CLEARvoz Journal Vol. 5, NOs. 1-2, (2019)

CLEARvoz Journal

CLEAR | Center for Leadership Equity and Research

Uncharted Territory:
The Nexus Between Doctoral Education and Community-based Learning

Elizabeth C. Reilly, *Loyola Marymount University*
Bryan P. Sanders, *Loyola Marymount University*

Abstract: One of the continual challenges facing professors who prepare TK-12 school leaders through the professional educational doctorate (Ed.D. degree), is ensuring a theory-to-practice framework, curriculum, and pedagogy. Furthermore, professors of doctoral programs whose orientation is social justice, often face the dilemma of how to infuse it as a cross-cutting issue with the theory-practice paradigm. Community-based learning (CBL), when embedded with social justice claims, can serve as a bridge between theory and practice, providing doctoral students with opportunities to achieve both goals. This qualitative case study engaged with this dilemma by investigating the efficacy of a community-based learning component that had been infused into a core doctoral leadership course. Through interviews with doctoral students, we sought to understand their perception of its connection to the program's social justice orientation, as well as the benefits, challenges, and recommendations for the efficacy of community-based learning. Students' input guided future course revisions that establish a clearer relationship among social justice themes, the program's learning outcomes, and the theory-praxis paradigm.

Keywords: *community-based learning, doctoral education, educational leadership, professional doctorate, service-learning, social justice*

Professors who prepare TK-12 school leaders through the professional educational doctorate (Ed.D. degree) face the ongoing challenge of ensuring a coherent and cohesive theory-to-practice framework, curriculum, and pedagogy (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2019; Perry, 2012). When courses principally focus on theory, educational leaders may not see the relevance to their daily work. Likewise, applications-oriented curriculum without sound theoretical bases results in leadership practices that lack fundamental empirical grounding and theory that arise from that scholarship. Scholars have documented this dilemma extensively, as the Ed.D. has undergone extensive re-envisioning nationally through the scholarly endeavors, praxis-oriented work, and collaborative efforts of over 100 Ed.D.-granting universities who are members of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) (Buss, Zambo, Zambo, Perry, & Williams, 2017; Perry, 2016).

Furthermore, professors of doctoral programs whose orientation is social justice are often left with the dilemma of how to infuse issues of class, equity, gender, race, and other related topics as cross-cutting issues within the theory-practice paradigm (Carnegie Project on the Education

Doctorate, 2019; McNae & Reilly, 2018; Noguera, 2001; Reilly, 2016; Reilly & Bauer, 2015; Santamaría & Gaëtane, 2014; Strom, Porfilio, & Lupinacci, 2016). First, the Ed.D. programs must seek to explicate a theory of social justice leadership (Theoharis, 2007). Second, the doctoral program's mission should both clearly state social justice claims and provide the means of operationalizing and evaluating them (Peterson, Bright, & Mukhopadhyay, 2016).

Community-based learning (CBL), when founded on social justice claims of personal and social consciousness of the conditions that affect society's cultural, political, social, and economic circumstances, invites a moral imperative to address them with tactics, strategies, and interventions (Freire, 1970). It is what makes the difference between volunteering one's time and seeking to transform civil society (Mitchell, 2008). CBL can likewise serve as a bridge between theory and practice, providing doctoral students with opportunities to achieve both goals. If the intent of the theory-to-praxis nexus is to make authentic change, and the foundation of that thinking is a recognition of the deep injustices woven into the fabric of society and the necessity of transforming power, then the struggle of how to enact those changes should become part of the CBL project (Freire, 1970).

The following research question guided this institutional review board-approved qualitative case study: How can community-based learning support the goals of a doctoral program focused on educational leadership for social justice? We sought to address how graduate students can engage in genuine change while acknowledging historical injustice. We investigated the efficacy of a community-based learning component that had been infused into a core doctoral leadership course. Through interviews with doctoral students and a review of relevant documents such as notes of class meetings focused on CBL and the students' post-CBL evaluations from their community partners, we sought to understand their perceptions of the relationship to the program's social justice orientation.

In the conversations, students explored the efficacy of CBL in the context of their course by discussing its benefits and challenges. They concluded by providing recommendations for improving the CBL model. Students' input guided future revisions to establish a clearer relationship among social justice themes, the program's learning outcomes, and the theory-praxis paradigm.

A year in advance, we planned the changes for a doctoral course titled, *Transformational Leadership for Student Achievement*—a part of the Ed.D. for Educational Leadership for Social Justice in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University (LMU). The course redesign incorporated an evaluation tool to assess the use of community-based learning through an exploratory qualitative case study. We designed this study to examine students' perceptions and experiences of community-based learning as support for the goals of the doctoral program and the course. The study further examined student perceptions of the access and barriers to including community-based learning in doctoral education. Through interviews with the students engaged in community-based learning projects and data from the community partners, we sought to uncover what promoted and inhibited their work. Finally, we sought student and community partner recommendations for improving the use of CBL in doctoral education.

Through this investigation, we provide a model that faculty and administration can use to consider, examine, and evaluate their use of CBL in doctoral courses. We also reflect on the benefits and challenges we faced in implementing CBL. We conclude with recommendations for the use of community-based learning with the goal of supporting social justice in graduate level education and suggestions for future research.

Positionality of the Principal Investigators

The "we" in this article primarily refers to two individuals. Chair and Professor of Educational Leadership and Administration, Elizabeth C. Reilly, initiated this course revision over a year in advance of its implementation by writing and receiving a competitive University grant that permitted her to work with University CBL staff. Bryan P. Sanders, who has since earned his doctoral degree, served as co-principal investigator and was a first-year doctoral student enrolled in the class that we investigated. Together, with input from LMU's Director of Community-based Learning, Lezlee P. Matthews, Ph.D., we co-constructed and executed the investigation.

We offer here some additional background about ourselves that provides context for our commitment to doctoral education, to social justice, and to community-based learning.

Elizabeth C. Reilly.

Education gives individuals possibilities. From the time I was a young child, this was the message that my mother, a Mexican immigrant, and my father, a second-generation Italian-American, relentlessly repeated. It is therefore no surprise that I view them as my first teachers—the ones who instilled in me the fervent and passionate drive to become educated and to become an educator. Somewhere in the foggy mist of my early years of teaching and my first administrative position in the K-12 educational system, I came to recognize with growing clarity that being a teacher meant being above all a learner, and that being a school leader meant being a teacher of teachers. John Dewey said that it is not enough for a man [or woman] to be good, but that he or she must be good for something. I saw that it was my work to see the gifts in others—both children and colleagues—and to help them discover these gifts and to use them wisely. I experienced novelist George Eliot's words in very real ways: "What do we live for if it is not to make life less difficult for each other?" This, then, is the fundamental purpose of education, the goal of teaching, and my work as a teacher, scholar, and educational leader.

Bryan P. Sanders.

Raised in a family of tinkerers and teachers, every day contained learning with books and learning by breaks. New ideas were revisions of reality and broken objects were opportunities to see what was inside. This approach to living had a deeper significance that emerged as I gained consciousness and began to understand my grandparents' stories. My mother's family escaped Hitler's Poland and my father's father fled, as a child, from Lenin's Russia. These were big ideas for a small me, and they heavily shaped how I view ingenuity, bravery, risk-taking, and the impact that society has on the individual. The world appeared beautiful and broken to my young mind. I could see that I had plenty to read about and just as much to repair. My concerns for social justice and constructivism developed far earlier than I was aware of those words. I became a young activist in my neighborhood and then began my K-12 teaching career at age 23. To this day, in my work with students, we tinker, we read, we collaborate, and we develop ways to improve and heal the world.

