The

Atlanta

.... The critical thing about the
service-learning concept is the
hyphen.

> Lee Heubner
> Staff Assistant
> to President Nixon

.... When the Urban Corps interns came here in
June, we discovered there was no baseball
league for inner city kids and nearby
facilities were closed to them. We called
a meeting, talked with some key people, and
now have two leagues operating for 200 young
men.

> Karl Paul
> Atlanta Urban Corps Intern

Service -Learning

Conference

.... The need is to concentrate on ways of helping the young to realize the
potential of their new sense of purpose and spirit for service.... It places
upon our colleges and universities the obligation to examine their policies
and practices and to make those adjustments necessary for the proper
exercise of student participation.... Of the 350,000 young people taking
part in the College Work-Study Program, most have been employed on
their campuses. We would like to see the ratio reversed, with the ma-
jority working off-campus.

> James E. Allen, Jr.
> Assistant Secretary for
>   Education and U. S.
>   Commissioner of
>   Education

a report

on the inaugural meeting

June 30 - July 1, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Further information on the Conference may be obtained from:

Atlanta Service-Learning Conference
c/o The Atlanta Urban Corps
30 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404-524-8091

I. INTRODUCTION

The Service-Learning Concept

To serve and to learn; these fundamental goals of our society are en-
grained in the American rhetoric.

But how to serve? and how to learn? An institutionalized, bureau-
cratized 20th Century America has effectively limited the answers to these
questions. For "service to country" America legislatively requires mili-
tary duty only, which many of today's young people find morally question-
able. For "learning" we have complex university systems with limited abi-
lity to respond to the individual and with oftimes old-fashioned views of
what is education and what is not.

However, considerable attention is currently being given to the role
of universities in service to society. At one extreme, arguments are
heard that community involvement by an academic institution threatens its
integrity and drains its resources. At the other end of the spectrum of
opinion is the view of the university as a shaper of society with special
social responsibilities because of its objectivity, standards, and resources
of knowledge.

These arguments about campus-in-community may obscure fundamental
questions of the role of the community as an educational resource. Can the
university perform its primary functions of education and the discovery of new
knowledge without an involvement in society? Can educational institutions
develop the type of manpower needed by a rapidly changing society, both as
professionals and as citizens in a democracy, without including the resources
of societal experience in the educational process? How might community
service, sought by many students, best be designed as a learning experience
and integrated with other aspects of a total educational program?

It is the thesis of the convenors of this Conference--many of whom are at the interface between education and community--that by combining the needs and resources of education both will better be served. It is hypothesized that the tension between the practical urgent demands of community and the requirements of disciplined rational thought of education can be a very productive force for the development of society and for learning and the advancement of knowledge.

This combination of action and reflection, of experience and examination, this integration of service and learning can foster a style of life where education and vocation are parts of the same fabric and the gap between community and education is closed. Simply stated, then, service-learning is an integration of the accomplishment of a needed task with educational growth.

It is clear that greater student involvement in community affairs is coming--it is already here in many ways but it is growing. Students want it, agencies need their services, colleges increasingly are encouraging it. National legislation to supplement Peace Corps, VISTA, Teacher Corps, and other programs is under consideration in Washington: are we prepared to utilize these growing opportunities productively for all parties?

A new approach is both necessary and possible. It requires new meaning for "practicality," new openness to change, new commitment to experimentation, new acceptance of the ability of youth, and indeed new social institutions and attitudes . . . . to say nothing of competent human beings who are prepared to function in the new society.

It is to search for these new attitudes and processes that the Atlanta Service-Learning Conference is convened.

The Atlanta Service-Learning Conference

Although there is a growing inclination to accept the service-learning concept as a valuable element of a learning experience, there is relatively little understanding of how the abstraction can be translated into a practicable model. Local leaders recognized the urgency for developing this model. Consequently, the Atlanta Service-Learning Conference was organized in the spring of 1969 to explore the implications of the service-learning concept, to define the elements necessary for a successful program, and to structure and implement a program in the Atlanta area to serve as a model for similar programs in other urban centers. The diversity of the sponsoring organizations is evidence of the broadly based interest and support at both national and local levels for the development of this program. The list of sponsors includes:

> The City of Atlanta,
> The Atlanta Urban Corps,
> Economic Opportunity Atlanta,
> The Colleges and Universities of Atlanta,
> Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
> The Southern Regional Education Board,
> Volunteers in Service to America, and
> The Peace Corps.

With the addition of Atlanta businessmen and persons from outside Atlanta, the sponsors are representative of the persons who are participating in the conference. In the organizational meeting, the sponsoring agencies decided on a six-month period for the conference during which the participants might utilize all available resources and examine in depth several important aspects of the service-learning concept. In order to facilitate this type of study, the conference has been divided into six work groups: namely, service, learning, curriculum and inter-institutional relations, research, finance, and methods and programs.

Each of the work groups will meet in a number of individual sessions in order to study the topic, raise pertinent questions, and suggest possible answers. During the six-month period each work group will chair a formal session of the conference. These sessions will have the dual roles of first, allowing the host group to profit from the experience of the other participants and, second, giving each participant the opportunity to relate his area of interest and study to the complete work of the conference. Having profited from this exchange of ideas, each work group will produce a report to be submitted to a Steering Committee, composed of work group chairmen and representatives of the sponsoring organizations. This Steering Committee will chair the final session of the Conference, to be held in December. At this session the integrated report will be presented and a program will be proposed for implementation.

The first session of the Conference was held on June 30 and July 1 and attended by over 300 persons. The format of the initial meeting included a number of speakers, seminars to introduce participants to the concept of service-learning, and organizational meetings of the work groups. The balance of this report contains the keynote address by U.S. Commissioner of Education, James E. Allen, Jr., summaries of other speeches and discussions, and a list of participants who attended the inaugural session.

