

A Visit With . . . Andy Furco

With this issue of the *IJRSLTE* we are excited to introduce a new feature: an interview with a prominent individual in the field of service-learning and community engagement. We begin here with **Andrew Furco**, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement, and Associate Professor, at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Furco has played a leadership role in advancing service-learning and other forms of community and public engagement in K-12 and higher education throughout the U.S.A. and across the globe. As an early proponent of service-learning in teacher education, Andy conducted numerous research studies, collaborated with many professional organizations, and inspired a generation of teacher educators, K-12 teachers and administrators, and other higher education professionals to enhance the quality of civic education and community engagement through the use of service-learning and other forms of public engaged pedagogy. *IJRSLTE* co-editor Jeffrey Anderson recently had the opportunity to interview Dr. Furco.

IJRSLTE: Andy, would you please describe your personal journey and how you initially got involved with service-learning?

Andy Furco (AF): I would characterize my journey as being very serendipitous, I often call service-learning “serendipitous-learning” for me. A lot of it is really a result of me just being fortunate and being in the right place at the right time. I don’t think I ever set out to have a career in service-learning. It just happened. I would say that it really began early in my career as a K-12 administrator. I was a middle-school vice principal, and I worked for a principal who was very innovative and had a lot of new ideas; in fact, probably he had a new idea just about every day.

One day he came in and said, “You know, I think it would be really great if our students would do community service.” I thought, “Oh, no! All the kids out in the neighborhood terrorizing everyone, and all the parents at my door wondering what their kids are doing outside of school!” But, it really changed my life. I saw amazing transformations in these young students that I knew we couldn’t capture in the classroom. The students who were in my office with discipline problems . . . They got involved with service-learning and would stay after school to work on their projects. They would say, “Mr. Furco, look, I did this. *I* did this.” We were just so proud of the work that they did and how invested they were in it. I thought “there’s something to this service angle that is very powerful.”

At the time, I was thinking about getting my doctorate, and I went to Berkeley to begin my studies. This was early 1990s, right when service-learning was just bubbling up. I started learning about this growing issue of service-learning. I was initially interested in studying issues pertaining to volunteerism and community service. But then, I realized that when we integrated service with academics, there’s a whole

other dimension to it. I went to my first National Youth Leadership Conference (NYLC) conference and met others who were interested in the topic. And I also met some kindred spirits at NSEE (National Society for Experiential Education). I ultimately decided to write my dissertation on service-learning.

Interestingly, I was discouraged from doing that by one of my initial advisers who didn’t think there was a lot of merit to this thing called service-learning. In fact, he said I’d probably never get a job anywhere and writing a dissertation on service-learning would ruin my career. Fortunately, I met K. Patricia Cross. Her area of research was in higher education, and my interest was on service-learning in K-12 education. But she was very interested in experiential education. So, I approached her and she said she’d be willing to work with me, and that proved to be an important turning point.

While I was writing my dissertation on service-learning, the University of California-Berkeley received a grant from the Corporation for National Service as one of the 13 demonstration sites for an AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America combination. Several faculty in the School

In regards to service-learning in teacher education . . . what we’re ultimately aiming for is to advance service-learning in K-12 education.

of Education where I was working on my degree, were asked to take on the directorship of the new service-learning center Berkeley would establish as part of this grant. The vice chancellor went to them and said, “We need a faculty director to run this new center here on service-learning,” and all this is brand new. Does anyone know anything about this thing called service-learning?”

They said, “Well, we have one student writing a dissertation on the topic,” and that was me. Since none of the faculty wanted to take on the directorship, the vice chancellor asked me if I could take on the responsibility not as a faculty director, but as director of this new center. Of course I was honored to be asked, but also very nervous about taking on this responsibility, as most of my work was focused on service-learning in K-12 education. I said, “Well, it makes sense to have a center for service-learning that’s going to help support faculty in developing service-learning courses. But, I think one of the things that is missing in the field is research.” And so I said, “Being a research university, I think Berkeley should develop a research center for service-learning”, which the vice chancellor thought that was a great idea. That’s how Berkeley’s Service-Learning Research and Development Center started in 1994. My adviser, Pat, agreed to allow me to develop the center and direct it, and I directed that center for 14 years. During this time, I finished my graduate studies, graduated, and ended up getting a faculty appointment at Berkeley, continuing as the Center’s director.

