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**Abstract**
Using Lee’s definition of service-learning as “an instructional method in which students learn course content by actively participating in thoughtfully organized service experiences related to that content”, this article offers a case of action-oriented service-learning. It shows one way to combine traditional teaching methods with an action-oriented approach to service-learning that benefits both the community and imparts critical know-how into the education of planning students. Through service-learning students acquire valuable skills and also increase their competence as practitioners and increase their confidence in their field in a way that nurtures their abilities and provides minimal risk to the clientele because the students are working under the guidance of faculty. As previous research from diverse fields have shown, service-learning benefits the students and the groups they encounter through their projects.
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Introduction

Using Lee’s definition of service-learning as “an instructional method in which students learn course content by actively participating in thoughtfully organized service experiences related to that content” (Lee, 2009, p. 1), this article offers a case of action-oriented service-learning. The method was applied in the spring of 2009 in an interdisciplinary studio course involving upper-level undergraduates and masters students at an urban research university in the United States.

Stakeholder participation in community planning is essential to effective planning practice. Among other benefits, the meaningful involvement of stakeholders fosters the democratic process, ensures that plans address relevant community needs, and improves the likelihood that plans will be accepted by the community. In addition, from the university’s perspective, having students engaged in stakeholder analysis through service-learning may promote “town-gown” relationships, especially in urban areas (Russo et al. 2007, esp. p. 199). Planning education should teach techniques for stakeholder engagement and the analysis of input from stakeholders as part of the preparation of future professional planners. The focus of this article is on one such technique and how it was used in a studio course to educate students through a service-learning project that involved stakeholders from an urban neighborhood. Students helped residents of this neighborhood examine important issues for their community and identify a manageable set of entities that can either help address those issues or that could thwart their efforts to deal with those issues.

Students of applied disciplines such as community planning benefit from experiential learning. The stakeholder analysis discussed in this article facilitated the mapping of stakeholders in a Cincinnati neighborhood as well as provided planning, engineering, and political science undergraduate students with an applied experience. This article offers an account of an interdisciplinary studio course in which students assess the development needs of a particular neighborhood and make recommendations for social, economic, and physical changes in response to a citywide community development initiative.

This article offers an action-research approach for the education of students of planning. It is important to note that the service-learning component complemented traditional teaching methods. Students were assigned readings about stakeholders and planning (one journal article and a professional piece pertaining to how stakeholders are being incorporated in transportation planning), to show the practical application of stakeholder analysis and to emphasize that it is a topic they will encounter in the “real world” of work as future planners. In addition, the students listened to lectures and explanations in the studio (classroom setting) to prepare them for doing a guided stakeholder analysis of their own for a community. A practical constraint was the university’s academic calendar (a set 10-week quarter), but students were able to have a relatively realistic experience of working in a community through the service-learning project described and explicated in this article. We estimate that approximately 200 student “service hours” were utilized for the project. (This was based on an
assumption that the four students each spent an average of 5 hours a week for the ten weeks on this project, including meetings with community partners, arranging the venue for the stakeholder workshop, convening and facilitating the stakeholder workshop, writing the report, and presenting the results at a studio open-house at the end of the quarter at which one academic and one community representative critiqued their work.)

Relevant Literature
Student involvement in the community development process is beneficial to the professional development of the student, as well as the functioning of community in coordinating community development initiatives. In the context of service-learning or an integrated studio/community experience, students benefit from opportunities to evaluate empirically tested community development knowledge and apply it in the community setting (Harris, Denise, and Thomas 1989). The students not only benefit from feedback through instructors and the formal grading system, but from interactions with members of the community served. Students also gain a realistic perspective on mechanisms of survival used by community members as well as the challenges and advantages of pursuing a career in community development (Harris et al. 1989). For many undergraduate students, experiential education is necessary to practice their craft (Freestone, Thompson, and Williams 2006).