Coincident with the launching of the Conference has been the creation in 1969 of the Atlanta Urban Corps, a group of 220 students serving full-time throughout the summer with 15 city and 35 private non-profit organizations in Atlanta. Most Urban Corps members are funded on the basis of 80% from the federal College Work-Study Program and 20% from the employing agency. The Southern Regional Education Board under grants from the

Economic Development Administration, Office of Economic Opportunity and De-
partment of Labor is providing support along with the Atlanta businessmen and
foundations to cover administrative costs and stipends for interns not
eligible for the Work-Study Program. VISTA has assigned 25 associate
positions to operate under Urban Corps auspices.

Sam Williams, director of the Atlanta Urban Corps, points to the
relevance of the educational aspect of the program. Nine staff members
make up the evaluation team which is responsible for developing and
assuring an education dimension for each intern's summer assignment.
Five professors serve as counselors to lend technical and educational
assistance to individual interns and groups of interns, and one professional
and three student staff members in the office plan seminars and coordinate
other means of helping the interns make their summer work experiences
educationally relevant. Each student is required to present to the Urban
Corps a report on his internship at the completion of his service period.

Thus the Urban Corps, in addition to accomplishing needed tasks in the
community and offering both a summer job and a relevant educational experi-
ence to its members, provides a practical service-learning laboratory for
the Conference. Through observation of the Urban Corps and participation
of its members, the Conference is assured the necessary dialogue between
theory and practice.

This is the setting in which the Conference is convened. Each of a
variety of perspectives has a distinct contribution to make to the enter-
prise. Additional participants, assistance and information are welcome.
It is only a beginning. But if theory and practice, students and faculty,
public and private bodies interact in the manner outlined, the Conference
will have something significant to say to Atlanta and the nation by the end of
1969.

Remarks by James E. Allen, Jr.
Assistant Secretary for Education
and
U.S. Commissioner of Education

None of you would be here today at this conference on service-learning
if you were not aware of how different the educational needs of young
people are today from those of past generations. All of you know
that the needs of the new generation are defined by its aspirations.
And that aspiration is the edge of the great divide between the
generations.

For past generations,--and I mean not only the parents but the
older brothers and sisters of today's young people--the touchstone was
vocation. The career as a means to the economic ends of material
well-being. The career as a means to the psychological ends realized
in achievement, success, and prestige.

Sometimes, of course, members of preceding generations thought
of the career as an avenue of service to conceptions beyond the
self--there are many professions with a humanitarian dimension in both
theory and practice. But for most people, the furtherance of such ideals
as the betterment of society was accepted as an extra-curricular activity.
Something to be done after the serious business of the day, if time
permitted.

For large and increasing numbers of young people today this situation is not only changed but reversed. It is the pursuit of goals beyond the self that comes first and the money and success that take second place.

Clearly it will take a new kind of education to accommodate such a change in traditional ways of thinking about man and society. We are still in the process of identifying it, but some things we know.

For example, we can be sure that an education that fits the needs of young people today must be broader than the school. Among the many artificialities the young reject is the idea that the classroom and the library are the best, if not the only, places for learning. Today's youth is as bored with four wall abstractions as it is with materialism.

Today's youth want an education geared to realities more vital than either theory or things. It is less interested in ideas than in values. Young people want their education to take them past knowledge to wisdom, and past wisdom to action--the kind of action that can translate their energy and their vision into new patterns of life.

The "now" generation doesn't want to wait for any of this. It finds the old hierarchies an ineffectual structuring of society. It has no use for the protocol of power as we have known it.

The new attitudes of young people toward education and the life for which it is presumably preparing them are sometimes criticized as

irresponsible. But it is precisely responsibility that they are asking for. Some people think youth wants to start at the top and rearrange society without bothering to find out what makes our institutions operate. In my opinion, it is the other way around. Young people want first-hand experience with our institutions to teach them their sociology. They want to learn the mechanics of social change by experimenting where it can actually happen.

This is the positive side of activism. This is what has taken students out of classrooms and away from well-paid, conventional jobs, leading them instead into the Peace Corps, Vista, and the Teacher Corps. This positive activism has moved young people past the Peace Corps, Vista, and the Teacher Corps; it has inspired them to invent their own ways of reaching people who need help. Store-front schools, street academies and many other innovative institutions testify to their enterprise.

By now it is quite clear that the activism of the 1960's is much different from that of other decades. The meaning of the difference has been captured in the words of Arthur Mendel, professor of Russian history at the University of Michigan "Youth no longer speaks for itself; it defines an era."

At the same time, in all their eagerness for a chance to deal directly with the raw stuff of history, in the making, today's young

people continue to want what school in the old classroom-and-library sense of the word should and can give them. They want background against which they can measure their experience. They want an education that breaks down the old barriers between school and community without breaking down either the school or the community.

This is what work-study programs are all about. There is no trend in education more promising, and the Federal Government is wholeheartedly behind it. Secretary Finch and my colleagues in the Office of Education are convinced advocates of the work-study concept, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is actively involved in promoting it.

It is very much in line with President Nixon's emphasis on volunteer effort as the key to community renewal. The President has called for a national clearinghouse on voluntary activities, with a computerized data bank to make available information about what has been tried and where, how well it worked, and what the problems were. The student employees working at HEW this summer will help assemble information of this kind on the volunteer activities of the young.

As you know, HEW is responsible for administering a program of Federal grants to colleges which provides some 350,000 students with the opportunity to work on or off the campus during their college career. HEW can pay up to 80% of the wages of the students as they partake of the educational experiences of working in a wide range of socially constructive projects. The scope of their activities is as broad as the social scene.

Of the 350,000 young people taking part in such work-study programs, most have been employed on their campuses, but increasing numbers are employed in local government agencies, schools, hospitals and other organizations, public and private.

