

“We Don’t Need Any More Brochures”: Rethinking Deliverables in Service-Learning Curricula

Kendall Leon and Thomas Sura

ABSTRACT

Drawing on recent scholarship on service learning in writing programs, and on community engagement with new media technologies, this article reflects on the adoption of service-based curricula into first-year writing programs. This article aims to contribute to service-learning scholarship by questioning the primacy of deliverables for public audiences as a goal of service-learning classrooms—those brochures, posters, white papers, and so on that provide evidence of our community “intervention” (Deans, “English Studies” 9). In particular, this article focuses on the use of digital technologies for the production of internally circulating deliverables. To do this, the authors propose engagement portfolios as a way to focus service-learning efforts on inquiry while providing community partners with meaningful deliverables—descriptions of their infrastructures and histories.

INTRODUCTION

In the 2010-11 academic year, the authors of this essay participated in developing a new service-learning curriculum for first-year composition at a large Midwestern institution. Our inquiry into developing this curriculum began with a visit to our campus volunteer center. The primary purpose of this center was to coordinate the placement of students, faculty, and staff volunteers with local community partners.¹ During our interview, the campus volunteer coordinator provided two interesting pieces of information. First, he described a “glut” of volunteers from departments across the campus and explained that finding volunteer opportunities in the immediate vicinity was becoming more and more difficult. For his two-person operation, the number of students being shepherded their way was becom-

ing increasingly difficult to manage. Second, with dead eyes, he said, “We don’t need any more brochures.”

These discoveries led us to wonder about the products of service learning in first-year writing courses. In other words, what were the students producing as a result of their service? While a significant portion of discourse about service learning argues for what it should do—mainly foster critical cultural awareness—we aim to contribute to service-learning scholarship for writing program administrators by focusing on the primacy of deliverables for public audiences—those brochures, posters, white papers, and so on that provide evidence of our “intervention” (Deans, “English Studies” 9). Our concern is that these deliverables often become the primary focus of service-learning courses in ways that can actually undermine the learning goals of first-year writing. To counter this focus, we articulate an inquiry-based approach to service learning that begins with students mapping the infrastructure of a community partner through genres like profiles and instruction sets. These documents are then collected into a form of an *engagement portfolio* that serves as the deliverable for a community partner. We specifically focus on the use of digital technologies for the production of these engagement portfolios because of the opportunities for invention, collaboration, circulation, and sustainability. We believe this strategy for developing service-learning curricula in first-year writing programs may better sustain administrative, course, and partnership goals over time.

SERVICE LEARNING IN FIRST-YEAR WRITING PROGRAMS

Service learning and community engagement are approaches to teaching writing that have received ample attention in rhetoric and composition, and as our volunteer coordinator suggested, in many other disciplines as well. Writing about service learning at its nascent stage, Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks, and Anne Watters describe how this type of curriculum can increase motivation for both students and teachers as well as establish connections between the community and all levels of the academy (2–3). Yet service learning is not without formidable challenges. Ellen Cushman argues that strong and sustainable community partnerships must avoid the “hit-it-and-quit-it relation” employed by so many service-learning initiatives (“Sustainable Service Learning Programs” 41). Likewise, Linda Flower asks writing teachers to [re]consider the goals and methods for these courses to better reflect and respect community knowledge (95–96). Therefore the arc of service-learning curricula has moved from simply writing *about* the community to writing *for* the community to writing *with* the community (Deans, *Writing Partnerships* 17).

Despite the wealth of information on service learning in higher education, service learning and community engagement specifically within writing program administration has been largely underexplored (Rose and Weiser 5). In *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, for example, only a handful of articles have explicitly addressed the subject. In 2004, Candace Spigelman argued that when adopting service-based curricula, writing program administrators must avoid treating the activity as an “individualist enterprise” (98). The rhetoric surrounding service learning, she argues, too often reinforces “radically individualist” ideologies like “equal opportunity, merit-based rewards, and individual action” rather than “foster[ing] (or at least rais[ing] awareness of the need for) social justice or social transformation” (96–97). In 2007, Nicole Amare and Teresa Grettano warned against one-size-fits-all, course-based approaches to service learning, contending that “issues concerning budgeting, student responsibilities outside the classroom, connections with organizations in the community, and training and commitments of faculty have made service learning difficult to implement everywhere” (58). They further suggest that “to work toward community engagement and reap some of the benefits of traditional service-learning initiatives, WPAs at certain institutions need to devise alternative programs that work within their institutions’ frameworks” (58).