Structure of the Article

We begin with a brief review of relevant literature to this investigation—namely literature regarding Ed.D. degrees focused on social justice and CBL and its application in higher education. Following the literature review, we present background into the doctoral course that we redesigned to include CBL. We then discuss the methodology, the findings, and conclude with benefits, challenges, and recommendations. In the appendices, we include the CBL unit that we implemented prior to the study and the revised CBL unit that sought to apply what we learned from this investigation.

Literature on the Ed.D, Social Justice, and Community-based Learning

Understanding the intersections of the Ed.D. degree, social justice, and community-based learning, as well as their impact on the coursework of doctoral students, is nothing short of complex. In this investigation, we sought to instantiate how community-based learning can propel forward the outcomes and the aims of educational leadership for social justice. The Ed.D. degree is uniquely poised to address this challenge and goal in doctoral education (Buskey & Karvonen, 2012; Robey, P. V. & Bauer, S. C., 2013; Sinclair, Barnacle, & Cuthbert, 2013).

Doctoral education programs for the Ed.D. have a built-in purpose to serve the community: "The intention of the redesigned Ed.D. has been to distinguish it from the Ph.D. that is preparation for scholarship while the Ed.D. program is preparation for practice" (Everson, 2006, p. 5). This intent encountered the challenge of professors and administration creating appropriate time for doctoral students to engage in community-based learning. The oft-heard phrase "community service" is nothing like community-based learning: "Participation is a necessary but hardly sufficient condition for learning" (Buskey & Karvonen, 2012, p. 19). Any dissonance between the mission statement and the coursework can greatly affect the credibility of CBL.

The Ed.D. program, by virtue of its creation, set its own path for change: "Faculty cannot teach about creating and leading socially just schools with credibility if they are not modeling these principles in their own departments, which includes working with practitioners on the front lines to reform schools" (Cambron & McCarthy, 2005, pp. 216-217). This was a radical suggestion—that as a doctoral program sets out to reform other schools, it too ought to reform itself. However, it was paramount that they do just that. A culture shift was an essential next step: "Community-university partnerships that move beyond the rhetoric of collaboration require universities to shift the university culture to (a) value community knowledge and share power with community stakeholders and (b) value and support faculty and student time, labor, and the outputs of community-engaged scholarship." (Curwood, 2011, p. 24). The potential for real change became possible when thinking and ideation became larger in scope and impact. The university degree came to life and had life-changing effects for students and their communities.

Important to the principles of social justice is that "community development starts with what is present in the community and the capacities of its residents and workers, rather than what is absent or problematic" (Jacoby, 2015, p. 8). Additionally, when this work was done well and with meaning, it asked also that local residents participate. The Ed.D. program had to rethink and rebuild its existing structures to accommodate its own purpose for existence and "reconstruct roles and relationships at the school level around a vibrant core purpose focused on social justice and directed at improving student learning" (Cambron & McCarthy, 2005, p. 215). Further, it was suggested in the literature that professors who teach in the doctoral program become active participants in national, state, and local politics to serve as models of engagement as well as mentor their students with recent experience: "Mentoring from a distance does not prepare educational leaders for this difficult work" (Cambron & McCarthy, 2005, p. 217). This served as yet another pivot point where graduate professors could demonstrate the credibility of their programs.

With the intentions clear and the goals written, nationwide Ed.D. programs still demonstrated ongoing efforts to put a community-based learning component into action: "Most institutions have traditionally only paid minimal attention to the development of their students as leaders in terms of offering specific leadership programs or curricula" (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001, p. 15). The disconnect was in part due to a growing importance and discussion of quantifiable data to measure the specific effectiveness of schools adequately preparing school leaders while downplaying harder-to-measure knowledge built from experience

(Cambron & McCarthy, 2005). The shift in focus to quantifiable data-gathering did not directly account for the anecdotal evidence which "indicated that student leadership participants cited increased confidence in their abilities, leadership skills, and willingness to serve in a leadership role" (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001, p. 16). These scholars agreed, though, that doctoral programs must focus on social justice in order to deliver a transformative learning experience for its up-and-coming school and community leaders.

Similarly, scholars also affirm that embedding the community-based learning experiences for doctoral students inside their coursework and studies would provide the best conditions for success: "In the case of educational leadership preparation, the curriculum must include a variety of opportunities for doctoral students to work in partnerships" (Everson, 2006, p.6). This approach honored the integrity of both the student and the community served by the partnership; however, the well-intentioned but unsustainable model of dipping in and out of communities to perform community service or to serve as a volunteer was not seen to match social justice goals. Further, "reciprocity implies that the community is not a learning laboratory and that service-learning should be designed *with* the community to meet needs identified *by* the community" (Jacoby, 2015, p. 4). The role of volunteering was not completely dismissed, however, though it was no longer promoted as a base level expectation:

> Interestingly, one of the independent variables that predicted each of the five developmental outcomes was hours per week in volunteering. The more hours students spent performing volunteer work, the more likely they were to show growth in the developmental areas of Leadership Skills and Knowledge, Civic Responsibility, their understanding of Personal and Social Values, and their awareness of Multicultural and Community Issues. (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001, p. 23)

The literature overwhelmingly agreed that a partnership in this critical social justice work must honor the identity and direction of the community served, and that this type of partnership led to the transformative work promised by the university to its students and to its partners (hooks, 2003; Lambert, Zimmerman, & Gardner, 2016; Santamaria & Gaëtane, 2014).

It was in the distinction from traditional service learning, community service, and volunteerism that community-based learning and critical service-learning programs defined themselves as better aligned with the Ed.D. program. This representative model for transforming education was most powerful when engaged in social justice work informed by critical theory and enacted through community-based service-learning experiences (Mitchell, 2008).

Additionally, the explicit engagement with Freirean (1970) principles allowed for doctoral students to gain necessary leadership experience: "How power relationships are produced and reproduced should be ongoingly observed and critiqued, with a consciousness geared toward reconfiguring power relationships to reverse current (and expected) hierarchies in traditional service practice" (Mitchell, 2008, p. 58). The "one and done" volunteerism did not empower doctoral students to see themselves as agents of social change, which has understandably been found as far more difficult a task.

The Ed.D. program holds great potential and power in providing a nurturing and challenging faculty-student engagement with community-based learning, but many barriers have been documented, including a "lack of imagination about how to connect disciplinary scholarship to public purposes; how to integrate teaching, research, and outreach toward meeting community needs; and how to fashion long-term careers as engaged scholars" (O'Meara, 2008, p. 28). When faculty leaders held central the purpose and vision of the Ed.D. program and advocated for its

manifestation through an authentic community-based learning experience, they modeled the transformative leadership capable of positive change for generations of underserved communities looking to transform themselves (Mitchell, 2008).

Community-based Learning, Transformational Leadership, and Social Justice Today

Much of the more recent literature on community-based learning (CBL) and social justice is framed through the phrase, "service-learning and social justice." A number of scholars continue a commitment to investigating service-learning, as it is viewed as a key means of developing citizens with a social justice orientation in university settings (Mitchell & Soria, 2018). The work focuses principally on undergraduate approaches to service-learning, with over 600 published studies in the past 30 years (Furco, Jones-White, Huesman Jr., & Segrue Gorny, 2016). Numerous scholars examined civic identity though the lens of human development (Kinloch, 2015; Mitchell, 2015). For the purposes of this investigation, human development themes were beyond our scope. Some smaller data sets, however, provide some insight on service-learning in graduate education and provided some related thinking on transformational leadership and social justice-oriented themes (Suess, 2018).