It was a great experience. I got to lead and work on over 30 research and evaluation studies on both K-12 and higher education service-learning issues. That really generated a lot of contacts and a lot of instrument development that still enrich my work today. I had the awesome privilege to work with over 30 graduates students who came to the center, who were funded by research grants the center received, and who have become great colleagues. It really turned into a wonderful experience for me, to immerse myself in the field, to keep progress on developments in a fast growing field, and to get involved with international associations.

During those 14 years with the Center, I was able to teach classes. I was able to advise students. I was able to publish. I was able to get grants to do research and work with faculty across different disciplines and continue my K-12 work. It was a really an exemplary opportunity for me. It challenged me in important ways that have helped me grow and develop.

Then ultimately as I was approaching year 15 as director, I thought, “Am I going to do this for the

rest of my life?” I got to that point where I thought that I really needed to stretch more. Again fortuitously, I was recommended for the Associate Vice President for Public Engagement position, my current position at the University of Minnesota. I thought, “Okay, I’m studying institutionalizing service-learning and engagement in higher ed, as well as in K-12. I write about the importance of strong leadership for service-learning, having an institutional plan, having a clear university-wide the definition—all essential components to institutionalize service-learning. Maybe now it’s time for me to put my money where my mouth is—my work where my mouth is.” I took a three-year leave of absence from Berkeley to try my hand at administration at the University of Minnesota. And it has been a great experience. It has given me the opportunity to build an agenda for the University and put in place some policies and structures that hopefully are helping the engagement work here grow and thrive.

I would also like to mention service-learning in teacher ed. The reason I think I got involved in that was because I did straddle both K-12 and higher ed. I was working with the California Department of Education on a six-year study of California K-12 Service-Learning Programs. At the time, there was a task force that was looking at how to better prepare teachers for service-learning in K-12, and I was part of the statewide task force on service-learning in teacher ed, which ultimately led to us getting a couple contracts to study that issue in California. That work ultimately led me to the International Center on Service-Learning in Teacher Education, and to leading scholars like you, Jeffrey.

IJRSLTE: How would you describe the current status of service-learning in K-12, higher ed, and teacher education?

AF: I think service-learning has evolved tremendously in the 25 years I’ve been involved. I think the current status is one where it’s really broad-based, and also deep. There are many different forms of service-learning that have emerged. There are many different lenses and perspectives that are applied to it in terms of social justice and democratic education, and there’s also the K-12 social studies civics lens, but there are also nuanced disciplinary lenses in the sciences, engineering and professional schools.

It’s very interesting to see how service-learning has evolved in so many ways. It really straddles so many different conceptual areas of education. It’s part of experiential learning. There’s an aspect that’s part of the service movement, the national service movement. It’s also part of community development.

Then, there's also the whole student development, student engagement issues. So it really straddles a lot of different areas, and that's a great thing.

However, I think this diffusion has also Balkanized the field quite a bit. I think early on, it was a relatively small field. There were a known cadre of kindred spirits, I would say, that would come together as a community and feel like they were part of something really important. Now, it all seems more amorphous and more diffused, as there are a lot of different approaches to service-learning that are taking place that don't necessarily intersect in ways that I think are always beneficial.

The current status for service-learning and service-learning in teacher education is definitely in an upward trajectory especially in American higher education. I think it has decreased quite a bit in K-12 education because of No Child Left Behind and the obsession with testing during the 2000s. Consequently, there has been a movement away from experiential education in K-12, although I think it's finally starting to come back.

Service-learning is likely more prevalent in higher education because we've been able to do more research in higher ed. It's a little easier to study college students than K-12 students. And so, we've actually been able to make the case for experiential learning and service-learning in higher education. And internationally, service-learning has really exploded. I see service-learning work developing in Asia and in Africa that remind me of where we were in the 1990s with service-learning; the definitional issues, the legitimization, the connection with academics, the difference between community service and service-learning, and all of the conversations we had are all being repeated in these other areas of the world. This is a sign that it's really bubbling up.

Then, you have places like South America and Europe where there are really deep pockets of this work that have already been established that are in so many ways head and shoulders above what we have envisioned in the U.S. in terms of quality and in

terms of its integration within the academic fabric of the educational systems.

