

Chapter Four

Moving Community-based Learning into the Mainstream University Curriculum: South African Opportunities and Challenges

Tim Nuttall

Introduction

This chapter draws on diverse curriculum experiences to sketch out a broad picture of South African opportunities and challenges for community-based learning as an arena both of curriculum reform and community development. This arena is a vital one in the dynamic, pressing context in which South African universities operate at present. Many Social Sciences disciplines are appropriate vehicles for moving further down the road of a ‘scholarship of engagement’, and the experiences informing this chapter include active involvement as a University of Natal representative in the national initiative called Community-Higher Education Service Partnerships (CHESP). The partnership programme aims to further the transformation of South African universities towards sustained community engagement in their curricula, to develop local communities as sites of civil society, and to enhance the provision of appropriate services in those communities.

Starting with a working definition of community-based learning, the chapter goes on to highlight international and national impulses for a scholarship of engagement. With this context in place, I pose a set of core questions which provide an analytical frame for understanding what is at stake in meaningful, effective community-based learning. A central requirement is that universities nurture a policy environment that is favourable to such initiatives. I flesh out this point by examining a draft policy document on community-based learning at the University of Natal.

A Working Definition of Community-Based Learning in the South African Context

This chapter deploys and explores the term ‘community-based learning’. It is necessary at the outset to provide a working definition and a rationale for its use. In South African public discourse, ‘community’ is most commonly understood to refer to historically disadvantaged, resource-poor black groups who bore the brunt of apartheid discrimination. Due to legalised social and territorial segregation, such groups generally lived in distinct locales, and largely continue to do so in post-apartheid South Africa. Used in this sense, ‘community’ has attributes both of deficit and of resilience in the face of multiple hardships.

There is a clear political and moral imperative that when a South African university engages in community-based learning it works in black townships and underdeveloped peri-urban and rural districts. Having said this, it is also important to assert wider definitions of ‘community’. The pragmatic reason for this is to engage as many academic disciplines and programmes as possible in generating new forms of socialised knowledge and practice, with the intention of contributing to the vitalisation of South Africa’s post-apartheid civil society. In its broadest sense, from a university perspective, ‘community’ is fruitfully understood as a locale, institution or group of people off campus.

This said, community-based learning can be understood to refer to a dynamic process linking real community priorities, issues and problems with student learning, research and development. It is a process which should involve multiple and diverse participants and partners in a mixture of on and off campus learning experiences. Outcomes of the process include an integrated, problem solving, multifaceted learning experience for students, the production of new forms of knowledge in relation to societal needs, and broader civic and social development. Community-based learning should explicitly involve more than ‘doing practicals’; the approach should be holistic, incorporating aspects of propositional, practical, experiential and inspirational learning (terms which are explained below). Exploring across these learning modes ensures a research orientation, in a wide sense, as well as approaches which draw on a spectrum of learning competencies: content knowledge, value judgements, inter-personal behaviour, and organisational skills. Community-based learning pushes higher education in the direction of multi-disciplinarity. It also offers an experiential mechanism for the integrated assessment of learning outcomes spelt out in academic programmes.

For community-based learning to occur in a meaningful and structured manner, off-campus learning sites need to be developed. Such sites ideally draw together

higher education institutions, community organisations and service providers in interactive partnerships. A flexible definition of ‘community’ enables the widest possible involvement of higher education, community and service partners in joint learning endeavours. Central to these partnerships should be notions of mutual benefit for the partners: each should participate in, and gain from, learning activities at community sites.

Community-based learning occurs in the ‘real world’; it cannot be divorced from its social context. It is a public encounter. Embedded in community-based learning should be the development of leadership, citizenship and community service among university students and staff, and in communities and service organisations. In this sense, community-based learning contributes to social development in multiple ways and forms.

In summary, community-based learning generates a variety of intellectually and socially beneficial outcomes in the form of new knowledge, discourse and action for higher education students and staff, and for participant communities and service providers.