In 2016, Suess, for example, examined the findings from 186 University of Pennsylvania post-semester surveys of undergraduate and graduate students from these four perspectives: service orientation and social engagement; complex problem-solving; transformative leadership; and evaluation. The students were enrolled in a variety of classes for their service-learning experiences; the study therefore provided some general data that the investigator used to make a case for the overall efficacy of service-learning. For the purposes of our investigation, we focused on the findings related to transformative leadership, since this was the theme of our course. Suess found that leadership skills such as the ability to connect to others, understand the issues of social inequalities and reflection on these circumstances "were positively correlated with a capacity for collaborative engagement and problem-solving/adaptability" (2018, p. 284). Negative correlations occurred if students viewed the social problems as intractable and if they were unable to adapt to challenges they did not anticipate. Again, because of the limitations of the study, it is unclear whether or not disaggregated data would suggest more resilient leadership skills for graduate students versus the undergraduates who were also part of this sample.

Furco, Jones-White, Huesman Jr., & Segrue Gorny (2016) stated that "the most positive and consistent findings of service-learning participation across different types of educational settings, student populations, and community settings are found primarily in the personal and social development domains" (p. 145). The investigators did, though, make a call for expanding and deepening the examination of the impact of service-learning on a variety of settings, for many purposes, and with varying populations of university students. Furco and his colleagues' work, however, suggested that examining service-learning within the context of work designed to promote leadership development may garner insight to support its efficacy.

Finally, some scholars are addressing service-learning from feminist standpoints (Seethaller, 2016), and others from critical theoretical perspectives (Warren-Gordon & Santamaría, 2018). Still others are seeking to instantiate service-learning by providing a philosophical lens, invoking, for example, John Dewey's work (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001). Each of these provided more nuanced perspectives on service-learning and did tie to our social justice projects and philosophical dispositions. As we move past our initial investigation, these scholars' approaches may inform future lines of inquiry.

Redesigning the Course

The goal of the redesign of this core course was to include CBL in a doctoral course titled, *Transformational Leadership for Student Achievement*. The course included 16 doctoral students who would participate in community-based learning (CBL) projects. So as to incorporate CBL into the leadership class, we restructured the student learning outcomes, developed a protocol for conducting CBL in the field, and designed the study by which we would assess it. This redesign began a year in advance of teaching the course.

Student Learning Outcomes

There were six student learning outcomes (SLO) for the course based on literature reflecting transformational educational leadership for social justice-oriented themes (Dugan, 2006; Coleman, 2012). In particular, SLO 6 provided a more nuanced attainment of the course's outcomes as it related to CBL.

The course's SLOs were as follows:

1. Articulate effective and relevant theories and models of leadership.
2. Apply transformational leadership in different situations including change, continuous improvement, cultural and organizational development, and reform.
3. Identify systems that support instruction and student achievement.
4. Analyze issues of social justice as related to school success for diverse learning communities.
5. Identify and apply methodologies that increase school-wide democracy and leader and teacher effectiveness with students from diverse learning communities.
6. Demonstrate a deeper insight into strengths and growth areas as a leader through community engagement.

For the purposes of this investigation, SLO 6, which was related to CBL, was most relevant and included these additional sub-SLOs:

1. Demonstrate a deeper insight into your strengths and growth areas as a leader through community engagement and fieldwork notes.
2. Identify leading theories and models of leadership and explain how those are evident in local leaders with whom we work in community-based settings.
3. Compare and contrast the relationship among leadership theories, organizational theories, and community-based practices.
4. Evaluate the relationship between leadership and social justice and its impact on you.

Planned Changes to the Curriculum and Teaching Methods

The students' CBL projects would focus on application of the leadership content in the course based on the four sub-SLOs that are detailed under SLO 6, Community Engagement. Students would engage in a series of activities with their selected community partners over a 16-week period for a minimum of 15 hours—the timeframe that LMU specified as suggested for CBL projects.

The CBL project had two components: the 15 hours of community-based fieldwork and a field notebook that consisted of at least 8 reflections. Students received points for each hour of documented service to the community partner. The students also received points for completing each reflection. One of those activities, although voluntary, would include the opportunity to participate in a semi-structured interview with us. Students who chose to be interviewed could elect to complete 14 hours of fieldwork in lieu of 15 hours, but none elected this option. The second

part of the project—the field notebook—had some structure. The students' 8 reflections had suggested topics for reflection, but were self-selected, based on prompts that were tied to the course's SLOs. The full CBL project is described in detail in Appendix A.

Doctoral student CBL placement.

We invited the sixteen students to select their sites. Seven students chose public, charter, or Catholic schools in the greater Los Angeles area. Nine of the students chose non-profit organizations as their community partners. The non-profit organizations ranged in type. Some examples of these community partners our students selected are as follows:

- Support for people with disabilities;
- Scholarship-granting organization for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) students of merit;
- White people against racism;
- Youth leadership;
- Equitable communities and agents for social change; and ,
- Religious and charitable activities, grounded in the Islamic faith, and focused on integrating Muslim Americans into American society.

Community-based learning process.

There are three components to the CBL process at our University. The first is the service agreement between the student and community partner, the second the supervisor's evaluation at the end of the agreed service period, and the third is an anonymous student survey that students can complete at the end of the project.

Service Agreement.

The Service Agreement is a contract that includes the following components:

- Contact information for the student;
- Contact information for the community organization;
- Specific tasks the student is expected to perform;
- Pre-service requirements (e.g., orientation, training, live scan, background check, etc.);
- The total number of hours the student plans to complete at the placement;
- The student and site supervisor signatures; and
- Student submission to LMU's Center for Service and Action (CSA)

The student and community partner agree on the goals of the project and the tasks and responsibilities that will meet the goals. The site supervisor is expected to provide the student with any training necessary to complete the work and feedback about performance and if necessary, any areas that need improvement.

Supervisor Evaluation.

At the end of the service period, the supervisor or designee completes an evaluation of the student's performance. It includes these components:

- The student fills out relevant course information before giving it to the site supervisor;
- The site supervisor evaluates the student on 6 criteria, confirms the total number of service hours completed, and suggests ways to make the experience better for the agency in the future; and
- The site supervisor signs the document and either gives it back to the student to turn in directly to CSA or submits it to CSA personally via email or fax.

Student Evaluation.

Following completion of the project, the student provides an evaluation of their experience at

the service site. The survey is voluntary and anonymous and is administered using Qualtrics software. The data is aggregated and used for LMU's CSA internal evaluation purposes.

Methodology

Both of us participated in all aspects of the study, from the design, to the interviews, to the analysis and production of this manuscript. Verbally, by email, and on the class learning management system, we informed the students of the purpose, the significance, and the research question for the investigation, and that their involvement was voluntary and confidential. We provided the interview questions, the Letter of Informed Consent, and the Experimental Subjects Bill of Rights in advance, along with their invitations to be interviewed. The students had the option of using their actual names or pseudonyms. Most elected to use their actual names, but out of an abundance of caution for protection of human subjects, we use pseudonyms for all participants.

The interview questions that we asked the students were as follows:

1. Context
    a. What is your name, your current professional position, and your relationship to the CBL project you undertook for your doctoral class?
2. Benefits of CBL
    a. What do you see are the benefits of community-based learning?
    b. Are there benefits you experienced in conducting CBL with marginalized individuals in underserved and cross-cultural contexts?
    c. Are there benefits that the organization or those with whom you worked experienced during your period of service?
    d. How does CBL promote an agenda of educational leadership for social justice? Why or why not?
3. Challenges
    a. What are the challenges that you faced in engaging in CBL work?
    b. How did you work through those challenges?
4. Mission and Goals
    a. What is the connection of the mission of the University to the work you did?
    b. What is the connection of the work to the goal of leadership for social justice?
5. Recommendations
    a. What recommendations would you offer to the professor and the LMU Center for Service and Action regarding doctoral students' engagement with CBL as a part of their course?
    b. Is there anything we have not asked that you think is important for us to know?