We hope to learn from student community service activities wherever they are taking place. In Michigan, for example, we know that students are leading the way in productive volunteer activities for various segments of the population of their state. Currently, some 10,000 student volunteers on the 27 different Michigan campuses, are engaged in projects many of which they have developed on their own initiative and maintain without much financial help from government sources. As an example of the varied and numerous projects, agriculture students from Michigan State University work together with inner city people in developing community garden cooperatives.

Elsewhere in the nation we find students contributing other types of social service to their communities. There is the Memphis Area Project South which sponsors "clothes closets" for needy families. Through this project, students also collaborate in planned parenthood programs in South Memphis and help in nutrition classes for low-income people.

Your own city has always been noted for its progressiveness. The fact that Atlanta is hosting the opening of the six-month conference is a fine example. It is equally encouraging to see Atlanta adopt the program of the Urban Corps as a model to meet urban needs.

Last summer there were 76,000 students employed in programs supported by Federal work-study funds.

This summer, the Office of Education will have 225 students on its own payroll. I should like to tell you something about the projected activities of these summer employees. A goal of the summer program is to promote communication between government and the youth community.

Some students will be organizing seminars for the Office staff on topics of concern and "relevance" to students today. Such topics include curriculum reform, university administration, urban universities, and an urban extension service. Other students will be researching programs and practices of the Office as related to student and youth participation. In particular we hope they will gather and analyze information on activities in the areas of work-study and volunteer community service, in order to help us determine where Federal involvement might be most constructive.

We can already begin to see the shape of some of the problems to be dealt with. One is how to get more of the students involved in work-study programs off the campus, into the community. We would like to see the ratio of on-campus to off-campus work reversed, with the majority working off-campus instead of the opposite situation which prevails now.

Another problem is how to overcome the dilemmas and disadvantages of the work-study program. Such as the difficulty of integrating new people into established organizations on a short-time basis. The accreditation dilemma—it is agreed that there should be recognition of service as a part of higher education, yet some universities have

found that formal accreditation of community work turns it into a
nine-to-five routine and diminishes dedication. However, other
universities and colleges have developed means for granting academic
credit to learning-service activities, making them integral to the
academic life.

These are not impossible problems. Like you, we believe that what
Aristotle said is true, "What we have to learn to do, we learn by doing."
We, too, will learn by doing.

We feel that we are opening up avenues of many kinds--between
youth and the larger community, between youth and government, between
the generations. We are committed to the new view of educational needs
that this implies.

The experience of groups like yours will be helpful to us as we
try to adapt the Federal Government's role to the changes taking place
in our society. We look forward to your recommendations as you review
and study the learning-service concept in the months ahead. I hope we
can draw on the report of your deliberations as a source of new models
for student contribution to community renewal.

With so much of the business of America and the world still
unfinished, it is heartening indeed to observe that perhaps the
greatest awareness of this unfinished business exists in the young.

The need, therefore, is to concentrate on ways of helping the young
to realize the potential of their new sense of purpose and spirit for
service. This involves intensive efforts -- far greater than yet

evidenced. It also places upon our colleges and universities the obligation to examine their policies and practices and to make those adjustments necessary for the proper exercise of student participation. So rather than challenging youth, it is they who are challenging us and it is, I believe, a most heartening and hopeful situation when exhortation is more needed by age than by youth.

# # # # # # # #

III.   INAUGURAL MEETING SUMMARIES

Welcome by Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr.

Atlanta's Mayor Ivan Allen opened the Conference on June 30 by focusing on the problems of the cities and the effect that young people can have on the solutions.   Allen defined the foremost urban problems as race, transportation, and financing of city services. He said that although "the structure of government is capable of coping with these problems...it is the failure of man to adapt which prevents the solution." "Atlanta," said Mayor Allen, "welcomes the entrance into city government of a group of concerned young citizens." He concluded that if the need is going to be met, it will be met by the youthful generation "that has the concern."

Service-Learning in Action in Atlanta: An Up-To-The-Minute Report

Chairman: Sam Williams, Director of the Atlanta Urban Corps

Members: Don Nelson, Georgia Tech Community Services Coordinator

Don Roe, Special Assistant to the President of Citizens and Southern National Bank

Charles Pyles, Associate Professor, Political Science at Georgia State College; Stern Intern Coordinator

Tara Swartsel, Atlanta Urban Corps Intern

Dan Sweat, Deputy Administrator, City of Atlanta

Atlanta Urban Corps

Sam Williams explained its purposes as:

(1) providing students with the practical educational

experience of learning through service to the local community.

(2) giving needed manpower to local agencies and community organizations

(3) encouraging students to not only learn about urban problems but to pursue careers in urban affairs.

He said that the Atlanta Urban Corps plans to grow from 220 interns in the summer of 1969 to 1000 interns in the summer of 1970. Also, plans are being made for a number of internships during the forthcoming academic year.

Georgia Tech Community Services Office

Don Nelson reported that the Georgia Tech community had thought that money could solve the problems of urban America. Now, he said, we are discovering that we can't live in a major city and not respond with some kind of feeling or action. It's no longer a question of money but how one commits himself to what's happening around him that really counts.

Dean Miller Templeton and he got together in November, 1969, and found that fifteen or twenty programs were being sponsored by Tech students, so the two of them formed the Community Services Coordinating Staff. Their primary objective was to coordinate the projects then operating and to try to get more students and faculty interested and involved. In the last few months he's had trouble just keeping up with what's going on!

Some of the projects students are involved in are: High Step, Free University, Techwood Tutorial, YMCA Institute of Understanding and the Tech Action Committee.

