



Service-learning in higher education between Spain and Mexico. Towards the SDGs

Aprendizaje servicio en educación superior entre España y México. Hacia los ODS

Dr. Fernando González-Alonso is a professor and researcher at Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca (Spain) (fgonzalezal@upsa.es) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6507-3433>)

Dr. Azucena Ochoa-Cervantes is a professor and researcher at Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro (Mexico) (azus@uaq.mx) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4515-9069>)

Dr. José Luis Guzón-Nestar is a professor at CES Don Bosco-Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain) y del San Pío X - Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca (Spain) (jguzon70@gmail.com) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1526-5058>)

Received on: 2021-05-22 / Revised on: 2021-09-12 / Accepted on: 2021-11-26 / Published on: 2022-01-01

Abstract

The article considers university Service Learning (SL) between Spain and Mexico, in the absence of literary reviews on SL and with the aim of generating motivation and commitment, through the experiences proposed and analyzed. For which, it addresses the roots, the philosophical and pedagogical foundations and the models that articulate and justify it as elements of great interest and relevance. Identify PHC experiences, designed by Universities in Spain and Mexico, that respond to the dimensions that are proposed and tend to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), in order to know, analyze, compare and value them. The experiences are applied by university students, with the support of network organizations, as a service to the community, in vulnerable social sectors of childhood, adolescence and youth, indigenous communities, women, etc. The students experience a remarkable learning, by adding theory and practice in real situations, related to art and cultural heritage, physical education, teacher training, environmental and civic education, solidarity participation, gender equality and psychopedagogical development and support. It shows a referential and prospective framework, turning the SL of both shores into cooperative strategies of teaching, services and socio-educational learning, which bring university and society closer together; for academic improvement, personal and group growth and civic and democratic participation, favoring the commitment to social justice and the progressive achievement of the SDGs.

Keywords: Service-Learning, higher education, social service, Spain, Mexico, Sustainable Development Goals.

Resumen

El artículo considera el Aprendizaje Servicio (ApS) universitario entre España y México, ante la inexistencia de revisiones literarias sobre el ApS y con la finalidad de generar motivación y compromiso, a través de las experiencias propuestas y analizadas. Para lo cual, aborda las raíces, los fundamentos filosóficos y pedagógicos y los modelos que lo articulan y justifican como elementos de sumo interés y actualidad. Identifica experiencias de ApS, diseñadas desde universidades de España y México, que respondan a las dimensiones que se proponen y tiendan a los Objetivos para el Desarrollo Sostenible (ODS), para conocerlas, analizarlas, compararlas y valorarlas. Las experiencias son aplicadas por estudiantes universitarios, con el apoyo de organismos en red, como servicio a la comunidad, en sectores sociales vulnerables de infancia, adolescencia y juventud, de comunidades indígenas, mujer, etc. El alumnado experimenta un notorio aprendizaje, al sumar teoría y práctica en situaciones reales, relacionadas con arte y patrimonio cultural, educación física, formación de maestros, educación ambiental y ciudadana, participación solidaria, igualdad de género y el desarrollo y acompañamiento psicopedagógico. Muestra un marco referencial y prospectivo, convirtiendo el ApS de las dos orillas, en estrategias cooperativas de enseñanza, servicios y aprendizajes socioeducativos, que acercan universidad y sociedad, para la mejora académica, el crecimiento personal y grupal y la participación cívica y democrática, favoreciendo el compromiso hacia la justicia social y el logro progresivo de los ODS.

Descriptores: Aprendizaje-Servicio, educación superior, servicio social, España, México, Objetivos Desarrollo Sostenible.

1. Introduction

A few decades ago, Service Learning (SL) as an innovative technique was on the periphery of academia, and today it has spread virtually throughout higher education. Few experiences of educational innovation have achieved such rapid and global success (Deeley, 2016).

In this article the historical and philosophical-pedagogical foundations of SL are initially described, and reference is made to meaningful experiences that make us better understand its history and future. Subsequently, a literature review of SL developed from higher education as a community service to more vulnerable individuals and groups is carried out. SL experiences have been developed in universities in Spain and Mexico, demonstrating its solidarity projects within the context of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the 2030 Agenda.

