From the Guest Editors

Community Service-Learning in Canada: Emerging Conversations

Nancy Van Styvendale, Jessica McDonald, and Sarah Buhler

In February 2004, *University Affairs* announced that community service-learning (CSL) "may be the biggest thing to hit undergraduate education in the last decade" (qtd. in Cawley, 2007, p. 2). Now, over two decades after CSL first took root in Canada, under the name of Service Learning at St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, this special issue invites engaged learning practitioners and scholars, both established and emerging, to take stock of the history of CSL, assess current practices, and consider how to move forward in the future. Is CSL the biggest thing to hit Canadian campuses since the late 1990s? With approximately fifty CSL programs or units across the country (Dorow et al., 2013), annual gatherings of scholars and practitioners, and a network of individuals who remain devoted to CSL despite challenges in funding and logistics, CSL in Canada has certainly made its mark, embedded in the context of a larger movement of engaged scholarship on campuses across the country—a movement exemplified in this very *Engaged Scholar Journal*, the first of its kind in Canada to focus on publishing community-engaged work.

Community service-learning is a form of experiential education—or "learning through doing"[1]—that mobilizes relationships between the university and the larger community, and between academic study and community-based knowledge and experience. "The standard argument," one of CSL's most esteemed scholars, Dan Butin, explains, "is that service-learning pedagogy rejects the 'banking' model of education where the downward transference

Nancy Van Styvendale   *Jessica McDonald*   *Sarah Buhler*

---

[1] As T. Chambers (2009) summarizes, "Experiential education is predicated on the conscious and intentional integration of students' experiences into the formal curriculum. John Dewey, who is often credited with being the father of experiential education, stressed that *how* students learn is inseparable from *what* students learn" (p. 80).

of information from knowledgeable teachers to passive students is conducted in fifty-minute increments" (2010, p. 3). In CSL courses or co-curricular activities, students are placed with community partners—for example, non-profit organizations, community-based groups, or, more recently, social enterprises, especially ones that are connected to not-for-profits. At these placements, students engage in a range of activities, from everyday operational tasks to collaborative, community-based projects or research. These activities, as Dorow and her co-authors (2013) assert, must "address social and community needs" (p. 69), as defined by community partners themselves. According to the Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning (CACSL), Canada's national service-learning organization,[2] CSL is an "educational approach that integrates service in the community with intentional learning activities. Within effective CSL efforts, members of both educational institutions and community organizations work together toward outcomes that are mutually beneficial" (CACSL, n.d.). This philosophy of mutual benefit is crucial to the CSL approach, which is grounded in what Butin (2010) calls the four Rs: respect, reciprocity, relevance, and reflection (p. 5).

In "What is Service-Learning?" M. Clevenger-Bright et al. (2012) explain that community service-learning is known by a number of different terms, including "academic service-learning, community-based learning, community learning, and experiential learning" (n.p.). While a proliferation of terms exists, and no one definition has been uniformly adopted (Butin, 2010), scholars and practitioners agree that CSL is distinct from volunteerism, which certainly involves all kinds of learning, but most of which is implicit or unintentional (Duguid, Mündel, & Schugurensky, 2013). In CSL, students use their experiences in the community to reflect critically on academic concepts and theories, and vice versa, using classroom content to process and analyze their learning in the community. CSL brings "the potential for transformative learning" (Levkoe, Brail, & Daniere, 2014, p. 71) to the forefront, asking students to interrogate what they are learning, who they are, and how knowledge and identity co-exist in and as a mutually informing process. As Bringle and Hatcher (1996) claim in their now standard definition, CSL asks students to "reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (p. 222).