‘Service learning’ is an alternative term, widely used in the United States in particular, for a broadly similar phenomenon (Stanton et al., 1999). In South African society, with its small middle class and limited practice of volunteerism, it can be argued that notions of ‘community involvement’, ‘leadership’ and ‘national development’ are better ones to emphasise in popularising the idea of universities as ‘engaged’ institutions. A broadly and loosely conceived term, such as ‘community-based learning’, has the advantage of embracing a wide variety of approaches to teaching and learning. The term can provide many angles for incorporating learning experiences outside the classroom into curricula and research within higher education. The term is also located firmly in the idea of university-community partnerships; it is potentially less student-centred than ‘service learning’ in that it suggests that off campus partners have both a teaching role to play and opportunities for their own learning and capacity building.

International and National Impulses for a Scholarship of Engagement

In the wake of intense economic globalisation, the information technology revolution, and the ending of the Cold War era, the world’s societies are undergoing profound change. The modern university, created in the matrix of institutions that undergirded the industrialising European nation states and their offshoots during

the 19th and 20th centuries, is experiencing multiple pressures to transform itself. Depending on one's perspective, the modern university is either in ruins, or is capable of re-organising itself into a flexible learning organisation in the new circumstances of 'network societies' (Bawden, 1999c; Readings, 1996).

With the notion of community-based learning in mind, I emphasise three broad impulses for re-figuring the modern university: first, the changing nature and claims of knowledge; second, the political pressures on universities to justify their existence; and third, the positive expectations amongst students of applied learning and the demand for work-related skills. These impulses point jointly towards a 'scholarship of engagement', a praxis that connects university-based classrooms and research projects with off campus sites of knowledge generation and action. The core purpose of this engagement is to address pressing issues in contemporary society, responding to the challenges of social development and democratic citizenship (Boyer, 1996).

The first impulse for change in the university sector relates to the diversification of locales of expert knowledge. A large part of the traditional rationale for universities as distinctive institutions is that they are sites of expert knowledge, where new knowledge is generated, debated and taught by professionals dedicated to this task. In this view, the university campus is the core locale of this expert knowledge; students go to the university to learn. In today's world of large corporate research and development divisions, of mass consumption of knowledge produced by a global media industry, and of widely dispersed access to expert information via information technology, the distinctiveness of universities as knowledge-sites is eroded.

The 'knowledge' impulse for the changing nature of universities can be linked, furthermore, to the need for new paradigms as social actors respond to the challenges of development at the dawn of the 21st century (Bawden, 1999a, 1999b). A case can be made for the need for new 'ways of knowing' and 'ways of doing' in contexts of intensifying globalisation (which brings in its wake both greater homogeneity and social fracture), of a multi-centred, highly unequal world economy, and of ecological and demographic crises. We live in a fast-changing, uncertain world. Approaches to generating new knowledge and praxis in these contexts need to be holistic, multi-disciplinary, dynamic, and socially rooted. To embrace these approaches, universities need to work with other sites of knowledge generation, and with broader learning communities and learning systems.

Drawing on other theorists who explore these new directions, Richard Bawden (1999b) advances a conceptual framework for knowledge and praxis in the

furtherance of systemic development. He argues that holistic learning involves a dynamic combination of propositional, practical, experiential and inspirational learning. Each of these four forms of knowledge has its own sub-systems of operation. Propositional knowledge is formal and conceptual; practical knowledge is applied to the prosecution of particular observable tasks; experiential knowledge is created through the transformation of personal experience; and, inspirational knowledge is that which shapes moral and ethical choices. The traditional university has the potential to generate knowledge in all four arenas; but classroom-based learning is distinctly limited in relation to the last three categories. Into this lacuna community-based learning offers distinct contributions to the creation of new forms of holistic knowledge.