From the article by Robert Sigmon *Service-learning: Three Principles* (1979) that originated this methodology and helped to establish and formalize it, numerous definitions of SL have been offered. Some of the most cited are:

SL is an educational experience linked to university in which students participate in an organized volunteer activity that meets the identified community needs and reflects around the activity, so that a further understanding of the course content is obtained as well as a more global appreciation of discipline and a better sense of civic responsibility. (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 221)

SL is a method by which students learn and develop through active participation in a carefully organized service carried out in a community and that meets their needs and is coordinated with a higher education institution and the community; it helps to foster civic responsibility; it integrates and improves students' academic curriculum and includes structured time for students to... reflect on the service experience. (Corporation for National and Community Service, 1993)

Finally, Ehrlich (1996) argues that:

SL joins community service and academic study to empower each other. The basic theory of SL is that of Dewey: the interaction of knowledge and skills with experience is key to learning. Learning begins with a problem and continues to apply complex ideas and sophisticated skills to increasingly complicated problems. (p. 3)

The various definitions converge in a consensus on the essential elements of SL pedagogy:

- Integration of learning objectives and service objectives.
- Completing academic learning objectives with civic learning objectives (citizenship education) and also with other learning categories (personal growth, professional development, intercultural competence, ethical research, research skills).
- Organized and structured process.
- Mutual collaboration between students, teachers, community members, and institutions that meet collective goals and build capacity among all.
- Critical reflection.
- Duration and intensity to produce significant SL results.

From a historical perspective, SL is a relatively new process in higher education. The term was first coined in 1967, in reference to a program of internships that was sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board (USA), and through which university students obtained academic credits and/or a federal-funded remuneration to work on community projects (Sigmon, 1979).

As a pedagogical practice in higher education, SL limited to a small group of participants until mid-1980. In the end, SL was gaining adherents and distinguished itself clearly from community services, because of its attention



to the integration of the service with academic study (Hollander et al., 2001).

The 90s have witnessed a great growth in SL, so it is now seen as a “vital force in educational change” (Liu, 1996, p. XI). Schools and universities have made a renewed commitment to civic responsibility and SL as a central vehicle for fulfilling the commitment (Ehrlich, 2000).

2. Philosophical and pedagogical foundations of SL

SL is a collaborative and democratic teaching-learning strategy designed to promote academic improvement, personal growth and civic learning and to foster social commitment. In it, students interact with community members, teachers, administration and service staff, in experiences related to academic material and to issues of public interest. Through guided reflection, students critically examine their experiences and articulate specific and applicable learning outcomes, thereby improving the quality of their learning and service. Students, faculty, and community members serve as co-educators, co-learners, co-servers, and co-generators of knowledge (Bringle et al., 2011).

The development of SL initiatives has been accompanied by a renewed interest in Dewey's philosophy, whose writings on the active nature and the benefits and conditions of participatory democracy “provide an early theoretical foundation for a pedagogy in which students are cooperatively committed to solving problems” (Speck & Hoppe, 2004, p. 19). Dewey (1859-1952), emphasize the importance of experience to the human being and especially in the field of education: *Experience and Objective Idealism* (1907) and *Experience and Nature* (1925). Dewey points out that:

Learning from experience involves establishing an active link between behavior and its consequences. It is an activity that opposes the traditional model of education, in which stu-

dents are imbued with passivity. Active learning through experience is advocated, based on the belief that ‘most learning is not the result of instruction. It is rather the result of free participation in a significant scenario’ (Illich, 1971, p. 39). [...] Dewey criticizes this type of education and advocates for a more progressive pedagogy, in which the student has opportunities to become actively involved in his or her own learning. Active participation concerns experience. It is not experience in itself because it must be educational, and it is only educational when significant knowledge is acquired. (Deeley, 2016, p. 51)

However, it is not possible to think that Dewey's philosophy is the only foundation (Giles & Eiler, 1994), there are others to explore. Therefore, it is appropriate to state that SL is a philosophy of “growth and human purpose, a social vision, a community approach, and a way of knowing” (Kendall, 1990, p. 23). It is a pedagogy:

Based on experience as a basis for learning and on the intentionality of reflection designed to allow learning to happen, it is based on the work of researchers and learning theorists, including Dewey, Piaget, Lewin, Schon and Kolb, who believe that we learn through combinations of action and reflection. (Jacoby, 2003, p. 4)

Dewey's contribution should be considered, which especially “criticizes the uncritical reproduction of knowledge and believes that students should learn to solve problems competently or develop an ‘attitude of the mind leading to good judgment’” (Deeley, 2016, p. 51).

