CHAPTER FOURTEEN

ETHICAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE ANTHROPOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY OF FOOD: COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING ACROSS DISCIPLINES

Chloe Armstrong
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Lawrence University
Carla Daughtry
Associate Professor of Anthropology, Lawrence University
Garrett Singer
Director, Center for Community Engagement and Social Change, Lawrence University

INTRODUCTION

Through course readings, class activities, and assignments, both Philosophy 115 Food Ethics (taught by Chloe Armstrong) and Anthropology 378 Anthropology of Food (taught by Carla Daughtry) address six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency, and sustainability (Clapp et al., 2022) – with an emphasis on access and agency. The concept of agency is tied to social justice issues, and that agency refers to people's power over food production, consumption,

distribution, and food as symbol and meaning. Related to agency, is people's access to food that is ethical, safe, nutritious, plentiful, affordable, and culturally appropriate. Our courses emphasize food access and agency, given the study of food systems through ethical and social justice perspectives, and extensive coverage in both classes of food activism and food justice movements.

Though the courses originated independently, our respective focus on access and agency spurred exploration of foodways on campus through campus kitchen tours and food management, Lawrence University's student-run garden, Sustainable Lawrence University Garden (SLUG), and our campus food pantry. These commonalities encouraged us to reflect on experiential learning elements in our courses together, compare syllabi, disciplinary and methodological approaches, and class size. With the support of Garrett Singer and the Center for Community Engagement of Social Change at Lawrence University, and contributors to this anthology through the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM), we recently redesigned our courses to systematically apply empirically informed best practices from experiential and community-based learning experts and literature (for example, Kieran and Haack, 2018; Kolb, 2014; O'Meara and Niehaus, 2009; Stoecker and Trynon, 2009).[1]

In what follows, we introduce each of our courses, PHIL 115 and ANTH 378, our community-based learning course redesign process, and lessons learned collected from instructor reflection, and feedback from students, colleagues, and community partners. We explore community-based learning (CBL) elements and food access through two lenses: first, course pedagogy and assessment as codified in our CBL course design/redesign chart *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design/Redesign* (Table 14.1); and, second, four values of ethical collaboration (respect, beneficence, justice, reflexivity). Our framework for ethical collaboration follows *The Belmont Report* (1979) and works by Chapdelaine et al. (2005); Doran, Rinesmith and Arena (2021); Padmanabha (2018); Racin and Gordon (2018); and Wendler (2012). Our collaboration led to the creation of a cluster of courses, along with a University Course (UNIC) 161 Introduction to Community-Based Learning, to generate intentional curricular pathways for students interested in food

security and community-engaged learning. In this paper we focus on the Anthropology and Philosophy course redesign processes and address our curricular course cluster in Chapter 13 in this volume, "Building a Cluster of Community-Based Learning Courses."

COURSE DEVELOPMENT AND GUIDELINES

Lawrence University's primary characterization of a CBL course is:

> In CBL courses, experiences in or with an off-campus community are deeply integrated with classroom learning, course assignments, and learning outcomes. These experiences involve significant participation in a community or interaction with community issues, concerns, or needs. Strictly observational field trips or field trips to other institutions with educational missions such as museums, botanical gardens, or zoos will not be sufficient to identify a course as CBL.
>
> (Lawrence University Instruction Committee, 2023)

This standard is implemented by Lawrence's Instruction Committee for designating CBL courses and adopted by the Registrar's Office tagging course features in our catalog for student course registration. However, this designation does not itself offer guidelines for developing curricular pathways and implementing CBL pedagogy best practices, nor does Lawrence University currently (2023) have guidelines. Thus, discussed in more detail below, we adapted a rubric for course redesign attuned to the specifics of course development and CBL pedagogy to assess our courses. We draw primarily on Macalester College's Civic Engagement Center (2015) *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design and Redesign*, which offers 10 axes across which to examine courses: values/background, goals/outcomes, community partnership, preparation/orientation, integration, reflection process, assessment/benchmarks, evaluation, product, and celebration/recognition. These 10 axes have helped us to understand and evaluate the CBL aspects of our courses, and we have included the axes and key questions in Table 14.1.[2]

Table 14.1. CBL Course Development and Assessment Chart, *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design/Redesign*