C & S Bank Community Action Programs

Don Roe reported that C & S Bank instituted the "Georgia Plan",

a "people to people program", in May of 1968. He said that it was an
action program on the part of private enterprise, without government
funds, to provide business opportunities to low income and disadvantaged
Americans. It is based on simplicity and sincerity and on four basic
assumptions:

(1) Two of the fundamental principals of democracy are government
by reason, not force, and the most good for the most people.

(2) Everyone wants to improve his standard of living.

(3) The incentive method is the best way to accomplish things.

(4) Government steps in to fill needs when business does not.

He said that the "Georgia Plan" was inagurated in Savannah with a
"spring cleaning" in which most of the volunteers came from two local
colleges, Armstrong and Savannah State. This was such a success that
in ensuing months thirteen other Georgia cities had clean-up operations.
In Atlanta, Vine City was the area affected. Altogether approximately
74,800 Georgians have participated in these clean-up endeavors. But,
he said, a one day clean-up won't solve problems. What comes afterwards
is most important. So the C & S Community Development Corporation was
established last winter with a budget of one million dollars. The
purpose of this organization is to provide funds for down-payment loans
so that first mortgage home financing can be obtained and to provide
equity capital for new businesses. So far, 1,000 families and twenty
businesses have directly benefitted from these loans.

The Stern Interns

Charles Pyles reported that three years ago the Stern Foundation
approached the American Society for Public Administration and said
that they had $30,000 available and would like to sponsor an internship
program, specifically for black students in public administration.

The challenge was not met at that time, but in the summer of 1968 the Georgia chapter decided to explore possibilities in this area. After one year of planning fifteen students from eleven colleges and five faculty advisors began a ten week work assignment in state and local government agencies. From over forty applications, the students chosen were selected on the basis of academic achievement, written expression, personality and character references.

Manpower Survey

Tara Swartsel reported that the Department of Labor is conducting a survey to find out how student manpower is being used in Atlanta. One student on each of ten campuses in Atlanta is researching to try to find out what is now available and what the potential is for service-learning at each college. When all the reports are compiled the schools will be compared and variations will be considered.

The Service-Learning Concept looks good, she said, on paper and looks like it would apply to everyone, but how can the concept be applied on all campuses without the curriculum becoming "gimicky"? Curriculum committees are jealous of class time. They don't want to use a professor's time and skills and have students taking time out of the classroom unless they see definite results in the field work as it relates to the classroom. She thinks this is the problem the participants of the service-learning conference must keep foremost in their minds.

Atlanta's Urban Observatory

Dan Sweat reported that five years ago Robert Wood, Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), saw a need for involvement of the academic community in the affairs of the local community. The

mechanism he envisioned was a system of urban observatories in major
metropolitan areas. The passage of the 1968 Housing Act enabled HUD
to assist in establishing urban observatories in Atlanta, Albuquerque,
Baltimore, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Nashville, and Washington, D.C.
The Atlanta Urban Observatory is based at Georgia State College and
has a close working relationship with City Hall, from which it originated.
It is also in the process of developing linkages with the other colleges
and universities in Atlanta.

Mr. Sweat said he believed that the Atlanta program has a head-
start because the Urban Corps program, whose philosophy is so close to
that of the urban observatory, is already in operation in Atlanta.

Address by Lee Heubner

Lee Heubner, staff assistant to President Nixon, addressed the
Conference at the dinner session on June 30. He struck a note of
caution, a note of perception and a note of hope for the participants:

> Let's be sure we have projects that make sense in
> terms of the people being served and the person being
> educated. Unless we're willing to do this rigorously
> and precisely and uncompromisingly, I don't think the
> service-learning program will be as successful as it
> really ought to be....

> The critical thing about service-learning is
> the hyphen....

> One thing under discussion in the White House
> is a federally-assisted program to support the
> position of campus service coordinator, someone to
> whom the students could visit to inquire about
> specific opportunities in community service. Also,
> the service coordinator would discuss with faculty
> members questions regarding academic credit and
> curricular changes related to community service.

Address by William Allison

Bill Allison, Director of Economic Opportunity Atlanta, spoke on June 30 on the "Needs of Urban America." He said that "these are troubled times. Our campuses are witnessing a revolutionary response by young people who want to do something about the world they live in. What happens on campus cannot be separated from what happens in the larger society." Allison urged cooperation between the academic community, government, and private agencies to solve the problems of the cities. He expressed a faith that the "Atlanta Service-Learning Conference is destined to spearhead the development of this union." He said that the idea of cooperation and union was long overdue. "Now is the time for them to work together." Allison concluded that participation is the key factor and, "service-learning is one way participation can be realized."

Service-Learning and National Programs

The national and international components of service-learning were highlighted at a symposium that included Tom Houser, Deputy Director of the Peace Corps; H. Jeffrey Binda, Executive Assistant to the Director of VISTA; Paul Cromwell, Special Assistant to the Director of the Teacher Corps and Michael Goldstein, Director of the Urban Corps National Development Office. Dr. Carl Wieck of Morehouse College was the moderator.

Noting that the Peace Corps had been in the service-learning business for eight years, Mr. Houser reported that "most returning volunteers say they learned more than they gave." Mr. Cromwell said colleges could become more relevant by working with businesses and

government agencies in arranging work assignments linked with classroom
studies.

Mr. Binda stressed the service aspect, saying it was vital, when
arranging for aid to the poor and disadvantaged, to assign persons
who can do the job well. Mr. Goldstein, former director of the nation's
first Urban Corps in New York City, outlined the program in which college
students serve with municipal agencies and are funded largely by the
College Work-Study Program.

The panelists agreed that experience in a service-learning
program would be valuable background for entry into a long term service
program. Also, it would help the participant to decide whether to
apply for such a service program.

