A core program in the University of Michigan’s community service learning offerings is Project Community. Founded in the early 1960s, Project Community is one of the nation’s oldest community service learning programs. It has been jointly conducted by the Sociology Department and a unit in the Division of Student Affairs (now part of the Edward Ginsberg Center for Community Service and Learning). Since 1980 Project Community has used specially prepared undergraduate students as peer facilitators and coordinators of other undergraduates’ community service learning experiences. These peer facilitators typically have been veterans of the Project’s community service learning activities. This article describes and analyzes the training and support programs developed to enable and prepare these students to be successful facilitators and to link their own and their students’ field experiences to the Sociology curriculum.

Why and How Do We Use Undergraduate Peers as Facilitators?

Students initiated Project Community at the University of Michigan, and student initiative and leadership has always been a major element in the overall program. As it became clear that community sites represented a major alternative arena for student learning, for learning about deeply felt issues at a personal and intellectual level, and for learning in ways often absent in the traditional undergraduate sociology curriculum, a more learner-based and democratic pedagogical structure seemed appropriate. The tradition of using undergraduate students as resident hall assistants, proc-

tors, advisors, career counselors, orientation guides, health educators and tutors is well-established in the student affairs arena of higher education (Winston & Ender, 1988; Powell, Pyler, Dickeson, McClelan, 1969; Materniak, 1984). However, this tradition is less established in the academic arena, although there is evidence of universities turning to peer teaching programs as an alternative to large lecture halls and the passive roles accorded to students in these environs (Carns, Carns, & Wright, 1993; Enders & Newton, 2000; Whitman, 1988). Generally it is argued that the special resources that peers have as educators is their closeness in age to other students, the ease of mutual identification that flows thereby, and the image of self and other initiative and commitment that comes from students seeing their peers in positions of instructional leadership.

In addition, in Project Community’s early years, peer facilitators were an essential resource to compensate for a lack of institutional support for faculty and/or graduate student instructor roles. As a marginal, innovative, non-traditional form of education, community service learning initially operated without significant instructional resources (although considerable staff support was forthcoming from the Division of Student Affairs). Due to this resource shortage, and the growing enrollment demands of students desiring this service-learning experience, unpaid undergraduate facilitation was a necessity. In more recent years, as more instructional (faculty and graduate student instructor) resources have been allocated to this venture, it has still seemed economically efficient and pedagogically sound to continue the use of this peer educa-
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ational model.

Given the academically non-traditional (and often challenged) nature of community service learning, and the priority it places on students’ generating their own reflections on experiential encounters with extra-university environs and phenomena, peer facilitation is a good ideological fit. Entrusting the facilitation of experiential encounters to trained undergraduates—to veteran peers—employs a somewhat more democratic pedagogical model. It suggests not only that learners can progress outside the classroom, but also outside the traditional pattern of faculty direction and control of instructional processes. Thus, it can make a unique contribution to the pedagogical options available to students and faculty wishing to explore more learner-empowered and initiated educational ventures.

We do not see these peer facilitators as “teachers” in the traditional sense of the term, but as coordinators of service logistics and as guides of other students’ learning. The peer facilitators are present when students are at their community service sites and they lead a weekly reflection seminar that integrates students’ field experiences with sociological readings, concepts, and interpretations. Facilitators thus prepare students for service and service-learning (Eyler & Giles, 1999) by helping them: develop competencies in building site/agency relationships, listen reflectively and ask appropriate questions, observe accurately and sensitively, become attuned to issues of cultural and class diversity, make connections to academic sociological material, and apply academic material to their service encounters (Howard, 1993; Menlo, 1993; Porpora, 1998; Vernon & Ward, 1993). The facilitators also monitor student participation in community service settings, manage the logistics of student travel to and from site, lead seminar discussions, help students grapple with sociological readings, and record completion of papers and other assignments. The overall responsibility for academic instruction and leadership rests with the Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) and faculty in the Sociology Department; they create the academic syllabus, organize reading materials, design oral and written assignments, and do all grading.

The peer facilitators may elect to receive academic credit for their work. Credit is not provided on the basis of peer facilitation itself, but requires effective performance in a series of papers that ask them to construct an analysis of the dominant pedagogies at the University, the structural/cultural forces underlying these approaches to education, the alternative pedagogical assumptions and principles of Project Community, the issues they faced as facilitators of their peers’ learning, and the structural as well as personal roots or explanations of their problems and successes as peer facilitators. The instructional agenda for these peer facilitators includes serious attention to their own intellectual growth as well as to their ability to facilitate others’ learning.

Undergraduate students may be willing but not necessarily able to perform these tasks. After all, little of their prior education (in elementary/secondary schools as well as in the university) has prepared them for peer leadership roles. Thus, an important first task is the recruitment and selection of competent undergraduates who have both an interest and ability in innovative educational experiences. In addition, Project Community and the Sociology Department have developed a training and support system to assist them.

Objectives of the Training and Support Effort

We have developed (and continually redevelop) a training and support program that attempts to achieve certain objectives. First, since Project Community’s primary academic base is in the Sociology Department, and students receive Sociology credit for their work, it is important that the peer facilitators develop some measure of sociological familiarity and expertise. The facilitators are not necessarily (nor primarily) sociology majors, nor are the students in their seminars and site groups. Thus, we are concerned with developing aspects of a sociological imagination rather than serious substantive expertise. The faculty and GSIs provide reading materials, give brief lectures (lecturettes) and lead experiential exercises that emphasize the importance of examining social structural, cultural, and organizational forces at work in the communities and community institutions where service is delivered. Since the primary sites in which Project Community is involved focus on schools, criminal justice facilities, and health care agencies, this material is easily linked to standard courses and elements of the Sociology curriculum (Ostrow, Hesser, & Enos, 1999; see also numerous articles in Teaching Sociology).