In experiential learning, such as service-learning and applied activities of students, it is assumed that learning occurs in different modes (Eyford 1989). Experiential learning involves a developmental process for students: concrete experience leads to observation and reflection which leads to generalization that gives way to testing or evaluating generalizations and concepts (Kolb 1984; Harris et al. 1989). Students learn theory and how to assimilate abstract concepts in the classroom, while gaining more immediate reinforcement of classroom experience through direct community-based interactions. Student involvement in participatory community planning involves the application of conceptual and operational understanding of the community process (Roakes and Norris-Tirell 2000). Operational understanding of community processes involves the development of competence and the skills appropriate for students to use to reach certain goals in various applied situations (Kirschner 1997). The goal of this experiential learning experience was to facilitate greater community awareness among students as well as provide students with an expanded knowledge of community development principles and practices. The particular mechanism for learning is a stakeholder analysis conducted in the Madisonville community, a neighborhood in the City of Cincinnati.

The stakeholder analysis provided architecture, planning, engineering, and political science students with direct experience handling the initial stages of a community redevelopment process in Madisonville. Student service-learning strategies, including ours, expands the toolkit of social research methodologies for students and allows them to gain insight into the perspectives of community members (Roakes and Norris-Tirell 2000). Furthermore, Kinsely (1994) found that students involved in projects outside the classroom are more adept at...
relating to course subjects and remember what they learned for a longer period of time. Coursework that engages students in applied research and community service can help students develop more positive beliefs about service and community as well as a greater sense of social responsibility (Harris, Denise, and Thomas 1989; Kupiec 1993; Markus, Howard, and Kling 1993; Walsh 1994; and Roakes and Norris-Tirrell 2000).

The application of service-learning approaches to politics and civics has gained attention in recent years. Service-learning has been credited with making arcane disciplinary knowledge relevant to students (Diklitch 2003). It has also been advanced as a way of “promoting civic activism” especially when students have an active role in the leadership of the project (Morgan and Streb 2002).

Our stakeholder analysis also provided several members of the University of Cincinnati faculty with experience organizing and facilitating an applied interdisciplinary research project. Interdisciplinary approaches to teaching have been found to improve and strengthen academic programs when faculty are given appropriate time and resources to collectively implement exercises (Chism, Lees, and Evenbeck 2002; Lindman and Tahamont 2006). Mintz (1999), Wergin (2001), Meacham and Ludwig (2001), and Lindman and Tahamont (2006) also report that professional satisfaction and collegial relations improve when faculty are allowed to experiment with new approaches to research and teaching, and develop working relationships with professionals of other disciplines in the university and community. For interdisciplinary programs to be successful it is important that faculty feel that their departments, colleagues, and university administrators support their work and are willing to invest funding and administrative resources into such programs (Lindman and Tahamont 2006).

**Stakeholder Conceptual Framework**

A stakeholder analysis is used for gaining insight into the social dynamics of a particular issue. Stakeholder analyses have been used to understand potential environmental, land, and community management inputs (Carter-North 2005). Much literature has been developed that supports participation of stakeholders in development processes. However, there are relatively few empirical studies that support claims about the importance of stakeholders (Brody 2003).

Stakeholders have been defined as individuals, groups, organizations, or communities that can affect or be affected by the outcome of a community or environmental initiative (Grimble and Chan 1995; Grimble and Wellard 1997; Chevalier 2001; Carter-North 2005). For example, Freeman’s (1984, 46) stakeholder definition: “A stakeholder in an organization is (by definition) any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives.” In this case, public sector stakeholders include the general public, contractors, other governments, interest groups, oversight bodies, and others (Thomas and Poister 2009). This paradigm includes almost everybody related to or affected by a planning process, whether they directly contributed to an outcome or not. Other definitions are more narrow and
associate stakeholders with land ownership, resources, and knowledge that, when incorporated into land-use plans, improves the quality of the plan (Brody 2003). This perspective holds that a stakeholder is someone who makes a tangible contribution to the planning process or outcome. For Bryson (2004, 22) stakeholders may “only be people or groups who have the power to directly affect the organization’s future.”