In terms of service-learning in teacher education, I think that it's struggling in all parts of the globe. In the U.S., it's struggling because of what's happened in the K-12 arena. There has been less interest in it and other progressive education pedagogies in general, and I just think there has been less of a need to look at the pre-service teachers' perspectives. That's unfortunate because I think if we engage our K12 students more intentionally in service-learning and these kinds of experiences, they are more prepared to do it in higher education, take on more sophisticated kinds of experiences. I don't see the kind of excitement around service-learning in teacher education that I see in some of the other areas of service-learning. However, there are glimmers of hope. I recently was asked to review a service-learning course for a teacher education program in Hong Kong. All the students at this teaching college are required to engage in a service-learning experience as part of their graduation requirement. So we may be seeing a resurgence in service-learning in teacher education initiatives in other parts of the globe.

IJRSLTE: What can be done to move service-learning in teacher education forward? Are there some lessons that have been learned in the past 25 years that we could apply to help enliven service-learning in teacher education?

AF: In regards to service-learning in teacher education, my perspective on this is that what we're ultimately aiming for is to advance service-learning in K-12 education. I think that the way to do this, and the way to encourage teacher education programs to change and transform, is not necessarily to work through the university, but rather perhaps work through the state credentialing systems and the accreditation systems that require teacher education programs to consider pedagogies like service-learning . . . or having State Departments of Education say that K-12 schools will need to incorporate the practice, and consequently, teachers will need to know how to address and use service-learning.

We have tried to advance service-learning in teacher education through the higher ed systems. But, this has become a bit challenging because the teacher education programs within the higher ed systems are beholden to the overall culture of the institution in which they are situated.

IJRSLTE: Thanks, Andy. What do you see as the role of research in service-learning in teacher education?

AF: I think it's essential and important. This is the

One of the constraints for advancing this field is that we don't go outside of our circle enough.

piece where the naysayers and those that don't ascribe to this kind of pedagogy are the first to say, "Well, it doesn't work" or "There's no evidence." The more evidence we have and the more research we have that supports the impact of this work on students, communities, teachers, and schools, the more we can make the case. I think research is essential and a very, very important part of what we must do.

I also think though what we tend to do with the research are often very superficial kinds of things. What I mean by this is that we do a study and we say, "Look, we have findings," But one study is not adequate. What we need to try to do is really think about replicating some of the most important studies and look at the findings across different contexts so that we can build a wide and deep range of evidence and a more robust understanding of the strengths and limitations of service-learning.

We preach a lot to the choir and we need to be able to work more directly with our critics and people who necessarily don't understand or aren't familiar with the work, so that we can engage them in conversation. I think that many outside the field would be very amenable and agreeable to this work if they understood it better. I think we just need to get outside our usual circles more and be more proactive in reaching out. I know it's not easy to do and I realize that I definitely should do more of this as well. One of the constraints for advancing this field is that we don't go outside of our circle enough.

IJRSLTE: It sounds like the most effective way to be advocate for service-learning is to think of ourselves as educators and educating various populations about what service-learning is and how it can be effective.

AF: Exactly, exactly. One of the strategies I use with our faculty here, especially faculty who are not familiar with community-engaged work is that I don't talk about doing service-learning. Rather, I talk about doing quality teaching. I talk about doing impactful research. This gets them to the table. Then when they come to the table, we explore the questions, "What are the strategies for quality teaching? What are the components and characteristics of impactful research?" This usually leads us to conversations about the role and importance of community engagement, as well as discussion of active learning and constructivist approaches.

Then we get into all of the other indicators of high-quality teaching. Then, we say, "Oh, here's one strategy called service-learning that contains many of these components." This is how we get people to the table. But if we say, "Come learn about service-learning and let me talk to you about service-learning.

practice." Right away, they begin to filter and think, "Oh, that's one more thing for me to do that I don't have time to do" or preconceived notions about service-learning kick in. I think we have to approach it all more strategically. We need to say "let's talk about education." We in the field must remember we are educators, we're not just service-learning proponents."

IJRSLTE: Would you like to say anything about issues of definition and purposes of service-learning in teacher education?

AF: I think we have to get clear on a host of issues. We need to make a case for why service-learning in teacher education is important. I think we still struggle with the definition of service-learning; it continues to mean a lot of things to a lot of different people. In one sense that's good because people can adopt it in ways that makes sense to them. But when it comes to building a field that is centered on an issue or broad area like service-learning in teacher education, we do need to have more clarity as to what service-learning is, what it can accomplish, and why we need more service-learning in teacher education. We need to clarify what would be indicators of success for institutionalizing service-learning in teacher education programs.