A second objective is to ensure that students who facilitate others’ learning activities have a high level of personal awareness of their own values, strengths and weaknesses—as students, as facilitators, as leaders, and as human beings interacting with others. Since we ask these students to take on roles that are often new to them, we focus on helping them come to terms with their own understanding of race/gender/class issues and their own interpersonal and instructional styles. This is especially important in the context of community service...
learning, since enrollment in these classes is more diverse than in most other university classes, and since many of the sites require university students to cross race and class boundaries and come into contact with community members quite different from themselves. A variety of self-report or self-assessment devices and exercises are used to help illustrate these issues and to help facilitators examine their own values and beliefs.

A third objective is to develop or increase these peer facilitators’ skills in guiding others through the community service learning process. As suggested earlier, university students must be prepared to enter the community, to learn how to behave as a “guest” or visitor in a service environment, and to sustain positive relations with agencies and their clients/consumers/citizens (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Moreover, as peers leading other students through an instructional as well as service process, facilitators must know how to help students examine and learn from these encounters, listen well, support others, challenge without intimidation, exercise and moderate authority, and engage others in sociological reflection. Since this co-learning process, as well as the community service itself, occurs in a group setting, facilitators must become acquainted with typical small group dynamics, especially small instructional groups, and with tactics of analyzing and intervening in such dynamics.

Our final objective is to build a cooperative learning community among the peer facilitators. Peer facilitation is difficult work, and both the nature of community service learning and peer facilitation run against the tide of traditional university instruction. Thus, these students must be able to rely upon and learn from one another and the staff throughout the academic year. This requires establishing trust and good working relationships among the facilitators and between them and the faculty, GSIs and student services’ staff members. We also try to have fun doing this!

Preparing and supporting undergraduates to conduct peer facilitation of community service learning within the context of the modern university presents numerous challenges. First, as noted, competent prospective facilitators must be recruited and screened. Moreover, since this course is academically credited within the Sociology department, some rudimentary instruction in a sociological perspective is crucial. Instruction and support also must be provided in small group dynamics and in the kinds of interpersonal processes that occur between any group of leaders and members. The special role of peer facilitation means that these students must be supported in understanding how to balance their identities to be both a peer and a facilitator of their peers’ learning. In this effort, prospective facilitators often are torn between a focus on gaining content competency (knowing enough about sociology) and gaining process competency (knowing enough about group interaction to facilitate others’ learning). Of course content and process are interactive and inform one another, but sometimes facilitators are more anxious about, or more committed to, one of these agendas. Finally, the larger organizational context within which community service learning occurs also poses challenges for facilitators. The many innovations of this effort (learning taking place outside the traditional classroom, the use of peer facilitators, a non-graded pass-fail credit system) places it at the margin of the university’s educational activities, and as such it sometimes is seen by students as a source of easy credit (or as a “blow-off” course). And the sheer time and energy it takes to facilitate this peer-oriented learning activity often places strain on facilitators’ time and energy for this and their other academic pursuits. Nevertheless, year after year substantial cadres of excited, competent, and willing students volunteer to provide such leadership to their peers.

Components of the Training and Support Program

The training and support program has been derived in part from the above objectives and challenges, and peer facilitators’ statements of their own training needs. For instance, over the years we have developed an instrument for assessing students’ skills in small group instructional leadership, and have used this self-report instrument to both sensitize facilitators to their task and to guide the training designs (see Appendix A). Consistently over the years the items that beginning peer facilitators report they feel least accomplished in are: (#3) “I know how to ensure participation by all group members”, (#11) “I am comfortable exercising my authority in the group,” (#13) “I know how to deal with students who treat this as a ‘blow-off’”, (#14) “I know how to respond to members’ different learning styles,” and (#21) “I know how to surface covert conflict that is harming the group.” Although issues of race/gender/class dynamics (#s 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20) typically are not initially indicated as central, they gain priority during the semester as the intergroup realities of the facilitation role and community service become clear (and items #14 and #21 indirectly contain this content as well). Many peer facilitators also soon discover that they do not (#26) “know the sociological content related to my site,” or (#28) “know how to use the sociological readings in seminar.”

In addition to the information gained from these
self-assessments, the staff use discussions at meetings, interviews, observations of facilitators, and analyses of facilitators’ journals as input to training designs. The result of this information-gathering process, over time, has been the design of the following components of a training and support program. In conjunction with a battery of brief lectures, readings and group discussions, a variety of experiential activities and relaxed or unstructured time blocks allow participants to develop social relationships with one another and to follow up on ideas raised through the structured lectures and related activities. Several different types of reading materials now are provided to prospective facilitators: (1) a coursepack includes readings on community service learning, the nature and structure of contemporary university education, sociological materials relevant to particular sites, and small group leadership techniques; (2) a specially prepared loose-leaf binder contains many examples of experiential exercises facilitators can use to stimulate participation, discussion and reflection in their seminars (Herman & Knife-Gould, 2001). Depending on pedagogical preferences as well as practical time and space constraints, various activities have been added to or subtracted from the preparation program over the years. However, the following activities are hallmarks of our peer facilitator preparation and support program each semester.

Pre-Semester Retreats and In-Semester Meetings

Multiple formats for implementing a “training curriculum” have been tried. Some of these activities occur at a pre-semester off-campus retreat and others at weekly staff meetings. A one-day retreat at the beginning of the semester originally was important for covering program logistics, the course syllabi, and basic strategies and common dilemmas relevant for peer facilitators of sociology-based service-learning. However, we discovered that this schedule often did not allow enough time to fully prepare facilitators and failed to provide ongoing support through the semester. In response, a half-day supplement was institutionalized. By holding the half-day at mid-semester, facilitators were able to raise current seminar issues and to gain feedback from peers, staff, and faculty. Later we built on the idea of supporting facilitators throughout the semester by establishing weekly staff meetings as a space to discuss sociological concepts, the practical details of service-learning pedagogy, what occurred in the previous week’s seminars, and preparation for the next seminar. The last adjustment in arriving at our current model was extending the one-day preparation into an overnight retreat. This has allowed for enhanced team-building opportunities and initiating a facilitator support network.

Each semester we “train” or prepare approximately 30 peer facilitators for these roles (together they work with approximately 200-250 students in 30 different community service sites/seminars each semester). Since there is considerable turnover in peer facilitator ranks, each semester we start almost anew, although we pay special attention to the ways in which “veterans” may help identify and respond to new facilitators’ needs.