These developments in the knowledge domain are connected with a second impulse: the political pressure on universities to justify their existence, and the related decline of state funding for universities. To the extent that universities are seen to be less and less central to the futures of individual nation states, they absorb less of the public purse than previously. In the post-Cold War era, the 'strategic' place of universities is less significant for the state and the major institutions which underpin it (Harkavy & Benson, 2000). In ways which are far from simple, the declining interest of the state in universities has made them more vulnerable to the determining interests of big corporations and donor agencies. But reduced state interest has also opened up new spaces for re-asserting the idea that universities are critical agents in the creation of strong, textured civil societies. In this view, universities justify themselves as public institutions because they nurture democracy as a public good; the rationale for universities should be far more than the production of technocratic knowledge and the education of professionals and managers with technical expertise.

The labour market is the source of a third impulse acting on universities. Although highly variable across the world's economies, contemporary labour markets are increasingly competitive and increasingly fluid. In response, students are pushed towards educational niches that offer job marketability or entrepreneurial prospects. The expansion of professionally oriented undergraduate degrees in business, information technology and law, for example, signals a response to this student demand. Among the majority of students – those who do not gain access to these niche areas – there is a growing demand for curricula with a more 'applied' bent. Students want to graduate not only with knowledge of content and theory, but with personal and organisational skills and experiences that will enhance their prospects of gaining jobs or enabling self-employment.

These three impulses point to a ‘scholarship of engagement’ because they push universities to stop seeing themselves as institutions of ‘light up on the hill’, places to which learners come. Rather, universities are under pressure to breach their ‘walls’, to be more outward looking, and to ‘engage’ more directly with the worlds of work and community in their core teaching and research activities. A long-established pattern of engagement has been to conduct research commissioned by government and business. The new impulses point to a far broader notion of engagement, one which permeates the undergraduate curriculum and involves students and not only academic researchers.

The three general impulses outlined above are manifest in varying ways and with differing intensity in specific national contexts. South Africa represents a distinct set of dynamics and impulses for a scholarship of engagement. Certain South African universities have a long history of involvement, in multiple ways, in the epic and often costly struggle against apartheid. Like most organisations involved in that struggle, the 1990s brought the need for universities to shift from ‘struggle’ mode to ‘reconstruction and development’ mode, from fighting against, to working for. Added to this strategic shift has been the complication of the hugely fractured nature of South African institutions, where racially-based policies spawned vertically divided but overlapping structures. This was particularly so with government departments. After 1994, for example, a single national education department was created out of multiple separate departments. Organisational unification was accompanied by a political need to signal a new direction in state education policy in post-apartheid South Africa: a shift from the teacher-centred, positivist pedagogy of Christian National Education, to the learner-centred, outcomes-based pedagogy of *Curriculum 2005* (Department of Education, 1997a). A bold new attempt to bring all educational and training endeavours into a single National Qualifications Framework (NQF) was intended to provide coherence to this far-reaching shift in teaching and learning

Together with the new national Department of Education, the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) defined 12 broad outcomes that should shape all education at school, university and beyond. In the *Draft Revised National Curriculum Statement for Grade R–9* (Department of Education, 2001: 17), these broad outcomes are categorised into seven critical outcomes and five developmental outcomes:

While these outcomes and competencies are specified for school learners, they apply with equal force to tertiary education. Many of the new curriculum features outlined above for the South African situation create impulses and new spaces for community-

based learning. How many of the specified outcomes and competencies can be developed and achieved simply with a classroom-based approach? Community-based learning has great potential to enrich the formal learning environment. By exposing students and their lecturers to real-world, problem-solving challenges, community-based learning modules challenge disciplinary insularity, encourage multi-disciplinarity, and nurture holistic learning, personal and organisational skills, and citizenship. These modules are potential engines for new knowledge and new practice, both for university staff and students, and for community and service provider participants. New curriculum directions for South African universities therefore point towards structured experiential learning in off campus settings.

Alongside these curricular impulses, a distinctively South African set of political pressures exist for universities to generate legitimacy for themselves. In the new democratic dispensation it is less easy than previously for the government to allocate a proportionately high subsidy to universities when the schooling system is in deep trouble. Indeed, part of the funding crisis for South African universities has been due to a government policy of increasing the proportion of its education budget which is allocated to primary and secondary schools. Historically, the better-resourced South African universities were, in effect, islands of privilege for white, middle-class students. The rising numbers of working-class black students at these universities during the past two decades has been accompanied by a new emphasis in state policy on universities becoming more active agents in social development.