For example, if you have a service-learning module in one course, then you have service-learning in teacher ed. Is that adequate? I think we need to have a better rationale around why and for what purposes and to what end. Without such goals, it will be difficult for all to move in the same direction, I know we have an International Center for Service-Learning in Teacher Education and we have the journal, we have a lot of groups that are discussing this issue. But, we are working in our own silos, and I just wish we could all come together and have a bold agenda to which everybody ascribes.

IJRSLTE: A number of people have been saying recently that the role of the community in service-learning needs to be enhanced and that more focus needs to be placed on securing positive community impact and enhancing community voice. Should that be done with service-learning in teacher education and if so, how can we do that?

AF: I think this is a very complicated issue. I say that because one, on the surface, that's obviously an important piece because we are doing work *with* community. We are providing service in the community and with the community. And we're supposed to have impact on crucial issues in the community. The community perspective and piece of that should definitely be an essential part. Where it gets compli-

cated is, with the question: “What does this actually mean?” When we say, “Okay, community voice,” who represents the community? And which voices are we talking about? And how do we get them to the table?

It gets to be very, very challenging. I agree that we need broader perspectives beyond academia and beyond the educational systems. We definitely need the voices of

businesses and governmental entities, residents, parents, different stakeholders in the community. To involve these stakeholders in a way that’s organized and systematic and constructive in terms of helping the teacher ed programs and K-12 systems, I think it’s very difficult to do. I personally have not seen a lot of great examples of how

to engage a broad-based group of stakeholders in a comprehensive way that really make a difference.

I think it’s because it quickly gets very representational. We bring people to the table, and they represent a particular constituency, community, or agenda that does not necessarily represent the broader community. I’m not sure I’m answering your question. But I think community voice, community participation, community involvement are all extremely important. But I continue to struggle with how to do this, especially at a large institution like mine where we have so many different communities and many different levels of involvement and representation.

IJRSLTE: What are your thoughts about the establishment of a community engagement major or minor or even a community engagement master’s degree program as a way to enhance service-learning in higher ed?

AF: Quite honestly, I’m not a big fan of this, although, I’ve been talking about developing a Ph.D. program focused on community engagement issues.

I guess I’m equivocal on this. I would say that one of the risks is that it can enclave the work. That is, it sets up service-learning or community engagement as a separate area of study, and thus has the potential to marginalize it. On the other hand, I think there are students for whom a degree program in community engagement would prepare them professionally to take on roles that involve community-based work. It would help them understand different communities; understand the principles, issues of power and issues of empowerment and the issues of participatory work and all those kind of things that are going to help them to be successful in community engaged practices.

Having a program that can pull together students from different disciplines, different perspectives could be very powerful. I think it’s workable and one that I believe could have a lot of benefits. My concern though is that this might lead some disciplines or departments to offload commitments to community to certain units, and in turn, miss the chance to see how community engagement can actually enhance their own disciplinary work. Those disciplines might say, “Well, there’s that community engagement program over there. That’s the group that does it, not us.”

One place where do I think major programs or a degree program can be very valuable is in the advanced degree arena, such as a master’s or doctoral program. I can’t tell you how many requests I have received over the last five years from individuals who are seeking their doctorates and asking, “Where can I go to get a Ph.D. in community engagement practices or community engagement philosophy or research?”

I think there’s a place for such advanced degree programs as the study of community engagement and service-learning is now somewhat codified. I think if there was a Ph.D. program on community engagement that focused on issues of diversity, community engagement, and the broader philosophy around it, I think it could be very powerful for preparing future faculty who do research on service-learning, future professionals who run engagement programs and centers, those who are interested in advancing the service-learning communications field, or other scholars or educators who are interested in community engagement.

IJRSLTE: Another issue that comes up in the field frequently is diversity. Are there strategies you would suggest that we use to increase the ethnic diversity of faculty, staff, and students who are involved with service-learning?

AF: Yes, absolutely. I think service-learning is a powerful pedagogy that actually can do this. I also think there’s a gender issue in service-learning as well that

This is one of the things I love most about service-learning. All of us contribute, but also all of us receive and learn from others who may have very different perspectives . . .

we need to be attentive to. The question is how can we diversify the service-learning field? Going back to what I've said earlier, I think that we should not just focus on doing service-learning for the sake of service-learning.