It gives importance to the creation of meaning, to the relationship between thought and language. Therefore, it is also important to consider Vygotsky (1962) since social constructivism is very alive in its foundations. Deeley (2016) states:

Social constructivism, or social construct theory, is a valuable component within the theo-



retical framework of SL. This also includes the theory of personal construction, which deals with how people understand or make sense of their personal experiences. [...] Through critical reflection on their experiences and academic work, it is clear that students modify and deconstruct their starting ideas about themselves and their understanding of the world. (p. 41)

On the other hand, collaborative learning is used again in SL, which is “relevant in a theoretical paradigm of SL because students are necessarily involved in a process of sharing reflective thinking within a small group mentoring environment” (Deeley, 2016, p. 44).

Although SL is primarily aimed at the university world, we include the field of adult learning in the construction of its paradigm. Following Knowles and Jarvis, this innovative technique has components of this type of learning, because the life experience can lead adults to question why and how they learn (Deeley, 2016, p. 54).

Another influence of SL is the theory of transformative learning. Transformation is often not the heritage of early education, but adults. When we talk about partnerships and transformations between campuses and communities, we mean significant changes in the way universities understand the world. “Transformation promises a greater holistic and coherent understanding of our common situations” (Jacoby, 2003, p. 39). Thus, the key factors of transformative learning include experience, critical reflection and development (Merriam et al., 2007).

There are other visions that have been projected on SL. For example, those who think it is based on critical theory and feminist pedagogy (Brown 2001; Deans, 1999). As Freire (1967) and Shor (1987) point out, critical theory emphasizes that education is political and should include a dialectical approach to problem-making and a critique of social systems and civil responsibilities of education. Feminist pedagogy also advocates the need for critical reflections and a dialog

related to the educational aspects of privilege and power (Weiler, 1991). These models point to the importance of placing SL in the context of social issues and challenges. Community-based research and participation development in SL are examples of how these pedagogies support community promotion, and give voice to the community with its strengths and needs (Strand et al., 2003; Reardon, 1998). In addition to the use of social learning and cognitive learning models, recent advances in the theoretical framework of SL and the construction of its paradigm include the use of a pedagogy of commitment (Lowery et al., 2006) and SL as a postmodern pedagogy (Butin, 2005).

Like Jacoby (2003), SL can be expected not to become:

Something educational that researchers document in a historical review published in 2030 as a passing fad, an innovative pedagogy that disappeared as corporate influences rebuilt the modern university into an efficient vehicle for delivering standardized education at low cost, but highly profitable (p. 39)

SL philosophies and initiatives integrate previous models and historically add other emerging paradigms that emerge in practice. It is a good example of the spirit that should be in our educational communities in search of promotion and transformation practices.

SL, its philosophical-pedagogical background and foundations, places us in a panorama of SL experiences that have evolved, as explained by Speck and Hoppe (2004) toward basic models: *philanthropic*, based on charity and philanthropy, in the face of social problems, mitigated by altruism and justice; the model of *civic participation*, where teachers and students are the agents who teach and serve society civically and democratically; and the *community*, projected in the local community, safeguarding virtues and rights. Later, García-Romero and Lalueza (2019) consider three theoretical frameworks on which the university SL is classified: 1) *experien-*



tial learning, centered on the learner who learns and finds meaning in what he/she does for the community; 2) *transformative learning*, which has to produce dissonance and new vocabulary because of the radical change that occurs; and 3) *critical theories*, with a pedagogy projected to community transformation.

3. SL experiences: Methodology, Dimensions and Objectives for Sustainable Development

This paper is documental research. As part of the methodology, the SL experiences are based on the models presented that integrate a mixed one, encompassing altruistic action, participative in the educational environment with social community projection and experiential and transformative learning.

We identified eight university SL experiences, four from Spain and four from Mexico, countries of our cultural origin and professional interest with SL projection, to know them, analyze them and evaluate them comparatively through concrete dimensions and indicators, since most of publications focus on the theoretical framework (Chiva et al., 2016; Zayas et al., 2018; Rodríguez-Izquierdo, 2020). Among the SL experiences published, we selected those proposed as an articulated project from the university, with recognition and institutional support that stand out for their identifying elements, health problems, education, culture, environment, etc., with reference to the Sustainable

Development Goals (SDGs) (ONU, PNUD, 2015).

