Within the framework of service learning, partnerships are essential to the success of merging faculty and community goals. In the text, *Reconceptualizing Faculty Development in Service-Learning/Community Engagement*, the authors provide various perspectives on how service-learning professionals can, as the title suggests, re-conceptualize the way in which they engage faculty for service-learning initiatives. As parts of a bike work together to enable the rider to continue to reach their destination, the text presents a holistic framework for students, faculty, administrators, community partners, and service-learning professionals to reach the goal of professional educational and community development. In four parts, the authors provide models of practice through the form of case studies, institutional spotlights, and faculty perspectives. Through these various avenues of information, the text proves effective in demonstrating how service-learning is an intersectional journey of engagement.

Recent books have explored specific approaches to community engagement and service-learning initiatives such as exploring this form of learning within feminist scholarship (Dean, Johnson, & Luhmann, 2019) and also through a framework on language learning (Clifford & Reisinger, 2019). Also, an emphasis on place-based learning has been explored in conjunction with the continued push for faculty and community partners to form interpersonal relationships to continue sustainable partnerships with the ultimate goal of social change (Dumlao, 2018; Yamamura, & Koth, 2018). Berkey, Meiner, Green, and Eddins’ book fits within the scope of recent books as it serves as a general resource for faculty development, no matter the specific approach of the service-learning program or community partnership. The text contributes to the cannon by highlighting ways that service-learning professionals cross borders of multidimensional identities. Each of the 12 chapters crosses these borderlands by highlighting how service-learning professionals, faculty, students, and community partners work together to improve skills, knowledge, and application.

The editors begin the book’s introduction by identifying as educators who are seeking to “empower all readers to reflect and explore their own identities, values, and passions” (Berkey et al., 2018, p. 3). They build upon Gloria Anzaldúa’s concept of borderlands and challenge readers to introspectively reflect upon their values and identities as they experience potentially transformational opportunities which will allow them to cross intersections of class, race, positionality, access, location, and implicit biases. This foundational section of the text is effective in how it allows readers to reflect on their existence within in Whitchurch’s (2013) concept of third space as they take on identities as scholars and practitioners. The book proceeds to enter Part 1 which presents the purpose of the book in terms of the holistic framework approach to the professional development of those involved in service-learning. Chapter 1 would be beneficial to readers because Welch and Moore show how the stakeholders within service learning and community engagement serve students, develop faculty, and partner within communities; varying readers are able to see themselves within the discussion starting from the first chapter. Chapter 2 of Part One proceeds to discuss the two paradigms often at the forefront of this form of engagement: collaborate engagement and scholarship. By acknowledging those often two concerns of university faculty, readers are more likely to
continue reading into Part 2 for the different types of faculty development through case studies and model practices.

Part 2 focuses on tangible and proven ways to build community through faculty development. The section begins with Chapter 3 by emphasizing that service-learning personnel should work to determine an objective to the service initiative, then integrate scholarship, teaching, and service. Soliciting the support of on-campus departments such as libraries, study abroad offices, disability services, academic student supports, and career services allows for more institutional collaborations and can yield a larger impact. Keeping the goals at the forefront, service learning professionals can aid faculty in creating these collaborations, seek grants and stipends for financial costs, conduct workshops and short-term programs for best practices, increase social media engagement, and determine “the goals they [faculty members] are trying to achieve, the needs of the institutions and communities, and likely effectiveness of different programming types” (Berkey et al., 2018, p. 104).

Chapters 3 and 4 showcase case studies from institutions across the United States which provide frameworks for establishing relationships between faculty and to develop support structures. For example, Boise State University in Idaho is featured as an example of an institution in a rural area and with limited organizations to potentially partner. Through this challenge, the university continues to work with available community partners. They also strive to combat the savior complex by encouraging and requiring continued reflection from students “on their growth and development to avoid ‘saving’” (Berkey et al., 2018, p. 124). This example reflects how other schools may have similar challenges; therefore, the text provides varying examples and case studies for small, large, urban, rural, long established, nascent, fully-funded, and limited resource programs to learn best practices from schools such as Johns Hopkins University, University of Central Florida, Portland State University, and Saint Joseph’s University.

Parts 3 and 4 expound on the information provided in Chapters 1 and 2, where much of the weight of the text lies. The final parts present more focus on the design of service-learning projects and the many challenges and conflicts which may arise between faculty. The goal of reciprocity between campuses and communities is an ultimate goal, but the authors do not deter from the reality that constant reflection and clarity of intentions can help to alleviate tensions.

This book is useful for a wide range of populations to include faculty seeking to integrate service-learning in their courses, service-learning professionals, community partners, and other on-campus supports. The vocabulary is accessible to these audiences, and the vignettes allow for a personable reading experience for scholars, practitioners, and community members.

One major strength of the book are the inclusion of charts, graphs, and graphic organizers. The featured case studies that are further presented in the text are conveniently placed after the Table of Contents in a chart that includes institutions, key takeaways, and transferable tools and ideas. Additionally, throughout the text, conceptual frameworks, threshold concepts, and transformative models are examples of how the written text is visually represented which can be useful for understanding newly presented concepts or concepts for modeling.

A limitation of the book is the lack of perspective from minority faculty or programs which offer service-learning partnerships. There is discussion concerning the reflective work that White scholars and students conduct to prevent the White savior complex, but the text does not provide the perspective of how racial minorities experience service-learning initiatives. Furthermore, although the featured institutions of higher learning are represented from across various regions of the United States, there were no Historically Black Colleges/Universities or Minority Serving Institutions highlighted in the text. This exclusion of voices limits the text in ways that readers can gain insight into other perspectives.
Understanding multi-faceted ways to approach service-learning initiatives is beneficial for all parties involved on college campuses and within partnering communities. The book’s focus on holistic frameworks is a core strength to promote inclusivity and effective faculty development. I recommend the book for scholars and practitioners who are open to set goals of collaborative engagement while continuously engaging in reflective practices.
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