In addition to the interviews, we held periodic feedback sessions with the entire class. Dr. Matthews facilitated some of these sessions. These sessions represented our conscious effort to model a transformational approach to organizational leadership. Borne out of the dialogues, we considered modifications to future iterations of the course. The doctoral students had multiple opportunities to share the benefits and challenges of CBL, as well as to make recommendations for improvement. Through this meta-loop of the program improving itself through a transformational model, we invited the students to carry it forward into their own CBL work. We consciously attempted to dovetail our efforts with the spirit and impetus for change found in the literature (Cambron & McCarthy, 2005; Mitchell, 2008; Santamaria & Gaëtane, 2014).

Assessing Trustworthiness of the Data

Following the interviews, we transcribed the audio recordings and provided a transcript for member checking to the students who participated and offered to send them a copy of significant findings from the study. We also assembled other documents that provided insight into the research question, such as notes from the class feedback sessions, the students' fieldwork notebooks, and the students' summative assessments from their community partners. We used a thematic, six-step analytical approach described by Braun and Clarke (2006) as the method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns or themes within data.

The concept of validity has historically been linked to quantitative research, so because this study used a qualitative approach, we applied the principle of trustworthiness (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2011). Guba (1981) named four strategies for assessing trustworthiness of qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

We established credibility by selecting research methods that are considered well-established in our field (Shenton, 2004). We further sought to establish credibility through our use of purposive sampling and the development of "thick" descriptions of students' responses. From the interview data, we wrote detailed narratives of each student's story. The stories of each student highlighted a dominant theme and a series of subordinate themes.

Transferability is more challenging with small-scale qualitative studies. While we are able to make suggestions for consideration as other professors consider the efficacy of doctoral education that includes CBL as a means to promote social justice, this was a study that included a limited number of individuals—seventeen in total. Furthermore, we recognize that the type of university (independent, faith-based), the demographics of the type of students we select for our doctorate, and other factors, may lead to different results in other settings. Even so, we believe the method we designed warrants use in other university settings and with greater numbers of doctoral students across the nation so as to expand the literature on this subject.

A study's dependability comes about by presenting findings and discussion to others with similar expertise who can affirm the veracity of the analysis and its meaning. This was manifested by each of us conducting individual analyses, comparing them to each other, and seeking to gain agreement on what we learned. We further sought dependability by continually reflecting on the processes we were using to gather data and making changes as necessary. For example, we discovered in the earliest interviews that if students' responses were vague, we needed to seek examples from them so as to provide a more detailed portrait of their opinions or experiences.

One of the techniques for establishing confirmability is to create an audit trail. Our audit trail included transparent procedures that were known to our institutional review board, the participants, and to ourselves. We have preserved letters of informed consent, an electronic paper trail of how we executed the study, and the data for a fixed period of time so that it is available for our future re-analysis and to future investigators.

Findings

Our interviews with the students and our examination of related documents such as supervisors' evaluations, revealed benefits, challenges, and recommendations. First, we present the background context for the interviews and the community partner survey data. Then, we present the three broad topics within the themes of CBL's relationship to the social justice mission and focus of the degree, transformational leadership, which was the course focus, and the students' overall experiences of their Ed.D. education. We conclude with the data from the community partners' surveys.

Background Context

The Ed.D. students enter our School of Education as a cohort of no more than 18 students each summer. This cohort had 17 students, 16 of whom participated in the study and one who served as co-principal investigator. Their first two doctoral courses occur in a summer session of six weeks, where we establish a pattern of one theory-oriented course and one methodology-oriented course each term. Following that summer, the students enter their first, 16-week fall term, which is when they enroll in the course, *Transformational Leadership for Student Achievement*. Although nearly all cohort members are full-time educators in roles varying from teacher leader to superintendent, the fall serves as "reality therapy" for students as they look towards continually balancing professional responsibilities, full-time student workloads, and personal demands for the next three years. The course met for 2.5 hours most Monday evenings from late August through mid-December.

We informed the students in advance of the fall term that there would be a fieldwork component of at least 15 hours in their theory-based course. Along with the professor, our University's Director of CBL provided the overview for CBL and their project, why CBL was a beneficial course component, and how they would select their community partner. Students had approximately four weeks to make their selection and begin their work. We assumed that permitting students to select their community partner provided greater agency in their control over both time commitment and personal or professional interests. The University had hundreds of community partners that it had vetted previously that would take student volunteers. If after reviewing that list and contacting prospective partners, no pre-approved community partner met their interests, students were free to put forth one of their own choosing. Dr. Matthews then worked with the organization to place them on the approved list.

Student Interviews

While we derived many benefits, challenges, and recommendations from the data, we highlight here a few key findings by sharing some of the doctoral students' stories. Kevin's story presents some of the benefits of CBL, Lilly's offers some of the challenges, and Rhonda's invites recommendations. Woven throughout their stories are the threads of leadership for social justice.

CBL benefits.

Students repeatedly reported that the singular opportunity to spend time in an organization that was not their own permitted them to consider transformational leadership in new contexts. Kevin described the challenge of grappling with making the connection between the theoretical discussions in class and what he saw happening in the after-school program where he volunteered. Much of the time, he felt the after-school program administrator was simply surviving. She seemed to view him as something of a breath of fresh air simply because there was another adult in the room with her 30 charges. She came to appreciate there was someone to take on the role of supporting the students with their homework or lead a game in the yard.

While at first, he did as he was instructed, over time Kevin took initiative in circumstances that he felt warranted his leadership engagement. He noted early on, for example, that some of the children were very disrespectful to the Director. Rather than punishing the children, he used the occasions to enter into dialogue with them about respect—what it is, how we demonstrate it, and how we should treat each other.

Kevin did believe that he was able to make the bridge between social justice and the CBL project. He noted, "Absolutely I think there's an ability to promote the agenda [of social justice]. One, because you're analyzing leadership and structure, but then two, specifically working in a

different context than what I'm specifically used to has its advantages as well" (Kevin, personal communication, n.d.). He felt that working in a different type of school and supporting children from a different socio-economic setting from his own school helped him to see how the principles of social justice took on even greater relevance.

CBL challenges.

As a single mother with younger children, Lilly's priority in selecting her community partner was that the work might be done remotely on evenings or weekends. She found the perfect partner to meet her need, but discovered that what they needed was a bit of a stretch, given her professional expertise. As a former high school teacher, she felt ill-equipped to write arts education curriculum for this national non-profit. Even so, she was an educator by training and as a current director of teacher education, understood how to access arts education resources to support her in the project development.

What Lilly had not accounted for in selecting her community partner was the project's relevance to a course in transformational leadership, and she found herself struggling to make the bridge between what she was studying in class and what she was doing for the organization. She mused,

> I'm feeling successful in terms of [the project]; I know how appreciated the work is. I know how happy they all are…and how excited they seem about it. I don't feel that there's a success in terms of leadership or in terms of it connecting. I see it as a good deed, that I'm contributing to something that's good, the service part. But in terms of it connecting to me learning something in this class, in this content…There's kind of a disconnect there. (Lilly, personal communication, n.d.)

Lilly suggested that were she to select a partner again, she would add the leadership criterion.

Lilly's story does not end with a lamentation, though. Some months after the class ended, the non-profit bestowed on her its highest honor at a national awards luncheon.

CBL recommendation.