What these scholars identified and addressed in different ways were deficiencies in how writing program administrators talked about and implemented service learning in their programs. For Spigelman, the answer to the rhetorical problem of service learning was to “take students beyond the coursework-outreach connection, beyond even a critique of systemic conditions and hegemonic discourses, to interrogate as well their own roles (and complicity) as service learners” (108). For Amare and Grettano, the answer to the challenges of implementing service-learning courses was to move their service learning outside of the traditional course-based model. In both cases, the scholars left ample room to address how WPAs might work to move students toward greater awareness of social justice and related issues within the formidable constraints of traditional course-based service learning.

In 2010, Shirley Rose and Irwin Weiser published *Going Public*, a much-needed collection exploring the intersections of service learning and writing program administration. This collection does a great deal for integrating service learning into the intellectual terrain of writing program administration, but it stops short of providing a how-to guide for writing program administrators. Instead, the focus of the collection is capturing the “emergence of a new conception and definition of the pragmatic work of writing programs, informed by a new rhetoric and renewed rhetorical theory as well as by new conceptions of disciplinarity and professionalism” (5). This

“new rhetoric” for engagement includes “developing awareness of new audiences, turning attention in different directions, and discovering new sets of arguments for curricula” (4). Our aim in the remainder of this essay is to examine some of that pragmatic work of service learning and writing program administration and to contribute to the lexicon of the new rhetoric that Rose and Weiser advocate.

THE ELEVATION OF DELIVERABLES

In order to contribute to a new rhetoric for engagement for writing programs, we want to begin by “turning attention in different directions” (Rose and Weiser 4). Right now, we presume that the default premise of some, if not many, service-learning curricula is to produce something for the community partner that will exist in external circulation: a public document that is rhetorically crafted for an audience apart from the community partner. The primary goal is that the community partner’s audience will see it, as if the only challenge for any community partner is “getting the word out” about what they are doing. For example, an engagement project with a local animal shelter may focus on creating community awareness about the animal shelter’s services. Hence, students compose brochures, flyers, or websites for the animal shelter’s perceived audiences.

In addition to meeting partnership goals for service-learning projects, instructors might feel compelled to have students produce something for the community partners by the end of the semester that can also be shown to the various audiences that writing program administrators have to respond to—including students, other administrators, scholarly venues, and possible funders for these service-learning endeavors. This challenge we are calling the *elevation of deliverables*. The purpose in proposing this term is to give a name to the often intense pressures both to provide a community partner with something that adds value to its work through external circulation and to document our own—teachers’ and students’—intervention in that work to our various audiences. To make it visible. We contend that this *elevation of deliverables* creates two counter-productive situations in service-learning curricula. First, it emphasizes product over equally valued curricular components like inquiry. Second, it severely limits the invention of possible ways students and teachers might engage productively with community partners.

The elevation of deliverables has its roots in articulations of what differentiates volunteerism from service-learning. In essence, volunteerism focuses on contributing hours of time to a cause while service learning combines volunteer time with classroom instruction and critical reflection

in order to achieve new insights and engage in public advocacy. The key difference for service learning, then, is the inclusion of a reflective component; however, this alone proved inadequate for practitioners. Thomas Deans, for example, sums up the difference this way: “[I]n addition to inviting abstract critical *interpretation* of cultural phenomena, service-learning initiatives demand the logical corollary, that is, grounded, active *intervention* in the very cultural context we inhabit” (“English Studies” 103). The deliverables of a service-learning course are the tangible embodiments of *intervention*. They are proof that we were here and that we did something. Examples of these interventions abound in the literature connecting service learning and composition studies. In 1994, Bruce Herzberg alluded to the evolution of service-learning deliverables:

At first, the projects were simple: Students in writing courses visited soup kitchens and wrote up their experiences. Later, as the service-learning program developed, students in accounting classes helped revise the accounting procedures of non-profit community service agencies and audited their books for free. Students in marketing and business communication designed advertising and public relations materials to improve the distribution of agencies’ services. (307)

In its first phase, reflection was the expected outcome, but as the curricula evolved, students began practicing the core competencies of their disciplines. Accounting students revised procedures and provided audits. Marketing students designed ads and public relations materials. What, then, could writing students do but write? In 2000, Deans reported that “novice college writers are working in teams to compose research reports, news-letter articles, and manuals for local nonprofit agencies; tutoring children and bringing that experience back to the classroom as a text to be analyzed alongside other texts; and collaborating with urban youth to craft documents in intercultural, hybrid rhetorics” (*Writing Partnerships* 97). These projects make sense, and they appear to fit so well. The problem is that this reporting of novice college writers engaging in these complex and meaningful projects glosses over how incredibly difficult it can be to identify and complete these projects at least to a satisfactory level within the time constraints of a sixteen-week writing course. As Cushman suggests, “The end-of-the-semester project model of service learning undermines its goal of providing real-world writing because the real research process and writing that professors engage in is grossly represented and generally overlooked as an integral part of the service learning” (“Sustainable” 46). With a finite amount of time and a dearth of heuristics for invention, it is easy, if not necessary, for instructors in service-learning courses to default to basic,

familiar genres that demonstrate what they've done *for* a community partner—posters, flyers, brochures, and even attempts at websites. But we must recall our volunteer coordinator's message at this point: "We don't need any more brochures."

To address this challenge to service-learning curricula, we invoke another element of the new rhetoric proposed by Rose and Weiser: "developing awareness of new audiences" (4). We propose turning attention from a community partner's external audiences to the community partner itself. Our inspiration for this shift is derived from Jeffrey Grabill's recent work connecting infrastructure and writing programs. In "Infrastructure Outreach and the Engaged Writing Program," Grabill contends that writing programs are already places where research and teaching happen. As such, writing programs provide the infrastructure necessary for research on engagement, but they often don't think of themselves in that way. Grabill defines infrastructure in many ways. He argues that infrastructure "supports work" and that it is "not stable, fixed—visible even—but rather emerges—becomes visible and meaningful through use (15). Furthermore, he asserts that "if we want to understand the rhetorical work that people do together, we must render visible the infrastructure that remains (or wants to remain) invisible and that supports, locates—participates in—that rhetorical work" (21). Though Grabill's work is expressly focused on writing programs, we want to apply the same ideas of infrastructure to engagement with community partners. Instead of students working all semester to make their intervention visible to the community partner's audiences, what if students worked all semester to make visible the infrastructure that supports the community partner's rhetorical work? Doing so may enable students to learn that writing is an embedded and supported activity that requires a systematic method and an awareness of new audiences—including the instructor, the instructor's future students who may work with the community partner, and the community partner itself.

While Grabill's notion of infrastructure helps us imagine one way we might approach work with a community partner, the idea of focusing inquiry on the community partner itself is not at all new. In fact, in 2002, Cushman asserted "the professor in service learning needs to understand the workings of these organizations just as much as the students do" ("Sustainable" 43). In the final section of this essay, we articulate a new argument for curricula that facilitate the turning of attention and the awareness of new audiences that we have described so far. It is an attempt to describe a systematic method of writing in service learning that re-imagines the portfolio—a ubiquitous and valuable tool in contemporary writing instruction—and its place in a new rhetoric of engagement.