1. Values & Background
a. What are your underlying values related to community engagement? b. What are your students' values/background to community engagement? How will you find out? c. What is your campus or Department values/mission related to civic engagement? d. What are potential community partner(s)'s values/mission?
2. Goals & Outcomes
a. What specific outcomes/goals do you have for the course relative to students, department, and community? b. What outcomes/goals can be facilitated by civic engagement components? "Traditional" components? Both? c. What specific kind of community engagement activities (service-learning, community-based research, public scholarship) can help you meet those goals? Why? d. What structure of community engagement activities can best help you meet the goals: optional or required; group or individual? One partner or many? Why?
3. Community Partnership
a. What community partner(s) might best match course goals (or allow you to adapt course goals in positive ways)? b. What is the potential benefit to the community partner? c. How much of a direct involvement in campus-community organization will the partnership require and by whom?
4. Preparation & Orientation
a. What preparation do you need for the course? Who will do this? b. What preparation do your students need for the course? Who will do this? c. What preparation do your community partner/(s) need for the course? Who will do this? d. Who will ensure ethics/responsibility? How? What are the ethical/responsibility questions inherent in this class?

Table 14.1. (*Continued*)

5. Integration
a. How will your readings, lectures, field trips, etc., be integrated with the civic engagement component? Kept distinct? b. How will the experiences/expectations of students and community partner(s) change due to the civic engagement experience? How will your expectations and experiences change? Where are you flexible and where are you not flexible? c. How will you factor in the unexpected and unintended? d. Where is the joy and meaning in this for you, the student, and the community partner?
6. Reflection & Process
a. What specific goals do you have for reflection? b. What methods will you use for your students to reflect and process their civic engagement work (journal, conversation, small group, electronic) and reach those goals? c. Who will have access to the student reflection/process? (Is it personal, group, public?) And who is included in the reflection? d. Specifically, how will you evaluate the reflection?
7. Assessment & Benchmarks
a. What does success mean in the context of this course? b. Are there benchmarks to success that you can set up? c. How will you know if you are successful? And when will you know? d. How will students know if they are being successful? And when will they know? e. How will community partners know if they are being successful? And when will they know?
8. Evaluation
a. How will students be evaluated? When? By whom? b. How will the partnership be evaluated? When? By whom? c. How will the overall course be evaluated? When? By whom? d. Who is the stakeholder in the evaluation? (Grant, Tenure Review File, Dept.) Are there ramifications?

Table 14.1. (*Continued*)

9. Product
a. What kind of end-product(s) is the best match for the course? b. Who is the audience(s)? c. Who will have access to the end-product? Feedback on the end-product? "Ownership" of the end-product? d. Will the end-product be adapted after the course?
10. Celebration & Recognition
a. How will the story of the course be told? b. Is there a safety net? Is there a next step/next life for the project? c. What would it mean for you, your students, community partner to feel valued? d. 4. Who needs credit and thanks? How?

Though approaches to each of the CBL design themes vary from course to course, in response to section 1: *Values and Background*, we adopt four shared values for ethical collaboration across our courses: *respect* (acknowledging the aims of different parties and the value of those goals), *beneficence* (working for better outcomes while minimizing harms), *justice* (seeking equitable and appropriate distributions of resources and duties), and *reflexivity* (recognizing the perspectives of different stakeholders impacted by the partnerships). A set of shared values guiding our CBL redesigns is fitting, because both courses include ethical commitments as part of the course content: PHIL115 presents theories of value and right action, and applies them as an assessment framework, and ANTH 378 emphasizes research ethics guiding inquiry and partnerships. It is understandable, then, that we are disposed also to appeal to a set of ethical commitments for guiding the partnerships that we have with one another, the students, and community partners, and cluster the courses together beyond thematic connections.[3] These have helped reshape our courses both theoretically as well as practically, alongside student evaluations and responses, and experiences at ACM workshops on food access and community-based learning, which we integrate into our discussions of courses below.

PHIL 115 FOOD ETHICS

Food Ethics was developed by our colleague Patrick Boleyn-Fitzgerald in 2014 to explore ethical and mindful eating practices. In adapting and offering the course since 2016, Chloe has witnessed the benefits of studying food systems and philosophy together, as well as the transformative capacities of experiential, service, and community-engaged learning strategies (Oxley and Ilea, 2015, survey of experiential learning in philosophy courses), alongside enriched collaboration with colleagues from other disciplines studying food topics.