In its ideal form, CSL reveals and destabilizes inequitable distributions of power, privilege, and knowledge. Students—and faculty—who have "absorbed the ethos of the university as the well-spring of expertise" come to realize, through CSL, that they are in fact "privileged to learn from practitioners and the 'clients,' their fellow citizens" (Cawley, 2007, p. 3). When done effectively, CSL thus contributes to the "democratization of knowledge—in which

---

[2] Dr. David Peacock, Director of CSL at the University of Alberta (personal communication, March 7, 2018) noted that CACSL is currently inactive, with no formal director, funding, or active steering committee. A call for a new volunteer director was issued at the 2016 CACSL conference, but no one was available to fulfill this coordinating role. The future of the alliance remains to be seen, but CSL practitioners and scholars seem to be redirecting their energies toward the broader project of CCE (community-campus engagement) in Canada, energized by the CFICE (Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement) project, a seven-year (2012-2019) SSHRC-funded action research project whose goal is to address the following question: "How can community-campus partnerships be designed and implemented to maximize the value created for non-profit, community-based organizations?"

many stakeholders with diverse backgrounds collaboratively engage in a process of sharing information and creating knowledge for use by communities" (p. 3). John Cawley of the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, the major financial catalyst of CSL in Canada, proposes that such collaborative knowledge creation "raises fundamental questions about the relevancy of universities as we know them" (p. 3). Cawley may sidestep, here, the ways in which universities continue to be integral to society at large, but his statement expresses a necessary call to recalibrate the notion that universities are the *central* site of relevant knowledge production. In their study of the larger field of community-engaged scholarship (or CES, which includes not only community-engaged teaching and learning practices like CSL, but also a range of community-based research methodologies), Barreno, Elliott, Madueke, and Sarny (2013) agree with Cawley's statement, writing that CES is "focused on rebalancing the relationship between university and community to ensure fulsome knowledge generation for the public good. . . .Well-practiced CES," they conclude, "is part of a larger journey toward social equality and justice" (p. 75).

Service-learning first arose in the United States in the 1960s, although its philosophical foundations are commonly located in the community needs-driven programs established by land grant universities of the early 20th century (Aujla and Hamm, this issue). In the intervening years, service-learning has become well-established and institutionalized in colleges and universities across the United States, with a period of exceptional growth and support by governments and institutions in the 1990s and 2000s. The late 1990s are generally recognized as the origin point of community service-learning in Canada, but its roots also "trace back to the late-nineteenth century, are as old as similar U.S. initiatives, and link to the intensification of social problems associated with the rise of urban-industrial society," as Keshen, Holland, and Moely (2010) observe (p. ix). Significant historical moments in the story of CSL in Canada include the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation's funding of CSL programs at ten universities, beginning in 1999; as well as CSL symposia at St. Francis Xavier University in 2001, the University of Guelph in 2002, the University of British Columbia in 2003, and the University of Ottawa in 2004. At the Ottawa gathering, the Canadian Association of Community Service-Learning (CACSL) was established, and in 2007, became the Canadian *Alliance* for Community Service-Learning—a terminological change that reflects what Smith (2010) has called the emphasis of Canadian practice on relationality, the organization's decentralized structure (Keshen, Holland, and Moely, 2010), and the inherent politicization of the field.

In 2012, in partnership with the University of Saskatchewan, CACSL held the first peer-reviewed CSL conference in Canada. Entitled "Impacts of Community Engagement," this conference was funded in part by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and brought together close to 150 faculty, students, staff, and community partner representatives to discuss CSL programs, practices, and research in Canada. Compared to the initial national meeting at St. FX in 2001, at which there were approximately ten people (Fryer et al., 2007), the number of delegates at the 2012 meeting revealed that there was a critical mass of CSL practitioners and scholars in Canada. During conference sessions, delegates reiterated the need for CSL research by Canadian scholars and about the Canadian

context, observing that most of the scholarship available at the time was from the United States (Carr, 2012, n.p.). In response to this call to support Canadian research and practices, editors Sarah Buhler and Nancy Van Styvendale invited conference participants and others to contribute to the current issue.[3] Many of the contributors here took part in the 2012 gathering or were delegates at a subsequent CACSL conference in 2014.