We connected SL experiences with the 2030 SDGs Agenda because they share goals that ensure peace and progress for the most vulnerable societies, as the 17 SDGs seek to end poverty (1) and hunger (2); ensure healthy living (3), inclusive, equitable, quality education and lifelong learning (4); support the availability and sustainability of water, sanitation (6) and affordable and safe energy (7); promote sustained and sustainable economic growth, full, productive and decent employment (8); foster peaceful and inclusive societies, equitable access to justice and the creation of effective and responsible institutions (16); promote terrestrial ecosystems and sustainable forests, land degradation and loss of biological diversity (15). They aim for gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls (5); provide inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements (11); reduce inequality between countries (10); ensure sustainable consumption and production (12); promote inclusive and sustainable infrastructures and industries (9); they combat climate change and its effects (13), the sustainability of oceans, seas and marine resources (14); they seek to reduce inequality between countries and revitalize the partnership for development (17).

In the experiences of SL, we use dimensions and indicators as criteria for analysis and assessment (Bellera et al., 2014; Campo, 2015; Escofet et al., 2016) from Table 1.

Table 1. Dimensions for the assessment of SL university experiences

1. Educational planning	2. Learning	3. Service	4. Participation
5. Competencies	6. Axiology and values	7. Networking and University	8. Vocational and professional
9. Coordination, evaluation and satisfaction			

Own elaboration from Bellera et al., 2014; Campo, 2015; Escofet et al., 2016.



4. SL experiences at universities in Spain

Some SL experiences designed at university degrees in Spain aim to solve social demands and needs, demonstrating identifying elements and analyzing experiences from the dimensions indicated. The application of ApuniS projects allows participants to live unique and meaningful real experiences with formative and vocational projection, and achievement of active citizenship in favor of the community (Pérez-Galván & Ochoa, 2017).

4.1. SL: A library for children's school

Students from the last year of Children's Education at the Autonomous University of Barcelona applied a SL project (González et al., 2015) creating a children's library for a school with students from two to six, during external practices. They learn as future teachers by analyzing needs, systematizing information, presenting the project and budget to the school's management team, deciding on methodology and resources, and doing a service to the institution. The network of work and collaboration is between the university community, trainees, school authorities, parents and library members.

Coordination between the agencies is provided through group meetings and the planning of activities, such as visits to the library, presentation of norms and their operation, elaboration of pictographs and photos, organization of books and drawings. Children are the beneficiaries and are motivated by interrelationship and participation in the project; they acquire competencies when searching for and managing information and working as a team. It directly influences the credits of the subject of Practicum, showing educational and social values. The project has a vocational and professional character toward the competencies of the teacher, perceived in the final evaluation. SDGs such as inclusive education, the promotion of learning opportunities and peace-

ful and inclusive societies, gender equality and women's empowerment are achieved.

4.2. SL: The Art of Learning Art. SL to build professional identity

Gregori-Giralt and Menéndez-Varela (2014) mention the SL experience based on the design of art projects by students of subjects of basic training of the degrees of Fine Arts at the University of Barcelona. As artists, designers and art conservatives, they guided their projects to solve some of the difficulties of the community, analyzing their needs, and applying the knowledge of the subject. Project ratings were improved based on the professional identity of groups with social commitment. They achieved the dimensions of pedagogical planning, learning and service in the vision and mission of the world around them; institutional linkage and vocational awareness and identity. They achieved SDGs such as inclusive, equitable, quality education and learning and reduction of inequalities, etc. Experience shows cooperative planning and learning around art, design and conservation. It highlights the high social and artistic value, the involvement and support of the university, transcending the consciousness and professional identity that connects art with more excluded human groups.

4.3. SL: A teacher for Datem

"A teacher for the Datem" is a SL experience, in which students from the Faculty of Education of the Pontifical University of Salamanca (UPSA) participate as external practices. Following a university model of education in values (Alonso & de Castro, 2015; Martín-García et al., 2021), they collaborate in a network on the project of the Marcelino Champagnat University of Lima (UMCH), along with the ONGD SED and the Institute of Marist Studies (IEM), among others. The service is provided to students from indigenous communities of seven ethnic groups:



Achuar, Awajun, Chapra, Shawi, Quechua, Wampis and Kanz, together with mestizos, who have attended for seven years during holidays in San Lorenzo, province of Datem del Marañon in the Peruvian Amazon, twice a year, once to deliver academic work (December and August) and another to get classes (January).