Perhaps the clearest indicator of this trend has been the *Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education* (Department of Education, 1997b), which spells out roles for higher education to contribute to 'the common good of society' and to South African 'reconstruction and development' priorities. One of the stated goals of transformation is 'to promote and develop social responsibility and awareness amongst students of the role of higher education in social and economic development through community service programmes'. A number of government departments, the National Youth Commission and student organisations have since expressed similar ideas to those in the White Paper. The National Research Foundation has recently implemented a policy to reward research that is socially relevant and applied. South African academics are increasingly conscious of the political and intellectual pressure to relate their work to local, regional and national development challenges.

The prospects for community-based learning are positive, if enormously challenging, particularly if the goal is to integrate university-community encounters into the academic curriculum for large numbers of students. The question then arises: what conditions are necessary for community-based learning to develop both

as a worthy, mainstream academic enterprise and as a contribution to processes of community development? For effective, legitimate community-based learning to occur it is vital that the university, and the communities in the sites at which students work and learn, are ready and prepared for the interactive relationships that are the lifeblood of this learning. The following two sections outline a matrix of categories and questions for evaluating the intentions and capacity of the participants in these complex learning relationships.

How Willing and Ready are Universities to Participate in Community-Based Learning?

It is probably true that every South African university has a mission statement that includes the notion of serving and developing ‘the community’ of which it is part. In recent years, ‘community service’ has joined teaching and research in a trio of institutional intent. That this is so indicates the strong sense, mentioned above, of universities in our society needing to show commitment to building a better post-apartheid society. Moving from awareness to action is the central challenge. The following categories of questions focus on the readiness and commitment of the university to act out its social mission through its curricular activities. The culture of research is also vital in setting the tone. Indeed, teaching, learning and research exist and develop interactively. These questions do not represent an exhaustive list, and are to be read as ‘exemplary questions’ only.

Policy frameworks which give expression to the university’s social roles

- ▶ How do these policies articulate expectations and ambitions for a ‘scholarship of engagement’?
- ▶ Is there recognition that community-based teaching, learning and research generates costs that are legitimate university costs in a manner similar, say, to the capital equipment costs of high-tech science laboratories?
- ▶ How is student learning in community-based learning modules assessed?
- ▶ Does the university’s research policy encourage community-based research?
- ▶ Does the university’s research policy encourage curriculum-oriented research?
- ▶ Is there a staff development policy that includes the ‘scholarship of engagement’ as a focus?
- ▶ Is there a student development policy that aims to encourage and equip students to see themselves as citizens and community builders?

- ▶ To what extent is there an expectation that each discipline should explicitly provide opportunities to involve staff and students in local community development?

Forms of organisation and choices about resource generation and allocation

- ▶ What forms of organisation exist to give programmatic weight, focus and coherence to community-based learning?
- ▶ Are sufficient resources (human, monetary, infrastructural) allocated to achieve weight, focus, coherence, legitimacy and effectiveness in community engagement activities?

The university's definition of itself as a 'service provider'

- ▶ How does the university articulate its community service roles?
- ▶ To what extent is the provision of an off campus service embodied within the curriculum in individual disciplines?
- ▶ To what extent does the university create working relations with off campus service providers in the public, NGO and private sectors?

How Willing and Ready is 'the Community' to Participate in Community-Based Learning?

While some might argue that the range of definitions of 'community' make it impossible to answer this question, I propose that the following questions provide a generally applicable framework across this variety. Drawing on the earlier discussion, I define a 'community' as a collectivity of people at an off campus 'site' who are organised or drawn together for residential, educational, cultural or issue-based purposes. This community can be more or less formally organised. In my mind's eye, in order to provide a focus, there is a local, materially-poor residential community, but the following questions are applicable to a wide assortment of 'communities'.