It is true that while CSL has become a prominent feature of the postsecondary landscape in Canada over the last twenty years, Canadian research on the field is just gaining ground. In their annotated bibliography of Canadian CSL research, Raykov, Taylor, and Yochim (2015) note that more than 60% of the existing research by Canadian researchers and/or about Canadian CSL has been published since 2010. This work has been published in relevant discipline-specific journals or in (primarily U.S.) journals focused on community-engaged teaching—notably, the *Michigan Journal for Community Service-Learning*. There is a robust international body of CSL literature,[4] but the majority of this scholarship is focused on the United States, where the history and tradition of service-learning is comparatively longer (Raykov, Taylor, and Yochim, 2015). Certainly, the shape of Canadian CSL has been influenced by developments in the U.S. and internationally, but there are important differences as well, particularly in terms of funding structure, government support, philosophy, and implementation, as Aujla and Hamm observe in this issue. Research from one national context is not necessarily or easily transposable to another.

There has been little scholarship that focuses on the distinct shape of the field in this country. Some important exceptions to this rule include the work of Alison Taylor et al. (2015), Tony Chambers (2009), and Tania Smith (2010) on the history, theory, and rhetoric of CSL in Canada, as well as comparative analyses of CSL in this country and others by Margo Fryer et al. (2007) and Sherril Gelmon et al. (2004). A number of reports and overviews of CSL in Canada also exist, funded and published by foundations such as the J.W. McConnell Family Foundation or Imagine Canada.[5] Gathering a variety of perspectives on CSL practice and research in this country, our issue incorporates and builds on this growing body of literature, as well as offering further comparative analyses of CSL in Canada, the United States (Aujla and Hamm), and Mexico (Calvert and Valladares Montemayor). Here, we bring together faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and community practitioners from across the country (with contributors from the West Coast, the Prairie Provinces, Ontario, and the East Coast) and from a representative variety of disciplines (from Health and Medicine to Women's and Gender Studies). Informed by the philosophy of mutual benefit that undergirds CSL itself, we hope that the research and reflections featured here will be of interest and use to a diverse audience, including scholars, instructors, staff, students, and community partners. In its

[3] Both Buhler and Van Styvendale were participants in the 2012 CACSL Conference. Buhler gave an invited workshop on evaluation strategies for community service-learning (with M. D'Eon and K. Trinder), and Van Styvendale was the Academic Director of the conference. The conference was supported by a SSHRC Public Outreach Workshops and Conferences grant, and this issue is one of a number of post-conference knowledge dissemination activities.

[4] Information Age Publishing, for example, has a series of ten collections focused on service-learning research.

[5] See, for example, Brown, 2007; Cawley, 2007; Gemmel and Clayton, 2009; Hayes, 2006.

dedication to examining community service-learning in the Canadian context, this issue seeks to feature aspects of the history, theory, practice, and future of CSL in this country.

The shape of community service-learning in Canada, as contributors to this issue observe (Aujla and Hamm; Kahlke and Taylor), is locally specific, based in particular regional and community needs, and quite variable across the nation—in part because of the country's geographic scope and dispersed population. Because there is no federal infrastructure or mandate for service-learning, engaged learning practices in Canada are open to great variability and cross-pollination. In addition to pieces that focus specifically on community service-learning, this special issue thus includes essays that turn to other models of community-engaged learning (CEL)—in particular, community-based learning (CBL) models such as Humanities for Humanity (Duncan), Walls to Bridges (Harris, Davis, and Sferrazza), and Wahkohtowin (LeBlanc), where university students take classes in off-campus settings (including community centres or prisons) with community members who might not otherwise be able to access postsecondary classes. Other forms of community-engaged learning include internships, co-op placements, and community-based research.[6] While we start with and focus primarily on CSL, we recognize that CSL exists as one of a range of interconnected community-engaged learning practices,[7] and as part of the larger movement of community-campus engagement or community-engaged scholarship in Canada—and in North America more broadly.

This approach was also a strategic component of the 2012 CACSL conference, where the keynote (Lloyd Axworthy) and two of three additional invited speakers (Keith Carlson and Simone Davis) were not CSL scholars or practitioners per se, but rather, engaged in other types of community-campus engagement and at varying levels, including largescale institutional change (Axworthy), community-based research (Carlson), and community-based education in prisons (Davis). In the follow-up conference survey, all of the delegates who responded thought that it was very useful (75%) or somewhat useful (25%) to have had speakers who situated CSL in the context of community-campus engagement and community-engaged scholarship more generally. Respondents commented on the complexity of the field, noting not only that it was the "spirit of CSL . . . to be inclusive" of a variety of approaches, but also that their own institutional or community roles necessitated an appreciation of engaged scholarship more broadly.[8]

---

[6] As CACSL details, "CSL and community based research are close kin with very similar principles. The main difference is that in community service-learning the focus is on providing whatever service the community needs, which can include research, but may also include other types of contribution to the work of the community agency."