The project is attended by more than 500 indigenous adults from Initial Education and Primary Education (Pérez, 2015) to obtain the degree that allows them to train and maintain the place in schools of their communities in the jungle of Peru. In January, UPSA students, along with other peers, develop teaching practices for subjects they have prepared. They conduct domestic tasks that praise coexistence. On the part of UMCH, the students of UPSA receive information, materials, program of activities, support and necessary training for the development of their functions in respect of purposes, norms and confidentiality, without any consideration, seeking the best of students.

The learning of students is based on the role exercised, the acquired competencies, the socio-educational values and the quality of the planned service. Vocational and professional awareness is observed in the teaching activity, with high satisfaction rates. Experience with the SDGs: they reduce poverty, ensure inclusive, equitable and quality education, reduce inequality, achieve inclusive, secure and sustainable human settlements, and strengthen means of implementation, revitalizing the global partnership for sustainable development.

4.4. SL: Physical education for youth with intellectual disabilities

The SL experience (Santos-Pastor et al., 2018) developed a physical education and sport project for youth with intellectual disability from the Promotor Program (training for the employment inclusion of youth with intellectual disability). Students and their professors of the CAFyD degree and Primary Education of physi-

cal education of the Autonomous University of Madrid formed a network with planned elementary physical education sessions, developing roles that favored the learning and the service of others. Participation, motivation, values and competencies achieved are confirmed in the assessment based on a questionnaire and diary, which reveal satisfaction and improvements. The SDGs were achieved, ensuring a healthier and better life; inclusive, equitable, quality and opportunity education; and more inclusive, resilient, and sustainable human settlements.

5. SL Experiences at Universities in Mexico

- Social service in Mexico is mandatory for all Higher Education students to have a degree in any career. It originated in the context of the Mexican Revolution (1910) and is implemented as a way of compensating the shortcomings and inequalities that arise as a result of this movement. According to Mungaray et al. (2002), social service in Mexican Higher Education was constituted as a spontaneous activity of high solidarity and reciprocity by university students. Article 5 of the Constitution was amended in 1945, establishing “the compulsory social service for students of higher education, making it a basic institution of social development in Mexico” (p. 33).

At present, social service remains as a mandatory requirement to obtain a professional title, in accordance with the provisions of the General Education Law, so future professionals must fulfill 480 hours of service. However, although it can be identified as a background, not all university social service programs are characterized as SL projects, due to the fact that they are not always explicitly linked to learning and that each institution determines the mechanisms for developing it.



Two social service practices were chosen in this article, although they are not named as SL, but still have elements to be considered as such. Two others are described, where the authors explicitly take the SL. The dimensions and indicators described were followed for analysis and assessment.

5.1. SL in Environmental Education Interventions

The document “Experiences of Intervention in Environmental Education are based on Guerrero Communities” (Figueroa et al., 2016), take social service of three generations of students at the University of Guerrero Regional Development degree (UAGRO). It describes the analysis of the contribution of social service projects to the field of sustainable environmental education.

Interventions focus on environmental education workshops: training for vegetable production, solid waste management and the construction of ecological stoves for women. These interventions contribute to the SDGs by ensuring a healthy life and promoting well-being for all; ensuring inclusive, equitable and quality education and promoting learning opportunities; guaranteeing access to affordable, safe, sustainable and modern energy; and ensuring sustainable consumption and production.

As for pedagogical planning, lessons focused on specific content on environmental education and health are observed, and they relate sustainability to human and animal health. The service is clearly defined in the construction of stoves, where students made agreements with the community to diagnose health, affected by respiratory problems associated with smoke inhalation of the cooking rings not only of the construction of the stoves, but a training program in the environment and health. The experience reflects the role of the students in giving answers from the knowledge they had, in carrying out all the activities and their logistics, contributing to their vision of learning and of

the world as they are very vulnerable communities in poor regions and with major educational and social problems in Mexico. The importance of the relation between university and community by the horizontal relationship is observed, in order to achieve learning through the service that met real needs. It should be noted that, as they relate to social service practices, we do not observe processes of reflection and evaluation as a substantial part of SL projects.

5.2. SL on solidarity participation and gender equity

An article conducted by Quiroga (2013) from the University of Monterrey (UDEM), reports the impact of SL methodology on women’s empowerment. The intervention carried out by students of the undergraduate course in Clinical Psychology developed a program to boost women’s decision-making capacity. The learning objectives focused on identifying and diagnosing behavioral, cognitive, emotional, and social problems. Quantitative data were measured on the rate and severity of partner violence in adult women who attend community service spaces and psychological variables, which moderate and mediate their presence. The activities were carried out along with the DIF (Integral Development of the Family), an agency of the federal and state government.