Icebreakers and Tone-Setters

Hopes and Fears

Early in the preparation process, students are asked to share their greatest hopes and fears about the anticipated facilitation experience. To begin the activity, students are given two index cards, “hopes” and “fears.” Students are then allowed three minutes to respond to the question, “What are your greatest fears about facilitating your seminar this semester?” It may help students if the activity leader asks them to think about their worst-case scenario. Responses are written on the fears card. When time has expired, students are asked to share some of their fears with the group. The comments are noted on newsprint, so the activity leader may illustrate commonalities and acknowledge the multiple issues of concern to be covered in the preparation program. This process is then repeated by asking students to articulate their greatest hopes on the remaining index card, followed by students sharing their hopes with the group. At the close of the activity, the cards can be leader collected, and follow up initiated with individual students who have particular or pressing concerns. If this option is exercised, the leader should ask students to include their names on the index cards.

The purposes of this activity are to break the ice and allow students to bond by sharing their most potent (positive and negative) a priori expectations regarding facilitation. For instance, prospective facilitators often identify the following hopes: “That my students will learn a lot,” “Participants at site will be affected positively,” “That they will like me,” “Students will participate actively,” “Discussion will not be forced but will be natural and lead to guided reflection,” “That I will learn a lot about my leadership and group functioning.” Among the typical fears are: “I don’t know much sociology,” “That the students will believe all the stereotypes about juvenile inmates,” “That the students and the children at the day care site will not make a strong bond with each other.” “Students will take advantage of me because I look young.”
“Students will see this class as a ‘blow-off’ and act accordingly,” “I won’t know what to do if no one talks in seminar.” Discussion generally illustrates to everyone that they have much in common, hence reducing their sense of isolation from one another. It also informs the instructional team regarding how best to support the facilitators during preparation and throughout the semester.

Self-Assessment of Facilitator Skills

The skill assessment instrument discussed previously is often used prior to, or at the beginning of, the training session to generate individual learning agendas, as well as inform the staff of facilitator needs. Prospective peer facilitators are asked to fill out this form (see Appendix A) individually and then to share their responses with others in a small group setting. This tool also is used at the end of the semester, as a way of self-assessing facilitators’ progress in skill development.

Personal and Structural Awareness (Diversity Issues)

Social Identity Group Exercise (adapted from Griffin, 1997, pp. 69-72, and Social Identity Group Exercise, n.d.)

Students are given the Social Identity Group Membership Profile and asked to mark their membership in each group. For the “other” category, students are invited to mark an additional group membership important to their social identity. After everyone has finished, the activity leader prompts students with a series of questions (e.g., “The two memberships which you know the most about,” “The two memberships that have most uniquely shaped your talent and ability,” “The one membership you would like to become more aware of,” “The two memberships that will have the greatest effect on how students perceive you as a facilitator,” “The two memberships that limit (or increase) your access to resources at the university”). For each question, the student marks the appropriate number of memberships in the column under the question number. For example, for the first question asked, students will mark the two group memberships most familiar to them under the first column, and so on. Once all questions have been answered individually, students are invited to share their profile with others, in pairs or small groups of three to four students (group size is limited in order to promote ‘space’ or ‘airtime’ for serious exchange). The activity leader should emphasize that students should only share information that is comfortable, but that everyone should attempt to challenge their comfort levels by trusting and pursuing their peers in conversation.

This exercise helps students explore, share with, educate, and learn from others regarding their multiple identities within society, and to recognize the privileges and constraints that may accompany them. It also is useful in identifying areas where students may need more information or critical analysis of their own or others’ identities, or social locations and their implications. It is important that facilitators be exposed to and consider these issues before they lead discussions and reflections on topics such as race, class, gender, inequality, privilege, and discrimination. Preferably, students will have information about, and be fairly comfortable with, these issues and their personal multiple identities before they facilitate.

Multicultural Groundrules (adapted from Canon, 1990)

In order to create norms that promote desired forms of interaction and exchange we typically engage students in establishing a set of “groundrules” for effective multicultural discussion. Sometimes we ask the group of students to suggest such groundrules, and at other times we present a proposed list of such norms and ask for reactions, additions, changes, etc. (see Appendix B). This exercise not only sets the stage for group self-control of inappropriate or intertemperate behavior that may occur around sensitive topics—it also models a process facilitators may use with the students with whom they work later.

Group Dynamics

Tower Building

For this exercise, students are divided into teams (approximately 5-10 people) and assigned to create the best structure within 45 minutes. The best structure is the tallest, most stable, and most beautiful, as determined by two judges (who are not part of any team). Structures may only be made of provided supplies, which are piled in the center of the room, at an equal distance from each group. Types of supplies include cardboard boxes, newspapers, magazines, egg cartons, milk containers, building blocks, tennis balls, crepe paper, tape, scissors, and felt strips. After the activity leader introduces the activity, he or she marks the time and allows participants to pull supplies from the pile. During the building process, the activity leader and trained observers circulate throughout the room and note how the group members interact with one another, as well as how the different groups work together. After 45 minutes, the activity leader asks participants to stop. At this time, judges observe each
structure and privately consult and make their decision, which is not announced until after the debriefing. Questions to consider for the debriefing include:

- How did the groups decide to divide the common pile of supplies?
- How did your group decide what to build? What was the formal/informal decisional process? Who influenced the decision?
- What were the roles of each person in your group? Was there a gendered division of labor? Did some people more or less ‘opt out?’ Was there a ‘leader’? If so, how did this person assume that role?
- How well did your group function? Why did it function this way? How satisfied are you with your group’s tower? What does your tower portray?
- How did your group interact with other groups? How much competition or cooperation did you see between groups? Did you share supplies? Why or why not?

The purposes of this activity are to develop skills in working with others under competitive pressure and to examine the intra- and inter-group dynamics involved. Students learn first-hand their teammates’ working styles and about their values related to beauty, use of scarce resources, competition, collaboration, teamwork, division of labor, and cooperation with authority. It also is a lot of fun and energizing, particularly effective after lunch or near the end of a tiring day of training.