If families face problems with child or spousal abuse, or drug use in the home, and they are referred to the Department of Children and Family Services, they are provided with a variety of wrap-around services and support. One of the support systems is a parent group that meets weekly, along with their children, who range in ages from birth through 17. The parents meet separately from the children, where they engage in an array of activities. Rhonda, who is by training a licensed counselor, volunteered with this agency for years, but gave it up when she began her doctoral studies. With the CBL assignment, she elected to return to work with the Wednesday night group.

Unquestionably, her counseling expertise was of benefit to the group, as she noted that in her school, where she then served as an assistant principal, she would have perhaps two or three children with severe behavioral and emotional issues. With this group, however, closer to 60% of the children suffered from severe issues, likely due to the family trauma. Besides the counseling support, she found her leadership experience was of benefit to the group. She led the design of more age-appropriate activities for the array of children and she was able to establish more structures that once in place, led to replicable practices in an organization that faced high turnover of its staff and volunteers.

While the work was satisfying, Rhonda reflected, though, on how to improve the CBL experience, given that doctoral students such as herself have "fed every community, helped every school, and painted every church." She asked if there was another level to CBL—a deeper way to

tie it to transformational leadership. She invited us to consider ways to enhance the experience:

> I would have loved to tap into people who do social justice work and pick their brains. I want to know how do you do [this work] without getting burnt out? How did you get here? How do you stay here? Is this sustainable? We're all trying to be those individuals. Are we now going to reinvent the wheel, and are we going to make the same mistakes? Are we creating a level of mentorship or a pipeline that we can guarantee that they would want us to see above and beyond themselves? Is that conversation happening that can happen outside of our professors? I think that part of it would, to me, be great. (Rhonda, personal communication, n.d.)

Rhonda emphasized that for doctoral students who subscribe to social justice precepts not only in theory, but in practice, that the "something more" of the experience must be beyond just community service. Opportunities to hear social justice leaders, to shadow them, and to receive mentorship would, in her mind, engender true transformational leadership.

Community partner reflections.

Towards the end of the semester and at the conclusion of the projects, the community partners completed an evaluation that consisted of a brief survey and an opportunity to provide narrative thoughts on their work with the students. Presented here are first the survey results and then a summary of their reflections.

Survey results.

Community partners completed a survey on each student that addressed six issues: attendance and punctuality, performance of responsibilities, maintaining a positive attitude, demonstrating respect for staff and respect for the clients, and understanding the issues the organization faced.

Table 1.
Student Scoring on Likert Scale of Quality

Evaluation Criteria	***1***	***2***	***3***	***4***	***5***	***Don't Know***	***Total***
Attendance & punctuality	0	0	0	0	12	0	12
Performed responsibilities well	0	0	0	0	12	0	12
Maintained a positive attitude	0	0	0	1	11	0	12
Demonstrated respect for staff	0	0	0	0	12	0	12
Demonstrated respect for clients	0	0	0	0	12	0	12
Demonstrated understanding of issue	0	0	0	0	11	1	12
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**70**	**1**	**72**

Source: Community Based Learning, Supervisor Final Evaluations

A rating of one (1) indicated no attainment of the item and a five (5) indicated the top attainment of the item. Of the twelve surveys available, nearly 100% of the students attained top ratings with each item. The results suggest a strong attainment of the six standards expected of the students in their work. These ratings were not confidential, so it is unknown the degree to which the community partner-supervisor felt free to be completely honest in the assessment, but based on the narrative data, there is no reason to suggest the partners did not reflect their actual perceptions of the students' performance.

Narrative comments.

The community partners provided comments on their students' work with their

organizations that were congruent with the survey data. Some comments follow:

- "The student was outstanding. [They] will be missed."
- "The student was a positive addition to our community and fully displayed an understanding of Restorative Justice."
- "The student has been very respectful of our community."
- "What [they] created for our organization is priceless. We are so grateful."
- "The student is an amazing critical thinker and is able to navigate through different environments in order to find resources and solutions. [Their] experience and feedback has also helped the staff get through recent rough times of transitions at our program. [Their] support came at a perfect time."
- "[Their] dedication to ensuring our youth enjoy and learn from a welcoming environment is commendable."
- "The student has been a tremendous source of support to our organization. [They have] helped us advance our goals in numerous ways."

Overall, the minimum 15 hours was not a great deal of time for the project. Even so, the students' ability to integrate easily into the new organizations was seamless, their empathy and respect for the partners and clients was highly evident, and the skills and leadership they exhibited were consistently strong.

Discussion and Recommendations

Several insights emerged from this investigation. We present below some of the benefits, challenges, and recommendations.

Benefits

Our investigation suggests there are numerous benefits to including community-based learning (CBL) in doctoral education. It provides a means by which professors and doctoral students can achieve multiple programmatic goals simultaneously.

Service to the community.

Student response to providing service to a community partner was overwhelmingly positive. Their supervisors' feedback was likewise enthusiastic and encouraging to and supportive of the students, our Director of CBL, and to us. One student, whose project helped a non-profit launch a national arts education initiative, received recognition as the non-profit's national hero, complete with a luncheon, awards ceremony, and national publicity (Lilly, personal communication, April 25, 2017; Koehl, 2017). Opportunities to embrace the missions of other organizations helped the students to experience entirely different leadership styles and organizational structures and to make connections to their own work settings.

Opportunity for Realizing Theory and Praxis.

The common themes that doctoral students cited as positive aspects of CBL centered around an increase of space and time to practice the principles of transformative leadership, to engage with communities, and to enact change. While a few doctoral students registered concern that the project did not make a direct connection to the leadership theories they were studying, the community partners' feedback emphasized many aspects of the praxis of leadership for social justice. The doctoral students broadly exhibited a critical thinking orientation toward solutions for problems that vex the organizations, coupled with a commitment to and appreciation of the actual needs of the community partners' clients.

Thus, while in real time, the focus of the course and the doctoral students' efforts may have seemed at odds, over time the significance of their work in terms of its social justice implications

may become more evident and the contributions substantial. The pebble in the pond metaphor is applicable: in attempting to assess the nexus between doctoral education and CBL, revisiting the impact over time may be of great benefit.

Challenges

Service to the community?

One of the benefits of CBL was also something of a liability. CBL in student coursework attempts to build a habit of service to one's community specifically and to society at large. It is frequently part of the undergraduate university experience, but less so with graduate education. In the case of the population of doctoral students whom we vetted and admitted, they already came hard-wired with strong commitments to social justice, to community service, and to fostering strong alliances and initiatives within their communities. This fact, coupled with their ardent, social justice orientation, led to ongoing debates within the cohort about whether the 15-hour experience was perpetuating the savior mentality often associated with volunteerism. In other words, there was little that could be done in so short a time frame, so we needed to consider whether there were real benefits to the community partner.

While the doctoral students debated the value of only 15 hours of work with their community partners, 100% of the partners reported the strong benefits of the partnership. Specific feedback in both their surveys and narrative comments suggested that the leadership the students brought—characterized by humility, compassion, and expertise for the organizations and for the clients they were serving—were of critical benefit to the community partners, regardless of the time limitation. In this way, power-sharing was evidenced in the doctoral students' attitudes and aptitudes, as well as in the partner's willingness to invite them into the organization that evinced the hallmarks of authentic, trusting partnerships. Future investigations could examine the power-sharing goal of the course in greater depth.

Another point of discussion among the doctoral students was their suggestion that the embedded CBL of this one course be expanded into a cross-cutting CBL project that ran through multiple courses throughout the three-year program. In this manner, the CBL project could serve as a tool for sustained engagement with organizations beyond the few months of the original design. The larger social justice goal of sharing power with organizations and assisting in their own organic growth would become more evident simply as a factor of time spent longitudinally. The debates in class were fueled by a deep passion and interest in Freirean concepts that the doctoral program values and teaches, so it came as no surprise that the doctoral students in this study were compelled to press their professors for greater engagement at the nexus of theory and practice.