This experience contributes to “achieving gender equality by empowering all women and girls” as SDGs, even if it is not explicit. Because the article focuses on showing the impact of the intervention, we cannot report the project process. Strategies guaranteeing quality service were included, such as participatory diagnosis with beneficiary institutions; teacher counseling; links with community organizations; and planned and managed activities.



5.3. SL in the implementation of public policy for children

López-Villarreal (2018) published the article “Learning Service in the implementation of public policy for children” from the University of Monterrey, describing an intervention carried out with methodology linked to the subject of Learning Theories, by strengthening:

The psychopedagogic of eight foster homes through the development of pedagogical manuals focused on the educational needs of children who live in these institutions (...). The experience analyzes the relationships among students who favored citizen education by implementing SL as a public policy process. (p. 1)

It is inferred that neither the process nor the results are described. The achievements of the SDGs are inclusive, equitable and quality education and peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development and access to justice.

5.4. SL on the “Adopt a friend” Program

There are 55 institutions of Higher Education (IES) participating in the international program of social service PERAJ “adopt a friend”. The objective is to support the psychosocial development of primary school students by accompanying young university students through tutoring, providing academic guidance, improving self-esteem, social skills and increasing their life horizon to overcome social and educational lag. The program contributes to the SDGs: ensuring a healthy life and promoting well-being for all ages; ensuring inclusive, equitable and quality education; and promoting lifelong learning opportunities, although not explicit. The service of university students is well defined, focusing on the reduction of psychosocial risks, the strengthening of social cohesion and the promotion of integral training and social commitment.

In the review, two articles that show the impact of this program on university education were found. The first called UADY-Peraj Social Service Program Evaluation “adopt a friend” (Santoyo, 2017), although it does not describe how to do it, it shows the positive impact on elementary students and the author’s discussion of redefining the time and duration of the program’s development. Regarding the study “analysis of the impact of the social program UBP Peraj “adopt a friend” with students of the Polytechnic University of the Bicentennial (Gómez & Escobedo, 2019), it focuses on the evaluation of the students, highlighting their honesty, active listening, patience and social commitment.

6. Conclusions

In light of the nature of SL (origin and purpose), we support SL as a collaborative and democratic teaching-learning strategy designed to promote academic improvement, personal growth and civic learning. It promotes public needs, in which students interact with community and university members in experiences, both academic and public interest. In the end, one of the most important objectives of SL is to bring the university closer to society.

SL university experiences like these enrich the entire university community and those who participate in one way or another, creating a true cooperative work network, which reveals the vocational and professionalizing sense toward community and mutual learning.

In the Spanish university aspect, unlike the Mexican, this type of experience is sometimes linked to the practice of subjects, and in others it is voluntary. SL experience is not always associated with the recognition of training credits.

Reviewing SL in Mexico, there is a lack of systematization of experiences, both of social service and SL in the IES. If starting that systematization allows us to sort and classify the experiences to check their planning, definition



and dimensions of action, to learn from the successes and errors, and thus to build learning and improve the practices, in Mexico we have a great way to go. In order to be able to account for the improvement of the introduction of this SL methodology which, although it has a long tradition, apparently it has not permeated the proposals for educational innovation of the IES. Moreover, it is necessary to evaluate and reconsider the university social service, since the lack of systematization does not allow to assess whether the objectives are met.

The matching dimensions of SL experiences in both countries highlight those related to learning, service, competencies, participation and evaluation. In the Spanish case, planning, management, systematization and networking are also outstanding.

Among the SDGs, those that appear in experiences of a marked educational and inclusive nature must be highlighted: ensuring inclusive, equitable and quality education and promoting learning opportunities; achieving gender equality; empowering women and girls; promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development and facilitating access to justice. Other SDGs, such as ending hunger; securing water; economic growth; infrastructure and industrialization; ocean and sea conservation, remain absent from the aims of the proposed SL.

The recipients of SL experiences in the two countries are people of excluded social groups such as the intellectual disabled, minors, women, indigenous people, etc., through actions of environmental and citizen education, equality and empowerment, psychopedagogic and social development, accompaniment and guidance, thus bringing the SDGs closer to people with the same rights.

In general, SL experiences create educational and curricular sustainability at the university, which is strengthened in its sense, purpose, social inclusion and solidarity. Similarly, they favor the knowledge, awareness, commit-

ment and progressive achievement of the SDGs through the planned actions.