This type of team-building and decision-making exercise simulates a life-threatening scenario and asks students to respond, individually and as a group. The exact type of scenario can vary, but our program usually uses a desert survival problem. Students are divided into small groups of 5-10 and receive the problem description, which is to rank a set of choices regarding materials or behavior in a crisis situation (in the desert survival problem, the situation is an airplane crash in the desert and participants are asked to rate, in order, the importance of salvaging 15 items). The problem is read aloud by the activity leader and each person is given 10 minutes to rank their personal choices. Then each group is given 30 minutes to come to agreement regarding their collective decision about these choices. Groups compare their choices with the official (“correct”) answers. In addition, groups discuss how they made their collective choices, the degree to which members feel satisfied with their level of agreement, and individuals calculate how much their personal choices differed from the group choice.

This exercise provides another opportunity for students to examine small group dynamics and the ways in which groups operate when they need to make decisions as a team. In addition, the degree to which individuals’ choices differ from the group’s collective choice indicates one’s openness to influence—for better or worse.

Collaborative Problem-Solving. (Broken squares, 1972)

For this exercise students are broken into groups of six, which includes five participants and one observer. Each group is given a set of manila or cardboard pieces that when correctly assembled constitute five equal-size squares. Once the rules have been clarified, students begin to work on the puzzle in silence. Members may give pieces to one another but cannot talk (ask for) or take them from one another. Each group continues to work until every group has solved the puzzle (groups that have completed the puzzle may closely observe groups that are still working). After all groups are finished, the activity leader initiates a discussion on the experience and incorporates the observers’ perspectives in each group.

This exercise helps students analyze the dynamics of interpersonal cooperation and to practice group problem-solving, particularly using non-verbal communication. It highlights the difference between solving a personal problem (creating a square) and a group problem (creating five equal-size squares). Students should also be able to draw lessons about what behaviors help and hinder effective group functioning.

Facilitator Skill Development

Problem Solving Scenarios (Chesler & Vasques-Scalera, 1999)

To begin this exercise, students are divided into small groups of five to seven people and each group is given a different scenario (see Appendix C for examples). Each group is asked to read the scenario, discuss the situation and the questions posed, and compose a role-play to enact potential solutions in front of other groups. After each group demonstrates their solutions, a short debriefing focuses on how they arrived at them and why the group thought it was the “best response.” A more extended debriefing can include discussing group responses to scenario questions, how people in the
scenario might have felt, what issues were paramount, and what type of proactive actions might have eliminated the problem.

This exercise is an active, energizing, and effective way to introduce realistic dilemmas students may face as peer facilitators. Running through these scenarios in a safe, supportive training environment allows potential peer facilitators to grapple with complex group facilitation issues before they may have to respond in their own seminars and site situations. Additionally, faculty and staff are available to identify issues that students may have overlooked, or to offer additional suggestions for managing the situations. They also can then address unresolved or particularly problematic situations in later staff meetings. It also has been useful to close this activity by discussing some of the typical dynamics and issues that arise in small instructional groups (see Appendix D) and to help students locate particular problems within this more analytic framework.

Panel of Veteran Facilitators

For this activity, a group of four or five students who have facilitated sociology-based service-learning courses in the past (i.e., veterans) can be selected to be on a panel. An activity leader opens the session by explaining why these students were selected to sit on the panel and how they can be helpful in addressing some of the new facilitators’ pressing concerns. The activity leader distributes index cards to all students not on the panel and asks everyone to write a question for the panel to answer. The activity leader then collects the cards, organizes them by topic, and moderates the panel discussion. Students in the audience who have previous facilitation experience, but who may not have been asked to sit on the panel, can be called on to share their experiences as well. Once some or all index card questions have been answered, the leader may invite the veterans to offer additional advice and solicit further questions from the audience. The veteran panel also may be asked to comment on some of the problem-solving scenarios and their proposed solutions.

The purpose of this activity is to encourage students in their process of learning from one another, and to use former peer facilitators’ experiences as resources. It also allows new facilitators to anonymously pose candid questions about the true nature of the peer facilitator role, potentially addressing some concerns from the hopes and fears exercise (described earlier) or that are related to items on the skill assessment instrument (see Appendix A). Once the veterans have demonstrated they have relevant expertise, newcomers may seek their further assistance throughout the semester.

Skill-Building Workshops

In developing training programs for peer facilitators, we have identified specific topics essential for building students’ facilitative capacities. The topics of concern certainly vary from student to student, but the following dilemmas appear to be relatively constant. To briefly address these topics, staff and faculty members have designed 45-minute workshops for each of several topics. Each workshop generally is presented to groups of 8-10 students, but is offered more than once, allowing students to attend more than one session.

Managing silence asks students to “brainstorm” possible reasons for student silence in a seminar discussion about the sociology readings or about their community service experiences. After generating a long list, students are asked to invent strategies to address these barriers. Veteran facilitators’ experiences are especially helpful in identifying specific strategies.

Getting the most out of what we read encourages students to think about how to help others read and glean critical information from texts. This activity first asks students to think about why the instructor asked them to read something. This is followed by discussing strategies to increase students’ understanding of an author’s argument or data, such as providing a list of critical questions ahead of time. Finally, strategies are explored to help students look back at a written piece and remember what it covered. The overall goal is to help facilitators learn how they may use a variety of tools, exercises, and strategies to increase students’ retention of material and promote useful discussion of a book or article.

Group stages and key issues focuses on increasing facilitators’ understanding of the typical group development stages and how they might work effectively with their instructional group at each stage. Some workshops covering this material focus on typical group stages: “forming, storming, norming, and performing” (Tuckman, 1965), or “infancy, adolescence and adulthood” (Weber, 1982). Other approaches focus on the “key issues” that are likely to surface in small groups, how these issues may manifest themselves in instructional groups, and what responses might be useful (see Appendix D, Chesler, n.d.).