[7] Terminology in the field of engaged scholarship and community-engaged learning is notoriously slippery and porous. While there is sometimes a conflation of terms—for example, Taylor et al. (2015) assert that CSL is also known as community-based learning or community-engaged learning (p. 5)—in other instances, CSL and CBL exist as distinct approaches under the CEL umbrella category. The editors of this issue abide by the latter categorization, while also recognizing the interconnectedness of these pedagogical approaches. See Furco (1996) and Mooney and Edwards (2001) for further discussion of experiential learning and the categorization of service-learning.

[8] See Butin (2006a) for a discussion of why "disciplining" service-learning—i.e. by developing discrete community studies programs that would serve as CSL's "academic home" (p. 57)—might be seen as a viable and desirable alternative to the broader approach remarked upon by conference attendees.

Butin (2006b) observes that the proliferation of service-learning since the end of the 20th century "mirrors a larger development in the academy—namely, higher education has begun to embrace a 'scholarship of engagement' (Boyer, 1990; Shulman, 2004), be it manifested as experiential education, service-learning, undergraduate research, community-based research, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or stronger relationships with local communities" (p. 473). While Butin is referring specifically to the United States, trends are similar in Canada. In the introduction to the inaugural issue of this very journal, Editor Natalia Friesen proposes that Canada's commitment to engaged scholarship followed the "lively debate in the United States on the nature and purpose of a university in general and of the 'scholarship of engagement' in particular" (p. 5), while also emerging from sociocultural conditions specific to our country. She draws on the work of Budd Hall (2013), who outlines three periods of engaged scholarship in Canada: first, from the early 20th century to 1998, during which engaged scholarship generally took place outside the academy, but had ties to university extension programs and organizations like Frontier College; second, from 1998 through the first decade of the new millennium, during which new community-university partnerships and research were catalyzed by the SSHRC CURA (Community-University Research Alliance) grant program;[9] and finally, the current period, during which engaged scholarship has been widely adopted by postsecondary institutions. As of 2013, Hall (2013) notes, between 50 to 60 universities had included engaged scholarship in their strategic plans and/or had infrastructure to support engagement.[10]

In 2017, at the annual C²U Expo conference, CSL scholars and practitioners from across the country joined with others involved in community-campus engagement (CCE) more broadly and gave support to draft a national vision statement that "commit[s] to working together to strengthen Canada's community-campus engagement (CCE) movement in service of the common good," calling on governments, universities and colleges, community-based organizations, private sector participants, professors, and students to engage in the process.[11]

In this context of increasing engagement, 2018 provides an opportune moment to assess the field of community service-learning and other engaged learning practices in Canada. Not coincidentally, this period of engagement is also a period of neoliberalism within higher education, characterized by the increasing privatization and corporatization of the university, the instrumentalization of knowledge, and the atomization of students-turned-consumers,

---

[9] SSHRC is a publicly-funded granting agency. The SSHRC CURA program no longer exists. The impact of this funding shift on the practice of engaged scholarship in Canada remains to be seen.

[10] See Kajner and Shultz (2013) for more on engaged scholarship in Canada.

[11] See *C²UExpo 2017 Collaborative Vision Statement on Community-Campus Engagement (CCE) in Canada* (https://carleton.ca/communityfirst/cross-sector-work/aligning-institutions/vision-for-cce-in-canada/). The statement was prepared by community and academic leaders from Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE), Research Impact Canada, the Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning, Community-Based Research Canada, and others.

as articles by Davis and Sferrazza make clear.[12] CSL, of course, is not always practiced in opposition to these changes, nor is it always compliant with them; it can be either, both, or occupy positions in between. As Raddon and Harrison (2015) argue, some scholars and practitioners see service-learning as a form of resistance to the ever-increasing socioeconomic disparities of the neoliberal era, while others see it as the "kind face" of neoliberalism, particularly when it is leveraged for university branding or used to inculcate values that are typically deployed in neoliberal politics, like individual "responsibility" over the welfare state.

