

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Education Scholarship

Education

2005

Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement

Penny A. Pasque

University of Michigan - Ann Arbor

Bruce L. Mallory

University of New Hampshire, bruce.mallory@unh.edu

Ryan E. Smerek

University of Michigan - Ann Arbor

Brighid Dwyer

University of Michigan - Ann Arbor

Nick Bowman

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/educ_facpub



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pasque, Penny A.; Mallory, Bruce L.; Smerek, Ryan E.; Dwyer, Brighid; and Bowman, Nick, "Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement" (2005). *Education Scholarship*. 4.
https://scholars.unh.edu/educ_facpub/4

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Education at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Scholarship by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

“WE CANNOT LAY CLAIM TO GREATER PUBLIC INVESTMENT - TO WHICH WE MUST LAY CLAIM IF WE ARE TO SERVE OUR FUNCTION IN A KNOWLEDGE-INTENSIVE SOCIETY THAT ALSO SUBSCRIBES TO DEMOCRATIC VALUES- UNLESS WE ARE SEEN TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD”.



Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement & Improvement

“SERVING SOCIETY IS ONLY ONE OF HIGHER EDUCATION’S FUNCTIONS, BUT IT IS SURELY AMONG THE MOST IMPORTANT. AT A TIME WHEN THE NATION HAS ITS FULL SHARE OF DIFFICULTIES...THE QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER UNIVERSITIES NEED TO CONCERN THEMSELVES WITH SOCIETY’S PROBLEMS BUT WHETHER THEY ARE DISCHARGING THIS RESPONSIBILITY AS WELL AS THEY SHOULD.”

Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement

The *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* conference and monograph was sponsored by the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good, Atlantic Philanthropies, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Johnson Foundation. The views expressed in this monograph, unless expressly stated to the contrary, are not necessarily those of all participants, the editorial board, or the sponsoring organizations.

Editors:

Penny A. Pasque

Ryan E. Smerek

Brigid Dwyer

Nick Bowman

Bruce L. Mallory

Copyright ©2005 by the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

Cover and logo by Marty Betts Design

Send inquires to:

Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement

MONOGRAPH

National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good


School of Education, Suite 2339

University of Michigan

610 East University Avenue

Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259


or visit us on the web at www.thenationalforum.org



Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement

Editors

Penny A. Pasque, Ryan E. Smerek,
Brigid Dwyer, Nick Bowman, and Bruce L. Mallory







Table of Contents

Introduction	7
Partnerships for Engagement Futures <i>Ryan Smerek, Penny A. Pasque, Bruce Mallory and Barbara A. Holland</i>	
Chapter 1	10
Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships: What has been Learned? What are the Next Challenges? <i>Barbara A. Holland</i>	
Chapter 2	18
Reflections on the Wingspread Experience <i>Bruce L. Mallory</i>	
Chapter 3	22
Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement: Faculty and Researchers' Perspectives <i>Ira Harkavy</i>	
Chapter 4	28
Challenges to Community-Higher Education Partnerships: A Call to Action <i>David Cox and Sarena Seifer</i>	
Chapter 5	32
Mission and Community: The Culture of Community Engagement and Minority Serving Institutions <i>Maurice C. Taylor, Brigid Dwyer, and Sandra Pacheco</i>	
Chapter 6	38
Research Universities Working Together to Serve Multiple Communities: The Committee on Institutional Cooperation Engagement Initiative <i>John C. Burkhardt and Rachel Lewis</i>	
Chapter 7	45
Partnering with the Old North State <i>Judith Welch Wegner</i>	
About the Conference Participants and Authors	60
About the Conference and Publication Sponsors	70



Introduction

Partnerships for Engagement Futures

Ryan E. Smerek, Penny A. Pasque, Bruce Mallory, & Barbara A. Holland

“Universities face high expectations from the societies of which they are part. They will be judged, and learn to judge themselves, by the variety and vitality of their interactions with society. Those interactions, and university decision-making to foster them, are what we term ‘engagement’. Twenty-first century academic life is no longer pursued in seclusion (if it ever was) but rather must champion reason and imagination in engagement with the wider society and its concerns” (Association of Commonwealth Universities, 2001, p. i).

Our society is in a period of dramatic change with the transition from an industrial-based to a knowledge-based economy, as well as technological advances, fiscal challenges of higher education, and cultural shifts in society as a whole. Increasing collaborations between communities and universities in order to influence the public good becomes paramount during this time of dramatic change. As frustratingly slow as the movement to strengthen the relationship between higher education and society sometimes seems to be, few social institutions are better situated than colleges and universities to stimulate significant community improvement. Individually and collectively, institutions of higher education possess considerable resources—human, fiscal, organizational, and intellectual—which are critical to addressing significant social issues. Additionally, these institutions are physically rooted in their communities. Therefore, investing in the betterment of their immediate environments is good for both the community and the institution. However, it is recognized that higher education institutions often fall short of making a real impact in their home communities. Therefore, a conference was convened to examine the current and evolving role of higher education institutions, particularly those operating within the context of coalitions, consortia and state systems, to catalyze change on issues affecting communities and society as a whole. Specifically, the focus of the conference was to develop and strengthen an understanding of how higher education might work more effectively with communities and we believe that consortia or collaboratives of higher education institutions, along with community partners, can learn from one another. Cooperation between efforts is important.

The papers offered in this monograph are the result of the Wingspread Conference on *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement*, conducted on October 27-29, 2004, in Racine, Wisconsin. The conference, the second of a three-part series, was sponsored by the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good at the University of Michigan School of Education, the Johnson Foundation, Atlantic Philanthropies, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The first conference in the series held in October 2003 and titled *Public Understanding, Public Support and Public Policy* focused on higher education’s role in society and the concluding conference will be held in the fall of 2005.

The Wingspread Invitational Conference Series follows a major National Summit on higher education’s commitment to the public held in Ann Arbor in 2002, sponsored by the National Forum. Over 250 scholars, state legislators, college/university presidents, students, foundation personnel, trustees, and community-based leaders participated in this Summit that produced the *Common Agenda to Strengthen the Relationship Between Higher Education and Society*. The National Summit followed a yearlong series of Dialogues across the country that focused on issues central to higher

education's commitment and engagement with society. Each Wingspread conference furthers another aspect of this *Common Agenda*.

This *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* conference convened a diverse array of academic, community, and association leaders and challenged them to consider how to strengthen higher education's concern for the community. We approached the agenda from several directions. First, attendees reviewed emerging and effective partnership practices between higher education and communities, recognized key challenges, and suggested the next major steps to be taken to advance campus-community collaboration. In addition, participants examined the current and evolving role of community engagement across the higher education sector, particularly looking at universities operating within the context of coalitions, such as the Kellogg Minority Serving Institution Leadership Program and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) – a committee comprised of the Big Ten institutions and the University of Chicago. Of greatest importance, the conference was intentionally designed to provide an opportunity for those working in higher education to learn from community leaders. Several inspirational and dedicated community partners were present at Wingspread to give their perspective of higher education institutions as potential partners in community improvement. This aspect of the conference was a highly valuable learning experience for all.

The conference was also designed to be a forum for groups with collective interests. This was achieved through a series of working groups that met periodically throughout the conference. These small groups were comprised of 1) a faculty group which discussed how community partnerships may be enhanced by research dissemination, 2) a group of administrators from Minority Serving Institutions (MSI) who convened in order to understand the unique role MSIs have in collaborating with the community, 3) the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) group which met to discuss how institutions might better prepare and train faculty for work within the community, 4) the North Carolina faculty members that convened to develop ideas to improve the state university's relationship with community partners, and 5) a group comprised of consortia and member-based organizations that focused on engagement and collaboration as an aspect of their mission. A community partner and a senior higher education administrator were also included in each working group in order to provide feedback and alternative perspectives. The groups explored the benefits and limitations of their organizations as agents of change in advancing higher education's commitment to engagement and the ways they might collaborate to strengthen engagement leadership and the visibility of successful community-campus partnerships. Overall, the working groups were highly praised by conference participants as being very worthwhile and productive; the chapters in this monograph are organized by the insights derived from many of these groups. The outcomes include observations about current practices and key challenges that represent the next important steps for strengthening higher education's commitment to engagement and partnerships with community.

A key insight gained by those in attendance was the need for more intentional relationship building with community partners. With several prominent community partners in attendance, it was possible to enlarge the understandings and sensitivities of higher education faculty and administrators. Higher education leaders were able to learn first-hand about how to structure programs effectively and what concerns community leaders might bring to this relationship. Furthermore, they were able to learn about the perspectives many community members hold of higher education, including a sense that universities operate with a kind of messiah-complex or through detached intellectualism. This alternative point-of-view was considered as a key component of improving partnership practices. On the other side, many of the community partners met sympathetic, conscientious faculty members at Wingspread, faculty who truly listened to their concerns and recognized the need for change in higher education culture and practices. This was a first step in building trust, removing misconceptions, and led participants to realize that the Wingspread meeting itself was a model of partnering across sectors. In the end, the conference's success emerged from the consensus about the nature of informed and responsive relationships among and between leaders in communities and universities.


At the conclusion of the conference, participants knew there was more work to be done, had many questions that remained, and had an expressed need to create more precise plans for future action. *How do faculty overcome the fact that there are few incentives or little preparation for them to engage in community improvement? How can working with communities be recognized as career enhancing, on par with the more traditional forms of teaching and research? How can efforts to improve communities through partnerships be sustained for the long term?* The chapters in this monograph seek to explore the road ahead and offer a direction for research and practice that will advance engagement and capacity for community-campus collaborations.