ENGAGEMENT PORTFOLIOS IN THE SERVICE LEARNING CLASS

In writing courses, portfolios are typically divided into two categories: best-works portfolios and process portfolios. According to Nedra Reynolds and Rich Rice, best-works portfolios are aimed most specifically at evaluation or presentation. They consist of polished drafts of multiple genres and generally focus on proving to an audience that its owner should “pass a course, receive an award, or get a promotion.” On the other hand, process portfolios are not expressly produced for evaluation or presentation. They create a space “specifically designed to benefit learners” because “students have the freedom to determine most of the content and the method of organizing it.” In essence, students choose from “a variety of artifacts that demonstrate how [they have] learned, not just what [they have] learned.” The glue that makes this portfolio more than a scrapbook is the student’s “collection, selection, and...reflection” (2). The value, then, for a portfolio pedagogy emerges out of its sensitivity to the writing process without neglecting the finished product, as well as the inclusion of reflection and inquiry to generate new knowledge about content and writing itself (Yancey 15–16).

As a result of our own work in service learning combined with our understanding of portfolios and a need to “understand the workings of these organizations just as much as the students do” (Cushman, “Sustainable” 43), we imagine using process portfolios more or less as a heuristic for working with a new community partner. In other words, rather than service learning requiring an instructor to invest countless hours uncovering a viable way for students to engage with a community partner, that work should actually become the work of the course, both initially and throughout subsequent iterations of the course.

We imagine these portfolios unfolding through any number of thoughtfully integrated tasks. Knowing full well that any context where this strategy is implemented will yield new ideas or remixes, we present here a pragmatic foundation from which to build. *Engagement portfolios*, in their most basic form, may include the following writing tasks:

- *Write a Profile.* Any organization is made up of individual people. Depending on the number of people, students profile each participant, including rich descriptions of who they are and what they do. Organizations, like compositions, are also “invented” as they emerge, respond to exigencies, are arranged and revised. The profile, then, might also include a historical investigation into how the organization came to be.
- *Write an Instruction Set.* In an organization of people doing work, there are processes enacted daily. Perhaps more common in profes-

sional writing and editing, instruction sets are a genre described by Anne Wysocki and Dennis Lynch in *Compose Design Advocate*. Students, using their interviewees as resources, write instruction sets describing the various processes that community partners engage in.

- *Write a Rhetorical Analysis*. As an organization of people doing work, any community partner will possess pieces of communication that may include memos, brochures, or websites. For this assignment, students analyze one of those pieces of communication, attempting to explain how it works by using a rhetorical lens. The rhetorical analysis might also delve into the function, impact and view of the organization in the local community.
- *Write a Position Paper*. In an organization of people doing work for a purpose, there will be complex community and social issues that the organization is working to address. For example, the issues may be how to persuade pet owners to spay and neuter their pets or how best to care for the elderly.

While these writing tasks may easily be produced and compiled into binders or books, to do so automatically is to ignore one of the great affordances of digital technology.

Recently, there has been burgeoning interest in exploring the particularities of, and implications for, incorporating new media and digital technologies in service-learning first-year writing classrooms. Toward this end, several scholars have developed heuristics and methodologies for new media engagement (Cushman, “Toward a Praxis”; Kimme Hea, “Developing Stakeholder Relationships” and “Rearticulating Web 2.0 Technologies”; Turnley). Employing these heuristics led us to think about electronic engagement portfolios as something other than static repositories of distinct Microsoft Word documents to facilitate better collaboration. Instructors and community partners may employ many of the Web 2.0 technologies that support collaboratively produced and shared knowledge through media (such as Prezi or wikis) that can be housed on the Web and located on a particular server.

While this may seem unconventional for a first-year writing classroom, there are several examples of wikis being employed in this manner. Allowing for “vertical knowledge building,” Chris Anson and Susan Cochran-Miller have demonstrated that wikis in the writing classroom enable “meaningful connections [to] occur not just between instructors teaching the same course, or between students within a section of a class, but also across space and time, between sections of the same course” (39). Instead of starting from scratch each semester, current students build on what stu-

dents from previous semesters have done. The wiki enables the writing to remain as a record and a heuristic.

We contend that these same affordances of sharing writing processes between classes from semester to semester would be especially applicable for students engaged in service-learning projects. In this regard, what is especially salient about the use of Web 2.0 technologies for electronic portfolio production is the capability to capture non-linear writing processes and the mundane (and yet nonetheless insightful) writing indicative of invention—such as planning documents, marginalia, sticky notes, and so forth. Such spaces might better afford memory, or documentation, of nuances in a shared knowledge-making endeavor and spark new ideas for how social network technology may be utilized by the community partner. In these ways, the community partner receives sustained attention, an opportunity to lead the action, and an impetus for innovating.