Sociological Imagination/Sophistication

Social Data Interpretation

For this exercise, students are divided into groups of four or five people and each group is
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given a data table of statistics. The table describes patterns of social differentiation and inequality in the institutional arena relevant to their service sites, particularly issues related to race, gender, class, and age (sources might include data tables from the Statistical Abstract of the United States or contemporary magazine or journal articles). Examples have included: student educational progress on standardized tests or educational attainment by race, gender, parental education, and size and type of community; average lifetime by gender, race, and state of residence; physician and dental contacts by patient race, age, and gender; persons arrested or incarcerated by gender, race, and age; income by age, education, gender, and race; voter participation by age, race, education, employment status, and region (any of these examples may also include figures from different years or decades). The activity leader then prompts each group to review the data and discuss what the table(s) illustrates. After the groups have done this, they are asked to “brainstorm” as many explanations or interpretations of these data as possible. These ideas are recorded on newsprint and the group is urged not to eliminate any idea, nor argue about the idea being outrageous or a myth: the activity leader should encourage the groups to list all possible reasons. After the groups have completed a list of explanations, they are asked to mark each with a “P” or an “S”; P signifies that the explanation reflects personal, individual, or small group factors, whereas S signifies that the explanation reflects systematic or structural factors. Once the groups have completed this activity, the newsprint sheets are posted and students are asked to share the results of their group’s work. To close, students and activity leaders can reflect on the process and content of the activity. Questions may include:

How difficult was it to determine what the data in the table illustrated?

How difficult was it to generate explanations for the data... and not rule out any of the ideas? Did it feel okay to pose explanations that you or others felt outrageous or wrong?

What do you think the marks on each explanation of a P or an S tell you? Did your group have more Ps or Ss? How does this relate to a “sociological perspective?”

Overall, how would you rate your group process? Did anyone lead, sit back and watch, get upset, feel ignorant? Who? How/Why? What could have been improved?

Where might you go for more information on the issues discussed (i.e., what sociological readings might help)?

As with all group work, students must be prepared for this task. In this instance, it is important for them to thoroughly read the data, and make sure they understand what the figures show, in order to critically reflect upon them publicly. Activity leaders have to lay the groundwork for trust and safety, so students can be honest with one another and brainstorm or discuss issues beyond a superficial, polite level. It requires time to work through issues that arise. Some students may experience “escalated feelings” leading to defensiveness and rigidity, some ‘explanations’ may offend people, and conflict may arise between group members; efforts to work with such reactions help prepare everyone for later encounters with other students.

This exercise helps build students’ familiarity with sociological data and interpretations, and allows them practice learning from, and using this material with, fellow students. Sociological concepts are used because Sociology is the credit-sponsoring department in this program and therefore that is the intellectual/academic perspective and material they will be facilitating in their seminars. From participation in this activity (and follow-up readings and lecturettes), it is hoped students will gain increased understanding about the structure of society and the institutions with which they are working, the realistic nature of stratification in these institutions, and some of the root causes of social advantage/privilege and disadvantage. Our experience is that it also provides another window into examining group dynamics, emphasizing the ways in which many of these activities serve multiple objectives.

Lecturettes provide a means whereby the faculty, GSIs, staff, or outside experts can present material to peer facilitators in a somewhat didactic, but brief (10-15 minutes) format. Usually these brief lectures are followed by suggested readings (linked to the coursepack), discussion, and/or invited responses to a specially posed series of questions. Some of the lecturette topics have included:

- Project Community in the broader contexts of the University (Chesler, 1993).
- Alternative pedagogies of ‘banking’ and ‘liberation’ (Friere, 1989).
- The Sociological perspective/imagination (Mills, 1959).
- The roots of school failure: A problem in social class relations.
- Racial discrimination in health care.

Star Power (Shirts, 1997). This simulation focuses on the dynamics of economic power. The instructions for running the game are numerous
and specific, but the basic premise is that students randomly receive chips of different value that divide them into three groups, each group symbolizing a tier of society based on the value of their chips (the distribution of wealth). Subsequently, students may move from one tier to another, depending on how they bargain and trade chips with one another. The leader must enforce a strict set of rules for such bargaining and control people’s movement up and down the privilege ladder (depending upon their accumulated chip values). Often students chafe at these rules, and the activity leader must exercise authority—the power of the state or police—in maintaining the economic rules of the game and the stratification system established. Once the society is established, the ruling class (i.e., the wealthiest group of students) can set the rules for the remainder of the game. Since the rules they set often may be or feel unfair (especially after the leader’s initial strong hand), there is often a revolt (active or passive) against the rule-makers and some students experience anomie or drop out. At this point, the activity leader can end the game and initiate debriefing and discussion.

This is a powerful simulation for promoting discussion about the origins of inequality, the possibilities of economic mobility, the creation of alienation and deviance or rule-breaking, and the uses and abuses of power in a competitive society. It should be followed by an intense debriefing which strives to uncover why the process went as it did, how individuals responded to their status and opportunities (or not) for mobility, how individual behavior and the structure of the game parallel (or do not parallel) society, and what broader lessons then can be learned about social structures and processes.

Throughout all these activities the training philosophy and approach emphasizes the time it takes to carefully debrief and discuss each activity. Processing reactions to a lecture or what happened during an activity, talking about what was learned, and allowing people to discuss their feelings/personal reactions to the activities is paramount to the learning experience. This encourages participants to reflect on their experience and to consider how to make use of their insights and learnings in their own facilitation roles.

Reflections on the Most Recent Peer Facilitator Training Models

During the 2000-2001 academic year, two peer facilitator training retreats were held each semester, and facilitators attended weekly staff meetings as well. The retreats took place at the beginning of each semester: one event was a two-day overnight and the other was one full day. Each facilitator was asked to fill out an evaluation form at the end of each retreat. After reviewing and coding the responses from 60 evaluation forms, four major categories clearly emerged from the data. These were: the strengths of the training program, the weaknesses of the program and suggestions for future training, the skills that were developed and how they will be integrated into the peer facilitation process, and what participants learned about themselves from the training.

The reported strengths of the program seemed to be twofold. Every peer facilitator commented upon one or more of the various activities/initiatives presented and why they felt these activities were valuable. The most popular activities included Star Power, the Tower Building Exercise (since these two activities require participant naivete, and often generate similar issues for discussion, they were not repeated with the same year’s group of potential facilitators), the problem solving scenarios, and Hopes and Fears. Of the 60 facilitators, 55 chose one or more of these four activities as their favorites, with Star Power (18/30), Tower Building (12/30) and the problem solving scenarios (25/60) being commented on most often.