The first chapter, *Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships: What has been Learned? What are the Next Challenges?*, is a reflection from Barbara Holland, co-facilitator of the conference. Holland shares what is known about the characteristics of engaged universities, presents common themes among partnerships, and challenges us to develop stronger and more effective community-university partnerships. In the second chapter, *Reflections on the Wingspread Experience*, Bruce Mallory, also a co-facilitator of the conference, offers his reflections on the three days spent at Wingspread. Mallory insightfully examines the setting, conversations, tensions, and emotions of the conference. Ira Harkavy, a renowned scholar from the University of Pennsylvania, shares three questions that guided the discussions of the faculty & researchers working group in the third chapter, *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement: Faculty and Researchers' Perspectives*. Harkavy reviews what a successful collaborative partnership looks like; what approaches, organizational structures, and activities are most likely to lead to success; and what specific steps need to be taken in the future. In chapter four, *Challenges to Community-Higher Education Partnerships: A Call to Action*, David Cox and Sarena Seifer raise important issues that face community-university partnerships noting that a reciprocal and constructive relationship is needed. The authors delve into the challenges of constructive partnerships and skillfully point out that faculty interests do not automatically translate into project interests of communities. Cox and Seifer highlight organizations that are successfully leading partnership initiatives, and finally, they issue a call to action to community members, consortia, and to the field of higher education. Maurice C. Taylor, Brigid Dwyer, and Sandra Pacheco discuss the unique and important relationship that Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) have with communities in chapter five, *Mission and Community: The Culture of Community Engagement and Minority Serving Institutions*. The authors believe that the traditional model of community-higher education partnerships neglects the relationship that Minority Serving Institutions have with their local communities. They offer that the inclusion of MSIs in the discussion of partnerships provides examples of mutually beneficial relationships. Furthermore, they express that these relationships should be further explored within the context of collaboratives as well as the community engagement and improvement movement. In the sixth chapter, *Research Universities Working Together to Serve Multiple Communities: The Committee on Institutional Cooperation Engagement Initiative*, John C. Burkhardt and Rachel Lewis review the engagement work of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, comprised of the Big Ten Conference and the University of Chicago. The authors provide the context within which the Committee was formed and then outline the product of their work in creating benchmarks for CIC institutions. They conclude with a summary of how the work was enhanced by the discussions at Wingspread. In the final chapter, *Partnering with the Old North State*, Judith Welch Wegner provides the historical context for the relationship between the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and the state of North Carolina. While each institution has its own unique history, this chapter serves as a reminder that relationship struggles between the community and the university are not new. Wegner also discusses the significant role students and faculty play in the relationship between community and university, and concludes with action steps for the future.

This document is, in part, a direct reflection of the challenging conversations between community members and higher education faculty, administrators, and graduate students that ensued at this conference. It is but one aspect of this larger movement toward strengthening the relationship between higher education and society. The dialogue series that created the *Common Agenda to Strengthen the Relationship Between Higher Education and Society* served as a precursor to this conference, and we anticipate that this *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* gathering precipitates next steps to further dialogue and action. Our hope is that the chapters shared here are informative and enlightening to those in the field who believe that such collaboration is the pathway to strengthening higher education's role in enhancing the public good.

References

Association of Commonwealth Universities. (2001). *Engagement as a core value for universities: A consultation document*. London: Author.



Chapter 1

Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships: What Has Been Learned? What are the Next Challenges?

Barbara A. Holland

By looking at the body of literature on civic engagement, especially the various Wingspread reports and declarations about various dimensions of the civic mission of higher education, one would observe just over a decade's worth of amazing growth, experimentation, exploration and inspiration. Wingspread has been the epicenter of reflection and discovery where diverse groups have gathered to articulate the vision, philosophy, theory, practice and principles that are the foundation of our current understanding of engagement.

The Wingspread reports demonstrate that much has been learned in understanding *why* we must renew the civic mission of higher education and invent contemporary approaches to making the intellectual assets of higher education accessible and responsive to public issues and opportunities. Additionally, much has been accomplished in building an understanding of *what* engagement looks like when it is effective, sustainable and institutionalized. Furthermore, we have gained a greater understanding about what outcomes we believe can emerge from engaged teaching and research. Yet amidst this success it has been challenging to discover *how* we achieve those ideal characteristics and how we document quality.

I believe it is a sign of our advanced state of understanding that the most intensely examined issues around the field of engagement over the last year or two tend to fall into two broad categories: 1) how to institutionalize engagement (which includes issues of measurement, rewards/recognition, infrastructure, faculty development etc.), and 2) how to create effective community-campus partnerships. Partnership issues are especially prominent and have gained attention in the following ways: Many recent campus-based workshops have emerged with the intent of improving engagement and partnership programs; "partnerships" is the theme of the 2005 Western Regional Campus Compact Conference; Trinity College has created an annual in-depth training institute on partnerships for community-campus teams; California Campus Compact held a special summit on partnership issues in Fall 2004 and is now launching several campus-community dialogues. Finally, this essay is part of a set of papers arising from the October 2004 Wingspread convening on the subject of "Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement."

Reflections at this 2004 Wingspread meeting centered on the nexus of "what do we know?" and "what strategies and actions will strengthen higher education and community partnerships?" As a part of the planning team we designed the agenda and realized that we did not want to use the time to build a list of the characteristics of partnerships because we had already participated in past years in other working groups that had generated principles or features of effective partnerships. Rather, when we met in October 2004, we wanted to use that prior work as a foundation of knowledge and move forward to identify critical and persistent challenges that require our attention in this field of work.

This chapter makes the case that a great deal has already been learned about the features and elements of effective community-campus partnerships and adds that there is growing convergence in the literature on these characteristics. However, as was discussed at Wingspread, we have much more to explore regarding techniques, practices, strategies and cultural values that produce beneficial characteristics. Therefore, additional challenges for future research and analysis are suggested.

Collaboration: Not a Traditional Strength of Higher Education

For students, faculty, and service-learning professionals, working with communities requires us to look beyond familiar and safe academic roles. Academic organizations are designed to be highly self-referential. We often have little understanding about why community partners work with our institutions or how they view the relationship. Certainly, the past has created, at best, a fragile foundation for a healthy relationship. In general, higher education institutions are seen as a benefit to their surrounding community. By its mere presence, an academic institution generates considerable and reliable economic activity that strengthens the overall community condition. But academic institutions also take property off local tax rolls, raise property values, consume nearby land and neighborhoods, generate traffic and parking problems, and occasionally release large numbers of party-minded students into once quiet residential areas. Higher education's tradition is not often one of strong town-gown relationships. Therefore it is not surprising, when academics reach out to invite community members to partner, they may be met with a cautious response. Even if the air is cleared over past tensions and disappointments, academics tend to be more intensely interested in explaining what they want and need from the partnership than skilled at listening and absorbing information about the community's motivations and expectations.

The Importance of Our Different Perspectives and Motivations for Collaboration

In previous partnership evaluation work I have done, community partners reveal a surprising state of awareness and realism about the pitfalls and possibilities of working with a college or university. Almost invariably, their interest in engaging in a partnership is inspired by a trusted relationship with one faculty member or academic professional. Truthfully, few community partners see themselves as collaborating with "the university," they see themselves as working with Prof. Smith and her students. This very personal level of connection is where most community partners feel some confidence there will be reciprocity, trust, and respect for their perspectives.

Community partners also often say they are motivated to make a difference in the education of students. That is they hope to inspire an interest in a career of service in the field related to their organization's work; they hope to understand the public issue of concern to the organization; or they hope to understand the role of public policy or at least to continue to be a volunteer for community-based organizations. These community partners see themselves as co-teachers and as colleagues to the faculty in working with students, whether or not those roles are recognized by others. Community members anticipate their expertise will have an impact on students, on the faculty member, and perhaps on other members of the campus community. They want to exchange their wisdom for access to new ideas and knowledge resources that may enhance their organization and its programs. As a result of the differences in campus and community expectations for partnerships, communities' interest in partnering is often much more intentional and well-thought out than academics tend to imagine.

Too often, faculty assume that in a campus-community partnership, the faculty role is to teach, the students' role is to learn, and the community partner's role is to provide a laboratory or set of needs to address or explore. Academics come to the community from what can seem like a privileged and wealthy context, and the power relationship in partnerships is not equal. Demographics, race, culture and language are often aspects of great difference between campus and community perspectives. This makes it challenging to ensure a free exchange across the partnership and to ensure mutual benefits to all parties. Human nature being what it is, we all act out of some degree of self-interest—faculty want to help their students achieve learning objectives and to develop a sense of civic and social responsibility; they want to develop lines of research that enrich their intellectual work; and they also want to see their work, or their institution's work, contribute to community well-being. Students want to survive class, get a good grade, learn more about themselves and others, and feel they are making a difference. Finally, the community wants to serve more clients, design more effective programs, raise more funds, increase their impact, and have their expertise and wisdom to be leveraged through collaborations that will not only enhance community, but also inspire students and faculty to be more involved in civic matters. Finally, community partners also want to tap into academic knowledge to promote economic stability, improve schools and youth outcomes, enhance community health and safety, and generally strengthen community capacity for improvement.

Each party has different expectations that challenge community partners to sift through divergent goals, expectations and cultures to find common ground where shared work would be of mutual benefit to all.

Converging Views of the Core Features of Partnerships

Outstanding work has been done over the last decade to explore the characteristics of effective partnerships. Various individuals and organizations have thoroughly examined partnership experiences and documented their perspectives on the elements associated with satisfaction, mutual benefit and sustainability. Most of this information appeared in reports that were developed independently of one another and rarely built on other works or previously synthesized models. As a result, there are a number of models of effective partnerships in the literature, but still no sense of broad consensus about their implementation. Certainly context matters and the nuances of partnerships are strongly influenced by the mission and culture of each campus and community; however, when we consider how much has been documented and learned about the essence of collaboration, it is possible to articulate a common core perspective.

Looking across some of the most well-known analyses of partnerships reveals considerable convergence in our understanding of the core elements. This very idea was considered at the October 2004 Wingspread gathering as a critical step in advancing the quality of and commitment to collaborations for civic engagement. By recognizing that we do know the essential characteristics of partnerships, we may be able to re-focus the critical attention of scholars and practitioners toward the more compelling and challenging questions about “how do we actually achieve those elements and characteristics of effective partnerships?”

There are many models of partnerships that have been published or presented. Four widely-known models are described below and the common themes that represent consensus on the elements of effective partnerships across them are identified. While there are certainly other constructs that are worthy of attention, four have been selected to be shared for the presented within this text. It is important to note that each of these models are based on extensive field work and input from campus and community perspectives and are well-documented. Only a brief summation of each appears in this publication; however, citations are offered for deeper exploration of the models. Finally, the simplistic explanation of each of the models below makes it even more obvious that the different partnership methods are really quite similar at their core and may suggest a growing convergence of our understanding of partnership work.

Model 1: Campus Compact Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships

This model emerged from a 1998 Wingspread gathering that used a competitive process to select eight teams as exemplary campus/community partnerships. Organized by Campus Compact and sponsored by the Corporation for National Service, the meeting challenged the teams of administrators, faculty, students and community partners to “examine the anatomy of campus/community collaborations” (Campus Compact, 2000, p. 1). From this work emerged a set of eight essential features, or benchmarks, organized into three stages of relationship development.