In dialogues pertaining to business functions, ‘stakeholders’ have been defined as shareholders or financial investors in a particular endeavor. However, the stakeholder definition has developed to including individuals and groups such as customers, employees, interest groups, those with political interests, and community representatives (Brown and Flynn 2008).

The definitional framework of a stakeholder used in this article closely mirrors Thomas and Poister (2009) and is defined as an individual or a group which can have a positive or negative impact on a given situation. A stakeholder can have access to resources that are required to implement an activity or has resources that can be mobilized to prevent the activity from being performed (Honadle and Cooper 1989). Thus a stakeholder can affect or be affected by actions, objectives, and policies.

Thomas and Poister (2009, 67-8) conducted a stakeholder audit of the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) and defined stakeholders, as opposed to the general public, as:

*The latter [stakeholders] includes, in addition to the general public, such actors a (1) particular customer or clientele groups, (2) private sector firms and nonprofit organizations who contract to help do the work of public agencies, (3) other governmental units that may be involved in the frequent intergovernmental provision of services, (4) interest groups or community groups who feel they have a stake in what public agencies do, and (5) policy-making bodies that both define the mission and provide the oversight to public agencies.*

For Thomas and Poister (2009, 68) the next step (for GDOT or a public agency) is to conduct a stakeholder audit that involves:

* (1) mapping of the universe of an agency’s stakeholders, (2) assessing the agency’s perceived needs for additional information relative to various stakeholder groups, and (3) developing suggestions on how to obtain that information.*

Out of concern for inclusiveness for those who participate in civic processes, the public sector may need a broad definition of ‘stakeholder’ rather than a narrow one (Thomas and Poister 2009). With a broad stakeholder definition, there is a challenge with delineating between individuals who have some input in or influence over community planning processes from individuals who (for whatever reason) provide little or no input or direction.
Madisonville Demographics
Madisonville is largely a middle-income community situated in the City of Cincinnati, approximately 10 miles from downtown. The population of Madisonville is approximately 6,000 (Maloney and Auffrey 2004). The median family income in Madisonville in year 2000 was approximately $55,000.00, slightly above the median family income of $53,000 for the City of Cincinnati in general. Only six percent of families lived below the poverty in 2000, contrasted to 18 percent in the City of Cincinnati (United States Census 2000).

Methods
A stakeholder analysis of Madisonville was conducted in the winter of 2009 at a community center. Participants in the analysis were identified and invited by members of the local community council. The council made a list of 21 potential participants and informed them of the date and time of the meeting. The participant list consisted of individuals who reside in and own property in the Madisonville community.

The goal of the stakeholder analysis was to provide Madisonville community members with a list of potential stakeholders in current and future community development initiatives, as well as a learning experience for advanced planning and political science students. Preliminary interviews with members of the Madisonville Community Council demonstrated a clear interest in neighborhood redevelopment.

Several meetings with key informants, who included the president of the Madisonville Community Council and a director of a neighborhood arts center, agreed to develop a list of invitees for a meeting to map potential community stakeholders. A meeting date was established by studio instructors and the key informants, and 14 community members attended (See Table 1). The students conducting the stakeholder analysis assisted members of the Madisonville community with developing a stakeholder structure that identifies community needs and actors, and brings them to the foreground (Freeman 1984).

Results
The Madisonville stakeholder analysis provided an educational experience for political science and planning students. A post-workshop survey was administered to community participants, and the results indicate that the workshop was helpful for all attendees in clarifying the definition of a stakeholder and useful for helping attendees gain insight about who the Madisonville stakeholders may be. The workshop was generally well received and most participants indicated that they would recommend the student-led stakeholder analysis for other communities.
The survey was administered at the end of the workshop and contained six questions (see appendix). Four of the six questions were close-ended and measured the usefulness of the workshop for participants. Two of the questions were open-ended, and asked the participants to provide their input on the part of the stakeholder workshop that was most helpful as well as other feedback for improving the workshop. Twelve of the 14 participants completed the survey.