This skepticism toward the field is not new, and it is, in fact, a productive expression of the self-reflexive approach for which CSL is known. In earlier scholarship, echoed in some of the essays here, theorists express hesitation about the very term and practice of "service-learning," pointing to how social hierarchies and the attendant inequities can be reified through the server/served binary of CSL's "charity model," in which the university is figured as provider of knowledge, expertise, and labour, and the community as beneficiary (Himley, 2004). CSL practices in Canada operate on what Chambers (2009) has termed a continuum of approaches, from "philanthropic" or charity-focused to "social justice" and "social transformative" approaches. Community and university partners both may invite or require contributions that fall more in line with the charity model of CSL, and ideas about what social justice-based CSL looks like can differ between practitioners, organizations, and institutions. Similarly, CSL has long struggled with a fundamental tension between its cultivation of "good citizenship" and its questioning of the social order on which such citizenship depends, a tension which Kahne and Westheimer (1996) famously describe in terms of the continuum of personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented citizenship that CSL encourages.

Along with other critical scholars of community service-learning, we posit that those of us who practice and theorize CSL must be vigilant and attentive to the transformative possibilities of the pedagogy, as well as its limitations or risks. Contributors to this issue do both, elucidating the potential of service-learning and other engaged learning pedagogies to encourage active citizenship, critical self-reflection, reciprocal relationships, and social justice, while also probing the assumptions and weaknesses of the field, pointing to its Eurocentric bias, its tendency to overlook community voice, its demands on community time and resources, and its elision of settler colonialism. In this milieu, we follow Davis (this issue) in wondering, "[W]hat would the consequences be, should faculty, students, university coordinators, community group staff and members aspire to genuine presence with one another, to listening receptively, connecting head and heart, and exploring what it means to acknowledge the ways that we are connected?" We hope that this issue provides an opportunity for just such practices of listening, exploration, and connection. We hope it is a gathering place, a conversation, and a springboard for the exciting work in which we are engaged across the country.

This issue brings together a diverse and dynamic collection of essays, "reports from

---

[12] Raddon and Harrison (2015) urge further research into the relationship between engaged learning and the sociopolitical context out of which it arises, arguing that service-learning can be seen as both a form of resistance to and an expression of neoliberal ideologies and governance.

the field," and conversations with community organizers. The first part of the "Essays" section includes three pieces that chart aspects of the history and context of CSL in Canada: Renate Kahlke and Alison Taylor undertake a systematic analysis of the CSL programs in nine McConnell-funded universities in Canada, while Wendy Aujla and Zane Hamm, and then Victoria Calvert and Halia Valladares Montemayor, examine the development of CSL in Canada by comparing it to the field in the United States and Mexico, respectively. Turning from the macro to the micro, the next two essays consider research that evaluates CSL in particular contexts. First, instructor Jana Grekul, along with graduate students Aujla, Eklics, Manca, York, and Aylsworth, considers the challenges and possibilities of teaching CSL in large group settings (specifically, in an introductory sociology class) and provides details about the pedagogical training of graduate student instructors. Next, Cathy Kline and co-authors Asadian, Godolphin, Graham, Hewitt, and Towle present the results of a community-based participatory research project, offering community perspectives on health professional education and presenting best practices for "authentic community engagement."

In the five essays that follow, authors consider key ethical issues surrounding CSL and create and extend novel theoretical approaches to the field: Brad Wuetherick argues for the potential of critical community service-learning to provide leadership training for students, and Jordan Sifeldeen proposes that CSL could deepen its theoretical foundations and methodologies by turning to the lexicon and archiving practices of queer pedagogy. Then, in contributions that together begin to address the gap in research about CSL and Indigenous peoples (Taylor et al., 2015), Mali Bain, Swapna Padmanabha, and Lori Hanson and Jethro Cheng examine CSL through the lens of decolonial and Indigenous research methodologies and pedagogical approaches. These three papers interrogate the colonial contexts in which CSL in Canada and abroad take place, proposing decolonial approaches to partnership development, CSL practices, and research in the field. In this context, decolonization refers to the need to centre Indigenous perspectives, acknowledge the effects of ongoing settler and neo-colonialism, and build respectful partnerships that honour Indigenous land and rights.