The use of digital technologies to capture what might be treated as more “mundane” acts of writing further supports our primary goal of inquiry-driven learning for the students. While the above list of potential writing tasks that students might consider including in their engagement portfolios may seem fairly traditional when seen as outcomes of a service-learning-based writing course (see for example Deans, *Writing and Community Action*), we postulate that the digital technologies that students engage with in their everyday lives represent potential inquiry tools. For instance, students can document the various writing processes, spaces and environments of a community partner by using cell phones to capture sound or video. Or, groups collaborating on a project might use text messaging as a way to record observations unobtrusively, problem solve, or brainstorm from different locales. In this way, the use of digital technology throughout the students’ engagement with a community partner extends a learning outcome of first-year writing as stated by the Council of Writing Program Administrators—to “use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts” (“WPA Outcomes Statement”)—beyond just the production and circulation of texts. The employment of everyday technologies also addresses obstacles that some instructors face when integrating writing technologies in their pedagogy. Everyday technologies may in fact be preferable to the less mobile and more expensive hardware and software that require extensive resources and institutional support to maintain. Students typically are already bringing such technologies to class; the portability of these devices allows for both mobile composing and for capturing writing in action.

IMPLICATIONS

Our new argument for curricula related to service learning relies on re-imagining the portfolio, both its audience and its apparatus. These two elements of portfolios are united here by a pedagogy focused on memory making, which speaks to the potential implications of employing engagement portfolios as deliverables in service-learning courses.³ To be more specific, we see ways in which engagement portfolios may yield positive outcomes for all of the stakeholders in service-learning or community-engagement encounters: student, community partners, teachers, and administrators.⁴

For students, engagement portfolios emphasize writing as a mode of sustained inquiry into local and contextual issues, rather than a mode of expressing an opinion about a solution to a more broadly defined and decontextualized social issue. For example, this approach might highlight the question “What does poverty look like in my community?” rather than “What should America do about poverty?” As Michael Norton and Eli Goldblatt explain, “Inquiry emphasizes the need to write and rewrite because writing matters to others around you” (32). Engagement portfolios emphasize the people working on these issues, the choices they make, and the limitations they must grapple with—choices that involve considerations of audience and purpose. Likewise, the assembling of engagement portfolios asks students to compose with a clearer purpose and multiple audiences in mind, as well as to consider the rhetorical effectiveness of their chosen media in reaching these audiences.

Our hypothesis is that through the primary research and reflection made central in this approach, students may make more progress toward the goal of critical consciousness than they might through the production of other common deliverables. Engagement portfolios would also allow for students to collect a range of writing materials such as notes, memos, and other important memory artifacts, which can often be more useful or insightful than “polished” writing—thereby extending their understanding of writing both in the composition classroom and beyond. Composition, as we all might agree, is not just about writing alphabetic texts. Composition is about composing, arranging, and connecting. Electronic engagement portfolios enable students to see composition in an expansive way as they work to create a robust and fluid memory of an organization.

One of the key tenets of service learning is the idea of reciprocity (Cushman, “Sustainable”). Having the rhetorical memory of their organization composed through engagement portfolios speaks to a beneficial outcome for community partners. Let us give you an example to illustrate this point. One of the authors recently joined a board of directors for a local organiza-

tion. There is currently no paid staff for the organization, yet they have been successful in achieving outreach to their primary audiences and in sponsoring a few major local events. However, the processes used to achieve these goals are not documented, nor are the events and outreach initiatives, nor the impact these initiatives (or the organization) has on the community. This is the kind of information and documentation that is needed in future compositions such as grant proposals. Engagement portfolios would provide an opportunity for students to collect and create this documentation. At the same time then, engagement portfolios, as we have articulated them, effectively blur writing *about* and writing *for* the community. Community partners may find useful questions, dialogues, or ideas that result directly from the students' thinking about the community partner and their work. If one semester of student engagement with the community partner yields the identification of one or two major challenges, then the next semester of student engagement may yield the identification of one or two feasible solutions. The third semester may yield one or two attempts at executing those solutions as well as the identification of one or two new challenges, and so on. The ability to share and build upon engagement portfolios would work well in both a one-semester approach to first-year writing and a two-semester sequence in which the portfolio would be the culminating outcome for the second semester.