Future work on SL may focus on the approximation or distance of known models, the follow-up of SL agents from their early school to their current university experience, as well as the review toward the conceptual change produced about SL. From the philosophical and pedagogical foundation, it is interesting to review the elements applied, as well as to continue the achievement of the SDGs from the experiences of SL.

References

- Alonso, F., & De Castro, R.M. (2015). Solidaridad y voluntariado: un modelo universitario de educación en valores. En J. Escudero y F. González (Coords.), *Solidaridad y voluntariado universitario. Relatos de Experiencias* (pp. 33-53). Servicio de Publicaciones (UPSA).
- Bellera, J., Albertín, P., & Bonmati, A. (2014). Criterios para valorar propuestas universitarias de Aprendizaje Servicio (ApS). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 196 (2015), 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.003>
- Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J.A. (1996). Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education, *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 221-239. <https://bit.ly/3EyUFrm>
- Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & Jones, S.G. (Eds.). (2011). *International service learning. Conceptual frameworks and research*. Sterling, VI: Stylus Publishing.
- Brown, D. (2001). Pulling it together: A method for developing service-learning and community partnerships based on critical pedagogy. Corporation for National Service.
- Butin, D.W. (2005). Service-Learning as Postmodern Pedagogy. En *Service-Learning in higher education* (pp. 89-104). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Campo, L. (2015). Una rúbrica para evaluar y mejorar los proyectos de aprendizaje servicio en la universidad. *RIDAS, Revista Iberoamericana de Aprendizaje Servicio*, 1, 91-111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1344/ridas2015.1.6>
- Chiva, Ò., Gil, J., Corbatón, R., & Capella, C. (2016). El aprendizaje servicio como propuesta metodológica para una pedagogía crítica. *RIDAS*,



- Revista Iberoamericana de Aprendizaje Servicio*, 2, 70-94.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1344/RIDAS2016.2.4>
- Corporation for National and Community Service (1993). The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. <https://bit.ly/36LXKEB>
- Deans, T. (1999). Service-learning in two keys: Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy in relation to John Dewey's pragmatism. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 6, 5-29.
<https://bit.ly/32TkbWW>
- Deeley, S.J. (2016). *El Aprendizaje-Servicio en educación superior. Teoría, práctica y perspectiva crítica*. Madrid: Narcea.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Ehrlich, T. (1996). Prólogo. En B. Jacoby and Associates, *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. Jossey-Bass.
- Ehrlich, T. (Ed.) (2000). Higher education and the development of civic responsibility. En T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. XXI-XIII). Americ.
- Escofet, A., Folgueiras, P. Luna, E., & Palou, B. (2016). Elaboración y validación de un cuestionario para la valoración de proyectos de aprendizaje-Servicio. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 21(70), 929-949.
<https://bit.ly/3EmeRg8>
- Figueroa, O., Chávez, R., & Hilario, A. (2016). Experiencias de intervención sobre educación ambiental sustentable en comunidades de Guerrero. *1er Congreso Nacional de Educación Ambiental para la Sustentabilidad*.
<https://bit.ly/3eGGpT>
- Freire, P. (1967). *Educación como práctica de la libertad*. Paz e Terra.
- García-Romero, D., & Lalueza, J. L. (2019). Procesos de Aprendizaje en Aprendizaje-Servicio Universitario: Una Revisión Teórica. *Educación XXI*, 22(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.22716>
- Giles, D., & Eyler, J. (1994). The Impact of a College Community Service Laboratory on Students. Personal, Social and Cognitive Outcomes, *Journal of Adolescence*, 17(4), 327-339.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.1994.1030>
- Gómez, I., & Escobedo, P. (2019). Análisis del impacto del programa social UPB Peraj adopta a un amig@ en estudiantes de la Universidad Politécnica del Bicentenario. *Memoria electrónica del Congreso Internacional de Investigación. Academia Journals*. México.
<https://bit.ly/2ySMsC2>
- González, A., Peña, C., Prat, M., & Rodríguez, L. (2015). Una biblioteca para la Escuela Infantil 0-6. Una propuesta de Aprendizaje Servicio. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 196, 142-148.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.024>
- Gregori-Giralt, E., & Menéndez-Varela J. L. (2014). El arte de aprender arte: El aprendizaje-servicio como instrumento para construir la identidad profesional del estudiante. Una propuesta para los estudios universitarios de arte. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 196, 100-105.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.018>
- Hollander, E., Saltmarsh, J., & Zlotkowski, E. (2001). Indicators of engagement. En L. A. K. Simon, M. Kenny, K. Brabeck, R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service learning*. Kluwer.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. Harper & Row.
- Jacoby, B., & Associates (2003). *Building partnerships for service-learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kendall, J. C. (Ed.) (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*. National Society for Experiential Education.
- Liu, G. (1996). *Community service in higher education: A decade of development*. Providence College.
- López-Villarreal, I. (2018). Aprendizaje Servicio en la implementación de política pública para la infancia. *RIDAS. Revista Iberoamericana de Aprendizaje Servicio*, 5, 1-11.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1344/RIDAS2018.5.1>
- Lowery, D., May, D. L., Duchane, K. A., Coulter-Kern, R., De' Bryant, Morris, P. V., Pomery, J. G., Bellner, M. (2006). A logic model of service learning: Tensions and issues for further consideration. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13, 47-60.
<https://bit.ly/2QPFMtw>
- Martín-García, X., Bär-Kwast, B., Gijón-Casares, M., Puig-Rovira, J. M., & Rubio-Serrano, L. (2021). El mapa de los valores del aprendizaje-servicio. *Alteridad*, 16(1), 12-22.