The four close-ended questions asked the participants to rate their agreement, on a scale of 1 to 10 with 1 as “Not at all” and 10 as “Extremely.” Question one asked the participants if the definition of stakeholder used at the workshop helped them clarify the roles that different organizations can take for collaboration and action. All participants expressed that the stakeholder definition used clarified the roles of different organizations by scoring between 7 and 10. All participants scored between 7 and 10 on question 2, indicating that the workshop was engaging. All participants expressed more confidence that action can be taken in the particular issues identified at the workshop, as a result of the workshop. All participants rated their confidence between 7 and 10. All participants suggested they would recommend the stakeholder workshop for other communities with ratings between 8 and 10.

This case also illustrates the expected lag between the time an action-oriented, participatory research project is completed and the occurrence of any impact in the target community. It is not unusual for student reports to count toward a course grade, but part of the goal should also be to serve the community in a meaningful way. This excerpt from correspondence to the instructor about how the work the students did will be used is relevant:

“In spring of 2011 we will begin the development phase [of a project addressing development of the business district]. The starting point for this will be the work that your group did. The information and vision provided by the Niehoff Urban Studio will drive much of the work and has empowered the neighborhood in visualizing what can be done. We are very grateful for all the work that was done and look forward to implementing much of it.” (Igoe 2010)

Thus, in this case, the students’ project was appreciated immediately by the participants in the workshop as evidenced by positive evaluations and it appears that the project will be used as the starting point for a project that will be undertaken nearly two years later.

**Learning Outcomes**

Students learned a variety of useful things through this class because of its service-learning component. A partial list of skills the students enhanced through this experience are teamwork, organization, analysis, and both oral and written communication.
Students in the studio class were required to form teams to complete projects. The students who worked on this project were all interested in applying the stakeholder analysis technique that was taught to all students in the class. The students had to work together and overcome each other’s schedules (e.g., one student attended a conference out of town to look for employment during the quarter), take advantage of the relative skills and talents of each team member, and take joint responsibility for planning and executing the project.

The students demonstrated their ability to organize a project that was quite complex, especially given the amount of time available. Among the tasks they had to coordinate and manage were making the room arrangements for the venue (the site where the stakeholder workshop took place); preparing handouts and audiovisual materials; documenting the event; and developing, administering, and tabulating a survey instrument.

One of the main lessons the students learned was a field-tested (Honadle et al. 2000) approach to doing stakeholder analysis, which they can use (and adapt) in their own practice. They learned to go beyond enumerating stakeholders, and to use a rigorous definition (incidentally, one that can be readily understood by community members and academics) of a stakeholder. They can differentiate among various types of situations such as ones requiring joint action (multiple stakeholders) and one in which a single stakeholder (entity or individual) controls all of the resources to “make or break” in the resolution of a problem, issue, or need.

The students had to prepare materials for presentation to community residents of varying degrees of education and with no common disciplinary background. They communicated orally as presenters and in various interactions with members of the community, both in the planning of the workshop and in running the workshop. During the workshop, the students produced a community needs matrix that reflects the interests of the individuals and agencies detailed in Table 1 (Honadle 2009). They also wrote a report that was shared with the leader of the neighborhood council.

In addition, students gained a sense of the importance of and challenges of democratic processes. There are tradeoffs between having more people involved and making the process manageable. One has to assume that the group invited (by the elected neighborhood council) to the stakeholder workshop are more or less representative of the interests of the community.