These activities seemed to elicit very similar responses among facilitators. The majority claimed the activities allowed them to bond with their peers, develop support networks, feel open and comfortable in their working environment, and feel safer talking about fears and concerns. In addition, many peer facilitators claimed that the chance to learn from veteran facilitators gave them a better indication of what to expect from the facilitation experience. The 10-12 returning peer facilitators at each training session helped create an atmosphere that encouraged new peer facilitators to learn from one another. Many of the facilitators also commented on the positive interactions they had with the Project Community support staff, the GSIs, and the faculty sponsor.

The most common weaknesses identified, or the most common suggestions for the future, involved the need for potential facilitators to actually practice facilitating a group of undergraduate service-learners (almost half mentioned this). Although the activities are a valuable tool for providing possible issues/conflicts to consider, they have not included actual practice during the training session. Due to time constraints it is unclear whether each potential facilitator could have the opportunity to role play such facilitation, though they could be split into small groups and run mock seminars. Later weekly staff meetings did provide additional opportunities...
for rapid follow-up of facilitators’ early experiences in their real-time tasks.

Another common suggestion was to spend more time focusing on first-time peer facilitators’ needs, especially their need for more information on the logistics of Project Community’s operations (i.e., student enrollment, assignments, coursepacks of readings, criteria for student attendance and performance, transportation to sites, meeting rooms, and times). Those attending the training for the first time also felt that they were not exposed to enough of the issues/conflicts that could arise and that not enough time was spent on providing all the information needed to facilitate for the entire semester. Though many commented on how valuable it was to learn from veteran facilitators, the newcomers did not feel that they had enough time to really engage in dialogue with veteran facilitators about concerns related to doing this for the first time.

One intention of the training program is to provide peer facilitators with skills they can take with them and use to lead their own instructional groups. Though we encourage students to develop their own style of facilitating, we provide them with as many tools as possible in order for them to feel confident and comfortable in creating their own facilitating techniques. The following are some of the specific skills peer facilitators claimed they gained and were prepared to utilize in their work with other undergraduates. The first group, involving the management of conflict, is linked to items #8, #16, and #21 on the Skill Assessment instrument (Appendix A); the second group focuses on dealing broadly with small group dynamics, reflecting items #2, #3, #5, #10, and #15 on that instrument; and the third group reflects the ability to seek and find help from peers and staff/instructors, noted in items #29–#33.

Conflict resolution techniques and the notion that conflict is not all bad (15/60).

Appropriate ways to deal with sensitive topics (10/60).

How to handle debates and when it is appropriate to intervene versus let it go (7/60).

Techniques in how to handle silence more effectively (12/60).

How to be an effective leader (11/60).

Consciousness of group stages, how group dynamics work, and how to address an entire group (10/60).

Communication techniques—intragroup and intergroup (10/60).

How to involve others in a discussion (8/60).

The ability to listen to opinions that are completely different than my own and be more open minded (8/60).

How to be comfortable asking for advice when needed (9/60).

The most insightful and interesting responses from students often concerned what they felt they learned about themselves through preparing for peer facilitation. Students reported greater trust and confidence in their own abilities, greater awareness of their social identities (including race/gender and class-based privileges), more detailed knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses in a facilitative role, and an increased understanding of the peer facilitator role. Since each peer facilitator comes from a different place in life and education, the specific personal effects of the training often were different for each person. The substantial amount of self examination and personal growth that peer facilitators experience through Project Community work is what sets this program apart from many other university student activities and courses. It also is one of the primary rationales for using trained undergraduates rather than graduate students, faculty, or university staff members in these facilitative roles.

Overall the evaluative responses were thoughtful and very informative. They have been an important resource for constantly refining designs for future training sessions and ongoing support meetings. Each semester we use past evaluations to better identify and meet potential facilitators’ needs. The pre-semester retreats, coupled with the weekly support staff meetings, provide us with a way to engage peer facilitators throughout the entire process.

Conclusions

Not only are these peer facilitators the “front-line troops” in the university community service learning program, they are the primary beneficiaries of a unique form of personal growth through service to others—to their fellow students as well as community members. Recent discussions suggest that, in a manner common to many educators and especially to peer educators, the facilitators learn and grow more than anyone else involved in this enterprise. They represent, and learn from, involvement in a more democratic pedagogy, one that often stands in contrast to the typical forms of instruction in the contemporary university. Since they are the most unique and powerful foundation of this alternative pedagogy, and the service-learning option in general, their proper training and support is critical to program success. In order to ensure the contin-
ued growth of these agents’ and others’ education, we constantly seek to update and improve upon the training and support provided.

The core tensions in the peer facilitator role are not likely to be vanquished by a training and support program, however sophisticated. These tensions are built into the struggles between classroom-based and community-based education, between peer and authority roles in instruction, and with the tradition of authoritative instruction by older experts that dominates systems of secondary and tertiary education in the United States. Neither are these training efforts, nor the use of peer facilitators, per se, likely to fundamentally alter the questionable regard with which much community service learning is viewed in higher educational circles. They do, however, represent one more way of enriching the educational experiences and citizenship preparation of this generation of college and university students.
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Appendix A: Skill Assessment

Facilitator self-assessment

Name ______________________________ Site ______________________________ Section # _______