Interestingly, the group felt strongly that their focus needed to be on how this model would help colleges and universities overcome the many obstacles of integrating “public service”¹ into academic work. “[T]he cooperative, collaborative model is not native to the university. Campuses are more likely to think of themselves as curators of knowledge rather than as students with much to learn from their neighbors” (p. 3). They were quite correct, given the continuing wide use of this report today across many types of institutions seeking to improve their partnership relationships and strengthen their commitment to engaged scholarship across the disciplines. The following is a brief listing of the benchmarks. The Campus Compact booklet describes each in detail and offers useful examples from experience in the field.

Campus Compact Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships (Campus Compact, 2000, pp. 5-7):

Stage I: Designing the Partnership

Genuine democratic partnerships are:

- Founded on a shared vision and clearly articulated values.
- Beneficial to partnering institutions.

Stage II: Building Collaborative Relationships

Genuine democratic partnerships that build strong collaborative relationships are:

- Composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect.
- Multi-dimensional: They involve the participation of multiple sectors that act in service of a complex problem.
- Clearly organized and led with dynamism.

Stage III: Sustaining Partnerships Over Time

Genuine democratic partnerships that will be sustained over time are:

- Integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions.
- Sustained by a partnership process for communication, decision-making, and the initiation of change.
- Evaluated regularly with a focus on both methods and outcomes.

Model 2: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Characteristics of Effective Partnerships

As Portland State University expanded its commitment to engaged teaching, learning and scholarship in the 1990s, the institution worked across its campus and community to develop an intentional approach to documenting the experience of partnerships. The effective elements of these partnerships were first reported in a 1998 paper prepared for a joint forum on school, university and community partnerships sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (Holland and Ramaley, 1998). HUD took a particular interest in this work because of its investment in grant programs supporting higher education involvement in community development partnerships. The HUD Office of University Partnerships, created in 1994, has continued to be a source of serious reflection and documentation of partnership features and practices. While serving as director of the office 2000-2002, I used data from HUD grantees to refine and improve the list of characteristics (Holland, 2001). The list has also been refined based on extensive input from numerous partnership workshops with campus and community partners and appears below.

Characteristics of Effective Partnerships (Holland, 2001):

- Joint exploration of goals and interests and limitations.
- Creation of a mutually rewarding agenda.
- Operational design that supports shared leadership, decision-making, conflict resolution, resource management.
- Clear benefits and roles for each partner.
- Identification of opportunities for early successes for all; shared celebration of progress.
- Focus on knowledge exchange, shared learning and capacity building.
- Attention to communication patterns, cultivation of trust.
- Commitment to continuous assessment of the partnership itself, as well as outcomes of shared work.

Model 3: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health's Principles of Partnerships

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) is a membership organization for both academic and community partners. Founded in 1996, CCPH provides a major forum for partnerships focused on the broad array of issues related to healthy individuals and communities. Through conferences, publications, training events, grant projects and web-based resources, the organization has been a major force for expanding civic engagement and partnership work.

From the beginning, CCPH leaders engaged members in systematic conversations about the nature of partnerships. After an extensive and iterative process that included many different perspectives, the CCPH Board of Directors approved a list of Principles of Good Community-Campus Partnerships in 1998. These have been widely disseminated and are used in settings beyond health issues to guide good partnership practices. The principles are discussed in depth in several publications and dissertations. A self-assessment instrument has also been created to guide examination of a particular partnership.²

CCPH Principles of Partnerships (CCPH, 1998):

- Agree upon values, goals and measurable outcomes.

-
- Develop relationships of mutual trust, respect, genuineness and commitment.
 - Build upon strengths and assets, and also address needs.
 - Balance power and share resources.
 - Have clear, open and accessible communication.
 - Agreed upon roles, norms and processes.
 - Ensure feedback to, among and from all stakeholders.
 - Share the credit for accomplishments.
 - Take time to develop and evolve.

Model 4: Council of Independent Colleges' Building Sustainable Partnerships

This report, which was developed by a summit of community partners, emerged from a different perspective than the other models that are mentioned above and is therefore an invaluable cross-check on the completeness of other partnership representations. Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) and its grant unit, the Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE), used the Engaging Communities and Campuses grant program (funded by The Atlantic Philanthropies) to advance engagement capacity through attention to four areas: faculty skills and knowledge, institutional infrastructure, academic culture and partner relationships. In 2002 CAPHE convened 21 experienced community partner organization leaders in a summit to capture community perspectives on partnerships between community organizations and higher education. From this they drew not only core elements of effective partnerships, listed below, but also detailed guidance on three major issues the community partners identified as critical to success: follow-through on commitments, cost-benefit analysis of partnership efforts, and parity in the partner relationships.³ While this report on partnership characteristics has not been as visible as some of the others, it is unique and influential in its focus on community views.

CIC Core Elements of Effective Partnerships (CIC, 2003):

- Goals and processes are mutually determined, including training for people who will work with community organizations or residents.
- Resources, rewards and risks are shared among all parties.
- Roles and responsibilities are based on each partner's capacities and resources.
- Parity is achieved by acknowledging and respecting the expertise and experience of each partner.
- Anticipated benefits justify the costs, effort and risks of participation.
- Partners share a vision built on excitement and passion for the issues at hand.
- Partners are accountable for carrying out joint plans and ensuring quality.
- Partners are committed to ensuring that each partner benefits from participation.

Discussion and Conclusion

In *Building Partnerships for Service-Learning* (2003), Barbara Jacoby points out there are multiple models or taxonomies of partnership characteristics and mentions some of those I have also chosen to highlight for this discussion. At that time, she took a somewhat cautionary tone stating, "there can be no recipe or formula for successful, sustainable, democratic partnerships for service-learning." Thinking today of the diverse models provided above, I would say that while we may not need or want to distill all of these into one common list of standards, which would belie the important subtle differences between critical contextual factors, it is obvious there is a great deal of replication across models. I write this reflective essay to encourage the reader to note that there is convergence across these representations that suggest, at a general level, a comprehensive list of the core elements of effective partnerships. Though worded differently and given different importance or emphasis, a number of concepts appear repeatedly. Without claiming to capture these commonalities completely, I offer the following six common themes or elements that seem especially obvious.

First, partners must jointly explore and understand their separate as well as common goals and interests. Parties do want different things from the partnership, but they can only be achieved or attained by cooperating. These relationships must be explicit and lead to the development of a mutually beneficial agenda that identifies where our separate interests are met through shared action.

Second, each partner must understand the capacity, resources, and expected contribution of effort for themselves and every other partner. This can create a realistic sense of expectations as well as a map of the different forms of expertise and wisdom each partner will bring to the relationship. Part of being a good partner is being clear about your own limitations, and respecting the assets and limitations expressed by others. You are working together because each brings unique skills to an endeavor.

Third, effective partnerships identify opportunities for success and evidence of mutual benefit through careful planning of project activities and attention to shared credit. Successes are used as occasions to celebrate and recognize their collective effort. Success is defined and measured in both institutional and community terms. Benefits are balanced with attention to cost, effort and goals.

Fourth, if the partnership is to be sustained, as opposed to being a discrete task, the focus of the project activity and partnership interaction is not merely a set of tasks, but the relationship itself. The core work is to promote ongoing knowledge exchange, shared learning and capacity-building. Partnerships come in different types and each requires a different level of partnership commitment ranging from a single interaction to an interdependent and transforming relationship (Enos and Morton, 2003; Sockett, 1998). Furthermore, successful partnerships plan intentionally for not just activities, but the form, type, processes and governance of the partnership based on the level, complexity and duration of activity.

Fifth, the partnership design must ensure shared control of partnership directions. Intentional and formal construction of the project team and/or an advisory group can ensure that all voices are involved in planning and decision-making and that communication channels remain open. All the models emphasize the need for intentional processes that ensure all have a voice in planning, problem-solving, and management of the work. Shared control can also help keep the entire partnership alert to the need to bring in new members as work evolves.

Sixth, the partners must make a commitment to continuous assessment of the partnership relationships itself, in addition to outcomes. Assessment that involves all partners is the glue that creates trust, generates new lines of work, funding, and keeps shared goals as well as expectations visible to all. The actual core work of the partnership is building the learning relationship that endures beyond individual projects or grants. In this way, we build sustained relationships that respect the needs and interests of all partners, and we use assessment as a constant tool for reflecting on our contributions and benefits – thus building deeper and more authentic reciprocity.

So what is missing from this overly-distilled list of elements for partnerships that most models tend to emphasize? I propose there are two types of information missing. First, the models discussed above describe the ideal features of partnerships. Some suggest process steps or values that are essential, but there is considerably much less written or documented about *how* a partnership would develop these ideal characteristics. We can see a vision of successful partnerships, but we have not adequately examined and captured effective strategies and practices. The second category of missing information is a host of challenging subtopics inherent in many of these common characteristics.

Finally, while there is missing information about partnerships, additional challenges exist. Challenges that require greater study and urgent attention in order to help us achieve the characteristics of effective partnerships have been listed below.

Core Challenges Regarding Attainment of Effective Partnership Characteristics:

- Power Differences – not all partners arrive at the table feeling an equal amount of power to influence and contribute. While the partnership characteristics emphasize the importance of shared power, we need to know much more about how to make partnerships more equitable. The above mentioned CIC concept of parity is also relevant to this challenge.
- Culture/Race Issues – majority institutions often seek to partner in minority communities but lack cultural competencies, respect or expertise to do so. There can also be “old business” between such institutions and minority neighborhoods near campus. Turning these tensions and deficiencies into partnership assets will strengthen both campus and community capacity.
- Language – rhetoric is a strong influence on partnership understanding, for good or for bad, and each partner talks about their perspective in different terms, styles, and with different cultural values in mind. A common

language may not be feasible, but we can explore pathways to better listening and comprehension...the essence of good communications.

- Leadership – strong and effective partnerships can be collapsed by leadership transitions or single strong personalities. The process/governance elements listed in the models hint at the need to learn how to create shared leadership or new leadership assets so as to avoid over-reliance on one or a few individuals.
- Documentation and Measurement – more work is needed to develop simple but compelling ways to measure the quality and impact of partnership work, especially from the perspective of community. A related need is a clear strategy for how data will be used.
- Resources – while the models all mention assets and shared decision-making, the quest for, and management of financial resources is still a challenge. In part, this is because grant funds, by their nature, create closed-end relationships. More work is needed to build capacity for shared funding and more favorable public policy to support this work.
- Visibility – successful engagement programs and partnerships abound, but their stories are rarely captured and disseminated. Public media and the higher education press have not given sufficient attention to recognition of this work. Many formal and informal organizations supportive of engagement have been launched, but they do not always stay aware of one another’s work and the potential for collaboration. Higher education as a sector has grown tremendously in its commitment to engagement in communities, yet the overall visibility is scant. The achievement of many of the ideal characteristics of partnerships, especially sustainability, will be enhanced by making the work better known to educational leaders, policy makers, community leaders, government, and the public.