Food Systems and Philosophy

Food Ethics is an introductory philosophy course that explores ethical answers to questions about food systems, starting with a familiar one: "what should I eat?" The course is structured around related questions and topic modules:

- Should you eat your cat? Ethical theories of value and right action.
- What is health? Industrial food production, distribution, and consumption – corn, groceries stores, history of the body mass index, and franchises.
- Who matters morally? Environmental ethics, sustainability, future generations, and organic food.
- Who is responsible? Consumer, corporate, and labor ethics.
- Duties to feed: ethics of hunger and malnutrition.
- Ethics of eating meat: slaughterhouses, hunting, and vegetarian diets.
- What is food justice? Food security, food sovereignty, relationships to food.
- Autonomy and paternalism: decisions, group dynamics, and systemic constraints.

Although philosophical inquiry is sometimes associated with intractable dilemmas, food systems offer cases in which identifying and prioritizing values alongside the application of knowledge, time, and resources can yield better outcomes. Examples of ethical interventions from the course include labor organizations, geographically responsive agricultural

practices, and animal welfare policy. Students practice inquiry locally by engaging campus groups to understand how values shape various organizations and policies on Lawrence campus's foodways (or fail to shape them) and apply ethical analysis to understand challenges in feeding communities.

The two main sets of philosophical skills integrated into the course are concept clarification and ethical reasoning. With respect to concept clarification, students tease out the connotations and moral valences of terms to avoid equivocation in food system interventions – for example, contrasting the government regulation of the term "organic" with the unregulated treatment of "natural." Additional key terms such as "sustainable," "obese," "healthy," "food desert," "food security," "genetically modified," "processed," "food sovereignty," and "authenticity" offer opportunities for conceptual clarification, exploration of concept origins in context, and consideration of whether terminology can be improved or replaced. The course also introduces ethical theorizing about moral aspects of food systems. Students examine their own ethical assumptions and practice ethical reasoning applied to case studies. Chloe focuses on identifying moral values (e.g., autonomy, respect, flourishing, welfare, and pleasure), integrating principles about values into arguments, and on argument structures and types (e.g., relevant moral difference arguments across cases).

In addition to philosophical methods, PHIL 115 is also an introduction to both the United States' food systems, and community-based learning opportunities. Course readings survey food production, distribution, and consumption patterns in the United States (historical and contemporary), such as farm bill legislation, seasonal farm work and farmworkers, corn as a commodity, processed and ultra-processed foods, organic food movements, franchises, school lunches, and the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program.[4] Exploring production, distribution, and consumption patterns on campus provides immediate, first-hand, and local experiences of foodways while engaging campus organizations and communities. Ethical theories offer a framework through which to understand these experiences, and the experiences, in turn, offer complex examples that can illustrate or challenge ethical recommendations (assignments below).

Chloe has offered PHIL 115 seven times, with enrollments of 30–35 students, featuring flexible content-modules supplying opportunities for ethical reasoning and conceptual analysis. For further sample topics, key terms, and readings see "PHIL 115 Food Ethics Sample Materials" online (https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.14507779).

Community-Based Learning

When Chloe first offered Food Ethics she wondered about student food access and agency on a residential campus. She met with the Executive Director and the Executive Chef of campus food services and learned about policy changes to reduce food waste by eliminating cafeteria trays, and local dairy farms supplying the cafeteria with milk and cheese. She also met with student organizations, such as the student-run garden (SLUG, which processes a portion of the cafeteria's waste for compost), the campus food pantry, and the Food Recovery Network (which donates perishable food from the cafeteria to local food banks). Beyond campus, she mapped grocery store locations, and student transportation opportunities from campus. These experiences helped connect Chloe to on- and off-campus communities, and she integrated those experiences into the course. Chloe has subsequently redesigned the course using community-engaged pedagogy best practices and syllabus assessments to help guide partnerships with campus groups. Macalester College's *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design/Redesign* (Table 14.1) was especially formative in the redesign process, and themes from that questionnaire are referenced throughout the subsequent sections of this discussion.