The community's self-consciousness of its assets, priorities, expectations and needs

- ▶ Is it able to articulate these assets, priorities, expectations, and needs both to its own community membership and to 'outsiders' wishing to interact with the community? (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993).

- ▶ How open and willing is the community to engage in ‘teaching and learning’ with outside organisations and, in particular, with university staff and students?

The nature of community organisation

- ▶ What is the character and quality of community leadership?
- ▶ What is the organisational breadth of the community (variety and number of organisations)?
- ▶ To what extent are social divisions accentuated within the community?

The qualities of community-based learning sites

- ▶ What is the quality of the partnerships working at the site?
- ▶ Is the site considered accessible by community members, university staff and students?
- ▶ Does the site widen and challenge the knowledge of each of the participants through the interactive generation of new knowledge and practice?
- ▶ Does the site contribute to visible social and institutional change among the participating organisations?

Probing the Quality of University-Community Interactions and Relationships

The above questions provide a means for evaluating the willingness and readiness of ‘the university’ and ‘the community’ to participate in community-based learning. For analytical purposes, I have so far envisaged each as distinctive actors. But now we need to bring them together in interaction, in inter-relationship. A defining quality of community-based learning is its interactiveness: the recognition that teaching and learning for both parties (and the constituents within them) rely on a mutual giving-and-taking. A central challenge of community-based learning is to enhance and enrich this mutuality, in the process producing not only new knowledge but new social relationships. The following questions probe the quality of these university-community relationships.

- ▶ Is the relationship best viewed as a short-term or a long-term one?
- ▶ How unequal are the power relations between the parties and what steps are taken to recognise and to reduce this inequality?
- ▶ To what extent is there a sense of reciprocity?
- ▶ To what extent is there a sense of mutual benefit for both parties?

- ▶ To what extent are there individuals within both ‘university’ and ‘community’ who play roles as relationship brokers between the two sectors?
- ▶ How do the partners in a project negotiate:
 - the contrasting discourses of ‘university’ and ‘community’, and seek common ground?
 - the matching (or not) of community development priorities with university curriculum and research priorities?
 - the differing time-frames of a university module and phases of community development?
 - the risks inherent in new ‘ways of knowing’ and new ‘ways of doing’?

The University of Natal’s Draft Policy on Community-Based Learning

In the late 1980s the University of Natal’s Executive Management initiated a series of evaluation and strategic planning projects. The culmination of this process of institutional debate and deliberation in changing times was *The Strategic Initiatives for the University of Natal*, produced in 1995 and revised in 1999. This document explicitly commits the University to curriculum and research activities which foster the ideals of community service, develop an understanding of the problems of society, and nurture skills required by ‘the new kind of graduate’ (University of Natal, 1999a: 4–5). *Strategic Initiatives* states that students should leave the University with a keen appreciation of the values and concerns of the different communities in which they will be living and working. Furthermore, students should have a sense of the historical context in which they live and of ‘what responsibilities and leadership roles they may be expected to fulfil’ (University of Natal, 1999a: 5).

This emphasis was further spelt out in the University’s *Institutional Plan 2000 to 2002*, submitted to the National Department of Education at the end of 1999. Service learning (or, to use the language of this chapter, community-based learning) is included as one of the University’s three ‘strategic initiatives aimed at ensuring quality’ (University of Natal, 1999b: 4–5). The *Institutional Plan* stresses the importance of university partnerships with public and private sector institutions, and with community-based organisations. It outlines the strategic challenge of integrating partnership and ‘engagement’ activities into the University curriculum ‘so that our students are able to learn the lessons they need to play a meaningful role in the reconstruction of our society.’ The current mission, vision and goals of the

University of Natal therefore express a strong commitment to serve South Africa, and the KwaZulu-Natal region in particular, through an emphasis on community development as a hallmark of high-quality teaching and research.