The primary method used to assess the students’ work on this project was an independent review by a Sociology faculty member who had no part in the project and a review by a community leader in Madisonville. The students presented their project at a public meeting at the studio at the end of the quarter and these two reviewers acted as discussants on a professional panel, pointing out strengths and weaknesses, asking questions, and commenting on the project. This process provides a valuable opportunity for students to receive critical feedback from both an academic and practical perspective. The studio does not permit an evaluation instrument designed to assess student learning on interdisciplinary studio projects such as the stakeholder project. (For more on this, see: Honadle 2010). One of the Planning
students on the team subsequently used the stakeholder analysis technique taught in the studio as part of the methodology for a paper (comparable to a senior thesis) on marketing a city’s image. (Samuels 2010)

The observations based on this case are rather complementary to the findings from a systematic study of how more than 200 high school students from 10 schools were affected by service-learning. Morgan and Streb (2001, 166) concluded that, “When students have real responsibilities, challenging tasks, helped to plan the project, and made important decisions, involvement in service-learning projects had significant and substantive impacts on students’ increases in self-concept, political engagement, and attitudes toward out-groups.”

**Conclusion and Discussion**

Students of planning require a diverse set of skills and knowledge. Part of that knowledge, such as the ability to analyze problems, can be learned through traditional classroom-style or even on-line coursework. However, for students to develop a deeper understanding of the context for planning and to acquire essential skills as teamwork, organization, communication for professionals and nonprofessionals (or people from professions other than planning), and other practical skills, it is important for them to have experience under the mentorship and guidance of qualified teachers.

This article has shown one way to combine traditional teaching methods with an action-oriented approach to service-learning that benefits both the community and, importantly, imparts critical know-how into the education of planning students. Through service-learning students acquire valuable skills and also increase their competence as practitioners and increase their confidence in their field in a way that nurtures their abilities and provides minimal risk to the clientele because the students are working under the guidance of faculty.

The importance of service-learning projects to strengthening democratic values has been underscored from other disciplinary perspectives. In the words of philosophy professor, Stephen Esquith, “Service learning projects, such as clearing vacant lots and tutoring in after-school programs, can be public work. But, public work should go beyond community service. It should prepare students and their community partners for participation in democratic political life.” (Esquith, 2003, 74) The service-learning project presented in this article helped to build the so-called “civic agency” of communities through the “democratization” of knowledge in which “ordinary people develop skills, habits, and confidence of citizenship.” (Boye, 2009, p. 2) By involving ordinary citizens from Madisonville in the identification of problems from their perspective and the delineation of stakeholders (using the political definition the students presented them in the workshop) the residents were empowered to act on their own behalf to develop their community.
Moreover, as some scholars of politics have suggested, service-learning may help students gain a sense of “efficacy” (the sense that their participation may actually make a difference in the political process) (Kahne and Westheimer 2006). It is worth noting that one study of civics education found that, while service-learning holds promise for civic education, we need more evidence from evaluations that democratic citizenship is helped by combining community-based civic experience and reflection in the classroom on that experience (Galston 2001). However, that study did not focus on students who had already chosen a career in planning, so the results may be more applicable to students in general.

As previous research from diverse fields has shown, service-learning benefits the students and the groups they encounter through their projects (Roschelle 2000). At a time when public universities may be needing more support from the communities they serve, examples of how these institutions are educating students while helping communities develop workable plans for solving locally identified issues may be useful.

Service-learning was identified as one of six recent trends in political science scholarship less than a decade ago. The finding from that analysis that “Service learning is labor intensive for faculty and requires additional resources and support services” (Kehl 2002, 231) may be self-evident. Nevertheless, this finding serves as a cautionary note or a rationale for the acquisition of supplementary resources for those considering adapting the approaches discussed in this article. Those resources might include release time for faculty, assistantships, and funds to defray out-of-pocket expenses associated with projects so that students will have the means to produce materials of professional quality as noted by Lindman and Tahamont (2006).