The above mentioned challenges come up again and again in discussions about partnerships, but they remain sticky issues that deserve our more rigorous consideration through systematic attention to research and documentation. In part, my purpose in this paper has been to propose that we declare victory regarding the general characteristics and core elements of partnerships and redirect our capacity for further discovery to the study of effective partnership techniques and strategies. We should especially focus on the above mentioned seven challenges that are primary obstacles to the further advancement of engagement and partnership development. Given the quality and quantity of partnerships at work in the field, the evidence and data we need to address these challenges surely exists. Collective study, reflection and debate among experienced campus and community partners have led us to a clear understanding of the features of partnerships. We must now direct that capacity and wisdom toward our next critical questions in order to solidify the potential of higher education-community collaboratives to continue to benefit from our shared endeavors. Hopefully, our approach to examining these challenges will also contribute to the greater diversification and expansion of scholars and practitioners who embrace engagement and partnerships. Doing so is essential to the fulfillment of engagement’s potential and true sustainability.

Footnotes

¹ The phrase “public service” is used here in place of engagement, as it was not yet the common term in 1998 when this meeting took place.

² All these resources and much more detail on the principles are available through the CCPH website, which can be found in the Reference list at the end of this paper.


³ These are reported in considerable detail in a brief report available from CIC, or on the web, as listed in the Reference list.

References

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. (1998). *Principles of good community-campus partnerships*. Seattle: Author. Retrieved December 8, 2004, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/principles.html#principles>

Council of Independent Colleges. (2003). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives*. Washington, DC: Author, and Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education. Retrieved November 20, 2004, from http://www.cic.edu/caphe/engaging_monograph.pdf

-
- Enos, S., & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Holland, B. A. (2001). *Characteristics of engaged institutions and sustainable partnerships, and effective strategies for change*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Holland, B. A., & Ramaley, J. (1998). *What partnership models work to link education and community-building?* Paper presented at the Joint Forum of the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC.
- Jacoby, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sockett, H. (1998). Levels of partnership. *Metropolitan Universities*, 8(4), 75-82.
- Torres J. (Ed.). (2000). *Benchmarks for campus/community partnerships*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.



Chapter 2

Reflections on the Wingspread Experience

Bruce L. Mallory

The Place

The claim that “context is everything” may be overblown, but I must begin these reflections on my experience at the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin, with a comment about the setting. Being a first-timer to the Frank Lloyd Wright designed residence, I was struck by the relationship between the physical environment in which we worked and the nature of the work itself. As a place and space intended to foster thoughtful reflection, the congruity between purpose and context was remarkable. The physical reminders of what it means to “reflect” were immediately apparent. The light itself, the late-October light, reflected off the water and through the leaves still clinging to the trees. The sky and vast lake reflected each other’s essence. During the first “reflection break,” as I gazed out the glass walls overlooking the creek, a great blue heron flew gracefully just above the surface of the water, gliding above its own reflection and away from this mortal observer.

This sense of quiet reflection was reinforced by the gentle, graceful staff who were ever present but never intrusive. The men in their bowties, the women in their black and white attire, provided a reassuring sense of elder wisdom and care in their warm demeanor and friendly smiles. In this sense, it was truly touching when the staff and conference attendees spontaneously celebrated the birthday of Dorothy, a member of the Wingspread staff.

The presence of sage elders echoed through the photographs of those who had come before us to the main conference meeting room called “The House.” The profound sense of history, social change, deliberation, and creativity was reified in the black and white images of Eleanor Roosevelt, Buckminster Fuller, David Rockefeller, Julian Bond, Frank Lloyd Wright, Les Aspin, and others who have come to Wingspread over the years. It was truly humbling to follow in such footsteps. I hope (and believe) that our work would have been appreciated by those who came before us.

The Design

As a facilitator, I was privileged to be involved in the design phase of the conference. Lacking prior experience of Wingspread, and not knowing the folks at the University of Michigan I was communicating with during the teleconferences and e-mails that preceded the conference, I was not completely confident about how the conference would transpire. My deep respect for Tony Chambers and Nancy Thomas, who helped connect me to the planning group, assured me that it would all be fine. And I recognize that my fellow planners—Penny Pasque, Ryan Smerek, John Burkhardt, Barbara Holland—were taking a chance on my role and competence as well. However, we entered into the design discussions with a shared commitment to open dialogue, an assumption that participants would be experienced leaders in the field, and a desire to create a structure that was both focused and able to accommodate diverse issues and perspectives.

The temporal structure was generally determined by the Wingspread model, thus our challenge was to create a balance between didactic and transactional talk within fixed time limits. In this light, we developed a relatively typical schedule that began with individual and panel presentations and then moved to small group work, to be concluded with plenary discussions intended to generate action items. These action items would in turn be directed toward local projects, to take back home or they might, we hoped, act as a stimulant to the next level of national discussion (i.e., to continue to develop what was unabashedly referred to as “the movement”). Within this standard structure, we hoped to pose questions that could provoke honest critiques, different—even oppositional—points of view, and more complex understandings of university/college—community partnerships and relationships than is normally the case. Throughout our planning discussions, we tried to design mechanisms that would create equity for all voices, regardless of affiliation or identity. Barbara was especially committed to this goal, and her frequent efforts to correct our academic-centric tendencies were effective as well as appreciated.

Once the conference was underway, it seemed to me and others with whom I talked that we had created a structure that privileged “expert” voices in the initial time blocks at the expense of open, spontaneous dialogue. Even as this concern emerged by the end of the first morning, the shift from didactic to interactive formats began to occur. In this way, any discomfort resulting from the “expert in front of the room” format dissipated. The shift to small group work formed around role- or constituency-alike identities provided the opportunity, just in time, to engage in deeper, more challenging conversations than could occur in the whole group. The memberships of the working groups had a logical and utilitarian basis; the concrete results of the dialogues suggest that the mix was effective and that the dispersal of community partners and educational leaders served the intended purpose.

In my own group experience, and apparently in others’, the dialogue was energetic, creative, and productive. The themes we had developed and referred to several times prior to the breakout discussions seemed to hit the mark, and the questions associated with each theme provided a good stepping off point. The Minority Serving Institutions (MSI) Fellows group, which Brigid Dwyer and I facilitated, began with a focus on “leadership,” one of the seven suggested themes, but we soon moved to a much more complex and complicated discussion that alternatively moved between broad ideological statements and quite concrete, practical examples of action to be summarized later in this essay.

The closing session on late Friday morning was effective and powerful. Those asked to make concluding remarks—Art Dunning, Edgar Lucas, and Grace Lee Boggs—approached the task with great thought and personal investment. Art drew our attention to the importance of the political, economic, and social context of community partnerships and the fact that efforts that fail to take context into account will not succeed. Similarly, efforts that fail to acknowledge the essentially conservative nature of universities, and the concomitant resistance to change, will be doomed. Edgar’s personal expressions of gratitude were heartfelt and humbling, reminding us that our dialogue had been about people as much as ideas and institutions. Grace’s words were characteristically wise, warm, and critical. She continued to challenge the power held by universities and their motivations for engaging in community partnerships. It seemed most appropriate that we would end the conference with a sense of dis-ease as we returned to the work of trying to create authentic collaborations. In this way, we moved over the course of two days from so-called expert, institutional voices to the words of those who work in the streets and storefronts in the name of social justice and community strength. It seems that the process we had designed in the abstract led to the desired results in the practice.

The People and What Was and Was Not Discussed

Not surprisingly, the success of this Wingspread conference resulted from the extraordinary group of people assembled by the Forum staff. The diversity of backgrounds, experience, ethnicity, age, gender, institutional affiliation, and perspectives created a rich mix of ideas that ranged from the philosophical to the concrete. Certainly the extra efforts that went into recruiting community partners were well worth it. Those voices became critical to the goal of authenticity and equity, even as they were small in number.

There was a constant tension throughout the conference between a tendency to defer to those associated with large research universities and the need to hear from those from smaller, struggling institutions. All participants seemed committed to making space for the latter, but those efforts sometimes felt forced and therefore token. In addition, the power and resource differentials between higher education actors and community actors were always present, except in the case of the Minority Serving Institution participants.

In fact, one of the tacit themes of the dialogue was about speaking truth to power, across different types of institutions and between institutions and communities. For example, some participants suggested that large research institutions can act like political empires, with their expansionist and “missionary” zeal. If “knowledge” is the new currency of the post-industrial age, then higher education controls the capital, doling it out with a sense of *noblesse oblige* and expecting to be thanked for doing so.

At a personal level, I was perplexed at the title of the conference, which could be taken as a marker for academy-centric thinking. Interestingly, the conference materials themselves were conflicted about the title, variously referring to “Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement” or “Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Improvement and Engagement.” I expect these were unconscious mistakes, but they are telling nonetheless. Both forms suggest that it is the community that needs improvement, and that higher education will be the impetus or gatekeeper of desired change. What would a different construction convey, for example, “Community Collaboratives for Higher Education Engagement and Improvement” or “Collaborative Engagement for Higher Education and Community Improvement”? Given more time, it would have been interesting to acknowledge these different constructions more explicitly, in order to learn something about how to find common language and common cause in such inherently unequal circumstances.

This discussion leads to another important theme that emerged during the conference, again focused on the choice of words. The provocative use of the metaphors “fear” and “lust” was meant to deconstruct the motivations of institutions seeking community partnerships, especially in the case of large universities located in depressed urban settings. But the diverse interpretations of the metaphors interfered with their intended impact, leading some to see this as further evidence of the “arrogance” of higher education. Similarly, in the MSI Fellows working group, my use of the word “collaboration” was challenged on the grounds that it often signifies the relationship between oppressor and the oppressed, as in “Fascist collaborators.” My effort to draw a distinction between “cooperation” and “collaboration” focused on the depth, complexity, and parity of the relationship, claiming that the former was simply instrumental interaction while the latter could imply more just forms of transaction and transformation. The interchange around these concepts was healthy and worth exploring at more length.

Further challenges to the meaning of taken-for-granted expressions arose around the concept of “community as resource.” Some found this phrase suggests the possibility of exploitation, as in the use of natural resources that are consumed and exhausted by material cultures. This sensitivity is similar to one I encounter in my work in early childhood education, where the notion of “children as our greatest natural resource” is viewed as exploitive. As such, “resources” are objects to be used (up), perhaps to be depleted without replenishment. Again, the power differentials between the resource user and the resource must be acknowledged. It is also true that universities and colleges can serve as resources to the community, but the historical realities suggest that it is more often the case that universities seek something from communities (research sites, internship placements, labor, political support) than vice versa.