As I often say, the goal is not to do service-learning. Service-learning is a means, not an end. The goal of service-learning is to improve student learning or impact the community. And we often find that service-learning itself is often also a means to build diverse partnerships and collaborative communities. When we focus the work on critical issues where there's poverty or the environment or health or youth or education, what often happens is that we see very diverse groups of people rallying around an issue of common interest and coming together to collaborate because the issue resonates somehow with each stakeholder and constituent. It's the shared interest and passion for the issue that creates diverse service-learning groups. The diversity often manifests organically as different groups of people find affinities and commonalities with each other because they all are passionate about a particular societal issue or care about a particular neighborhood. This is one of the things I love most about service-learning. All of us contribute, but also all of us receive and learn from others who may have very different perspectives on how to approach the work we're doing together.

Another issue regarding diversity that is important is that we have to do more to understand the role that power, place and privilege play in this work. I'm delighted that literature is discussing this important issue more fully, and that there is more research being done on critical service-learning. For service-learning in teacher education, this issue is especially relevant given that K-12 teachers are working in increasingly diverse settings. I'm working on being more personally aware of this, and I certainly have a lot to learn. And I think the diversity issue extends beyond racial, ethnic, religious, and gender diversity. In service-learning, we must also be able to work effectively with diversity of disciplines, diversity of methodologies, diversity regarding reasons for doing service, such as charity versus social justice, among other kinds of diversity. We tend to go into community experiences with the certain mindset or certain set of assumptions and expectations, and thus the experience could unintentionally seem uninviting to those who don't ascribe to the particular philosophies or the way of thinking or way of doing work. And some are just uncomfortable with having to work in a setting where there is a diversity of purpos-

es, perspectives, and approaches.

I would also say, in terms of increasing diversity, we also have to consider the overall structures that are in place around access, especially in higher education. When we're not attracting a diverse pool of students to the institution, then it's very hard to expect that our service-learning is going to engage a diverse group of individuals.

When we're not attracting diverse group of faculty to the institution it is unlikely, we're going to have a diverse group of faculty engaged in service-learning activities. There are these broader structural issues that have been to be addressed as well, so it's not just a service-learning issue.

IJRSLTE: Do you have any advice that you could share for junior faculty who are just beginning careers in teacher education who are interested in service-learning and doing research on service-learning?

AF: I would say that it's very easy to get discouraged because of the prevailing norms, practices, structural barriers, and financial barriers that are present.

When we're passionate about something and really believe in it in our gut, when we know it's the right thing to do to persevere, I firmly believe that we should not let the barriers before us hold us back. I shared my own personal experience when I was told early on that I shouldn't engage in this work, that it would ruin my career and I'd never get a job. I almost changed my dissertation to school vouchers because my advisor had said that would be the next big issue in K-12 education. But, I felt it in my gut that pursuing service-learning was the right thing, and I persevered. Was it a risky move? Absolutely. But, I knew that this is what I was interested in. So, my part of my advice is to not let go of that passion and not get discouraged. When one is in a vulnerable position, it is risky to push back against or try to change entrenched institutional practices and cultures. To be successful, one has to strike a delicate balance between pursuing what one is passionate about and doing what one needs to do to succeed within an institutional culture.

What I mean to say is that it is important to be willing to adapt the nature of one's discourse and practice to fit the circumstances. This is another way of saying that you have to play the game to some extent. I've seen, unfortunately, too often too many faculty say, "Well, I'm not going to play that game. I'm going to publish the things I want to publish. I'm going to publish in the journals that I want to publish in and I'm going to do it my way." Then, they might find themselves hitting a roadblock around promo-

tion and tenure, and it doesn't serve them well. This is what I mean about striking a balance. Pursue your passions, but understand that we have more power to make institutional change when we're inside the culture or the institution than when we're outside of it.

The way we transform this field and its legitimacy in higher education or teacher education is to get into positions of influence where we can make decisions and catalyze change. And until we get into those positions, we remain quite powerless to really change things all that much. Part of the strategy of playing the game is to change the nature of our discourse. Like I say, when I work with faculty, I don't say, "Well, we'll talk to you about service-learning and community engagement. Instead, I focus on talking about doing quality teaching and high impact research." In other words, I'm using the discourse that will resonate to those I need to partner with in order to be able to enact change.

I change the nature of the discourse because for that individual or community, for that group, for that discipline, that's the discourse that resonates. I think we just have to learn to do this; it's a skill to be able to navigate those discourses. That's why I truly value the work I did at Berkeley as service-learning director working with different academic departments. It gave me the opportunity to learn more about which discourses resonated with which disciplines; and this was very valuable.