The final three pieces in the Essays section turn to community-based educational initiatives that bring together university students and community members who might not otherwise have access to postsecondary education. The papers look at initiatives that are distinct from CSL in that they do not invoke "service" by either university or community partners as a primary activity or aim. As Davis explains, the model used in these endeavors is often one of co-learning rather than service-learning, although the insights put forward about such initiatives can be translated to other community-based learning (CBL) contexts, including service-learning.[13] In John Duncan's piece, the focus is on examining the philosophy behind Humanities for Humanity, a free, community-based, university-style course run by Trinity

---

[13] While CBL has been variously parsed, we use the definition provided by Lori Pompa, Founder of the Inside-Out program: "Community-based learning—quite distinct from charity or the 'helping' modality—involves what Freire calls 'conscientization' and a critique of social systems, motivating participants to analyze what they experience and then act. The pedagogy of community-based learning, when done with great care and integrity, has the power to turn things inside-out and upside down for those engaged in it" (p. 24). Clearly, this definition resonates with understandings of critical service-learning adopted by many contributors to this issue.

College (but with incarnations across the country); Duncan reflects on his experience linking faculty, university students, and community members to discuss literary and philosophical texts. Invoking John Dewey's classic theory of educative experience, Judith Harris's essay then examines a different community-based educational initiative, Walls to Bridges, as a means of introducing the Circles of Safety model, which unites multiple constituencies within and beyond the university to support the education and reintegration of Indigenous women who have experiences with the criminal justice system. Simone Davis furthers the discussion of Walls to Bridges in the piece that concludes the Essays section, arguing that the "*how* of being together" needs to be centralized in joint community-university learning projects, and situating community-based learning as the site of collective imagination-building for social transformation.

The next section of the issue, "Reports from the Field," highlights the voices of community partners and students.[14] In her piece, Geri Briggs draws on her experience as Director of the Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning (CACSL) to propose key principles for improving community-campus engagement (CCE). Then, informed by her role as Executive Director of the Volunteer Action Centre of Kitchener Waterloo & Area, Jane Hennig discusses some common issues around community-campus partnerships, including the undervaluing of community perspectives in research, on steering committees, and at symposia, and she highlights how community-campus relations can be improved through new funding models and more dedicated efforts to include community voices. The final two essays in this section provide critical meditations on the transformative potential of community-based co-learning endeavours: Anna Sferrazza analyzes her experience as a non-incarcerated student in a Walls to Bridges class, arguing that the model offers a radical intervention in the current neoliberal climate by prompting students to work collaboratively rather than competitively, and to consider course content through embodied connections; and Dan LeBlanc discusses the Paideia—or "deep learning"—of wahkohtowin, a Cree word that means "interrelatedness" or "kinship," as he provides a Law student perspective on the Wahkohtowin model, a community-based learning initiative influenced by Indigenous pedagogy which brings together former gang members, Indigenous high school students, and university students to theorize justice and enact social change.

Our "Exchanges" section includes two lively conversations between the editors and community organizers. The first exchange puts veteran community activist Joan Kuyek in conversation with Nancy Van Styvendale to discuss CSL from a social justice perspective. Within the context of community-campus partnerships, Kuyek evaluates some of the challenges around funding protocols, pressures to publish, student placements, and project timelines, stressing that the guiding question of "*why* are we doing this?" needs to be

---

[14] It is important to note that the perspectives of community partners have until recently been lacking in the literature on CSL and engagement more generally (Steiner, Warkentin, & Smith, 2011; Stoecker, Tryon, & Hilgendorf, 2009). Even in the existing literature, the focus has primarily been on student outcomes and benefits, rather than on community partner perspectives (Carr, 2012), a phenomenon that Cruz and Giles (2000) see as linked to the marginalization of community service-learning in the academy and a need to showcase the effectiveness of this approach to skeptics and funders.