These official expressions of intent on the part of the University are shaped by current preoccupations with the nature of knowledge and skills required in the changing political economy of South Africa, which is in turn shaped by the global economy. But the University's emphasis is also rooted in a long tradition of community engagement in certain sections, units and disciplines of the University. Particularly during the turbulent 25 years which preceded the end of apartheid rule, the University provided institutional shelter and nurture to a range of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working in rural development, water, health, urban housing, and the trade union movement, for example. Significant external funding was raised during the 1980s for a Community Internship Programme, which paid for students to work in community settings during weekends and vacations. Since the mid-1990s, to cite another example, senior members of the University administration have participated in the Midlands Partnership Programme, an important regional educational consortium. The University of Natal is at the national cutting edge of applied research into HIV/AIDS.

Alongside these kinds of extra-curricular and research initiatives, a number of academics have worked to strengthen community engagement in their teaching courses. Some disciplines, such as Adult Education and Social Work, have a long pedigree. But others, such as Rural Resource Management, Community Resource Management, Psychology, Geography and Political Science either started afresh or thought anew about what 'doing practicals' meant. These curricular initiatives were thinly dispersed and heavily reliant on committed individual academics who maintained little contact with each other. Accompanying such initiatives, a number of new community-oriented University institutions have been established during the past five years or so. Most prominent are the Leadership Centre, the Centre for Government and Policy Studies, the Unilever Ethics Centre, the Centre for Environment and Development, the Centre for Rural Development Systems and the Centre for Community Outreach and Service Learning. Most of these new structures have required external funding to support their existence.

In summarising the University of Natal's character as a community-oriented university during the 1990s, the picture emerges of a publicly committed executive leadership, a strong strategic intent expressed in core University documents, and a growing number of dispersed curricular and institutional initiatives. There is not, however, a clear policy for taking the University's mission and strategic intentions

forward, and for linking diverse on-campus initiatives in a broader institutional approach. The challenges facing the University are those of rendering systemic an institution-wide orientation to community-based learning that enables it to become central to campus life and to the relationships between the University and its surrounding communities and institutions.

During the course of the year 2000, the CHESP core planning groups on the Pietermaritzburg and Durban campuses drafted a *University of Natal Policy on Community-Based Learning*. The 'University of Natal Draft Policy on Community-Based Learning' (Unpublished report, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, 2000) has three main parts. A preamble defines community-based learning and situates the policy document within the University of Natal's existing diverse community engagement activities. The next part addresses five general curriculum principles, articulating the value and importance of community engagement, quality partnerships, holistic learning, multi-disciplinarity, and integrated assessment practices. The third part of the document addresses five aspects of policy:

- 1 Mainstreaming community-based learning.
- 2 Establishing partnerships.
- 3 University recognition and encouragement of participants in community-based learning.
- 4 Structures for the strategic advancement of community-based learning.
- 5 Resource allocation and strategic advancement of community-based learning.

In seeking to mainstream community-based learning as part of its contribution to excellence in teaching and learning, the draft policy spells out that each undergraduate degree programme should offer at least one credit-bearing module which involves students in significant learning at a community site. The policy commits the University to enter into formal agreements with community-based learning partners. The University's approach to the hiring and promotion of staff, and to staff development, is to contain explicit emphasis on the importance and value of community engagement. Alongside the University's annual staff award for teaching and research excellence is envisaged a community engagement award in recognition of excellence in community-based learning. Students will be encouraged to register for community-based learning modules, and a student development programme in the Student Services Division will assist with preparing students to participate effectively in these modules. Community-based individuals who perform teaching functions at community sites will be appropriately recognised as associate staff of the University, though not through direct financial reward.

The draft policy document recognises that structures are required for the strategic advancement of community-based learning. Academics require an organisational infrastructure spanning administrative support for taking students to off campus sites, a teaching timetable that is flexible enough to incorporate off-campus sessions, and a co-ordinating network that links up different modules working at the same site and connects different sites to each other. Furthermore, the effective organisational capacity of community sites to work with students is also, in part, the responsibility of the university. The draft policy recognises that there are additional financial and human resource implications flowing from a programme of community-based learning. Both internal budgeting and attempts to attract donor funding are required to meet these additional costs.