Self-selected CBL.

Our initial intent was to match students with community partners that the University had previously vetted and had a working relationship with. The community partners ranged from schools to soup kitchens. Given that doctoral students are mature, working professionals, it seemed reasonable to assume that selecting one's partner would provide buy-in and permit the students to exercise agency in selecting a setting most beneficial to themselves.

Unfortunately, the lack of structure became more of a challenge than an asset in many instances. Because it was up to the site supervisor to work with the student on what their work would consist of—and the range of needs varied greatly—there was no consistency between and among sites as to what the student's CBL work would be. One student might be tutoring students while another was designing a database. Referring back to the SLOs for the course, there were not

consistent leadership experiences offered that directly related to the outcomes.

Another structural challenge related to the time students took to select their community partners. Our parameter was generous—a month—but losing 4 weeks of a 16-week semester served as a liability for those who took longer. Some had no data early on and therefore no contributions to make to our ongoing debriefing sessions in class. Some of the students who took longer to find their placements also then experienced some anxiety in feeling rushed to complete their projects.

Time commitment.

One of the challenges arose with the roll-out of the project and the concern of the majority of students that 15 hours of fieldwork was a burden in addition to their professional responsibilities, two courses, and other assignments for the leadership class. Although we made accommodations by reframing some class sessions as "working sessions," there was a loss of class time to process their experiences and to engage more deeply in other aspects of the curriculum. We suspect that notification of the CBL project, its time commitment, and the project requirements prior to start of the semester may alleviate the concerns to some degree. We remain unclear about the impact of the schedule changes, though, without further investigation.

Recommendations

We offer several lessons learned and recommendations for professors who are considering including CBL as a component of their doctoral courses.

Clear relationship between the SLOs and CBL activities.

If the goal of CBL in a doctoral course is more than just conducting community service, then we recommend professors reflect on their Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and what activities the students will conduct in the field that will align with them. Readings for any course can serve as a basis for developing activities that will reinforce the course's SLOs.

We also invite professors to align the choice of community partners with the SLOs and CBL activities. Arguably, any non-profit organization would provide leadership opportunities with a social justice focus, but the students did not seem to make as clear a connection if the organizational mission was not directly connected to education. Further research may provide insight into why this was the case. Our students who chose to conduct activities in organizations that were education-oriented—schools, non-profits that support education—saw the greatest relevance to social justice, leadership, and their doctoral studies.

While in version 1.0 of the course we invited students to use our University's Center for Service and Action to support their selection of a community partner, the results were too mixed in terms of achieving a close alignment with the SLOs. In version 2.0, we redesigned the CBL activities to align more directly with the SLOs. We also recommended that students, who all worked in public, charter, or independent schools—and on occasion in higher education or other non-profit organizations—conduct their work with their organization's colleagues.

Working with Linda Lambert (2016) and her colleagues over the following year, we developed specific leadership activities that aligned with the course SLOs and the six themes of their book that address the development of leadership capacity in educational settings. There were two, principal components to the revised CBL unit: conducting the field-based fieldwork with individuals at the site and memorializing the project through reflections and activities with those same individuals. Appendix B provides details of the revised CBL project in its entirety. While we have anecdotal evidence to suggest that this iteration provided a stronger relationship of SLOs to the activities, such as a more flattened power structure with leadership in the organization, we must

continue the data-gathering and examine this further. In future investigations we will assess the impact of the changes we made that resulted from this first study.

University and other community-based learning resources.

Professors need not go it alone. Many universities provide departments or units that focus on CBL and their staff are accustomed to supporting professors' inclusion of CBL in their courses and programs. Any community's many non-profit organizations will also provide abundant support and resources for supporting CBL.

In our case, a university-based competitive grant supported our work in the course redesign that allowed thoughtful consideration over time about how to integrate CBL. In addition, the ongoing partnership and support of our university's CBL department helped with implementation and with modifications over time.

A model for assessing CBL.

This investigation and our transformation of the course sought to integrate this emphasis on theory to practice in its methodological approaches with the University's mission. We found that the three "buckets" of questions about benefits, challenges, and recommendations regarding CBL's relationship to social justice, transformational leadership, and to doctoral education provided robust insights into our students' experiences. Each interview took less than an hour and might be conducted as a focus group to great benefit. The interview tool, then, provides an effective means for faculty to assess CBL.

In addition, although our University, which is a faith-based, independent institution, has a mission that is based on Jesuit-oriented values, all universities have missions that may serve as foundational support for including CBL in coursework. Other agencies such as those who accredit our programs that include state, regional, and/or national such as Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), or with whom we affiliate, such as American Educational Research Association, Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, or University Council for Educational Administration, generally include a social justice orientation in their missions, guiding principles, and standards. These can serve as guidance to support Ed.D. programs with a social justice focus.

Opportunities for future research.

While greater numbers of university faculty nationally are working to include CBL components in their courses, until this study, no empirical investigation had been conducted that could serve to inform faculty decisions regarding the efficacy of including CBL in their doctoral courses to forward the university's mission, program learning outcomes, and faculty's student learning outcomes. Two of the limitations of this study were the sample size and the context of the university—faith-based and mid-sized, independent. We recommend future studies include larger samples of doctoral students at a variety of institutional types. We also suggest a longitudinal study where doctoral alumni are invited to consider the impact of CBL after some time has passed.

Other participants in future studies might also include doctoral professors who teach the courses, and administrators who oversee CBL at the universities. While we did have some data from our community partners, a more-robust protocol that includes in-depth interviews may provide more insight from those who receive and support the students conducting CBL. Finally, a quantitative approach might provide a means to reach a larger sample of students in a shorter timeframe.

Summary

The choice made at every university to house, staff, and fund a graduate school of education represents a set of values that focuses on the good that people can create in the world. Courses that

consciously help bridge students' experiences from theory to practice serve as examples of meaningful work—this is work that fosters new work, and is never complete, particularly when entered into with the spirit and intent found in the literature and in the findings of this study. We agree that graduate-level education must itself transform so as to address the authentic needs of the students and the communities with whom they wish to partner. A disruption, a renewal—this mindset will attract a new type of student and professor interested in aligning community-based learning, social justice, and doctoral-level coursework (O'Meara, 2008).

Engaging in social justice work through community-based learning at the doctoral level assumes we have an interest in developing tools and practices to transform communities. And further, it suggests we wish to develop tools and practices with the community itself so that they can nurture and sustain their own multigenerational trajectory change. We wish for the readers and proponents of this work to engage deeply and with awareness so as to promote a sustainable and effective collaborative relationship with the community and the university.

References

Braun V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/1347976.pdf

Buskey, F. C. & Karvonen, M. (2012). Evaluating innovative leadership preparation. *The Journal of Leadership Education 11*(1), 204-221. DOI: 10.12806/V11/I1/TF2

Buss, R. R., Zambo, R.; Zambo, D.; Perry, J. A., & Williams, T. R. (2017). Faculty members' responses to implementing re-envisioned Ed.D. programs. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(9), 1624-1640.

Cambron-McCabe, N. & McCarthy, M. (January & March 2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy, 19*(1), 201-222. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.841.9905&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2019). *CPED Framework*. Retrieved from https://www.cpedinitiative.org/assets/images/cped_infographic_5.png

Coleman, M. (2012). Leadership for diversity. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 40*(5), 592-609. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143212451174

Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (January/February 2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(1), 15-27.