Course Assignments

Two community-engaged learning projects make up about 50% of the coursework in Food Ethics (Table 14.1: *Integration*). The first assignment requires observing, participating in, and reflecting on a campus organization, while the second assignment communicates out to campus communities about foodways (Table 14.1: *Reflection & Process*). The expanded audience of the second assignment emphasizes that community

organizations are not merely subjects of written assignments, but interlocutors and partners for some of the coursework (though Chloe grades them according to a rubric, Table 14.1: *Evaluation; Product*).

Assignment 1: Values in Policy and Practice

The first community-engaged assignment bridges students' personal commitments, first-hand experiences in an organization, and the values promoted by that organization. Students learn about the policies and operations of SLUG, the cafeteria's food management corporation Bon Appetit, and the campus food pantry, alongside each organization's ethical commitments (sustainability for the garden, sustainability and wellness for the food management corporation, and welfare and agency for the pantry). Next, through volunteer experiences, students examine how policies are put into practice. The subsequent written assignment (approximately 4–6 paragraphs) includes four components: student observations of policy and practice in an organization, identification of values promoted by those practices, value trade-offs and prioritization, and additional lines of inquiry. Because these experiences are not curated exclusively by the instructor for learning, students practice metacognitive skills such as understanding when additional information is needed, when to ask questions, who to pose questions to, and alternative information resources if questions go unanswered (Table 14.1: *Goals & Outcomes*).

Assignment 2: One Wise Choice Poster

In a second assignment, students detail one recommendation about food using course materials to generate an ethical argument. Formatted as posters, they go on display on the first floor of Lawrence University's library. Students exercise agency in choosing a poster topic or issue and write for a broad audience that extends beyond the instructor grading the assignment to the patrons of the library (Table 14.1: *Product; Recognition*). Between the two assignments, students both gather information from the Lawrence community and share information with that community. The poster display creates an opportunity to celebrate student work as a

group alongside community partners, and we go to the library as a class to read and discuss the posters (Table 14.1: *Celebration*).

Lesson: Introductory and Exploratory CBL Experiences

Though combining ethics, foodways, and community-engaged learning opportunities limits the depth of exploration in any one of those topics, the content and skills involved complement each other and are mutually reinforcing. Student feedback (gathered anonymously, midterm and at the end of the course) affirm that students are engaging all three aspects of the course:

- The course made me think in different ways about food. I am a vegetarian, and before it was just because I cared about animal suffering. Now, I am considering fossil fuel input, worker conditions, etc.
- My favorite parts of the course were when I would be convinced of a position and then a topic would come up that would make me completely rethink my opinion. This course was a very relevant, stimulating way to think deeper about actual issues that we face in the world.
- All of the work was very thoughtful and helped connect some of the more challenging concepts to everyday life. I think this is super valuable in this class because the issues tackled in the course are extremely relevant to today
- I particularly appreciated the focus on our food systems in the United States then the zoom in on our food systems at Lawrence.
- I found our discussions on food sovereignty and recommendations either from readings or classmates really engaging. It was cool to hear about other people's ideas on ways we can become better with our relationship with food.

Lawrence University's CBL course designation stipulates that CBL courses partner with off-campus organizations through activities that go beyond tours and presentations. Research on community partnership and collaboration also recommends deeply integrated engagement between students and community organizations, such as shared goal-setting and project development between students and community

members (Doran et al., 2021; Ricke, 2021). PHIL 115 does not meet these criteria. Nevertheless, Chloe maintains the assignment and engagement structure described above so that students can practice heuristics and strategies (including critical observation – see Stern and VanNatta, 2002) for learning about an organization's values, practices, and campus impact, and for reflecting on current and future work with campus organizations. This type of observational engagement is important for service research and projects (as demonstrated in the discussion of ANTH 378 below), but might be overlooked if students are eager to develop projects and research questions about complex circumstances. Class visits, volunteer shifts, and tours help students get their bearings in different organizations and different roles within organizations. This also prompts students to integrate theoretical aspects of the course with their own experiences, a practice that can discourage plagiarism on written assignments (Lang, 2013).