Further, communities are essentially permeable, open settings, while universities are closed institutions not easily accessed by outsiders. Communities require no special credentials to be a member (at least not explicitly); universities are by definition places where status and credentials count for much. Thus, the sensitivity to the metaphor of “resource” must be understood as grounded in the historical and significant power differentials at play.

These ideas took on special meaning in the MSI Fellows working group. The ideas of that group will be represented in a separate essay of this monograph, so I will only comment on two themes that are relevant here. First, the power and political relationships between MSIs and their surrounding communities are qualitatively different from those between research universities and their immediate neighbors. The distinctions between the experiences of Johns Hopkins and Morgan State serve as an example to generalize from. As Maurice Taylor put it, MSIs are part of the phenomenon of diaspora; they, like their inner city minority neighbors, are dispossessed and often disenfranchised. MSIs do not serve the mainstream of American higher education; a significant number of them are now on the edge of viability. The institutions, like their neighbors, struggle for existence, power, and recognition, both locally and nationally. In this sense, there is much greater parity in the power relationships and collaborative partnerships that characterize MSIs and communities. Forms of engagement may be more co-equal and interdependent. Dean Taylor writes, “Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) are more likely to be integrated and engaged in their communities because the fortunes of one tend to be the fortunes of the other. Partnerships between HBCUs and

their communities are often about mutual dependency rather than about messianic leadership” (2004). This unique relationship offers opportunity for mutual collaborations and shared forms of engagement.

When the relationship is more one-sided, arguably the more typical case, the concept of “university partner as cultural anthropologist,” suggested by Sandra Pacheco, is useful. In this light, faculty and students seek a deep understanding of “another culture” before they determine how to enter, interact with, and leave the community. There is conscious effort to participate in the rites, routines, and rituals of the community, and to behave in ways consistent with community norms. And just as contemporary cultural anthropologists face the dilemma of objectivity vs. social action when they observe injustice, university actors must be clear about the ends they are pursuing when they enter into communities. If the community setting is viewed as an *in situ* lab, or a “living classroom,” an object to be measured or observed, the likelihood of exploitation and insult seems greater. If the community is respected as having worth in its own right and the professor or student understands herself to be a potential intruder or a guest, the relationships will be more equitable and mutually rewarding.

Other valuable ideas will be found in the MSI Fellows paper that is forthcoming. It will be critical for the particular circumstances of minority serving institutions to be recognized as the national discussion on HE-CE partnerships develops. There will be much to learn here, and the lessons will have pedagogical, leadership, political, and financial implications. A beginning point will be to call for national and state policies that assure the viability of minority serving institutions. The interdependence of these institutions and the communities in which they function (geographic as well as social) is real and valuable for both sets of interests.


Closing Thoughts

One of the dilemmas that may face the “public good” movement in higher education is in the way in which universities necessarily operate as corporate entities while they seek engagement with what has come to be called the “third sector” (e.g., see Georgetown University’s Center for Democracy and the Third Sector). Universities and colleges belong either to the public or private sectors of the political economy. Communities, made up of informal and formal networks of citizen actors, are neither—they constitute a third sector. In this third sector, community-based networks focus on highly local problems, from the affordability of housing to the care of children after school and the placement of stop signs at busy intersections. Formal as well as informal community groups address crime prevention, the quality of local schools, the use of land for neighborhood gardens, and the closing of streets during festival celebrations. In Robert Putnam’s terms, it is these community networks that create social capital. They are not corporate in the legal or structural sense, and as noted before, they are open, permeable forms of affiliation.

If, as academics claim, institutions of higher education produce intellectual capital, and communities have the capacity to produce social capital, perhaps this suggests where the twain shall meet. Intellectual capital without social grounding and “real world” testing is of little value; social capital without the infusion of new ideas and experimental-analytical tools defaults to the status quo, even when the status quo creates obstacles to individual and community development. Such an understanding of what each partner brings to the dilemma of asymmetric collaborations may be the first step toward creating a transformative approach to engagement that advances both institutional and community goals. This is not to say that universities are without social capital or that communities do not embody intellectual capital as well, but an understanding of their distinct roles and purposes in society can point toward a site for mutual dialog and action. Again, the lessons to be learned from the experience of minority serving institutions and their communities could be quite useful in resolving the dilemma I have portrayed.

Lastly, if the work of this conference is to be translated into concrete actions and a new understanding of the public obligations of higher education, we must expect that academic leaders—deans, provosts, presidents, trustees—speak often and loudly to this end. Recent commentators have lamented the loss of strong public voices in higher education relative to pressing social problems. Certainly this loss of voice is not because there are fewer issues to speak to. Rather, it seems that the corporate sensitivities of universities and colleges tend to suppress public comment and advocacy.

Our institutions do produce and hold intellectual capital. Our commitment now must be to engage the social capital that struggles for growth and sustenance in local neighborhoods, towns, and cities. A strategic joining of these two forms of capital, based on principles of democratic participation and social justice, could hold great promise. The goal of reciprocal and equitable engagement, in this light, seems possible, if not imperative.



Faculty and Researcher Working Group Participants: Tony Chambers, Arthur Dunning, Ed Fogelman, Richard Guarasci, Ira Harkavy, Jeffrey Higgs, Leonard Ortolano, and Jane Rosser

Chapter 3

Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement: Faculty and Researchers' Perspectives

Ira Harkavy

The following questions help to organize the faculty and researchers' working group's essay from the Wingspread Conference on October 27-29, 2004: (1) What does a successful collaborative partnership between a higher education institution and a community look like? (2) What approaches, organizational structures, and activities are most likely to lead to successful collaboratives for community engagement and the public good? (3) What specific steps might be taken to develop successful collaboratives?

(1) What does a successful collaborative partnership between a higher education institution and a community look like?

The faculty research group identified three key components for a successful partnership.

1.1 Purpose.

A successful partnership is characterized by democratic and civic purposes. The colonial colleges were founded with service as a central aim. Benjamin Franklin founded Penn as a secular institution to educate students in a variety of fields. The other colonial colleges were largely created to educate ministers and religiously orthodox men capable of creating good communities built on religious denominational principles. Specifically, Harvard (Congregationalist), William and Mary (Anglican), Yale (Congregationalist), Princeton (Presbyterian), Columbia (Anglican), Brown (Baptist), Rutgers (Dutch Reformed), Dartmouth (Congregationalist) were all created with religiously based service as a central purpose.

Service to society and fulfilling America's democratic mission was the founding purpose of the land-grant universities. Established by the Morrill Act of 1862, land grant colleges and universities were designed to spread education, advance democracy, and improve the mechanical, agricultural, and military sciences. The spirit of the Morrill Act was perhaps best expressed at the University of Wisconsin, which at the turn of the century designed programs around the educational needs of adult citizens across the state.

The urban research universities founded in the late 19th century also made service their central goal. In 1876, Daniel Coit Gilman, in his inaugural address as the first president of Johns Hopkins, America's first modern research university, expressed the hope that universities should "make for less misery among the poor, less ignorance in the schools, less bigotry in the temple, less suffering in the hospitals, less fraud in business, less folly in politics" (Long, 1992, p. 119). Following Gilman's lead, the abiding belief in the democratic purposes of the American research university echoed throughout higher education at the turn of the twentieth century. Simply put, the democratic mission served as *the* central animating mission for the development of the American research university, including both land-grant institutions *and* urban universities.

“It is not possible to run a course aright when the goal itself is not rightly placed” (Benson, 1978), Francis Bacon wrote in 1620. An abiding democratic and civic purpose is the rightly placed goal if higher education is to truly contribute to the public good.

1.2 Process.

In accordance with the purpose discussed above, a successful partnership should be highly democratic, egalitarian, transparent, and collegial. Higher education institutions should go beyond rhetoric of collaboration and conscientiously work *with* communities, rejecting a unidirectional, top-down approach, which too often describes the actual practice of university-community interaction. The higher education institution and the community, as well as members of both communities, should treat each other as ends in themselves, rather than as means to an end. That is, the relationship itself and the community partners and their welfare (not developing a specified program or completing a research project) should have preeminent value. The collaborative should be significant, serious and sustained, beneficial to both the institution of higher education and the community, and lead to a relationship of genuine respect and trust.

1.3 Product.

A successful partnership strives to make a positive difference in both the higher education institution and the community. Contributing to the well being of people in the community (both in the here and now and in the future) through structural community improvement (e.g., effective public schools, neighborhood economic development, strong community organizations) should be a central goal of a higher education collaborative for the public good. Research, teaching, and service should also be enhanced as a result of successful partnership. Indeed, working with the community to improve the quality of life in the community may be one of the best ways to improve the quality of life and learning within a higher education institution. Among other things, real-world community identified issues and problems are enormously complex, multidimensional, and ever changing, requiring interdisciplinary cooperation and new combinations of schools, departments, and fields if solutions are to be found. In short, when institutions of higher learning give very high priority to actively solving strategic, real-world, problems in and *with* communities, a much greater likelihood exists that they will genuinely contribute to these communities, effectively educate their students for democratic citizenship, develop the knowledge necessary for a democratic society, and significantly advance the public good.

(2) What approaches, strategies and organizational structures are most likely to lead to successful collaboratives for community engagement and the public good?

The faculty research group focused on four areas that are crucial for a successful partnership.

2.1 Institutional Orientation.

A review of the university and college engagement in community development, depict various stages and depth of participation, particularly in the millions in capital development and programmatic activities in local communities in and around these colleges. A key question is not only what activities have occurred, but how much, if any, has community engagement occurred in these activities? Related questions include: How have communities and residents become involved in campus-led activities? How does institutionalization of these activities hinder or help residents and communities to thrive? What do these sectors need from one another in order to develop more effective university-community partnerships? Do worries over daily living and existence prevent residents from fully engaging in the process? Are colleges and universities doing enough outreach to these residents?

No longer working in isolation, academics and residents are forging effective partnerships, at times with the help of the funding community. Nonetheless, there are still specific steps that will assist these collaborative initiatives: documenting successful solutions to critical community problems which showcase the best of research (the university) and practice (the community) to national audiences, increasing the access communities have to practical knowledge about what works, and increasing the capacity of community-based nonprofit organizations to conduct their own research and program implementation. Most important, a partnership must be of real benefit to the community, resulting in an increase in community capacity, increased access to the higher education institution and its resources, solutions to real community problems, and the development of a trusting, democratic relationship with the university.