Curwood, S. E., Munger, F., Mitchell, T., Mackeigan, M., & Farrar, A. (2011). Building Effective Community-University Partnerships: Are Universities Truly Ready? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 17(2), 15–26.

Dugan, J. P. (May/June 2006). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(3), 335-343. doi: https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2006.0028

Everson, S. T. (2006). The Role of Partnerships in the Professional Doctorate in Education: A Program Application in Educational Leadership. *Educational Considerations*, 33(2), 5–9.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Furco, A., Jones-White, D., Huesman Jr. R., & Segrue Gorny, L. (2016). Modeling the influence of service-learning on academic and sociocultural gains: Findings from a multi-institutional study. In K. M. Soria & T. D. Mitchell (Eds.), *Civic Engagement and Community Service at Research Universities*, pp. 143-163. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Guba, E. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 29*(2), 75-91.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope.* New York, NY: *Routledge.*

Jacoby, B. (2015). Introduction to service-learning. In B. Jacoby, (Ed.) *Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned*, pp. 1-25. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Rhoads, R. A. (2001). The dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education: A philosophical perspective. *Higher Education, 44*. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered

Kinloch, V. (2015). Critical service-learning initiatives. *Theory Into Practice, 54*, 1–4.

Koehl, M. (March 29, 2017). Serving the environment and the community one crayon at a time. *HuffPost*. Retrieved from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/serving-the-environment-and-community-one-crayon-at_b_58dc446ee4b04ba4a5e2508f

Lambert, L., Zimmerman, D. P., Gardner, M. E. (2016). *Liberating leadership capacity: Pathways to educational wisdom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

McNae, R. & Reilly, E. C. (Eds.) (2018). *Women leading education across the continents: Harnessing the joy in leadership.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Mills, G. E. & Gay, L.R. (2019). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*, 12th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Mitchell, T. D. (Spring 2008). Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 50-65.

Mitchell, T. D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice, (54),* 20–28.

Mitchell, T. D., & Soria, K. M. (2018). *Educating for citizenship and social justice: Practices for community engagement at research universities*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Noguera, P. A. (2001). Racial politics and the elusive quest for excellence and equity in education. *Education and Urban Society, 34*(1), 18-41.

O'Meara, K. (2008). Graduate education and community engagement. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, (113), 27–42.

Perry, J. A. (2012). What history reveals about the education doctorate. In M. Macintyre Latta & S. Wunder, (Eds.). *Placing practitioner knowledge at the center of teacher education: Rethinking the policy and practice of the education doctorate*, pp. 51-72.

Perry, J. A. (2016). *The Ed.D. and the scholarly practitioner.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Reilly, E. C. & Bauer, Q. (Eds.) (2015). *Women leading education across the continents: Overcoming the barriers.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Reilly, E. C. (2016). Bridges of accessibility: Signature pedagogies in graduate education. In V. Stead, (Ed.). *RIP Jim Crow: Fighting Racism through Higher Education Policy, curriculum, and cultural interventions* (pp. 163-174). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Robey, P. V. & Bauer, S. C., (2013). Change in university-based programs of educational leadership: How responsive have programs been? *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 8*, 261-279. DOI: 10.1177/1942775113498375

Santamaría, L. J. & Gaëtane, J. (2014). Cross-cultural dimensions of applied, critical, and transformational leadership: Women principals advancing social justice and educational equity, *Cambridge Journal of Education, 44*(3), 333-360. DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2014.904276

Seetholler, I. C. (2016). Feminist service learning: Teaching about oppression to work toward social change. *Feminist Teacher, 25*(1), 39-54.

Seuss, G. E. L. (2018). Beyond service toward human liberation: Social relatedness and transformative leadership through academically-based community service. In T. D. Mitchell & K. M. Soria, (Eds.), *Educating for citizenship and social justice: Practices for community engagement at research universities* (277-288). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*, 63-75.

Sinclair, J.; Barnacle, R.; & Cuthbert, D. (2013). How the doctorate contributes to the formation of active researchers: What the research tells us. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(10), 1972-1986.

Strom, K., Porfilio, K., & Lupinacci, J. (June 2016). Getting explicit about social justice:

Operationalizing an elusive construct in neoliberal times. *CPED White Paper Project 1* (1). Retrieved from https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.cpedinitiative.org/resource/resmgr/docs/CPED_data/white_papers/Strom_Getting_Explicit_.pdf

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(2), 221-258.

Warren-Gordon, K., & Santamaría Graff, C. (2018). Critical service-learning as a vehicle for change in higher education courses. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *50*(6), 20-23. DOI: 10.1080/00091383.2018.1540817

Appendix A
Community-based Learning Project 1.0

Community Based Learning Project

Fieldwork hours due throughout Term
Final Fieldwork Notebook Due [date] at 11:59 PM posted on BB/Journal

150 for fieldwork; 80 for field notebook points

The community-based learning assignment is intended to provide a semi-structured opportunity to:

1. Demonstrate a deeper insight into your strengths and growth areas as a leader through community engagement and fieldwork notes;
2. Identify leading theories and models of leadership and explain how those are evident in local leaders with whom we work in community-based settings;
3. Compare and contrast the relationship among leadership theories, organizational theories, and community-based practices; and
4. Evaluate the relationship among personal, organizational, and spiritual leadership through the lens of faith and justice.

Community-Based Field Experiences (150 points)

This assignment includes a minimum of 15 hours of community-based work at a community-based, youth-oriented setting or other pre-approved community partner. You will receive 10 points for each hour of documented work.

1. Students register for a community-based field placement through the LMU's Center for Service & Action. http://studentaffairs.lmu.edu/activitiesservice/centerforserviceaction/aboutcsa/
2. Students contact their placements.
3. Students will document and receive a sign-off on the hours served from community partners.
4. Community partners will complete evaluations on students at the conclusion of the hours served. This evaluation is due at the same time as the field notebook, scanned and posted on MyLMU in a PDF.
5. Additional, detailed information about the semester schedule for the CBL project is on MyLMU.

Field Notebook (80 points)

In addition to at least 15 hours of community-based work, you will keep a field notebook in which you record your work and reflections following each site visit. A template for each entry will be posted on MyLMU. The field notebook will be checked on an ongoing basis and receive credit at the end of the semester. You will receive up to 10 points for each reflection.

CBL Field Notebook

Over the course of the term, you will keep a "field notebook" in which you record your impressions of your CBL work.

1. By the due date, your field notebook should contain a minimum of **eight** entries.
2. The final (eighth) entry should be a summary of what you have learned, the connection between CBL and transformational leadership for student achievement, the relationship to your own values and beliefs, and any other themes you wish to reflect on.
3. Each notebook entry should be between 1 and 2 double-spaced pages. Each one should be dated. Each should occur at different points in the term.
4. The entries should be submitted as ONE document.

You can select your prompts from those listed below or devise your own:

1. What is your role at the community site?
2. What were your initial expectations? Have these expectations changed? How? Why?
3. What do you observe about the leadership of the organization?
4. To what degree does the organization embody principles of transformational leadership?
5. To what degree does the organization embody principles of constructivist leadership?
6. To what degree is the leadership of the organization congruent with your values and beliefs about leadership?
7. Do you note any organizational problems for which improvement science might be applicable? If so describe the problem.
8. What about your community involvement has been an eye-opening experience?
9. What specific skills have you used at your community site?
10. Describe a person you've encountered in the community who made a strong impression on you, positive or negative.
11. Do you see benefits of doing community work? Why or why not?
12. Has your view of the population with whom you have been working changed? How?
13. How has the environment and social conditions affected the people at your site?
14. What institutional structures are in place at your site or in the community? How do they affect the people you work with?
15. Has the experience affected your world view? How?
16. Why does the organization you are working for exist?
17. Did anything about your community involvement surprise you? If so, what?
18. What did you do that seemed to be effective or ineffective in the community?
19. How does your understanding of the community change as a result of your participation in this project?
20. How can you continue your involvement with this group or social issue?
21. How can you educate others or raise awareness about this group or social issue?
22. What are the most difficult or satisfying parts of your work? Why?
23. Talk about any disappointments or successes of your project. What did you learn from it?
24. During your community work experience, have you dealt with being an "outsider" at your site? How does being an "outsider" differ from being an "insider"?
25. How are your values expressed through your community work?
26. What sorts of things make you feel uncomfortable when you are working in the community? Why?
27. Complete this sentence: Because of my service-learning, I am....

