## **Table Themes and Facilitators**

### **1. Partnership Development**

- Dr. Robert SHUMER, *Research Associate & Lecturer, Curriculum and Instruction, University of Minnesota, United States*

### **2. Institutionalization of Service-Learning**

- Prof. Dayle M. SMITH, *Professor of Management and former Chair of the Organizations, Leadership and Society (OLS) Department at the University of San Francisco, United States*

### **~~3. Outcome-Based Measurement~~**

- ~~• Prof. Dwight E. GILES, Jr., *Professor of Higher Education Administration and Senior Associate at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education in the College of Education and Human Development, University of Massachusetts, Boston, United States*~~

### **4. Cross-Cultural/International Service-Learning**

- Prof. YEN Jen Chi, *Director, Service-Learning Center, Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan*

### **5. Student Leadership and Training**

- Ms. Nurredina WORKMAN, *Program Coordinator, Cal Corps Public Service Center, University of California, Berkeley, United States*

### **6. Critical Reflection**

- Prof. LAU Tai Shing, *Director, Service-Learning Programme, Chung Chi College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

### **7. Technology, Innovation and Service-Learning**

- Mr. Brant KNUTZEN, *Educational Designer, Teaching and Learning Centre, Lingnan University, Hong Kong*

### **8. Curriculum Design and Training**

- Dr. TENG Su Ching, *Head of the General Studies Programme and the University Core Curriculum at SIM University, Singapore*

### **9. Knowledge Transfer and Service-Learning**

- Ms. TANG Pui Yee, Phoebe, *Senior Project Officer, Asia-Pacific Institute of Ageing Studies, Lingnan University, Hong Kong*

### **10. Addressing 21st Century Challenges Through Service-Learning**

- Dr. Enrique ORACION, *Director of Research, Silliman University, Philippines*

**Table: 1**

**Theme: Partnerships for Service-Learning**

**Facilitator: Dr. Robert SHUMER, *Research Associate & Lecturer, Curriculum and Instruction, University of Minnesota, United States***

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- Partnerships built from empathy and emotional sharing—shared experience
- Constructivist curriculum → create meaning from experiences
- Who controls the partnership? “Any service program that doesn’t have learning component is doing a disservice”
- Need political side to service, otherwise just providing public services for free—need to demand and critically question why that service wasn’t there
- W.T. Chan fellowships: partnerships between China universities and US service providers

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Fellows learn how to do service
- US orgs learn “cultural competence” about Chinese
- We create models that can be transferred—Chan fellowship creates partnership to create models for fellows to take back with them
- “It’s not rigor, relevance, and relationships. It’s relationships, relevance, and rigor.” Establishing TRUST most important.
- Putnam: democracy works only with trust
- Need to redefine university definition of time so that students have enough time to build relationships—Shumer had student “immersion” program –3 courses (Sociology of Work, Ethnographic Research, Writing) join together and students commit 15 hours/week with community organization—that’s their year. Community organizations don’t want college students for 1-2 hours/week!

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- S-L amorphous concept that resists exact definition. Context matters
- A purist S-L program has no academic need but is driven by community needs.
- Find student interests and follow them, guide them into academic learning (we undervalue what students bring to the table).
- Why would universities want to promote S-L on institutional level? Because universities are privileged and take quite a bit from communities, but they want to give back—and they do so by giving responsible leaders as students.
- Need to understand community before entering and their strengths=“affirmative education”. Start with the good things and understand their skills/knowledge.

**Table: 2**

**Theme: Institutionalization of Service-Learning**

**Facilitator: Prof. Dayle M. SMITH, *Professor of Management and former Chair of the Organizations, Leadership and Society (OLS) Department at the University of San Francisco, United States***

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- How do schools become involved in S-L?
- Leadership
- How S-L is being developed into institutions that have pressure from government? (in developing countries)
- What challenges are faced by the institutions?
- Ways to promote S-L (strategies)

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Lack of resources in some places to carry out S-L
- Connect research with S-L
- Teaching, research, service linked together
- Lack of experience of S-L in China (NGO) because of politics
- Young, new professor--difficult to do so
- Honour of Service-Learning given to students to attract them

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- n/a

**Table: 4**

**Theme: Cross-cultural/International Service-Learning**

**Facilitator: Prof. YEN Jen Chi, Director, Service-Learning Center, Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan**

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- What are the biggest challenges for developing international programs?
- Success of Fu Jen
- Always attract students who are just interested in tourism

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Challenges: difficult to find the same vision/mission (build up the co-operation and trust)
- Some students just want to have fun → want to be a tourist
- Situation of W.T. Chan fellows: situation in the U.S. (sharing experience) → especially in Southern U.S.
- Discipline: student set the rules

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- Don't just teach students to go out on their own—join them and be a learning partner
- Partnership relations
- Home stay?
- Understanding our own culture
- Identity → Culture shock
- Cultural exchange
- Identity—how students can introduce themselves to those overseas

**Table: 5**

**Theme: Student Leadership and Training**

**Facilitator: Ms. Nurredina WORKMAN, Program Coordinator, Cal Corps Public Service Center, University of California, Berkeley, United States**

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- What kind of workshop/training organized by Workman?
- How to know we are the way to develop leadership (What is leadership?)
- How to make intrinsic motivation to others
- How do I know when I have skill/leadership?

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- When do you know that you have leadership? → take intention to act and reflect on yourself. Ask people.
- Leader vs. leadership (social change model of leadership): a group of people share some goal and work collaboratively to bring change
- Share same goals → hold people accountable (→ nagging). Motivation + permission.
- It's about motivation or ability?
- Kolb's Experiential Model
- Know who you are when you do

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- n/a

**Table: 6**

**Theme: Critical Reflection**

**Facilitator: Prof. LAU Tai Shing, Director, Service-Learning Programme, Chung Chi College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong**

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- How to help people to self-help when they only expect outsiders to help?
- Difference between reflection and critical reflection?