foregrounded in all community-campus work. The second exchange brings together three community representatives from Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Chantelle Johnson, Executive Director at CLASSIC (Community Legal Assistance Services for Saskatoon Inner City); Phaedra Hitchings, former Regional Coordinator for Frontier College in Saskatchewan; and Stan Tu'Inukuafe, social worker at Oskayak, Saskatoon's Indigenous High School. Their conversation highlights the benefits of their work with CSL while it also discloses the pressures on community partners to provide resources and labour, both material and emotional.

As a gathering of essays that attends to the diverse ways in which CSL is practiced and understood in Canada, much ground is covered in this issue. But much work has yet to be done. What we offer is a snapshot of some of the many approaches to and theories about community service-learning in this country, in conversation with a number of community-based co-learning projects. There are, of course, many other forms and iterations of community-engaged learning in Canada. In particular, this issue does not engage deeply with CSL in Québec or Francophone contexts more broadly.[15] This gap highlights one of the difficulties that exists with building a CSL movement in Canada, particularly across linguistic differences (Fryer et al., 2007). And while we have included community voices, there exists the need for more of these voices, both on their own and in collaboration with university partners, in addition to the voices of university staff, who we acknowledge have instigated much of the work of building CSL partnerships and programs in Canada.

Since the last decade of the 20th century, there has been an increased focus in the Canadian academy on community engagement, engaged scholarship, and community-university partnerships. The time is now ripe to reflect on the theories, practices, and effects of community service-learning as one of the major forms of engagement and partnership embraced by postsecondary institutions across the country. Where have we come from, and where are we going? The papers in this special issue of the *Engaged Scholar Journal* begin to answer these questions by providing an overview of the field and outlining some of its key practices and theories. They further present promising practices in terms of community-university partnership development and community-campus engagement. Meaningful relations between universities and communities is crucial as we consider and confront the innumerable social, economic, environmental, and political challenges that we face. It is our hope that this issue makes a contribution to this work.

---

[15] It is worth noting the work of Remi Tremblay from Université du Québec à Trois Rivières, who served as a member of the CACSL steering committee in the late 2000s and brought innovative CSL programs to the Université du Québec à Trois Rivières (Charbonneau, 2009).

Acknowledgements

About the Authors

Sarah Buhler is an Associate Professor at the University of Saskatchewan College of Law. Her research focuses on community lawyering and access to justice. Email: sarah.buhler@usask.ca

Jessica McDonald is a Ph.D. candidate in English at the University of Saskatchewan. Her primary research areas are Canadian literature, literary cartography, and postcolonial literatures and theories. She has been involved in CSL as a learner and researcher, and she continues to be committed to engaged learning practices as an instructor. Email: jessica.mcdonald@usask.ca

Nancy Van Styvendale (*corresponding author*) is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Native Studies (U of Alberta) who researches in the fields of Indigenous North American Literatures, carceral writing, and community-engaged learning. She was Academic Director of the national CSL conference at the University of Saskatchewan in 2012, and has been involved in CSL and other forms of engaged learning since 2007. Email: vanstyve@ualberta.ca

References

Barreno, L., Elliott, P. W., Madueke, I., & Sarny, D. (2013). *Community engaged scholarship and faculty assessment: A review of Canadian practices*.

Brown, S. D. (2007). *Community service and service learning in Canada: A profile of programming across the country*. Imagine Canada.

Butin, D. (2006a). Disciplining service learning: Institutionalization and the case for community studies. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 18*(1), 57-64.

Butin, D. (2006b). The limits of service-learning in Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(4), 473-498.

Butin, D. (2007). Justice-learning: Service-learning as justice-oriented education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40,* 177-183.

Butin, D. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. New York, NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.

CACSL. (n.d.). What is community service-learning?

Carr, V. (2012). CACSL 2012: Impacts of community engagement. Unpublished conference notes.