2.2 Faculty Involvement.

Within universities, efforts to promote stronger connections to communities raise a number of concerns. Objections are raised that community engagement distracts from the faculty's primary tasks of research and teaching, that it values applied research over basic research and social relevance over standards of excellence, that it jeopardizes professional objectivity and political neutrality and thereby undermines the university's claim to institutional autonomy, and last but not least that it involves more work for the faculty. These objections arise in part from misunderstandings about what an institutional culture of engagement entails and from a disregard of the interdependence between the well-being of the university and the well-being of the communities of which it is a part.

Rather than distracting from research and teaching, community engagement enriches both activities, as evidenced by the growing number of faculty and students who participate in programs of public scholarship and civic learning in collaboration with community partners. Moreover, responsiveness to the practical needs of communities inspires basic research no less than applied research, since the discovery of new knowledge is often essential to the solution of immediate practical problems. In fact a clear distinction between basic and applied research is belied by actual experience throughout the natural and social sciences in which there is an ongoing constructive interplay between practical challenges and fundamental theoretical inquiries. The distinction between social relevance and standards of excellence is similarly misleading: Mediocre research and teaching do not serve community interests any more than academic interests. The effective application of knowledge to meet social needs is itself a test of the validity of the knowledge, and in this respect solving practical problems is a critical part of the process of inquiry.

The concern that community engagement means more work for the faculty assumes that engagement involves a separate set of activities distinct from the core professional work of research and teaching. In reality, however, community engagement is not distinct from, but is integral to, all other professional work: it motivates and contributes to research and scholarship, teaching and learning. Community engagement does not impose an additional burden on the faculty but changes and redirects the conduct of inquiry and the process of learning. Community-connected research and learning are different in some important respects from conventional disciplinary-oriented research and classroom teaching, but they are a source of important new knowledge and valuable learning experiences. The institutional challenge is to recognize and reward such public scholarship and civic learning as central to the faculty's professional work.

Concerns about preserving professional detachment and political neutrality raise the important questions of what responsibilities universities have for improving conditions of life in the communities of which they are a part and what stake universities have in strengthening a democratic society. There are no simple answers to these questions. Yet it could be argued that the distinctive mission of the university as it has been traditionally defined—to seek and disseminate the truth—is most secure in a liberal democracy. The values of free inquiry and open discussion we cherish in the university are parallel to the values of free speech, religious toleration, and free assembly that are central to liberal democracy. Democracy is distinctive in safeguarding the widest scope for free inquiry because the legitimacy of democratic practices and decisions rests finally on persuasion and consent, which require ongoing open discussion of prevailing claims to truth and authority. American experience as well as the experience of other countries demonstrates time and again that bad times for democracy are bad times for the university: Times of war, religious zealotry, and political paranoia endanger both democracy and the values of the university.

At issue in all these concerns is the difference between an institutional culture of detachment and a culture of public engagement. Historically, there is a notable tradition of productive, mutually beneficial connections between public, land-grant, and private research universities and their surrounding communities. The culture of institutional detachment that characterizes present-day research universities developed following World War II and during the era of the Cold War. It developed as part of what Clark Kerr calls the shift from the Land Grant to the Federal Grant university. During that period a culture of institutional detachment, together with an ideology of value-free disinterested science, perhaps served the interests of both funding agencies and academic researchers. But times have changed, and a culture of institutional detachment no longer serves (if it ever did) the interests either of the university or of the larger society. Although the acknowledgment of civic purposes as a distinctive responsibility of the university is still uncertain, there have been within the past decade important signs of renewal. Further changes in academic culture and institutional practices are required: The boundaries of our professional worlds must be redrawn, extending them outward to connect with communities as sources of valued knowledge and experience; what counts as significant knowledge must be redefined, shifting away from work within distinct disciplinary paradigms to focus on

solving important problems; the structure of institutional incentives and rewards must be reviewed and revised. These are the formidable challenges that lie ahead.

2.3 Institutional Leadership.

Senior institutional officers at universities and colleges are a necessary component in the larger mosaic of campus and community leadership for civic engagement and democratic education. Presidents and provosts, in particular, must reaffirm the centrality of positive and active citizenship within the legacy and mission of the institution. It is incumbent on them to operationalize this goal within the vocabulary and educational practice of the institution. Simply put, they must insist on the institution's faithful partnership with its own neighborhood community and beyond, practicing institutional citizenship as vivid witness for its students, alumni and campus community.

This senior responsibility is not only established through adequate resource distribution and institutional neighborhood partnerships, but presidential leadership must also assess the institution's true capacity for sustaining enduring community partnership. An internal institutional audit will establish what the university or college can truly support and where and how to align the institution's mission, resources and practices with the demonstrated community needs. By establishing several major priorities for partnership, presidents and provosts will signal the major, but not exclusive, terrain for sustainable college commitments. This needs to be achieved with a presidential initiative to establish a genuine dialogue among campus and community partners, then proceeding with an audit of campus resources and practices. The end result will be a proclamation of major initiatives for sustainable long-term partnerships.

By assessing institutional capacity and aligning the university's commitment with specific community needs, joint initiatives are more likely to flourish. Student learning, compelling research and genuine community progress are the likely results.

The senior leadership team will set the stage for meaningful dialogue with the other campus stakeholders—faculty, students, parents, trustees, alumni, administrative staff, campus workers and friends of the institution. They will be more likely to value these commitments when understood as not fads or merely good intentions, but sustainable and strategic components of undergraduate education, deep learning and democratic responsibilities.

Finally, there is important need for civic-minded associations to provide national leadership for citizenship education. Dialogue, fiscal resources, retreats, conferences on best practices, and symposia on reflective practice all prove to be critical components in these efforts. One additional suggestion focuses on the help we can provide for individuals and programs located in a seemingly civic diaspora within their own institutions. They need legitimacy, research and outside collaborations to extend their work and further the importance of civic education on their campuses. One modest suggestion would provide them with civic engagement visiting consulting teams, fully funded externally, and composed of college presidents/provosts, faculty, appropriate administrative staff (student affairs and/or directors of civic partnerships), student leaders and community partners. Akin to multiple day campus accreditation visits, these teams would assess, assist, link and propel these efforts at the involved, but not civically centric, campuses. Best practices and positive role models help senior leadership, faculty and staff champion and community partners find valuable linkages, proven practices and important colleagues. It is likely that these will move civic education programs to the top of their respective university priorities.

2.4 Infrastructure.

The location of a community-based learning center should be at the heart of the academic line within a university's organizational structure. The director of the center should report to either the chief academic officer or the president of the university. Part of the center's mission should be keeping the focus of all levels of the university (e.g., top officers and administrative staff, members of the board of trustees, faculty and students) on community engagement as a strategy for meeting the university's core missions of excellence in teaching and research.

A key function of a community-based learning center is to be a broker of connections between the community and the university. Such a center can carry out its role as a point of access and a crafter of connections by responding to

1. Requests from *community* organizations for assistance by identifying faculty and students who have an interest in working with community groups on specific issues.

-
2. Requests from *faculty* for assistance in identifying community organizations that could be partners on community-based research projects, service-learning courses, or community service internships.
 3. Requests from *students* who have community-based research ideas but do not know how to locate community partners.

Alternatively, a community-based learning center can take a proactive role by identifying projects that will bring together faculty, students, and community organizations to work on important social problems. This requires a priority-setting exercise that aligns the university's capacities and the community's needs. It may also require creating formal partnerships between the university and the community for purposes of raising funds for project implementation.

While a university needs to sort out its own strategy for helping to create and sustain relationships between the community, faculty, and students, there is a counterpart infrastructure need on the community side, and a university can help with this. Working together with community organizations, a university can help to build a presence within the community for implementing various elements of university-community joint projects. For example, in a project involving tutoring, the university could help raise funds to support tutor coordinators at the schools at which tutoring takes place. Such coordinators could help the schools make more effective use of the resources of the university.

The work of building capacity (in both universities and communities) to support effective university-community partnerships must be viewed as a long term, ongoing process.

(3) What specific steps might be taken to develop successful collaboratives?

3.1. Encourage serious and sustained examination about developing means to promote a shift from a disciplinary to a problem-solving mode of pedagogy and research that involves community members as active, valued participants from problem identification through the implementation process.

3.2. Reward universities for the actual development of democratic, mutually beneficial, mutually respectful partnerships with their communities, not on the basis of mere rhetoric espousing democracy and partnership.

3.3. Gather, identify, and disseminate best practices in all areas of campus/community partnership building and engagement activities. Although best practices have been previously identified by several national organizations and consortia, foundations, and individual institutions, the integration of these documents and models is timely given the level of institutionalization on a national, regional, and local level.

3.4. Develop benchmarks of excellence for campus/community partnerships and civic engagement, such as Barbara Holland points out in an earlier chapter, based on what we already know about best practices in a variety of areas including service-learning, campus/community partnerships, faculty development programs, community-based research, democratic participation, disciplinary engagement, the scholarship of engagement, and administrative practice. The creation of a shared understanding of best practice benchmarks and models will allow for standards of excellence developed to date to be effectively disseminated to institutions and communities currently engaged in program development and exploration.


3.5. Compile and disseminate a list of all of the existing resources available for campus/community engagement including organizations, publications, web-based resources, conferences, and professional development opportunities, funding resources, and advisory structures.

3.6. Create a consulting program that would provide cross-disciplinary consulting teams that could undertake site visits and evaluations to assist college/universities and their community partners. Knowledge of the multiplicity of institutional and community histories, missions and locations should be represented on the consulting team. The diversity of location of higher educational institutions must be represented in the models presented and disseminated.

References

Benson, L. (1972). *Toward the scientific study of history*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Long, E. L., Jr. (1992). *Higher education as a moral enterprise*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University.



National Consortia Working Group Participants: David Cox, Barbara Holland, Elizabeth Hollander, Theodore Hullar, Anne Kohler-Cabot, Cheryl Maurana, Caryn McTighe Musil, Lori McQueen, and Melissa Pearce

Chapter 4

Challenges to Community-Higher Education Partnerships: A Call to Action

David Cox and Sarena Seifer

The Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement meeting at the Wingspread Conference Center in October 2004 focused on two questions: What has been learned about these collaboratives? and What will be the next challenges? In a previous chapter of this publication, Barbara Holland provides a thorough review of emerging answers to the first question. Drawing on research from a number of sources, she identifies core themes about what has been learned. These include the following: 1) partners must jointly explore and understand their separate and common goals and interests; 2) each partner must understand the capacity and expectations of the other; 3) project planning is essential to success; 4) sustained partnerships require commitment to the partnership itself as well as partnership tasks; 5) partnerships must provide shared control of partnership directions; and 6) sustained partnerships require ongoing assessment of the partnership relationships.