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Ask them questions, work out answer together
- To think and ask questions about the situation accurately!
- Generate obligation from what you do, not expecting to be thanked
- Break stereotypes and biases

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- n/a

**Table: 7**

**Theme: Technology, Innovation, and Service-Learning**

**Facilitator: Mr. Brant KNUTZEN, *Educational Designer, Teaching and Learning Centre, Lingnan University, Hong Kong***

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- What is Second Life?
- Can technology apply in less-developed countries?
- Real life vs. Second Life
- Impacts of Second Life

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Real life vs. Second Life
- The technology and the younger generation
- How to build up the world in Second Life, and the ideas coming from
- The products made by the Shantou students

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- The popularity of Second Life
- The technology advantages in China

**Table: 8**

**Theme: Curriculum Design – Getting Started**

**Facilitator: Dr. TENG Su Ching, *Head of the General Studies Programme and the University Core Curriculum at SIM University, Singapore***

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- Faculty not wanting to spend time on it. 50 faculty members
- Universities do not have such programs/curriculum. Not enough community partners.
- What kind of training for S-L students?
- What kind of training for faculty?

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Faculty rotated to be involved in S-L so no one feels burdened.
- Faculty can be incentivized—some research grants
- Instead of looking for community partners, students design projects first—or community based research projects

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- Make Service-Learning developmental so that students move from level 1 (Year 1) to level 4 (Honors Programme). This will also raise the level of quality in S-L. These S-L Honours students can become interns with Faculty to support them in S-L work.



**Table: 9**

**Theme: Knowledge Transfer Through Service-Learning**

**Facilitator: Ms. TANG Pui Yee, Phoebe, Senior Project Officer, Asia-Pacific Institute of Ageing Studies, Lingnan University, Hong Kong**

*1. Major questions raised from participants*

- What is knowledge transfer?
- Service Learning = Knowledge Transfer?
- What are the differences between the two?

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Service Learning is one of the viable and effective platforms for Knowledge Transfer to take place.
- Knowledge Transfer emphasizes much on the process while Service Learning is a teaching method.
- Service Learning, with the added perspective of Knowledge Transfer, works hand in hand to make a strong and sustainable impact on the society.
- Difficulties of promoting service-learning among students and teachers.
- The role of service-learning office/ SAO

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- Indonesian delegate: Service learning provides a platform for students to apply what they learn in the book to real life situation. The level of knowledge being transferred to the community is little but the students are taking an advantages of the platform, knowledge transfer could be another perspective added to the project
- Taiwanese delegate: Knowledge Transfer is an integral part of the service learning projects he is working in Taiwan, especially those cooperating with high schools. Students came up with creative way to conduct projects for the high school students on different topics
- Chinese delegate: The KT-SL perspective is being practiced too in mainland China, though it is in their early stage of development. University will organize students to deliver "manner/culture", "technology" and "Hygiene and Health" to the poor Northern part of China, leveraging on the knowledge they learned in the University. The model has a great potentials and breakfast discussion would serve the purpose of sharing knowledge and establishing partnership for meaningful KT-SL project.
- Hong Kong delegate: from HK PolyU the role of SAO in service-learning helps the teachers a lot. And discussed about the pros and cons of making service-learning compulsory in 334 Education system.

**Table: 10****Theme: Addressing 21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges through Service-Learning****Facilitator: Dr. Enrique ORACION, *Director of Research, Silliman University, Philippines****1. Major questions raised from participants*

- What are the major problems and challenges we facing in implementing service learning in 21st century? What're the solutions?

*2. Major topics/ideas of discussion*

- Major problems and challenges
  - Intercultural competence: to get people speaking different languages and from different cultural background to learn together. First, people have to speak one common language so that they can communicate with each other. Local students can partner with international students and help their peers. Second, they have to well prepare themselves before they join the program, e.g. they have to have some ideas about the place they are going to go.
  - Ageing population: Service-learning can help the growing population of old people. First, service-learning students get to know the needs and situation of the elderly so to promote further help in the future. Second, service-learning can also help promote family support to the elderly financially and psychologically.
  - Resources: Limited funding is available for service-learning.
  - Heavy workload of faculty: If faculty would like to incorporate service learning into his/her course, he/she has to take more extra work and spend more time, but no rewards or recognition for the extra work. Hence, some appropriate recognitions or tokens should be addressed to faculty, e.g. to reduce their teaching workload.
  - Student motivation: Getting student involved and feel interested in service learning curriculum, and learn better in SL programs are a challenge. Students usually treat the program as a part of the course requirement. Faculty should make their students more dedicated and make the reflection more excited, e.g. video presentation, and to reward them, e.g. more course credits. In addition, faculty can bring NGO or community partners to their classrooms to share with your students to get students committed. Students have to demonstrate what they learn in SL program.
  - Value and serve: It should be promoted to build up a caring society and a mission of "education for heart". Faculty should get students to do reflection, to prepare them psychological and mentally for their service learning.
  - Environmental issues.

*3. Further questions/new ideas*

- Apart from the topic, participants also shared their experiences of developing service learning in their own countries. In the US, there are some well-established organizations to support developing SL programs, materials and guidelines for faculty and program funds are available. However, in Philippines, a bottom-up approach was used. Faculty heard about the concept of SL and started implementing in school and then to promote this approach. In India, it was similar to Philippines', but they gained supports from the government to incorporate SL in teaching.