Food Security Across Disciplines

In past iterations of the course, students have developed proposals for empirical studies of food security on campus, for integrating garden produce in the food pantry, and introducing dormitory Resident Advisors specializing in food access – all projects that go beyond one-page poster projects. Chloe helps students find methodological resources to support these projects, especially in upper-level courses across the University. For students interested in ethics and methods for understanding value conflicts, Chloe recommends upper-level ethics courses in philosophy. For students seeking other methods of inquiry, she searches course catalogs for food-related courses in other departments (including Art History, Spanish, English, Government, and Economics). She collaborated with Carla Daughtry (Anthropology) and Garrett Singer (Special Assistant to the President)[5] to help students engage non-profit organizations working to address food access challenges. This collaboration created a cluster of courses (including PHIL 115) as a curricular pathway to explore food access on and off campus and generate information about those systems not previously available.[6]

ANTH 378 ANTHROPOLOGY OF FOOD

Carla's Anthropology of Food, taught since 2015, examines food within the framework of culture: how food becomes involved in the work of building identities, making meaning, organizing society, exerting power, and creating social practices among groups of people. The *Food and Culture Reader* (Counihan and Van Esterik, 2018) and *Black Food Geographies* (Reese, 2019) frame our social justice perspective. Learning outcomes highlight 1) anthropology's theoretical and methodological approach to food studies; 2) how cultural practices and cultural meanings shape foodways; 3) how structures of power (race/ethnicity, citizenship status, gender, class, religion, etc.) impact food systems; and 4) how globalization impacts food systems. In short, Anthropology of Food explores how scholars, activists, and policymakers draw upon key concepts of food security, food access, and food agency, and other concepts like food deserts, food apartheid, food sovereignty, and food justice.

A New Community-Based Learning Project

In the spring 2023 iteration of Anthropology of Food, Carla designed a new Community-Based Learning Project (online at https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.14507779) in relation to the CBL cluster outlined in *Building a Cluster of Community-Based Learning Courses* (Chapter 13).[7] The following both summarizes and assesses this new CBL project considering Macalester College's Center for Community Engagement *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design/Redesign* (Table 14.1).

Overview of Students

In spring 2023, Anthropology of Food enrolled 14 students, an optimal class size for methods training, workshop activities, transportation logistics, and not overcrowding a community site (Table 14.1: *Preparation & Orientation; Integration*). Fulfilling the global diversity general education requirement, Anthropology of Food drew students from multiple disciplines including anthropology, art, biology, environmental studies,

government, gender studies, psychology, religious studies, and neuroscience. This disciplinary diversity afforded opportunities to emphasize how anthropology's four fields (cultural, biological, linguistic, and archaeological) bridge the arts and humanities, social science, and STEM. However, this same disciplinary diversity required basic training of students who had not undergone anthropology's theory-ethics-methods sequence (Table 14.1: *Preparation & Orientation; Integration*).

Project Overview

Three small teams of students collaborated with campus dining (Team Bon Appetit), the campus garden (Team SLUG), and an organic grocery store (Team Market) to ethnographically explore local food systems and food security issues, including the design and implementation of surveys that served the needs of their community partners (*Goals & Outcomes; Community Partnership*; Table 14.1).

1. Team Bon Appetit partnered with Lawrence University's campus food provider.
2. Team Market partnered with an organic food store.
3. Team SLUG partnered with the campus garden (Sustainable Lawrence University Garden).

Drawing from Setha Low's *Spatializing Culture* (2017) and Jean Schensul and Margaret LeCompte's *Essential Ethnographic Methods: A Mixed Method Approach* (2013), Carla's students employed a mixed methods approach to data collection (Table 14.1: *Goals & Outcomes*; *Preparation & Orientation; Reflection & Process*).

Students used three ethnographic methods:

1. Participant observation (site tours, unobtrusive observations, and fieldnotes).
2. Document analysis (brochures, newspaper/magazine article, archival, meeting minutes, website materials, social media, blueprints, or maps, etc.).
3. Survey collaboration serving the needs of community partners (Table 14.1: *Community Partnerships*).

Methods and Analysis Training

Throughout the 10-week term, class lecture and workshop activities integrated methods training, data analysis, and peer review activities (Table 14.1: *Preparation & Orientation; Integration; Reflection & Process*). Principles of beneficence and ethical engagement shaped our CBL process (Table 14.1: *Values & Background*; *Community Partnerships*): 1) showing dignity and respect; 2) adhering to anthropology's prime directive to first, do no harm; and, 3) communicating clearly and honestly so that community members – and not just students – benefit from CBL activities.