For teachers, especially considering that many of the people teaching these courses may be graduate assistants or adjunct faculty, the outcomes include strategies for contending with the elevation of deliverables and the sustainability of relationships with community partners. During the initial stages of engagement with the community partner, the instructors too can focus on inquiry, using the course to learn—along with the students—about the community partner. Most discourse about higher education employs the “co-learner” rhetoric for incorporating technology into pedagogy (e.g., Davis and Marsh; Frost; Journet); however, there is no reason it cannot apply to other circumstances. The pressure is off of the instructor to make the course solely about video, audio, or Web production; instead, the course can focus on inquiry.

Furthermore, the elevation of deliverables requires that projects be completed within a semester (Lawler). Students may take away from this project timeline an inaccurate understanding of what it means to write in community spaces. Portfolios would allow projects to operate more on a writing-*with* approach because they can be responsive to the rhetorical timing of a community partner. The culminating project for a particular class could then be a blueprint for how to enact the next step to address a particular problem or exigency. The artificiality of the semester timeline also contrib-

utes to a problem of sustainability. A well-developed engagement portfolio might result in more usable (and later adaptable) writing for community partners who have high turnover rates for staff and volunteers. Such a portfolio would also allow a community partner to decide, along with students, which technologies to use to deliver a project or meet a goal, at any given time, in this way invoking what James Lawler describes as an “agile methodology” to teaching technologically rich service-learning courses (118). Engagement portfolios can be taken up by subsequent classes for pedagogic and project development but can also be utilized as a resource to enable research on community and engaged writing as it creates a sharable memory of the project planning. Therefore, one instructor could not only share that history with the community partner but also feasibly pass that history on to a different instructor or WPA so that the relationship can continue.

This benefit for the instructor applies at the administrative level as well. Engagement portfolios can be a method for achieving programmatic cohesion and memory, as well as new models for assessment. As part of a group of instructors teaching a service-based approach to first-year writing, we often struggled to determine what these courses had in common (aside from meeting the overall goals for the first-year writing course). Our initial impetus was to collect shared readings for the course to ground all of our sections, especially as we had the added complexity of the course needing to fulfill the goals for our composition course. We found it difficult to come to a consensus about which readings equally fit the needs of the particular section or project, and as writing instructors, we did not want to put the emphasis on readings as the glue binding our sections together. Instead, we see adopting a shared portfolio approach to teaching this course as a way to ensure cohesion.

Portfolios would also allow us, as administrators, to better assess the rhetorical abilities developed through a service-based writing pedagogy in comparison with a more traditional approach. For a service-learning pedagogy, portfolios can enact rhetorical memory in several ways. Whereas we found that, in their cover memos to their service projects, students myopically focused on the production of the project, portfolios would allow students to consider their development of critical practices in multiple moments in a course and not just in the production of the project itself. Even if we were only to consider the project, portfolios might extend students’ consideration of their invention and engagement to include nuanced moments in their service project cycle and not just those that students would typically consider to be relevant to a writing course. Further, the development of engagement portfolios as a deliverable of the course allows an infrastructure to emerge that supports continuity and continuance of

our courses to help “enable the work of others” including teachers, students and our community partners, which is the work of a writing program (Grabbill 15).