Appendix B
Community Engagement Through Leadership Project 2.0
Reflections and Field Experiences Due Throughout Term
Final Fieldwork Report and Community Partner Evaluation Due [date] at 11:59 PM
Post on Brightspace
300 points total: 150 for field experiences and 150 for field notebook

The community engagement through leadership project is intended to provide a semi-structured opportunity to:

- Demonstrate a deeper insight into your strengths and growth areas as a leader through community engagement and fieldwork activities;
- Identify leading theories and models of leadership and explain how those are evident in local leader with whom we work in community-based settings;
- Compare and contrast the relationship among leadership theories, organizational theories, and community-based practices; and
- Evaluate the relationship among personal, organizational, and spiritual leadership through the lens of faith and justice.

1. Community-Based Field Experiences (150 points)

This assignment includes community-based work at a "community, youth-oriented setting or other professor- approved community partner." *The work may take place at your present work site (school or non-profit) or one that you wish to investigate and support.* You will receive up to 150 points for the work at the site, which includes any document analyses, interviews, meetings, and conversations related to addressing the leadership activities.

- Students contact their organization and gain permission to engage with the chosen site.
- Students register for their community-based field placement through the LMU's Center for Service & Action. See Brightspace for the PDF form. Once the form is completed, send it to [Director of CBL].
- Students will document and receive a sign-off on the activities completed with community partners at the conclusion of the term.
- Community partners will complete evaluations on students at the conclusion of the activities completed and the report delivered. This evaluation is due at the same time as the field notebook, scanned and posted on Brightspace in a PDF.
- Additional, detailed information about the semester schedule for the community engagement project is on Brightspace.

2. Field Notebook (150 points total)

During the fieldwork, you will keep a field notebook in which you record your reflections on leadership capacity and work with your chosen organization. The field notebook entries will be due on an ongoing basis and receive credit at the end of the semester. Note that there

are two parts for each activity: a reflection on the content from *Liberating Leadership Capacity* and an activity applying the content. You will receive up to 20 points for the first five activities and 50 points for the final report.

Chapter 1 Activities: Leadership Redesigned

a. Write a reflection on *Liberating Leadership Capacity*, Chapter 1. Page 18, Figure 1.3: All theories have assumptions. Do your present beliefs agree or disagree with these assumptions? Why, why not? Provide examples. No more than 2 pages double-spaced. Due [date], 11:59 PM under Module 1, Assignment 2.
b. Plan and execute Activity 1 with community-based partner: Using Figure 1.1 on p. 7, assess the organization's traditional versus constructivist leadership approaches and actions. Provide evidence. You need to receive feedback from at least one other individual in the organization. Due [date], Module 1, Assignment 3.

Chapter 2 Activities: Fostering Leadership Capacity

a. Write a reflection on *Liberating Leadership Capacity*, Chapter 2. Page 33, Figure 2.3: Analyze your own behaviors as a leader. Copy the chart, highlight it, and upload it to Brightspace. Provide a brief narrative with your reflection regarding the assessment. No more than 2 pages double-spaced. Due [date], 11:59 PM under Module 2, Assignment 1.
b. Plan and execute Activity 2 with community-based partners: Using Figure 2.1 on p. 24, assess the organization's leadership capacity with these two elements: breadth of participation and depth of skillfulness. Provide evidence. You need to receive feedback from at least 3 other individuals in the organization. Due [date], at 11:59 PM under Module 2, Assignment 2.

Chapter 3 Activities: Designing Professional Learning Cultures

a. Write a reflection on *Liberating Leadership Capacity*, Chapter 3. Page 33, Figure 2.3: Analyze your own learning curve. Using Kegan's constructive development theory, he describes different levels. Which of the four level(s) resonate with you? More than one may be relevant. Also, design two steps you can take as a part of your professional learning path to move your development forward. Provide a brief narrative with your reflection. No more than 2 pages double-spaced. Due [date], 11:59 PM under Module 2, Assignment 1.
b. Plan and execute Activity 3 with community-based partners: Using Figure 3.2 on p. 55 and based on your analysis in Chapter 2, assess with individuals in the organization the applicable learning path. What are three "next steps" the organization could engage in? Provide their feedback. You need to receive feedback from at least 3 other individuals in the organization. Due [date], at 11:59 PM under Module 2, Assignment 2.

Chapter 4 Activities: Collaborative Dimensions of Leadership

a. Write a reflection on *Liberating Leadership Capacity*, Chapter 4. Page 66, Figure 4.1: Assess your understandings of each core areas. Select one skill area and describe two learning goals for yourself and how you will achieve them. Provide a brief narrative with your reflection. No more than 2 pages double- spaced. Due [date], 11:59 PM under Module 3, Assignment 1.
b. Plan and execute Activity 4 with community-based partners: Using Figure 4.2 on p. 67 diagnose with individuals in the organization the starting place for collaborative dimensions of leadership. What are four strengths and four issues for the four identified areas? If growth areas, what are "next steps" the organization could engage in? Provide their feedback. You need to receive feedback from at least 3 other individuals in the organization. Due [date], at 11:59 PM under Module 3, Assignment 2.

Chapter 5 Activities: Democratization of Knowledge

a. Write a reflection on *Liberating Leadership Capacity*, Chapter 5, pp. 88-92. Consider these three domains: *knowledge for, knowledge in, and knowledge of*. Reflect on one of the most pivotal learning experiences in your career. Describe the experience. Identify which type of knowledge was developed and write about the experience in the appropriate column. More than one may apply. How does this process inform your future work in leadership communities? Provide a brief narrative with your reflection. No more than 2 pages double-spaced. Due [date], at 11:59 PM under Module 3, Assignment 3.
b. Plan and execute Activity 5 with community-based partners: Using Chapter 5, pp. 88-92, share with them the three domains of knowledge. Ask them for ways in which the organization can broaden the construction of knowledge for, in, and of. You need to receive feedback from at least 3 other individuals in the organization. Due [date], at 11:59 PM under Module 3, Assignment 4.

Chapter 6 and Epilogue Activities: Creating Capacity for Systems Change & Pathways to Educational Wisdom

a. Write a reflection on *Liberating Leadership Capacity*, Chapter 6 & Epilogue. What are your take-aways from our work and the work with your community partner? What wisdom did Linda Lambert, our guest speaker, share that is memorable? She emphasized three dimensions: Figure 6.1 (p. 104); Shared Elements of Success (pp. 113-114); and Epilogue & Wise Schools (pp. 124-126). Provide a brief narrative with your reflection. No more than 2 pages double-spaced. Due Monday, [date], 11:59 PM under Module 4, Assignment 1.
b. Plan and execute Activity 6 with community-based partners: This is your final report to your organization with whom you worked this term. Write up a brief analysis of the five assessments you conducted with the organization. Conclude with recommendations for their consideration. Present your report and findings to them. Have your supervisor sign off on your evaluation. Post both on Brightspace. Due [date], at 11:59 PM under Module 4, Assignment 2.