Final Product and Celebrations

Besides a deeper understanding of local food systems, students ideally learned that ethical research relationships come from building trust and rapport, power-sharing, attending to insider-outsider statuses, and demonstrating genuine care or concern (Table 14.1: *Assessment & Benchmarks*; *Evaluation*; *Product*). In the end, ownership of survey instruments and data were transferred to our community partners (Table 14.1: *Community Partnerships*; A*ssessment & Benchmarks*; *Evaluation*; *Product*). In a celebratory last class, students shared food security discoveries and their reflections on methods in team presentations followed by individually written ethnographic reports (Table 14.1: *Product*; *Celebration & Recognition*).

Lessons Learned: Food Access and CBL Redesign

During the last week of the term, Carla distributed a post-CBL Survey (online at https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.14507779) for students to reflect on nine questions about process, power and privilege, food security concepts, ethnographic skills, and advice for future CBL students. Nine out of 14 students responded, completing from six to all nine questions. Besides knowledge gained about local food systems and food access, student responses pertained to Macalester's Center for Community Engagement *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design/Redesign* (Table 14.1). The post-CBL Survey questions and student responses can be read online at https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.14507779

The following briefly summarizes five key lessons for both food security and CBL redesign.

Lesson 1: CBL develops important skills and dispositions for life.

> *Listening. Even from the readings, I learned listening is very insightful and tells you a lot more about people than you might expect.*

When asked to list the most effective skill they developed, three students attested to the value of listening in ways that echo *Black Food Geographies* push for "quiet and intentional listening to the everyday" and "stories… demanding to be heard [that]… require us to listen" (Reese, 2019, 4, 12). Thus, CBL pedagogies build basic ethnography skills such as relating, communicating (listening, questioning, explaining, discussing), observing, recording (as discussed in Schensul & LeCompte, 2013).

Ultimate responsibility rested with the supervising professor to facilitate permissions and regularity of the communication. After that, students were charged with maintaining communication with their community partners at every phase of the collaboration – "checking-in" at their sites, setting meetings for survey design, transferring survey instruments and data, and saying proper farewells. All these basic skills proved essential for the success of CBL projects, and students appreciated how they transfer to other domains in life.

Lesson 2: Process over product allows for flexibility and the unexpected or unintended.

> *Adaptability! We had to change our survey very quickly around and then start finding a whole new demographic of students to reach out to during weeks 9–10 so we had to be quick and adaptable without letting the loss seep us in!*

Carla emphasized process over product to manage the fast flow of a 10-week term and other contingencies like spring snow postponing the campus garden tour or Memorial Day delaying the launch of site surveys.

To ease tension and anxiety, Carla emphasized the value of exploratory ethnography for discovering shared community perspectives about food security and not testing theory nor resolving problems. Putting a premium on processes allows for *flexibility* and the *unexpected or unintended*.

As expressed in the student quote, Team Market scrambled to administer customer satisfaction surveys to fellow student shoppers when the store owners 1) proved reticent to share customer emails for online surveying but 2) failed to facilitate in-store surveying. While Team Market's survey response rate was in the single digits, their handling of difficult conversations and reflection on process was most impressive.

Lesson 3: Iterative moments of reflection afford understandings of power and privilege in CBL and food systems.

> *I am privileged to have had experience in working with sustainability-based food programs, so I had a decent background knowledge going into it. I also grew up with access to food and organic food, so I come from a place of privilege and may not be able to fully comprehend the extent food insecurity is present.*

When asked "what ways did differences in power and privilege emerge in your experience," students addressed both food access and inequalities related to knowledge production. Two students discovered how college students experience food insecurity even at a well-resourced liberal arts institution like Lawrence. Five other survey responses centered on power imbalances between students and community partners, particularly the challenge of negotiating survey question design. For instance, Team Bon App examined why the students' goals to investigate food service worker conditions was nixed by the Executive Chef and General Manager's preference to survey student menu choices. Likewise, Team Market examined why their interests in the ethno-racial and class diversity among store customers lost out to the organic food store owners' preference to do a customer satisfaction survey. Both teams lamented how structural inequalities topics (labor conditions, food access) were shelved in favor of food choice topics (menu selections, customer satisfaction).

Moving forward, pre-CBL and post-CBL surveys for community partners need to be a future priority, especially for gauging CBL benefits to the community and helping broker relationships between students and community partners.