Remarks by Edward DuCree and Arthur Hansen

The final session of the Conference dramatically focused on the
diverse and sometimes conflicting interests which must have a part in
determining the nature of a service-learning program. Ed DuCree,
director of Emory University's Upward Bound Program, called for the
examination of goals and effects of current service programs.

Quoting from Shakespeare's "Hamlet", DuCree said the question
remains, "to be or not to be." Black people want to be, to exist,
he stated. Service programs which fail to help people to exist as
human beings are of little or no use, he said. For example, he said
that some tutorial programs in which white volunteers teach black
children have the effect of impressing on the children the value of
being white rather than teaching them the a b c's.

Dr. Hansen, President elect of Georgia Tech, reminded the audience
of the university's traditional roles of learning and research.

Service to the community, which became a major goal of many universities following the land-grant act of a century ago, is also a legitimate goal, he said. The question is whether service per se is a learning experience and therefore deserving of academic recognition. Hansen said he would not want to accredit service experiences until he was convinced of their learning inputs.

A small demonstration decrying the effect of Georgia Tech's expansion on nearby residents interrupted Dr. Hansen's speech and led to an extended session in which heated debate gradually gave way to some fundamental problems in the areas of service-learning and black-white relations. A partial report on the exchanges is contained in Mr. DuCree's reply to a participant who described the role he was playing. Mr. DuCree said, "We don't want you to play a role; we want you to be a person."

Seminar Summaries

. Midway through the inaugural meeting, seminars were held to discuss all aspects of the service-learning concept and to assist participants in selecting a work group. The seminar chairmen were:

James Austin, Georgia Municipal Association

Robert Clayton, Spelman College

Clavin Cox, the Atlanta Constitution

Phillips Ruopp, Peace Corps

Russell Williams, Atlanta University

No conclusions emerged from the seminars, but among the comments and questions were the following:

How is learning-by-serving different from learning-in-the-classroom?

The service-learning concept may lead to a radical change in the concept of the university and education in general.

Government administrators must control service-learning programs, not colleges.

A consortium of colleges should run the service-learning program in Atlanta.

Can cultural empathy be taught?

High school students, drop-outs, and housewives should be in service-learning programs.

Urban Corps interns should receive academic credit for their learning experiences.

What criteria should be applied to matching an intern with an opening to insure that both performance and learning will be at a high level?

These observations, together with the questions posed in Section IV, will be considered by the respective work groups.

IV. WORK GROUP SUMMARIES

The Conference is functioning primarily through its six work groups: service, learning, curriculm and inter-institutional relations, finance, research, and methods and programs. Each work group is to marshal available resources, study in depth its assigned topic, sponsor a session of the Conference, and submit a report describing its observations and recommendations leading toward a comprehensive model for a continuing service-learning program.

Sponsorship and dates of subsequent Conference sessions are as follows:

Service	August 18
Learning	August 19
Curriculum	mid-September
Finance	October
Research	November
Methods and Programs	November
Steering Committee	December

Below are summaries of the first work group meetings on July 1 and some of the questions each is exploring.

Service Work Group

Chairman: Ross Coggins, Regional Director of VISTA

Ross Coggins opened the discussion by asking those present to mention what services students are now doing or could do in regard to service-learning. The discussion of this question raised many others, most of which were left unanswered. It will be the purpose of this group to answer such questions as:

(1) What criteria define relevant services and who should have priority in determining the relevance or potential learning experience of a service-type job?

(2) Can agencies and colleges cooperate among themselves and with each other in the rendering of services?

(3) Who is to be served: the student, the college, the agency or the people, or a combination of all?

(4) Are universities attuned to the needs of the community and can they accept the idea that a service career mode is vital to our society?

(5) What should be the size of the service rendered, in comparison with societal needs?

(6) Should service be full-time or part-time and how long should it last?

(7) What services can agencies accept and what kinds of agencies can accept youth in service?

(8) Does tutoring, etc., satisfy the needs of the "now generation" with their sense of urgency and need to see quick results?

(9) What do students think are the major service needs and will the university allow the student to work for meaningful change in the system?

Learning Work Group

Chairman: Sally Cantor, Atlanta Urban Corps Intern

The meeting of the section on Learning was begun by a description of the Mars Hill Project, its origin and outline. One enthusiastic professor was given a grant to instigate and develop interest in the concept of service-learning. He looked into curriculum and local service opportunities. It began with a tutorial program and then a recreational program. This became the field work for physical education, sociology, etc. The communication which is necessary for this to come about smoothly is possible in a small school. There is a problem in the structure of a large university which makes it almost impossible to integrate this kind of learning. How might this be overcome?

Many segments of society are concerned with this kind of learning taking place. Students are the largest mass of participants. Thus the training ground for students, i.e. the university, must be changed first. There are places in the traditional college structure which could be changed to be more in line with this new concept. For example, in the practice-teaching part of an education major. Instead of being a complete block of time at the end of the learning period, it would be more relevant and thus valuable to have the

practice-teaching interwoven with the academic study, over a greater length of time.

Practical experience makes theory more concrete but it requires a place to plug into the traditional curriculum. Practice-teaching is an easier area to see the possibilities; but how can this type of learning be given academic credit in other courses? You can learn something from anything you do if you are perceptive, but to be given academic credit what one is doing must be put to academic analysis.

Learning is not just of one type; it consists of different processes. What kind of learning happens when one is put in a context of people and problem-solving? If the ultimate goal is being sensitive to each other, how can one avoid complete relativism? Perhaps this is only a part of the desired goal and can be fitted into the whole as a matter of degree. It would be valuable to question an intern to see if his learning can be classified, if an analysis can be made of the learning possibilities. It is very important, however, that this not become Step 1, 2, 3 on how to become a successful learner.