In a similar manner, Holland and others have begun to identify a range of challenges for community-campus partnerships (Seifer, 2004). One focus for these efforts has been to identify challenges that are specific to the disparate (and sometimes competing) interests of community and university partners. Another focus has been to identify challenges that arise from studying and improving many community-campus partnerships. This chapter will explore these two types of challenges and propose a potential solution.

Challenges from Disparate Interests and Expectations Between Communities and Universities

Holland notes that higher education institutions define themselves as organizations that discover and disseminate knowledge, yet they tend to be self-referential. In this context, “self-referential” means that institutions focus on issues that pertain to themselves without considering a broader perspective. Colleges and universities impact the communities in which they are located through the way that they use space and resources. Although they examine themselves inwardly, higher education institutions often ignore the effect their activities and interactions have on the surrounding communities. This tendency manifests itself in the projects and activities that higher education personnel undertake. Faculty members’ first priorities are to teach and research, and students’ first priority is to learn. However, these two interests do not automatically translate into meeting the needs or matching the individual project interests of communities.

Seifer (2004) goes further to point out that even if the interests of individual projects involving community residents, faculty members, and students are supportive of one another, broader institutional needs may conflict with community interests. For example, one can find situations in which institutions seeking to meet their space needs are displacing the families of children who participate in tutoring and educational outreach partnerships. In other words, attempts to fulfill institutionally defined needs sometimes dislocate the same persons that the project partnerships seek to serve.

Higher education institutions' tendency to self-reference leads to other challenges. Faculty members' roles and rewards are commonly based on contributions to their disciplines and institutions—contribution to community is either a small part or no part of the faculty rewards system. Thus, there may be little incentive or even a disincentive for faculty members to spend the time required for effective partnering.

Another challenge identified by Seifer (2004) is the failure of higher education institutions to fully engage with or coordinate the range of resources that could be useful for community partners. As a result, the potential for the partnerships to advance both community and higher education institutions is not realized.

Challenges for communities' participation in partnerships can arise from unrealistic expectations by community partners about higher education institutions. Higher education institutions' principal roles in society are to advance and disseminate knowledge; communities' principal interests in partnering with these institutions are commonly to obtain and provide services or resources. Thus, there is a potential disconnect between the mission of the institution and the interests of the community. If the service or resource needs of a community do not align the college or university's role of advancing and disseminating knowledge, then the higher education institution is unlikely to deliver what the community expects.

Similarly, community residents often see higher education institutions as rich organizations with flexible resources. Given differences in power and wealth between communities and campuses—especially for economically distressed communities—these perceptions are understandable. However, many higher education institutions have few available resources that can significantly affect communities. Indeed, the motive for many community partners to enter these relationships is to expand their access to resources; however, this is not always possible. Community partners that hold inflated expectations may be disappointed by the end result, which could then lead to mistrust and could curtail future partnerships.

Another challenge speaks to the imbalance in the organizational infrastructures and capacities of many communities and higher education institutions. Higher education institutions are comparatively mature, active and aggressive organizations and are comparatively rich in resources. As a result, the interests of the higher education partners are more likely to drive the partnership. Given these circumstances, it is particularly important that communities develop their own internal capacities. If this step is not accomplished, the partnership can tend to further (rather than narrow) the power and resource gap between communities and higher education institutions. In addition, Seifer (2004) finds that the higher education institution often initiates the relationship. As a result, the interests of the college or university, which may differ from those of the community, tend to drive the selection and design of projects.

Challenges for Studying and Improving Partnerships

Challenges for thinking about and improving partnerships take several forms. One challenge, noted in Holland's discussion, is concerned with how we have been going about the task of creating knowledge about community-campus partnerships. Many studies about partnerships to date have remained at the case study level. Efforts to build on prior learning and to synthesize results are limited, and as a consequence, there is a rich descriptive literature of the unique characteristics of different partnerships. However, there is limited knowledge about the general features of successful partnerships, and even less is known about the general processes for building and sustaining them.

Another challenge, ironically, may be found in the many efforts that have arisen to address partnership challenges at broader levels. The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, and the New England Resource Center have been partners in efforts to change faculty roles and rewards to be more supportive of community-higher education partnerships. Other community and higher education associations have been encouraging and supporting partnerships with an aim of providing experience and knowledge about addressing partnership challenges. Some of the organizations and projects involved with this work are shared in Table 1.

Table 1: *Partial List of Organizations and Projects Involved in Community-University Partnership Work*

- The results reported by Seifer (2004) come from the work of **Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH)** a national organization that promotes health through community-campus partnerships.
- The **American Association for State College and Universities' (AASCU) American Democracy Project** is based on community-campus partnerships.
- Sections of the **National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC)** are reporting on and advocating for the partnerships.
- **Campus Compact's** work with service-learning has led to one of the larger national movements encouraging the development of partnerships and leading to principles and lessons learned from partnerships.
- The **National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good** is providing leadership in addressing the link between partnerships and service to the broader interests of communities and higher education institutions.
- The **Association for Community-Higher Education Partnerships** was formed with the explicit purpose of focusing on partnerships with economically distressed partnerships and is leading an effort to identify keys to "real" partnerships.
- National associations representing aspects of communities are working to address the questions, such as **The National Congress on Community Economic Development (NCCED)**, which sponsored the **National Council on Community-University Partnerships (NCCUP)** to advance partnerships with its community members.
- **Seedco Inc.**, a national community development operating intermediary, is supporting academic partnerships as a key part of its community building strategy.
- Among foundations funding community-higher education partnerships, the **Johnson Foundation** has sponsored a series of conferences on the issues associated with developing effective partnerships.
- The **W.K. Kellogg Foundation** sponsored the first of a series of 75th anniversary seminars on Schools of Public Health as Engaged Institutions.

Each of these separate initiatives has a niche in addressing the challenges associated with the partnerships, and each should be encouraged to continue and develop answers within its niche. However, a set of challenges remains from these separate efforts. One of these is reflected in Holland's observation about limits to developing understanding and strategies. At present there are too few forums and symposia across these many initiatives to cumulate knowledge and foster synthesis of these findings; as a result, shared learning and significant action has been limited. In particular, there is a need for forums in which community partners involved in higher education partnerships have opportunities to share their experiences and collaborate with one another.

Another challenge that stems from the many separate efforts is especially significant for realizing the full potential of these partnerships. Realization of that potential will require a transformation within communities and especially within higher education institutions. In his study of the development of higher education in the U.S., Ira Harkavy (1997) identified a critical factor for bringing about that level of change; that U.S. research universities have come to form the dominant model for how higher education institutions are to perform in society. This transformation occurred following World War II when large amounts of federal funds used to support basic research related to national defense. The result was to move research to the forefront of many higher education institutions. Yet there are many questions that remain unanswered about the role of these institutions: What was essential for that transformation? How has this transformation helped or hindered community-higher education partnerships?

This observation about federal funding is neither a claim that it will take defense-level spending to transform U.S. higher education institutions into supporters of community-higher education partnerships, nor it is an attempt to compete with or limit national defense or other types of spending. However, it is our contention that a robust and sustained level of federal funding is necessary if the number and level of such partnerships are to be sustained and expanded. Federal money is often essential in leveraging institutional and local support for partnership projects. Such funds are particularly attractive to universities as they often pay for significant indirect costs. Federal funding is valued by higher education institutions because of the prestige, recognition, and legitimization it represents. Further, federal support of a project or initiative is a confirmation that the project is an important part of the national agenda. In sum, if community-higher education partnerships can be expected to advance, the availability of significant federal dollars will be critical.


Achieving a sufficient level of federal commitment will be a difficult task. Current fiscal pressures at the federal level due to a combination of foreign policy commitments, domestic program demands, and revenue cuts combine to increase that difficulty. Acting separately, none of the many initiatives in support of community-higher education partnerships is sufficient on its own to achieve that federal commitment. Success will require collaboration among these initiatives to form a critical mass sufficient to achieve the federal support required to truly institutionalize community-higher education partnerships as a fundamental part of U.S. higher education.

Conclusion and the Call for Action

The 2004 Wingspread Conference on *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* identified emerging understanding of the characteristics of partnerships required for sustainable success. Work across the U.S. by a range of organizations is aimed at solving challenges that often curtail community-campus partnerships. Conference participants are organizing to bring together this learning to further the movement. Achieving the full potential of the partnerships will require developing collaboration among those groups for critical sustained funding and learning.

References

- Harkavy, I. (1997). The demands of the times and the American research university. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11, 333–336.
- Holland, B. (2005). Reflections on community-campus partnerships: What has been learned? What are the next challenges? In P. A. Pasque, R. E. Smerek, B. Dwyer, N. Bowman, & B. Mallory (Eds.), *Higher education collaboratives for community engagement and improvement* (pp. 10-17). Ann Arbor, MI: National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good.
- Seifer, S. (2004, December 17). Message from our executive director. *Partnership Matters: Newsletter of the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health*, 6(23), 2. Retrieved December 20, 2004, from www.ccph.info



Minority Serving Institutions Working Group Participants: Grace Lee Boggs, Brigid Dwyer, Bruce L. Mallory, Sandra Pacheco, Santos Rivera, and Maurice C. Taylor

Chapter 5

Mission and Community: The Culture of Community Engagement and Minority Serving Institutions

Maurice C. Taylor, Brigid Dwyer, and Sandra Pacheco

Introduction

The Wingspread Conference on Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement provided an opportunity to examine college and university partnerships with community organizations. Over the course of the three days we spent together, members of community organizations, professors, graduate students, and directors of college and university service organizations exchanged ideas about partnerships between colleges and universities and their surrounding communities. In this space we were also able to discuss at length, not only the types and models of higher education-community partnerships that exist, but also the historical nuances that surround such partnerships. Representatives of the different groups shared their various institutional interests and organizational values in order to establish a broader scope for our work. Representatives also discussed the personal experiences, beliefs, and salient issues in establishing partnerships within our own spheres.

This chapter summarizes the discussion at Wingspread focused on Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs), a group of higher education institutions that comprise Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs). The participants in this small group included three fellows from the Kellogg Minority Serving Institutions Fellows Program, the director of The Boggs Center to Nurture Community Leadership, one graduate student, and the provost of the University of New Hampshire.

Discussions among the MSI participants centered on two broad areas. First, we focused on the experiences of MSIs and the ways in which MSI university-community partnerships differ in comparison to the university-community partnerships among larger, traditionally white institutions (TWIs). The plenary sessions suggested models in which TWIs initiate community partnerships in order to advance the institutional interest of the university, rather than utilize a model that speaks to community-higher education partnerships that already exist. In addition, our small group discussed the often long-standing economic and social relationships between MSIs and their surrounding communities. The second area discussed concerned the similarities and differences between and among HSIs, HBCUs and TCUs regarding particular approaches to community-higher education partnerships.