Lesson 4: CBL pedagogies engage key concepts of food security through first-hand experiences.

> *I think this helped enhance my understanding of food apartheid, as I saw the disparities between grocery stores and Appleton in relationship to access to healthy food.*

When asked to "Identify a specific academic concept that you now understand better as a result of your CBL experience," three students wrote about the concept of food access at the level of individuals, communities, and populations. Besides the food apartheid testimony above, two other students saw food activisms at the organic food store because it accepts EBT (food stamp) tokens in awareness of income inequality, and sources food to resist the unsafe and unethical treatment of animals, plants, and people. Finally, one last student shared that they improved their understanding of positionality (i.e., how personal identity and social position can condition research and learning). In these ways, students learn first-hand what food security and food access means locally through CBL pedagogy that emphasizes community collaboration in the knowledge-building process.

Lesson 5: The Lawrence University CBL Cluster enhances ethical engagement.

> *Community-Based Learning is collaborating with a partner in the community and providing a service while engaging in mutual education.*

When asked to "describe what is CBL," a disappointingly low four out of nine students underscored the ethical engagement and beneficence. Beneficence pertains to the values related to civic engagement and the potential benefits to the community partner in Macalester's Center

for Community Engagement *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design/Redesign* (Table 14.1). Despite Carla's emphasis of doing no harm and reciprocity in CBL project guidelines, five out of nine students described the community as a laboratory for student learning or a site to observe people and their characteristics. This persistent extractive approach to community demonstrates the need for CBL course clusters, giving students multiple experiences and sequential reinforcement of beneficence and ethical engagement. Beyond the 2022–2023 academic year, we hope more students will move through the CBL cluster creating a prevailing culture of ethical engagement with communities.

CONCLUSION

Chloe's experiences with PHIL 115 Food Ethics underscores the value of introductory CBL experiences, including short-term volunteerism, community-member presentations, and field trips. Such courses might fall outside institutional CBL course designations and lack deep, ongoing, student-initiated community collaboration, but they offer foundational experiences for further engagement and student agency, and support course learning goals across philosophy skills, introduction to CBL, and information about the United States' foodways. Chloe's Food Ethics course also integrates in-class activities to prepare for those experiences, including soliciting and workshopping questions, sharing them with community collaborators, and reviewing sample work for assignments. The new CBL project in Carla's Anthropology of Food class provides meaningful fieldwork experiences for students with on-campus and off-campus communities. In a post-CBL survey, students report better understandings of food security concepts thanks to first-hand experiences. They appreciate the development of basic data collection skills and dispositions such as patience and the capacity to deeply or actively listen, which are all important for several domains in work and life.

With respect to teaching tips for instructors thinking about CBL pedagogies, what stands out are process and reflection. When it comes to CBL pedagogies, the teaching and learning of steps in a process – relating, communicating, data collection, reflection, and analysis – takes priority over any final product or outcome, particularly when academic terms

or semesters are 10 to 14 weeks or fewer. One can say the exercising of process is the learning outcome. Moreover, CBL instills the value of deep reflection which is a key value of ethical engagement by integrating a series of reflection activities throughout the project – from pre-CBL survey to reflection journals and a post-CBL survey. Chloe's PHIL 115 Food Ethics and Carla's ANTH 378 Anthropology of Food both put respect, beneficence, justice, and reflexivity into practice alongside critical and iterative student reflection.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to Dan Trudeau, William Moseley, Paul Schadewald, and participants of the Understanding and Fostering Food Access and Community Resiliency through Experiential Learning and Civic Engagement workshops (supported by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest Faculty Career Enhancement Program), for encouraging and sustaining this research.

NOTES

1 By "experiential learning" we mean activities approximating Kolb's Experiential Learning Cycle (Kolb 2014, 32–51) – concrete experience, observation of and reflection on that experience, application of theoretical or abstract concepts and definition to those experiences, and active testing of those concepts in new situations – where the concrete experiences are outside of the classroom. Community-engaged learning is a type of experiential learning where concrete learning experiences stem from reciprocal relationships between students and communities – which can occur in volunteerism settings, community service, fieldwork, campus organizations, and internships.

