Possible Discussion Questions for Tania Mitchell's Article

1. How do "traditional service-learning (service to individuals)" and "critical service-learning (service for an ideal)" differ from one another? (What differences make the difference so to speak?)
2. Is the distinction useful?
3. Why pursue one model of service-learning rather than the other? Decision criteria?
4. In the contexts of the CCE, CC, and Colorado Springs, what are the challenges of pursing one model rather than the other?
5. Is critical service-learning too audacious for CC and Colorado Springs? If not, how can we "transform social justice theory into service learning practice" (page 62)? What would that look like here at CC and in Colorado Springs?
6. With which model is your work at the CCE currently aligned (rhetoric versus reality)?
7. Are student development and community change mutually exclusive (theory versus practice)?
8. Do we currently support the complementary relationship among service activity, course content, community needs, and student outcomes? If so, what are some specific examples? If not, how can we?
9. Do we currently ensure community input? Integrate community (page 58)? If so, what are some specific examples? If not, how can we?
10. What do relationships based on "connection" look like? Have you seen this in your work here or anywhere else? How can we avoid "artificial homogenization" and foster "authenticity" instead (page 59)?

Mitchell doesn't distinguish between "service-learning" and "community-based learning." What differences do we see? Have we just dropped the baggage associated with "service" without tackling the social justice aims of critical service-learning?