For each statement below place a check in the response category (“never”, “seldom”, “sometimes”, “often”, “always”) that best describes how you currently feel about your abilities/skills and your hopes/concerns about facilitating a Project Community site/seminar experience for other undergraduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group facilitation skill</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>seldom</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I can make the goals of the seminar clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I know how to help members feel they are part of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know how to ensure participation by all group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I know how to avoid being the sole center of members’ conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can ensure that all members’ opinions are listened to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am comfortable having members express positive feelings about service-learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am comfortable having members express negative feelings about service-learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can help people confront one another constructively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know how to help the group make collective decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I know how to involve people who feel left out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am comfortable exercising my authority in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am secure in my status as a peer-facilitator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I know how to deal with students who treat this as a ‘blow-off’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I know how to respond to members’ different learning styles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I can create a supportive climate in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I can handle race and ethnic conflicts that arise in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I can identify my own stereotypic beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am aware of the impact of my race and gender on others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I can identify issues of inequality and oppression at site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I know how to incorporate issues of inequality and oppression into group discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I know how to surface covert conflict that may harm the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I know how to give constructive feedback to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I know what my ‘hot buttons’ are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I am aware of the impact of my personal style on others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I can deal with some students not liking me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I know the sociological content related to my site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am comfortable arranging site orientations, service hours, and managing other site-related logistics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I know how to use the sociological readings in seminar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am comfortable seeking help from the Project Community staff if I experience difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am comfortable seeking help from my fellow coordinators if I experience difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am comfortable seeking help from the Sociology GSIs if I experience difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am comfortable seeking help from the Sociology Professor if I experience difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I know where to get help on the above items (1-28) that I need to improve upon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For any of the items (1-28) on which you would like to improve your skills, identify:
- a. What (more specifically) do you need to know or know how to do?
- b. From whom or where would you like to get assistance on this issue?
Appendix B: Suggested Multicultural Guidelines
for our Interaction and Learning Together*

1. Our primary commitment is to learn—with instructors, each other, materials, and our work together. In such an endeavor we know there are differences amongst us in interests, values, skills, scholarly orientations, and experiences.

2. Racism, sexism, classism, homophobia, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination exist in the society and university, and most of us carry some of this baggage within ourselves—in our hearts and minds. They are likely to surface on campus and in class from time to time.

3. One of the meanings of institutionalized racism is that we have been taught systematically (although perhaps covertly) misinformation about our own group and especially about members of other devalued or oppressed/disadvantaged groups (this is true both for dominant and dominated group members). This is true about race and racism, gender and sexism, and other forms of difference.

4. We should try not to blame people for the misinformation they/we each have been taught or for the (often unconsciously or unintentionally) offensive views they/we may hold. But we should hold each other responsible for repeating misinformation or continuing to create offense and pain once we have learned otherwise.

5. We should assume that people are doing their best, both to learn the material in class and to behave with good will in anti-racism, non-sexist, non-homophobic, and multicultural positive ways.

6. We should actively pursue opportunities to learn about our own groups and those of others, yet not to enter or invade others’ privacy when such inquiry is not desired. Thus, we should try to share information about our own groups with members of the class when appropriate, respect decisions not to share information when expressed, and not demean, devalue, or ‘put down’ people for their experiences or views.

7. We should each actively try to combat the myths and stereotypes about our own groups and others’, and try to transcend the walls of ignorance or antagonism that diminish personal learning, peer collaboration, group support, or service to the community.

8. As we try to create a safe and productive atmosphere for open discussion, at times members of the class may wish to make a comment that they do not wish to be attributed to them or repeated outside the class. If so, the person should preface or follow her or his remarks with such a request, and the others should agree to honor such requests and not repeat such remarks.

*Similar guidelines were initially developed by Lynn Weber Canon (1990), Memphis State University, and later modified by Mark Chesler, University of Michigan.
Situation 1:

You walk into seminar the first day and as you look around the room, you notice three of your hall mates sitting and talking to each other. You are surprised because you didn’t know they were in the class but you go on with the start of class. You introduce yourself and say a little bit about the course. Hands immediately start going up when you get to the part about weekly journals and the final paper. “Why do we have to write a paper? I thought this was about community service.” “I have exams in the evening so will have to miss seminar on the last week of every month.” “How hard do you grade the journals?” “Do I have to buy the coursepack?” “I need to leave early today, I have concert tickets.” You try to field the questions as best you can but you feel completely bombarded. One of your hall mates in the back raises a hand and you think, “phew, finally someone to back me up.” She says, “Will you be letting us out early, we have that dorm party tonight.”

What might people be feeling in this situation? Why might they have those feelings?

The students raising the questions
The other students in the class
The coordinator

What kinds of issues/dynamics/challenges are happening in this scenario? What are their sources?

What kinds of actions, if any, would you take as a coordinator?

a) to prevent this situation from happening?

b) to respond to or deal with this situation if it happens in your seminar?

How might you turn this situation into a learning moment?

As a coordinator, where might you go for assistance in this situation?

Situation 2:

In a seminar a white male student was verbally dominant and a bit overbearing from the beginning. He always seemed quite opinionated. One day he was expressing his understanding of the street culture and sexual behavior of people in urban centers (e.g., Detroit), when an African-American woman quietly challenged him on his views and perceptions. He didn’t really listen to her, verbally dismissed her comments, and continued to defend his position. She became quiet, and when the class ended, left abruptly. The coordinator was not able to act fast enough to interrupt this exchange or to talk with her before she left. Afterwards, the coordinator decided to call the woman and ask her how she was feeling, whether she was alright, etc. The woman said she was hurt and a bit angry, and didn’t know whether she wanted to be around “that jerk, or that class.” But she didn’t want the coordinator to do anything. She did not come to the seminar the next week.

What might people be feeling in this situation? Why might they have those feelings?

The two identified students
The other students in the class
The coordinator

What kinds of issues/dynamics/challenges are happening in this scenario? What are their sources?

What kinds of actions, if any, would you take as a coordinator?

a) to prevent this situation from happening?

b) to respond to or deal with this situation if it happens in your seminar?

How might you turn this situation into a learning moment?

As a coordinator, where might you go for assistance in this situation?
Situation 3:

The students in your seminar are mostly caucasian, from the Detroit suburbs and out of state. They have been going (twice so far) to a high school site populated predominantly by Latino/a students. The neighborhood is lower middle-middle class, the school is run-down looking, with a heavily littered yard, and several police patrol the area adjacent to the school. Several students reported in seminar that they have never seen a school like that and that going there makes them nervous. In one session several of them turn to the one Latino student in the class and ask him to tell them about the students in that school. He says, “I’m from a small rural community in California and have no idea.”