Cawley, J. (2007). *Community service-learning: Reflections from the foundation*. J. W. McConnell Family Foundation.

Charbonneau, L. (2009). Community connections: Students are the driving force behind the rapid growth of community service learning projects across the country.

Clevenger-Bright, M., Hays, K., Henricksen, L., Hlebain, D., Maglalang, J., Packard, M., Raftus, D. (2012). What is service-learning? [PDF document].

Cruz, N. L., & Giles, D. E. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, special vol.(*1*),* 28-34.

Chambers, T. (2009). A continuum of approaches to service-learning within Canadian post-secondary education. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 39,* 77-100.

Dorow, S., Wolfe R., Taylor, A., Trueblood, L., & Goebel, M. (2013). "The stranger" in CSL pedagogy and research. In L. Shultz and T. Kajner (Eds.), *Engaged scholarship: The politics of engagements and disengagement* (pp. 69-88). Rotterdam, NL: SensePublishers.

Duguid, F., Mündel, K., & Schugurensky, D. (2013). *Volunteer work, informal learning, and social action*. Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.

Fryer, M., Wallis, R., Sattar, K., Annette, J., Battistoni, R., & Lund-Chaix, A. (2007). Context and culture: Models of engagement around the world. In S. Gelmon and S. Billig (Eds.), *From passion to objectivity: International and cross disciplinary perspectives on service-learning research* (pp. 3-20). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In B. Taylor (Ed.), *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning* (pp. 2-6). Washington, DC: Cooperative Education Association.

Gelmon, S., Sherman, A., Gaudet, M., Mitchell, C., & Trotter, K. (2004). Institutionalizing service-learning across the university: International comparisons. In M. Welch and S. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 195-217). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Gemmel, L., & Clayton, P. (2009). *A comprehensive framework for community service-learning in Canada*. Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning.

Hayes, E. (2006). *Community service-learning in Canada: A scan of the field*. Canadian Association for Community Service-Learning.

Himley, M. (2004). Facing (up to) "the stranger" in community service-learning. *College Composition and Communication, 55*(3), 416-438.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what? The politics of service learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *77*(9), 592-599.

Kajner, T., Chovanec, D., Underwood, M., & Mian, A. (2013). Critical community service learning: Combining critical classroom pedagogy with activist community   placements. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19*(2), 36-48.

Keshen, J., Holland, B. A., and Moely, B. E. (2010). Introduction. In J. Keshen, B. A. Holland, and B. E. Moely (Eds.), *Research for what? Making engaged scholarship matter* (pp. ix-xviii). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Levkoe, C., Brail, S., & Daniere, A. (2014). Engaged pedagogy and transformative learning in graduate education: A service-learning case study. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 44*(3), 68-85.

Mitchell, T. (2008). Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*(2), 50-65.

Mooney, L. A., & Edwards, B. (2001). Experiential learning in Sociology: Service learning and other community-based learning initiatives. *Teaching Sociology*, *29*(2), 181-194.

Pompa, L. (2013). Drawing forth, finding voice, making change: Inside-Out leaning as transformative pedagogy. In S. W. Davis and B. S. Roswell (Eds.), *Turning teaching inside out: A pedagogy of transformation for community-based education* (pp. 13-26). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Raddon, M., & Harrison, B. (2015). Is service-learning the kind face of the neo-liberal university? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 45*(2), 134-153.

Raykov, M., Taylor, A., & Yochim, L. (2015). *Community service-learning resource base: Canadian CSL studies*. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Shultz, L., & Kajner, T, eds. (2013). *Engaged scholarship: The politics of engagement and disengagement*. Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.

Smith, T. S. (2010). Rhetorical strategies of the postsecondary community service movement in Canada. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic   Engagement, 1*(2), 1-18.

Steiner, S., Warkentin, B., & Smith, M. (2011). Community forums: A unique approach to community service learning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(1)*,* 282-307.

Stoecker, R., & Tryon, E., with Hilgendorf, A., eds. (2009). *The unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Taylor, A., Butterwick, S., Raykov, M., Glick, S., Peikazadi, N., & Mehrabi, S. (2015). *Community service-learning in Canadian higher education*.