There is always the problem of how to bring out what has been, or is being learned. It is difficult to bring life-style to a conscious level where it must be for our purposes. It will be necessary to compare the goals and patterns of both traditional university-learning and service-learning. For example, a university stresses committment to truth, to principle; service stresses committment to people, to becoming involved with those around you. In university-learning, decisions are made after all the facts are gathered and a logical assessment of them has been made. With service-learning, the situation demands that action must often be taken without all the facts, by a "feel" for the right moment of what seems the most viable alternative. One must have confidence to do this and live with the consequences, be willing to make changes as factors change priorities.

Questions to be considered by the work group include the following:

Can learning take place in roles which students consider socially irrelevant?

How can students be helped to grasp the broader implications of what they really learn by serving?

What relationship exists between individual student goals and the choice of alternative service opportunities?

How can students be helped to raise the important, relevant questions about their service experiences?

How can interested, knowledgeable, and accessible faculty be identified and enlisted in the service-learning experience?

What implications of experience-based learning are pertinent to higher education in general?

How, in fact, do students learn from experience? How can it be measured?

How can community needs, student interests, and university programs interact to yield significant learning on the part of everyone involved?

What methods and techniques are most effective in preparing students for their job and community roles?

Curriculum and Inter-Institutional Relations Work Group

Chairman: Dr. William W. Pendleton, Professor of Sociology, Emory University

In the opening meeting of the curriculum work group there was a very general discussion of the problems involved in incorporating a service-learning program into established academic framework of higher education.

A question was raised as to whether a service-learning program was a legitimate element of any academic program. There was some debate as to whether it could be considered the responsibility or even a legitimate function of a university to provide the student with a broadening experience. It was decided that one of the major tasks of the work group would be the development of a structure which would insure that the student utilized the full learning potential of the service experience.

Several suggested elements of this structure were: faculty advisors, seminars, and student reports.

There were other questions concerning the basic structure of the program. For example: How would service-learning experiences be integrated into the existing departmental structure? On what basis would credit be given? What would be the ratio of hours worked to credit-hours received? How many credit-hours of service-learning could be counted toward graduation? What channels, such as independent study, special programs or seminars with labs, already exist which could be used as a mechanism for giving credit for a service-learning course?

Certainly the most valuable product of this initial meeting was an awareness of the complexities of the problems confronting the work group. A number of questions were raised, several others will be focused on at later meetings. The following questions are a few of those for which the curriculum work group will attempt to provide conclusion.

What courses now exist as training for other forms of service which could be relevant to service-learning programs?

What inter-institutional relations now exist which could be utilized and developed for internships and program development?

What effects will the service-learning experience have on student expectations in the curriculum area?

What are the potentials of a faculty consultant service?

What are the possibilities for utilizing community members as instructors or resource people within the classroom?

What are the possibilities for and problems of cross-crediting among institutions?

Finance Work Group

Chairman: William Jones, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Presiding: Charles Hamblen and Charles Moore, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

The first questions raised about funding were: who, how much, and how? It was stated that the program was not to be directed by the Federal government, but that the government should be a source of funds, primarily through legislation.

Mr. Hamblen reviewed what was available through Federal programs. He said that perhaps the best sources have suffered a cutback in appropriation (the Cooperative Education Program and Education for Public Service), but they might be refunded in the next fiscal year. Mr. Hamblen was asked how to go about requesting Work-Study funds. He said that the application must be made by an institution by November 1st. If the institution includes a proposal for meaningful off-campus activities it will receive priority in the allocation of Work-Study funds. It was remarked that many colleges did not use a large amount of their funds or did not include descriptions of off-campus activity in their requests for funds. The funding for such a proposal would be 80% federally funded and 20% funded by the agency.

Discussion then centered on the study made by 22 Republican Congressmen concerning student unrest. Their recommendations were:

1. Don't cut off funds to institutions which have experienced student rebellions.

2. Establish a National Youth Foundation to encourage student participation in community problems.

3. Increase funds for student aid.

4. The government should expand its lines of communication with students.

In addition to raising money from federal programs, it was suggested that service-learning projects approach foundations and businesses as they might have greater flexibility in awarding funds for the purposes of the particular project. It was stated that a program already under way might stand a good chance of obtaining support as it would demonstrate committment to the idea.

Other suggestions were that students are good at maximizing funds if allowed to go after them, and that students should be a part of the decision-making process when financial aid officers submit plans for utilizing Work-Study funds.

Additional questions to be examined by the work group are:

(1) In funding service-learning programs, what share should be borne by the agency being served? by the student of an educational institution? by the government?

(2) How should the Atlanta Urban Corps be financed in the future?

(3) What proportions of Work-Study funds should be spent on off-campus service activities?

(4) Should all students in a service-learning program receive a stipend for their services?

Research Work Group

Chairman: Timothy Ryles, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Georgia State College

The immediate objective of the research work group is to determine the availability of student manpower for service-learning programs in Atlanta. With over 40,000 college students in metro Atlanta, a Conference-related survey is being made to find out how many of them would be interested in service-learning projects, and under what conditions (such as stipends and academic credit). Surveys are also being conducted to determine the demand for students in service-learning programs, attitudes of employers toward them, and attitudes of student interns.

Over the longer range the work group plans to consider ways of involving students in research and ways of linking research on service-learning with the curriculum.

It was agreed that the quality of research should not be compromised simply to give students responsibility for it. Thus, some students will need training in research methodology.

The work group agreed to try to identify "what we don't know about service-learning." As an example of a practical research project, it was suggested that a study be made of what makes a "good" Urban Corps placement and what makes a "bad" one. Such research would be conducted in close cooperation with the Urban Corps staff.