What might people be feeling in this situation? Why might they have those feelings?
  What might the caucasian students be thinking/feeling?
  What might the Latino student be thinking/feeling?
  What might the other students in the class be thinking/feeling?
  What might the coordinator be thinking/feeling?

What kinds of issues/dynamics/challenges are happening in this scenario? What are their sources?

What kinds of actions, if any, would you take as a coordinator
  a) to prevent this situation from happening?
  b) to respond to or deal with this situation if it happens in your seminar?

How might you turn this situation into a learning moment?

As a coordinator where might you go for assistance in this situation?

Situation 4:

It’s the third seminar of the term. You have spent the first two seminars on introductions, and logistics of the course (overrides, background checks for sites, where to buy the coursepack, etc.). You and your students have just had their first site visit and are anxious to talk. They have already been asking you when they can “really get into it.” You begin the seminar by asking students to report on the kinds of things they observed at site. You get excited as you listen to them reporting out because they have already observed some pretty important things (for example, one student observed how all the administrators at site are white while almost all of the support staff are African American and Latino); people seem to be listening to one another and building on each other’s comments; there is a lot of energy in the room. You can’t wait to start dissecting the issues. When it seems as though the reporting is done, you ask, “So what does this tell us about how power operates in society?” The room falls silent. You try again, “OK, does any of what you are saying resonate with the readings you did for this week?” Students start to fidget, two guys in the back begin talking to each other, and you notice that the person next to you has begun doodling.

What might people be feeling in this situation? Why might they have those feelings?
  The students in the class
  The coordinator

What kinds of issues/dynamics/challenges are happening in this scenario? What are their sources?

What kinds of actions, if any, would you take as a coordinator
  a) to prevent this situation from happening?
  b) to respond to or deal with this situation if it happens in your seminar?

How might you turn this situation into a learning moment?

As a coordinator, where might you go for assistance in this situation?
Situation 5:
You are a couple of weeks into the term and are noticing that students never bring up the readings. You suspect that they aren’t really doing them or doing them well, and when you ask the class, several students report that they haven’t bought the coursepack yet. You tell the students that doing the readings are mandatory and that they will have to incorporate them in their final paper, but you suspect that they’re not convinced. You decide to try to more actively incorporate the readings and inform them that from now on they will have to incorporate the readings into their journals. Several students moan and groan about this but you move on. During the next seminar you ask the class what they thought of the readings and the group falls silent.

What might people be feeling in this situation? Why might they have those feelings?
- The student without the coursepack
- The other students in the class
- The coordinator
- The GSI when you tell her about the situation

What kinds of issues/dynamics/challenges are happening in this scenario? What are their sources?
What kinds of actions, if any, would you take as a coordinator
a) to prevent this situation from happening?
b) to respond to or deal with this situation if it happens in your seminar?

How might you turn this situation into a learning moment?
As a coordinator, where might you go for assistance in this situation?

Situation 6:
You have had several seminars and site visits and for the most part things are going well. When you get into seminar, however, one student dominates the discussion, and while the student has a lot of interesting and informative things to say, it is beginning to feel like a monologue. You notice that the other students seem distracted, some are having side conversations, and others are working on assignments for other classes. You have made several comments about the importance of seminar being a safe and inclusive space for discussion, but he doesn’t seem to get the message. You try to interject and ask other students what they think, but the dominant student is pre-med and knows so much about the health issues you are talking about, that you all feel somewhat less equipped to contribute. You want to get him to stop but you don’t want to make the student mad at you; and you definitely don’t want to end up with no one talking.

What might people be feeling in this situation? Why might they have those feelings?
- The dominant student
- The other students in the class
- The coordinator

What kinds of issues/dynamics/challenges are happening in this scenario? What are their sources?
What kinds of actions, if any, would you take as a coordinator
a) to prevent this situation from happening?
b) to respond to or deal with this situation if it happens in your seminar?

How might you turn this situation into a learning moment?
As a coordinator, where might you go for assistance in this situation?
### Appendix D: Key Issues to be Dealt with in all (Instructional) Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group issue</th>
<th>The way it looks in any group</th>
<th>The way it might look in Project Community</th>
<th>Some things You can do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td>• who’s in</td>
<td>• seating patterns</td>
<td>• total group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how far in</td>
<td>• posture</td>
<td>• subgroup work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• criteria &amp; procedure for entry</td>
<td>• formal registration</td>
<td>• shift seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• informal leader dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task clarity &amp; commitment</strong></td>
<td>• activity level</td>
<td>• treat class as “blow off” credit</td>
<td>• prepare for sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• production</td>
<td>• “we also have to write?”</td>
<td>• weekly tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• shared definitions</td>
<td>• my learning vs. our learning</td>
<td>• apologize or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• “how many hours of service?”</td>
<td>• check lesson plan with graduate student instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norms &amp; rules</strong></td>
<td>• behavioral expectations &amp; rewards</td>
<td>• seriousness of venture</td>
<td>• open to group influence within limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• informal patterns of relating</td>
<td>• degree of agreement: peers / peer leader</td>
<td>• plural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• acknowledging and managing differences</td>
<td>• starting and ending time</td>
<td>• work and play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• agreement on what is ok</td>
<td>• meeting requirements</td>
<td>• confronting resistance and sabotage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction &amp; influence</strong></td>
<td>• struggles with authority and control</td>
<td>• who’s “in charge”</td>
<td>• clarify and act on your leader role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• status and power systems</td>
<td>• resistance to authority</td>
<td>• plural leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• control of communication</td>
<td>• who’s the “smartest” or “best service person”</td>
<td>• encouraging/requiring participation in tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• social inclusiveness &amp; cliquishness</td>
<td>• identity groups stick together... and/or are excluded by others</td>
<td>• are feelings important in group? choice of talking about them or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• good/bad “feelings”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>• dealing with other systems</td>
<td>• sociology requirements &amp; personnel</td>
<td>• membership renegotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• site rules and regulations</td>
<td>• task renegotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• staying “in here” or “out there”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output &amp; production</strong></td>
<td>• task accomplishment</td>
<td>• personal learning and social service</td>
<td>• individual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• feeling empowered</td>
<td>• individual vs. group</td>
<td>• group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• individual in group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>