2 In addition to Macalester's worksheet, we have drawn upon Kieran and Haack's (2018) PRELOAD rubric (Partnership, Reflection, Engagement, Logistics, Objectives, Assessment, Definition), IUPUI's taxonomy for service-learning courses to develop and assess the CBL aspects of our courses, published in Steinberg et al. (2011).

3 We highlight ways in which these values are formative for our courses, and for a further discussion of how they have shaped our efforts at the more

general curricular level in Chapter 13 of this volume, "Building a Cluster of Community-Based Learning Courses."

4 Chloe introduces six dimensions of food security (availability, access, utilization, stability, agency, and sustainability) early in the course to assess different components of foodways such as production, distribution, and consumption patterns.

5 When this work began, Garrett was serving as the Director of the Center for Community Engagement and Social Change (CCE). Though he was able to retain this project in his new portfolio, the responsibility for sustaining this collaboration will ultimately transition to the new Director of the CCE.

6 For a discussion of the details and creation of our curricular cluster of courses, see Chapter 13, *Building a Cluster of Community-Based Learning Courses*.

7 This assignment integrates six dimensions of food security (Clapp et al., 2022) as a central framework for each group's project. For more details please see supplementary materials (online at https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.14507779).

REFERENCES

Chapdelaine, A., Ruiz, A., Warchal, J., & Wells, C. (2005). *Service-Learning Code of Ethics*. Anker Publishing.

Clapp, J., Mosely, W., Burlingame, B., & Termine, P. (2022). Viewpoint: The case for a six-dimensional food security framework, *Food Policy,* 106, 102164 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2021.102164

Counihan, C., & Van Esterik, P. (2018). *Food and Culture, A Reader*. Routledge.

Doran, M., Rhinesmith, C., & Arena, S. (2021). Perspectives of community partner organizations in the development of ethical service-learning guidelines. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 27(1): 155–180.

Kieran, L. & Haack, S. (2018). PRELOAD: A rubric to evaluate course syllabi for quality indicators of community engagement and service-learning components. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education*, 10(2): 39–47.

Kolb, D. (2014). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development* (2nd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lang, J. M. (2013). *Cheating Lessons: Learning from Academic Dishonesty*. Harvard University Press.

Lawrence University Instruction Committee. (2023). *Request for Designation as Community-Based Learning (CBL)*. Unpublished internal university form.

Low, S. (2017). *Spatializing Culture: The Ethnography of Space and Place*. New York: Routledge.

Macalester College Civic Engagement Center. (2015). *Faculty Worksheet on 10 Themes of Civic Engagement Course Design/Redesign*. https://wp.stolaf.edu/ace/files/2015/03/Course-design-worksheet.pdf

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research.* https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/sites/default/files/the-belmont-report-508c_FINAL.pdf.

O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service learning is… How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 16(1): 17–32.

Oxley, J. & Ilea, R. (Eds.), (2015). *Experiential Learning in Philosophy: Philosophy Without Walls*. New York: Routledge.

Padmanabha, S. (2018). Indigenous methods and pedagogy: Revisiting ethics in community service-learning. *Engaged Scholar Journal*, 4(1): 143–160.

Racin, L., & Gordon, E. (2018). *Community Academic Research Partnerships in Digital Contexts: Opportunities, Limitations, and New Ways to Promote Mutual Benefit*. https://elabhome.blob.core.windows.net/resources/mou.pdf

Reese, A.M. (2019). *Black Food Geographies: Race, Self-Reliance, and Food Access in Washington, D.C*. The University of North Carolina Press.

Ricke, A. (2021). Applying students' perspectives on different teaching strategies: A holistic view of service-learning community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 27(1): 21–44.

Schensul J., & LeCompte, M. (2013). Structured approaches to ethnographic data collection: surveys. In J. Schensul & M. LeCompte (Eds.), *Essential Ethnographic Methods: A Mixed Method Approach. Ethnographer's Toolkit*, *Book 3*, (pp. 241–279). Altamira Press.

Steinberg, K., Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (2011) Civic-minded graduate: A North Star. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(1), 19–33.

Stern, D., & VanNatta, M. (2002). Teaching critical observation as a sociological tool. *Teaching Sociology* 30: 243–253.

Stoecker, R. & Trynon, E. (Eds.) (2009). *The Unheard Voices: Community Organizations and Service-Learning*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wendler, R. (2012). Human subjects protection: A source for ethical service-learning practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(2): 29–39.