Methods and Programs Work Group

Chairman: William W. Allison, Economic Opportunity Atlanta

Presiding: John Cox, Atlanta Youth Council

The work group decided to begin by finding out what methods are used by other intern agencies in the nation. Michael Goldstein was named national chairman of this field work group. Other members are:

Phyllis Atkins, Truly Bracken, and Cynthia Knight--Atlanta
Margaret Davis--Athens, Georgia
Gordon Drennen--Georgia
Tim Collins--North Carolina
John Bromley-Kentucky and Tennessee
Alga Hope--Florida
Sandra Mincey--Alabama
Kent Christison--Virginia

After obtaining basic information on existing programs in service-learning, the work group decided to consider alternative methods and examine possible ways in which the Conference should relate to other programs.

V. ATLANTA SERVICE-LEARNING CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Ivan Allen, Jr.-City of Atlanta
James E. Allen, Jr.- U. S. Office of Education
*William Allison-Economic Opportunity Atlanta (EOA)
Walter Anderson-EOA
James Austin-Georgia Municipal Association
Yvonne Bankston-EOA
H. Jeffrey Binda-VISTA (Washington, D.C.)
John Blakley -Stern Intern
William Boone, Jr.-Stern Intern
David Bootier-Southern Regional Education Board (SREB-Tennessee)
John Bromley-Peace Corps (Tennessee)
Norman Brooks-U.S. Office of Education
Charlotte Buford-SREB (Georgia)
*Linda Bulloch-SREB (Georgia)
Stephanie Bush-Stern Intern
Russell Caldwell-SREB (Georgia Municipal Association)
Kenneth Christison-SREB (University of Virginia)
Mary Ann Carroll-Peace Corps (Georgia)
Robert Clayton-Spelman College
Lee Clowers-Florida Governor's Office
*Ross Coggins-VISTA (Georgia)
Timothy Collins-Guilford College
William Combs-Peace Corps (Texas)
Calvin Cox-Atlanta Constitution
John Cox- Atlanta Youth Council
William Cozzins-Georgia Tech
Paul Cromwell-Teacher Corps (Washington, D.C.)
Terrence Cullinan-Stanford Research Institute
Kenneth Darnell-Defense Contract Administration Service
Margaret Davis-Stern Intern
Sue Day-U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Georgia)
Michael Douglas-Atlanta University
Edward K. Downs, Jr.-Stern Intern
* Carthur Drake-Morehouse College
Gordon Drennen-Stern Intern
Eleanor Duckett-Mars Hill Community Development Institute
Edward DuCree-Emory University Upward Bound
Noel Dunivant-North Carolina Resource Development Internship Program
Roscoe Dunlap, Jr.-Stern Intern
Elizabeth Dyer-Peace Corps (Georgia)
* Donald J. Eberly-National Service Secretariat
David L. Edwards-SREB (Lynchburg College)
James Elens-SREB (Mars Hill College)
David Ford-Stern Intern

*Members of Conference Steering Committee

Casey Fredrick-Mars Hill College
Michael Goldstein-Urban Corps National Development Office (New York)
Claude B. Green-Clemson University
Katherine Griggs-SREB (South Carolina)
David Grubbs-Middle Tennessee State University
Douglas Haire-SREB (Georgia State College)
Charles Hamblen-U.S. Office of Education (Georgia)
Grace Hammonds-Stern Intern
Arthur G. Hansen-Georgia Tech
Michael Hart-SREB (Georgia)
James Hertenstein-Georgia Tech YMCA
Lee Heubner-Office of President Nixon
Richard Hoffman-Mars Hill College
Lois Hollis-Stern Faculty
Solomon Hollis-Stern Faculty
*Edward Holmes-Emory University
Alga Hope-SREB (Florida A & M University)
Martin Hope-Georgia Department of Family and Children Services
Roma Hopper-Georgia State College
John Hough-Mars Hill College
Thomas Houser-Peace Corps (Washington, D.C.)
John Howard-Wheat Street Baptist Church
James Irwin-Georgia Municipal Association
Enoch Johnson-EOA
Joy Jones-EOA
*William Jones-HEW (Georgia)
Tyrone Joubert-Stern Intern
Ernest M. Kahn-University of Maryland
Anders Kaufmann-SREB (South Carolina)
Patrick Kelly-Georgia Tech
Daniel Kendrick-Georgia Department of Family and Children Services
Jane Kibler-Urban Training Organization
*Joseph D. Kimmins-Peace Corps (Georgia)
Earl O. Kline-Georgia State College
Paul Knipper-Peace Corps (Louisiana)
Joseph Kushner-Valdosta State College
Alex Lacey-Georgia State College
Antoine Laiche-Peace Corps (Georgia)
H. Page Lee-Mars Hill College
Earl Leininger-Mars Hill College
Carol Lim-American Friends Service Committee
Elearnor Main-Emory University
John Mallet-Psychologist, Atlanta
Thomas Manley-North Carolina State Planning Task Force
Kathy Marks-SREB (Georgia)
Jenifer Mauldin-Fulton County Health Department
William E. McMurry-Georgia State College
Lou Moelchert-Mars Hill College
Toby Moffett-HEW (Washington, D.C.)
Charles Moore-U.S. Office of Education (Georgia)