Conclusion

The strengthening of civil society is essential for ensuring the deepening of democracy in post-apartheid South Africa. The need to build vibrant, empowered, self-reliant local communities, drawing on the assets of local actors and institutions, is integral to fostering citizenship and national development. South Africans live with the bitter and divided legacies of apartheid; we know we have lived through a remarkable democratic transition of worldwide significance during the 1990s, and we dare to hope for a better future in a harsh, globalising world. In creating a fledgling democratic order, institutions and organisations across our complex society have re-examined their priorities and purposes. As part of this process, universities across the nation have indicated an ever more central commitment to community engagement.

This chapter has argued that the community orientations of universities have both socio-political and knowledge imperatives. For these imperatives to reach into the core of university life they need to become part of the teaching and learning curriculum. Community-based learning offers, I believe, an appropriate vehicle for making this happen.

References

- Bawden, R. 1999a. 'The Community Challenge: The Learning Response.' Paper presented to *CHESP Leadership Capacity Building Programme Seminar*. December, Cape Town.
- 1999b. 'Unity through the Diversity of Knowing: A Systemic Perspective.' Paper presented to *CHESP Leadership Capacity Building Programme Seminar*. December, Cape Town.

- 1999c. 'Universities in Development: A Systemic Perspective.' Paper presented to a *University of Natal Research and Development Workshop*. November. University of Natal, Durban.
- Boyer, E. 1996. 'The Scholarship of Engagement.' *The Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1): 13–26.
- Department of Education. 1997a. 'Call for Comments on the Draft Statement on the National Curriculum for Grades 1–9.' Government Notice No. 788. *Government Gazette*, Vol. 384, no. 18051, 6 June. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- 1997b. 'Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education.' Pretoria: Government Printer.
- 2001. 'Draft Revised National Curriculum Statement for Grade R–9.' www.education.gov.za/DoE_Sites/Curriculum/New_2005/draft_revised_national_curriculum.htm.
- Harkavy, I. and Benson, L. 2000. *The Role of Community-Higher Education-School Partnerships in Educational and Societal Development and Democratisation*. Paper commissioned by the Joint Education Trust, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Kretzmann, J.P. and McKnight, J.L. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Towards Finding and Mobilising a Community's Assets*. Northwestern University, Evanston: The Asset-Based Community Development Institute, Institute for Policy Research.
- Nuttall, T. 1997. *Historical Studies: A Statement of Intended Learning Outcomes*. University of Natal. Pietermaritzburg: Department of Historical Studies.
- 2000. 'Intent and Practice: The CHESP Initiative and Steps Towards Systemic Integration of Community-based Learning into the Curriculum at the University of Natal, South Africa.' Paper presented to the *7th Conference of the International Consortium for Experiential Learning*. 4–8 December, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Nuttall, T. and Luckett, K. 1995. 'Teaching and Learning History as an Academic Discourse: Showing First-year University Students How to Read and Write like Historians.' *South African Historical Journal*, 33: 83–100.
- Nuttall, T. and Wright, J. 1996. 'Texts, Contexts, Conflicts: Reflections on Teaching a South African Postgraduate History Course in the 1990s.' Paper presented to the Conference on the *Future of the Past: The Production of History in a Changing South Africa*. University of the Western Cape, July.
- 1998. 'Exploring Beyond History with a Capital "H"?' *Current Writing*, 10(2): 38–61.
- 2000. 'Probing the Predicaments of Academic History in Contemporary South Africa.' *South African Historical Journal*, 42: 26–48.

Readings, B. 1996. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Stanton, T., Giles, D.E. and Cruz, N.I. 1999. *Service Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on its Origins, Practice and Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

University of Natal. 1999a. '*The Strategic Initiatives for the University of Natal*.' Durban: University of Natal.

—1999b. '*Institutional Plan 2000–2002*.' Durban: University of Natal.