The other advice I would offer is to seek out individuals, mentors, people I call kindred spirits, who really can be supportive and who have faced the challenges you may be facing. These are people who can really inspire and help and be a support, because sometimes we don't find that in our own work with faculty or with students. Oftentimes, these mentors are outside of the main circles we operate in.

Lastly, I would say that to succeed as a faculty

member who anchors his/her work in service-learning, it is essential to connect the work to a discipline, namely, the contemporary issues within an established discipline, which in my case is education . . . although some would say education is not a discipline. As we know, there's an ongoing debate as to whether education is a discipline.

When we establish ourselves as someone who's scholarly work is primarily or exclusively service-learning or service-learning in teacher education, we really set ourselves up for an uphill battle. To make it as a faculty member, we have to situate that work in a broader discipline. My question is always, "What's the disciplinary anchor that you're going to use throughout your career that's going to help you connect your work to what is more established?" Our work in service-learning has to be grounded in and build on existing work. Others have to see the relevance of the work that we do.

I have to admit that I've gotten a lot of push back on this idea, mainly from service-learning colleagues who say, "Well, by aligning service-learning to an existing discipline, you're perpetuating an old paradigm by trying to acknowledge and legitimize the traditional disciplines."

My response to this is that we can try to challenge the traditional disciplinary boundaries and structures, and create new disciplines that embrace the study of service-learning and community engagement as a discipline. And, we have seen the emergence of great disciplines, such as women's studies and ethnic studies, that are really now legitimate wonderful disciplines, resulting from the efforts of scholars who pushed back on the traditional disciplines. However, for service-learning and community engagement, we still have a long way to go before we can call it a discipline. We are still building its knowledge and research bases. The proliferation of publications, journals, conference, associations, and involvement across the globe is certainly a testament to the growing interest in this area of study and practice. And I think over time, a discipline can emerge. I know Dan Butin would be happy to hear me say this, as he and I have disagreed over whether or not service-learning should cast as a discipline. But, I have not promoted this idea as I don't think we've yet have got enough of a foundation. After all, we are still trying to define what service-learning is, after all these years!

I believe that at this time, our strategy should be to work to be as successful as possible with the structures that are before us, and to be realistic about the things we can and cannot change. Like I said, I've seen too many cases of individuals who have really

. . . in the 1990s we never envisioned service-learning enjoying the popularity it now has. For me, it is about hope, passion, and perseverance . . .

tried to change some of entrenched structures within academia or have attended to shift focus of academic disciplines by extending the scope of the disciplines' areas of focus, and their careers have suffered for their efforts. I can tell you that even with a relatively high level leadership position like mine, at a university that is very supportive of community engaged work and service-learning across the disciplines, my ability and influence to shift academic culture is very limited. And I know of at least three university presidents who in the last couple of years were let go because they had a bold reform agenda that included community engagement; perhaps the agenda was seen within the prevailing culture as being a bit too bold. Higher education is definitely changing, but I think is changing slowly and incrementally.

IJRSLTE: We're about at the end of the interview. Is there anything else you would like to share that we haven't discussed?

AF: I just want to say that we are and have been building a field., and perhaps will establish a discipline. We know that to build a field takes a generation. I think we need to remember this. I think sometimes we quit too soon. It has been great to see people involved in moving this field forward over so many years now. I can tell you that in the 1990s we never envisioned service-learning enjoying the popularity it now has. For me, it about hope, passion, and perseverance, coupled with patience and willingness to work within systems that ultimately lead to securing broad legitimacy and building a field.

I often say it's like a spiral. We return to the same issues over time. Each time we come back, the coil gets a little thicker. We again return to old issues, and then the coil gets a little more thick. Each time we do this, the coil gets thicker and stronger and ultimately, it's going to really have the strength to have its own weight that defines a deep and legitimate field. It's just great to see this coil/field take shape over the last couple of decades and to see what's happening across the globe.

IJRSLTE: I think you've been a huge part of that, Andy. You've been a catalyst and stimulus for getting things moving and keeping the momentum going.

AF: Thank you. I feel very fortunate. One more thing I do want to say. This is a wonderful field for me because of the people who are in it. This is a field filled with amazing individuals who like to share, who are collegial, who care about their work and each other, and who cherish opportunities to work together. It's wonderful. It's really wonderful.