CONCLUSION

The new rhetoric for engagement that Rose and Weiser call for comes at a crucial moment in how we think about writing program administration. The Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) campaign undertaken by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, has explicitly articulated that civic knowledge and engagement—on both local and global levels—are essential learning outcomes for liberal education (“Essential Learning Outcomes”). As writing program administrators, our challenge is to preserve what we already know about impactful writing instruction while developing its nuances and expanding its scope to address the learning needs of the twenty-first century. Likewise, our argument for something new—engagement portfolios—is in reality a call to enhance and enrich a founding tenet of rhetoric and composition as a “dappled discipline” (Lauer 20). In 1984, Janice Lauer extolled the virtues of the multidisciplinary of rhetoric and composition but also suggested that this virtue comes at a price. She wrote, “As [Howard] Ranken cautions, anyone who borrows work from another field must not only acquire an accurate and thorough grasp of the work itself, but also must understand its context, history and the status it enjoys in its parent field” (26). Like Janice Lauer, and later, Ellen Cushman, we suggest that our ventures into service learning are much the same as our ventures into other fields. While we stand to gain from these ventures, we must also engage in them thoughtfully and thoroughly with our students. Our hope is that engagement portfolios provide one way for us to approach community partners with the same respect and thoughtfulness that Lauer, Cushman, and others have suggested, striving to understand their work but also striving to understand their context, history, and status in order to truly be of service.

NOTES

1. This model for an on campus volunteer center may differ from other models insofar as the volunteer center focused solely on volunteer placement and connection, with the occasional facilitation of service projects to garner student involvement. The pedagogical considerations of service learning in the classroom are addressed at a separate office on campus, which serves as the general teaching development center.

2. Paying attention to questions of “what” might seem [current] traditional in light of the trend in rhetoric and composition to attend to matters of “when” (i.e., DeVoss, Cushman, and Grabill); or the “how” (i.e., Sirc). However, service learning in the writing classroom—especially in the multimedia writing classroom—deserves attention in its uncomplicated reification of the “what.”

3. As instructors teaching some of the pilot sections of our writing program’s attempt to integrate service learning into our first-year composition classes, we grounded the course theoretically and methodologically for students in memory and memory-making. Memory is an especially salient aspect of the rhetorical canon here because we consider memory as part of communities and community building within different spheres, including geographic areas, digital spaces, and writing programs. Memory has been invoked in writing program administration scholarship, primarily focused on institutional memory through genre and documentation (Dyer). Within community literacy and service learning scholarship, memory becomes a resource for invention, reinvention, and continuance (Muttick; Monberg). Finally, memory is widely studied in professional writing and digital studies as questions about archiving, documentation, and recollection as they relate to participation and collectivity abound (Whittemore; Haskins; Haas). Memory creates overlaps between these scholarly areas as we raise questions of sustainability and circulation.

4. We are currently in the midst of piloting the use of engagement portfolios in our service-learning writing classrooms and assessing these outcomes.

WORKS CITED

- Adler-Kassner, Linda, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters. “Service-Learning and Composition at the Crossroads.” *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*. Ed. Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks, and Ann Watters. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1997. 1–17. Print.
- Amare, Nicole and Teresa Grettano. “Writing Outreach as Community Engagement.” *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 30.3 (2007): 57–74. Web. 3 Jan. 2012.
- Anson, Chris, and Susan K. Miller-Cochran. “Contrails of Learning: Using New Technologies for Vertical Knowledge-Building.” *Computers and Composition* 26 (2009): 38–48. Print.
- Cushman, Ellen. “Sustainable Service Learning Programs.” *College Composition and Communication* 54 (2002): 40–65. Print.
- . “Toward a Praxis of New Media: The Allotment Period in Cherokee History.” *Reflections: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy* 5 (2006): 111–32. Print.
- Davis, Octavia and Bill Marsh. “Networking, Storytelling and Knowledge Production in First-Year Writing.” *Computers and Composition* 29 (2012): 175–84. Print.

- Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service Learning in Composition*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 2000. Print.
- . *Writing and Community Action: A Service Learning Rhetoric with Readings*. New York: Longman, 2003. Print.
- . "English Studies and Public Service." *Writing and Community Engagement: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Thomas Deans, Barbara Roswell, and Adrian J. Wurr. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010. 97–116. Print.
- DeVoss, Dànielle Nicole, Ellen Cushman, and Jeffrey T. Grabill. "Infrastructure and Composing: The *When* of New-Media Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 57 (2005): 14–44. Print.
- Dryer, Dylan B. "The Persistence of Institutional Memory: Genre Uptake and Program Reform." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 31.3 (2008): 32–51. Print.
- "Essential Learning Outcomes." *Liberal Education and America's Promise [LEAP]: Vision*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2012. Web. 24 July 2012.
- Flower, Linda. "Partners in Inquiry: A Logic for Community Outreach." Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters 95–117. Print.
- Frost, Erin. "Why Teachers Must Learn: Student Innovation as a Driving Factor in the Future of the Web." *Computers and Composition* 28 (2011): 269–75. Print.
- Grabill, Jeffrey. "Infrastructure Outreach and the Engaged Writing Program." Rose and Weiser 15–28. Print.
- Haas, Angela. "Wampum as Hypertext: An American Indian Intellectual Tradition of Multimedia Theory and Practice." *SAIL: Studies in American Indian Literature* 19.4 (2007): 77–100. Web. 20 Dec. 2011.
- Haskins, Ekaterina. "Between Archive and Participation: Public Memory in a Digital Age." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 37 (2007): 307–32. Print.
- Herzberg, Bruce. "Community Service and Critical Teaching." *College Composition and Communication* 45 (1994): 307–19. Print.
- Journet, Debra. "Inventing Myself in Multimodality: Encouraging Senior Faculty to Use Digital Media." *Computers and Composition* 24 (2007): 107–20. Print.
- Kimme Hea, Amy. "Developing Stakeholder Relationships: What's at Stake?" *Reflections: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy* 4 (2005): 54–76. Print.
- . "Rearticulating Web 2.0 Technologies: Strategies to Redefine Social Media in Community Projects." *Higher Education, Emerging Technologies, and Community Partnership*. Ed. Melody Bowdon and Russell Carpenter. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2011. 235–43. Print.
- Lauer, Janice. "Composition Studies: Dappled Discipline." *Rhetoric Review* 3 (1984): 20–29. Print.
- Lawler, James P. "Critical Success Factors for Partnering with Nonprofit Organizations on Digital Technology Service-Learning Projects: A Case Study." *Higher Education, Emerging Technologies, and Community Partnership*. Ed. Melody Bowdon and Russell Carpenter. Hershey: IGI Global, 2011. 106–23. Print.

- Monberg, Terese. "Listening for Legacies, or How I Began to Hear Dorothy Laigo Cordova, the Pinay Behind the Podium Known as FAHNS." In *Representations: Doing Asian American Rhetoric*. Ed. Luming Moa and Morris Young. Logan: Utah State UP, 2008. 83–105. Print.
- Mutnick, Deborah. "Inscribing the World: An Oral History Project in Brooklyn." *College Composition and Communication* 58 (2007): 626–47. Print.
- Norton, Michael H. and Eli Goldblatt. "Centering Community Literacy: The Art of Location Within Institutions and Neighborhoods." *Rose and Weiser* 29–49. Print.
- Reynolds, Nedra and Rich Rice. *Portfolio Teaching: A Guide for Instructors*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006. Print.
- Rose, Shirley and Irwin Weiser, eds. *Going Public: What Writing Programs Learn from Engagement*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2010. Print.
- Sirc, Geoffrey. *English Composition as a Happening*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2002. Print.
- Spigelman, Candace. "Politics, Rhetoric, and Service-Learning." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 28.1/2 (2004): 95–113. Print.
- Turnley, Melinda. "Integrating Critical Approaches to Technology and Service Learning Projects." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 16 (2007): 103–23. Print.
- Whittemore, Stewart. "Metadata and Memory: Lessons from the Canon of *Memo-ria* for the Design of Content Management Systems." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 17 (2008): 88–109. Print.
- "WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition." *Council of Writing Program Administrators*. Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2008. Web. 16 July 2012.
- Wysocki, Anne Frances and Dennis Lynch. *Compose, Design, Advocate*. New York: Longman, 2007. Print.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake, ed. *Portfolios in the Writing Classroom*. Urbana: NCTE, 1992. Print.