- <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v16n1.2021.01>
- Merriam, S., Cafarella, R., & Baumgartner, L. (2007). *Learning in Adulthood*. Jossey-Bass.
- Mungaray, A., Ocegueda, J. M., & Sánchez, M. D. (2002). *Retos y perspectivas de la reciprocidad universitaria a través del servicio social en México*. ANUES.
- ONU, PNUD (2015). Objetivos Desarrollo Sostenible. Agenda 2030. <https://bit.ly/3h19Nmh>
- Pérez-Galván, L. M., & Ochoa-Cervantes, A. (2017). El aprendizaje-servicio (ApS) como estrategia para educar en ciudadanía. *Alteridad*, 12(2), 175-187. <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v12n2.2017.04>
- Pérez, R. (2015). San Lorenzo Datem. En J. Escudero y F. González (Coords.), *Solidaridad y voluntariado universitario. Relatos de Experiencias* (pp. 33-53). Servicio de Publicaciones (UPSA).
- Quiroga, A. (2013). Aprendizaje Servicio en México: participación solidaria en pro de la equidad de género. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social (RIEJS)*, 2(2), 55-73. <https://bit.ly/3GbOQ3F>
- Reardon, K. M. (1998). Participatory action research as service learning. En K.M. Reardon, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (73), 57-64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.7307>
- Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M. (2020). Aprendizaje Servicio y compromiso académico en Educación Superior. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 25, 45-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicod.2019.09.001>
- Santos-Pastor, M. L., Cañadas, L., Martínez-Muñoz, L. F., Calle-Molina, M. T., Garoz-Puerta, I., Sanz-Arribas, I., Álvarez-Barrio, M. J., & Ponce-Garzarán, A. (2018). Programa de Educación Física para Jóvenes Universitarios con Discapacidad Intelectual desde Metodología de Aprendizaje-Servicio. En F.J. Murillo Avances en Democracia y Liderazgo Distribuido en Educación. *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Liderazgo y Mejora de la Educación. RILME*, 136-139.
- Santoyo, D. (2017). Evaluación del Programa de Servicio Social UADY- Peraj “Adopta a un amig@”. *Perspectivas Docentes*, 64, 9-17. <https://doi.org/10.19136/pd.a28n64.1915>
- Shor, I. (Ed.) (1987). *Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching*. Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Sigmon, R. L. (1979). Service-learning: Three Principles. *Synergist*. National Center for Service-Learning. *Synergist*, 8(1), 9-11. <https://bit.ly/3EoRiU7>
- Speck, B. W., & Hoppe, S. L. (Eds.). (2004). *Service-learning: History, theory, and issues*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). Principles of Best Practice for Community-Based Research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(3), 5-15. <https://bit.ly/2DrbyKx>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962), *Thought and Language*. MIT Press.
- Weiler, K. (1991). Freire and a feminist pedagogy of difference. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61, 449-474. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.61.4.a102265jl68rju84>
- Zayas, B., Gozávez, V., & Gracia, J. (2018). La dimensión ética y ciudadana del Aprendizaje Servicio: Una apuesta por su institucionalización en la Educación Superior. *Revista Complutense De Educación*, 30(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.5209/RCED.55443>