E. Phillip Morgan-Emory University
Robert Mostellar-Southern Regional Council
Ukanga C. Mudakha-Stern Faculty
Donna Mull-SREB (Georgia)
Ryland Needom-Stern Intern
Donald Nelson-Georgia Tech Community Services
Gloria Nelson-Peace Corps (Georgia)
* Robert Nelson-Peace Corps(Georgia)
John Niblock-SREB (Georgia)
Jerry Norris-Stern Intern
Patrick Ntukogu-Morehouse College
William O'Connell-SREB (Georgia)
David Palmer-Georgia State College
* William Pendleton-Emory University
Mario Perez-Reilly-Middle Tennessee State University
Rogbert Phillips-Stern Intern
George Podelco-City of Nashville
Roger Prior-U.S. Department of Commerce (EDA-Washington, D.C.)
Charles B. Pyles-Georgia State College
Frank Raines-White House Fellow
* William R. Ramsay-SREB (Georgia)
Sara H. Reale-Georgia State College
Doris Richardson-YWCA (Georgia)
David Roberts-Southern Education Foundation
Donald Roe-Citizens & Southern National Bank, Atlanta
Jack W. Rollow-Georgia State College
Thomas Roth-Mars Hill College
Marlene Rounds-SREB (Atlanta University)
Phillip Ruopp-Peace Corps (Washington, D.C.)
Roger Rupnow-Georgia Tech
Wendell H. Russell-Oak Ridge Associated Universities
* Timothy Ryles-Georgia State College
Logan Sallada-U. S. Office of Education
Charles Sanders-Stern Faculty
Paul Sholar-Mars Hill College
Robert Sigmon-SREB (Georgia)
Doris Sims-Stern Intern
Peter Skinner-Peace Corps (Florida)
Dora Skypeck-Emory University
Margaret Ruth Smith-SREB (Georgia)
Janis Somerville-North Carolina State Planning Task Force
Sandra Spruill-City of Atlanta, Aviation Department
Gideon Stanton, III-Tulane University
Mary Stevens-Emory University
Lonnie Stewart-SREB (Georgia State College)
Daniel Sweat-City of Atlanta
Levi Terrill-VISTA (Georgia)
Barbara Thompson-National Student YWCA

Sherman Thompson-University of South Florida
William Traylor-Emory University Legal Services Center
Wallace Tyner-Peace Corps (Texas)
Simeon Udunka-EOA
Princella Wade-Stern Intern
Merle Walker-Agnes Scott College
Phil Walker-Georgia Tech
W. P. Walker-Mars Hill College
Frank Walls-City of Savannah
Oliver Welch-State Planning Department
Plemon Whatley-EOA
Anthony Whedon-Morehouse College
Daniel White-Georgia Tech
Carl Wieck-Morehouse College
Larry R. Williams-Office of Economic Opportunity (Georgia)
*Russell S. Williams-Atlanta University
Dorothy Wilson-Atlanta Public Library
*Prince Wilson-Atlanta University Center Corporation
Kenneth Wittemore-Fulton County Health Department
Michael Wittman-Florida Governor's Office
J. McDonald Wray-University of Georgia Institute of Government
James Wyatt-Mars Hill College
Gayle Yates-HEW (Georgia)

ATLANTA URBAN CORPS INTERN PARTICIPANTS

Linda Alexander	Rose Haywood	Betty Peters
Rudine Arnold	Ernest Henderson	John Petzelt
Phyllis Atkins	Janice Herring	Susan Pickard
Burnley Bainbridge	Dorothy Hicks	Sanford Prater
Stanley Ball	Joseph Hill	Bessie Quillens
Edwin Barrett	Elizabeth Hillbrath	Gene Roberts
Franklin Benfield	Joan Hollenbach	Linda Robinson
Manie Berk	John Hotard	Tim Rogers
Solomon Berry	Mostaffa Howeddy	Russell Rucker
Jacqueline Blackwell	Narma Ingram	Lloyd Sanders
Walter Bloom	Martha Irby	Valerie Scalera
Marianne Boder	Tommy Isaac	Michael Silberstein
Carol Bonner	Margaret Jaccino	Carol Simmons
*Truly Bracken	Rudolph Jefferson	Teia Sinkfield
Regina Brackston	* Babs Kalvelage	Deborah Small
Jane Bridges	Alvin Keck	Christine Smith
Charles Brown	Kathleen Kennedy	Janie Snider
Lisebeth Brown	Lloyd Keys	Tom Snider
Robert Brown	Steve Kiemele	Valinda Spalding
James Bruce	Ria Kirshstein	Jim Spence
*Sally Cantor	Cynthia Knight	Julius Stephens
Raines Carroll	Maureen Kreger	Michael Stubbelfield
Steve Chandler	Judith E. Lange	Evans Sturdivant
Roosevelt Childress	* Melinda Lawrence	Tara Swartsel
Charles Choice	Stephen Lester	Charles Thomas
Dan Christenberry	Diane Lewis	Jerry Thompson
Nancy Cogoran	King Fun Liang	Constance Thurmand
Richard Combes	Andrea Luce	Valerie Tomlinson
Brenda Comer	Gordon Lurie	Bill Travis
Diane Cousinea	John Mann	Sally Tucker
Careatha Daniels	Jon Martin	Larry Tully
Mary Daniels	Jenifer Mauldin	John Tumlin
*Mark Dash	Anna Maycaux	Betty Underwood
Sylvia Dawson	Emmett McCord	John Waggener
Inmond Deen	Albertine McCrary	Carol Watkins
Sarah Dennard	Patricia McLaughlin	Patricia Watkins
Pamela Dozier	Joseph Menez	Paula Whatley
Walter Dricer	Bill Millkey	Coloria Wheeler
Peggy Durrah	Alan Miller	* Dave Whelan
Joanne Flemister	Ken Millwood	Ben White
Michael Floyd	Sandra Mincey	Dawn White
Grange Fretwell	Addie Mitchell	Roslind Williams
*Kytle Frye	Madie Moore	* Sam Williams
Beverly Gaither	James Mulligna	Olivia Williamson
Maggie Gerber	Carmencita Myrick	Diane Wilson
Frank Goodson	Harold R. Nash	Susan Windom
Mary Ellen Gordon	Helen Newman	Mike Winston
Beverly Grimes	Nancy Ann Norbert	Gary Wood
Alice Hamilton	Shirley Owens	June Woodward
Resna Hammer	Richard Padgett	Carolyn York
David Hanley	Bill Patterson	Sue Zander
Charles Haynes	Belinda Pennington	