Despite any institutional challenges and extra effort required for faculty to engage in this kind of action-oriented, community-based participatory research (Honadle 1996), these experiences are valuable for faculty teams. This kind of research helps faculty understand the real-world problems of implementing techniques they teach in the classroom. It also gives faculty a way of connecting their universities to the community by doing what they do best as scholars. In addition, by having faculty work on actual problems in the community, it gives faculty ideas for further research. Moreover, by working as teams, faculty learn from each other about research and approaches from other disciplines, consistent with the finding of Chism, Lees, and Evenbeck (2002) and Lindman and Tahamont (2006). Faculty observe each other’s teaching and have informal interactions in which they can ask each other questions and discuss problems from very different scholarly perspectives. An Anthropology professor who had previously been a liberal-arts professor teaching in the studio offered a personal reflection of the value of the experience:

“The benefits, to me, of participating in the [studio] include, first, seeing things from a different perspective. I learned to appreciate visual forms of representation and learning as well as the critique method of team work. Second, the quality and visual presentation of the [studio] projects I have seen over the past two quarters is impressive: I can only gain by learning more about their process.” (Rees 2008, p. 3)
This article raises questions that could prompt further research and additional projects to sustaining these new partnerships. (1) How can community needs be addressed through research in a way that is both timely for the community and compatible with academic calendars? Classes typically take place over a 10-week quarter or 15-week semester. Synchronizing the need for students to learn content, apply it in a community-based project, and complete related papers or reports with the ideal timeframe from the community’s perspective is a serious challenge. (2) How do faculty sustain new partnerships formed through community-based participatory research? These efforts are often discrete projects with little or no follow-through once the project ends. (3) What difference do these projects make in the communities served? The communities are laboratories for these projects, but do the projects have impacts once the projects are completed? (4) What rewards and incentives within universities exist to support and sustain these kinds of efforts? Not only do these kinds of projects entail faculty and staff resources, but the evaluation of faculty has to value this work. To be specific, do the guidelines for retention and promotion of faculty encourage faculty to participate in these kinds of projects or do these kinds of projects represent a perceived risk, especially to more junior (tenured) faculty? Further, are university systems for evaluating faculty flexible enough to assess contributions by teams rather than just individual faculty members teaching in traditional formats? Of course, the issue of evaluating team-taught courses is not unique to these kinds of projects.
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Table 1. Stakeholders for Madisonville identified by students at the Winter 2009 Stakeholder meeting

Madisonville Community Council

Homeowners
Retailers
Drug Dealers
Press
Churches
City Government
Parents
Homesteading and Urban Redevelopment Corporation (HURC)
Madisonville Residents
Recreation Center
Madison Education and Assistance Center (MEAC)
Community Problem Oriented Policing (CPOP)
Cincinnati Police Department (CPD)
Citizens on Patrol
Cincinnati Human Relations Commission Youth Service Workers (CHRC YSW)
Apathy Residents
Children
Neighborhood Business District Property Owners
Weed & Seed
Children’s Home
Southern Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA)
Cab Company
Schools
Absentee Property Owners
Indian Hill
Teen Council
Banks
Real Estate Agencies
Developers
Library
Appendix

Thank you very much for participating today in this important process for Madisonville. We would appreciate your feedback so we can further refine the Stakeholder Analysis for future communities. We are also very interested in learning how it impacted you personally.

Respectfully,

The University of Cincinnati Students and Faculty

(Please circle a number that most represents your response to the statement.)

1) The definition of stakeholder used today helps me to clarify the roles that different organizations in Madisonville can take for collaboration and action.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all Indifferent Extremely
Results:

10 Extremely – 3
9 – 2
8 – 3
7 - 4

2) I found today’s workshop to be engaging (It encouraged my active participation).

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all Indifferent Extremely
Results:

10 Extremely – 3
9 – 1
8 – 6
7 - 2

3) As a result of this workshop, I am more confident that action can be taken on the particular issues we identified.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all Indifferent Extremely
Results:
Results:

10 Extremely – 3
9 – 2
8 – 4
7 - 3

4) I would recommend this process for other communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results:

10 Extremely – 8
9 – 2
8 – 2
7 - 0

5) The part of the Stakeholder Analysis that was most helpful was:

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

What other feedback can you provide that would help improve this workshop?