Within these two areas of focus, particularly interesting conversations emerged on three topics: the meaning of collaboration and cooperation in the context of university-community partnerships; the impact on partnerships where the university possesses greater power and resources than the surrounding community; and the concept of the community as another culture. The remainder of this text will focus more explicitly on these aspects of the discussion.

The Standard Model

There are many different models for community higher education partnerships. The model presented at the Wingspread Conference assumed a large research university with sufficient resources to support ancillary service

projects aimed at improving a surrounding community. This model also assumed a community population that differs by race and/or income from the students, faculty and staff at the university. The primary struggle for a university under such a model is to find ways to “spread the wealth” without patronizing, demeaning, or otherwise dominating members of the various community-based organizations with which the university is doing business. Such a model ignores, however, a large number of colleges and universities that do not share such an approach to university-community partnerships—Minority Serving Institutions.

Typically MSIs do not have significant wealth disparities between themselves and their local communities, and they generally have fewer operating resources compared to large research universities. Because they often differ with respect to mission, population served, and resource base from TWIs, it is imperative that they approach community partnerships with strategies that reflect those differences. The standard type of community-higher education partnerships is predicated on two primary assumptions: 1) there is a wealth disparity between the institution and the community, and 2) the communities that surround higher education institutions and the institutions themselves are distinct and separate, not just physically, but also culturally. Generally speaking, MSIs do not meet these two assumptions; rather they tend to be institutions that are closely connected to their surrounding communities wherein the community and the institution organically work together. The two are largely dependent upon one another for economic and social viability. Thus, if MSIs were to embrace the standard model of partnerships, they could damage not only the community, but also themselves; thus, for MSIs, the standard model is simply not appropriate. This point will be elaborated below with specific reference to HBCUs.

Although MSIs often have different funding sources than other institutions of higher education,¹ many MSIs express a great commitment to service and to their local communities. HBCUs have traditionally had more of a focus on community partnerships in the missions of their institutions than have other institutions (Henry, 1998). Rowley, Hurtado, Ponjuan, and Mawila (2003) found that Historically Black Colleges and Universities actually allocate more money for public service activities than other higher education institutional types. Furthermore, they found that HBCUs have levels of community partnerships more or less equivalent to the partnerships at other institutions. As such, HBCUs as well as Tribal Colleges and Hispanic Serving Institutions occupy a particularly challenging position as they maintain their traditions of service and intimate ties to their host communities. The institutions grapple with these traditions as their missions evolve and resources are reallocated towards or away from community partnerships. In summary, the standard model assumes that colleges and universities pursue community partnerships to advance altruistic, though typically ancillary, interests. Representatives of the MSI work group observed that MSI community partnerships are often tied to those colleges and universities historical mission.

The Nuance of Language Use

An earlier chapter of this manuscript discussed the struggles that were faced throughout the conference with respect to the use of appropriate language. Specifically, participants struggled to find appropriate language to convey the necessity of equitable partnerships between higher education institutions and communities. Discussion about language use occurred not only in the larger plenary sessions of the conference, but also continued in the MSI small group as we wrestled with the terms “collaboration” and “cooperation.”

On the surface, these two terms convey the ideas of working together and partnership; however, upon closer analysis, both terms may contain pejorative connotations. For example, “cooperation” suggests that communities must *cooperate* with the institution’s aims. That is, cooperation may suggest a degree of coercion based on the power differentials described earlier. Alternatively, “collaboration” may be associated with phrases such as “collaboration with an enemy,” suggesting that colleges and universities are not desirable and trustworthy partners. Discussion about these terms was spirited and allowed us as advocates of community empowerment to think more deeply about language use and how the unintended impact of terms and phrases can influence the quality of community partnerships. However, because of the fluid relationship between community-Minority Serving Institution relationships, the impact of terms and/or language may in fact be minimalized when compared to the potential for offense amount TWIs and their communities.

After the Wingspread Conference ended, thoughts about our discussion on terminology continued to percolate. Introspective thoughts and personal debates on the issues surrounding community-higher education partnerships continued. Questions about the way in which “community” is defined and used on the university campus arose.

Questions were posed such as, is the word “community” inclusive or exclusive? And, does the term “community” serve to connect people or draw lines and create distinct groups?

The word “community” often is intended to *include* people as members of a group. When the phrase the “university community” is used, it is often used to refer to those who attend or work for the institution, and sometimes also includes nearby citizens and residents who participate in college or university events. However, when preceded by an article—*the*, the phrase “the community” is used as a way to distinguish between groups, between those on campus and those who are off of it; and it thus becomes a way to exclude some from *the* “university community.” Likely, this word choice reflects an unconscious distinction that is made in the English language; nonetheless, the difference between “community” and “*the* community” convey pejorative connotations similar to those that “collaboration” and “cooperation” induce.

However, similar to “collaboration” and “cooperation,” “community” and “*the* community” carry less significance in descriptions of how MSIs and their surrounding communities relate to efforts to advance common goals. Within their common history of social oppression and/or economic neglect, MSIs and their communities are more reliant on one another for success. In this light, opportunities for MSIs, especially HBCUs and Tribal Colleges, to dominate community resources are limited.

Characteristics of HBCU-Community Partnerships

While not all Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)² have identical missions, all share common origins tied to the history of racial segregation. The core mission of most HBCUs is to provide access to educational opportunity for dispossessed children of the Diaspora. Hence, HBCUs were developed to educate largely the poor descendants of American slaves, and their African, Caribbean, and occasionally Native American kin folk. The communities in which HBCUs are located tend to reflect the community of poor, black, and brown people from which their students are drawn. The communities in which HBCUs are typically located are part of the very Diaspora that underlies their mission. As such, for HBCUs, the mission to provide access to educational opportunity for children of the Diaspora means having a different kind of relationship with its community than the one contemplated by what we have referred to above as the “standard model.”

HBCU-community partnerships differ in several significant ways from the model contemplated by Wingspread participants. First, while it is true that the faculty and administrators, in particular, may have personal wealth and a level of education that sets them apart from the community in which the HBCU is located, the institution itself is not likely to have surplus resources to support community improvement projects. The nature of HBCUs’ collaboration or cooperation with its surrounding community is consistent with its mission; i.e., to supply that which it provides to its students—namely education, information, and access to opportunity. The name of the national organization of presidents of HBCUs, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), reflects the shared historical mission of its member institutions. This mission is also the shared hope of the residents in most of the communities in which HBCUs are located.

Second, the model contemplated at Wingspread assumes that the power and resources of the university are vastly different from that of the community in which it is located and that the university can influence business leaders and congressional and/or state legislators to help the community and/or its community based organizational partners. For many HBCUs, there is little difference between the power and resources of the institution and that of the community in which they are located. Often the business leaders, government agencies, and legislators neglect both the HBCU and its community.

In fact, many HBCUs that are engaged in numerous community partnerships ranging from flood relief to efforts to provide affordable housing are also struggling to remain financially and academically viable. Because they have been so invested in their local communities, some HBCUs have sadly lost the struggle to remain active in their communities and stay afloat as colleges and universities.

Morris Brown College (GA) is perhaps among the most visible example of an HBCU that is well known in its community³ but has lost its regional accreditation and therefore its ability to access to federal funds for tuition for its students. Barber-Scotia College (NC) has also recently lost its accreditation. A number of other HBCUs are facing various accreditation sanctions⁴ that threaten their institutional as well as their community’s viability. Ironically, the

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) has placed LeMoyne-Owen College (TN), represented at the Wingspread conference by the executive director of its Community Development Corporation, on “warning.” St. Augustine’s College (NC), which also has a Community Development Corporation, was placed on “probation” by SACS. While these are examples of the most extreme cases of institutions that contribute to their communities and have had negative consequences, not all HBCUs are in situations in which their accreditation is being threatened.

Third, the idea of the community as “another culture” that needs to be studied as a separate entity from the university quickly gained acceptance at the Wingspread conference, especially within our small working group. While it is true that communities of poor people of color are not without internal complexity, the notion that the community is distinct from the university makes more sense where a major research university, with a traditionally white faculty, staff, and student body, is located in the midst of or is attempting to form partnerships with a blighted urban or rural community. Universities represented at the Wingspread conference that fit this model include Stanford and the University of Pennsylvania. The clash of cultures between the university and community involving these universities and their respective communities is apparent and studying the community as a separate culture may indeed be necessary in order to initiate effective community engagement.

On the other hand, because in large measure of the history of segregation in American higher education, the faculty, staff, and students at HBCUs more closely reflect the population of their surrounding communities in terms of race, socioeconomic status, and (sub)culture. This is not to suggest that studying the community surrounding HBCUs is without merit; it is to suggest, however, that such an exercise is likely to reveal as much about the role of the particular HBCU in the community as it reveals something previously unknown about the community. In short, HBCUs are more likely to be integrated and engaged in their communities because the fortunes of one tend to be the fortunes of the other. Partnerships between HBCUs and their communities are often about mutual dependency rather than about messianic leadership.

While these specific cases were tailored to the experiences of HBCUs, they are also relevant to the experiences of HSIs and Tribal Colleges. While not explicitly discussed here, Hispanic Serving Institutions and Tribal Colleges are also very tied to their communities and regularly engage in partnership activities.

Recognizing the Particular Characteristics of Communities

As has been previously mentioned, universities are not isolated from their local and regional communities. Relationships are developed for different purposes. Simply maintaining open communication with the neighboring community benefits both parties. Some communities are identified as disenfranchised from mainstream society and therefore in positions of greater relative need. That is, some community residents are economically disadvantaged with fewer resources available to them. Colleges and universities are more likely to reach out to communities that fit this profile in order to share their resources.

Furthermore, many institutions believe students should be engaged in working with communities as part of their educational experience. As a part of this institutional commitment, students are encouraged to think beyond their own needs and the needs of their family and friends to assume some responsibility for the greater good of society. In practical application, students demonstrate social responsibility in various ways such as providing assistance in a “clean up” activity, tutoring, and mentoring to younger students in schools within the community.

Providing services, as stated above, benefits any community. However, who determines community needs—the university, or the community, or both? What type of relationship is it? Is it reciprocal? Does one party serve the role of giver, where the other party is the dependent receiver? Colleges and universities can easily play a role of giver and perceive the community as the beneficiary of its gifts, when, in fact, communities return gifts to students when providing them with rich life experiences.

Are all communities created equally? That is, do we assume similar community characteristics in all communities? How do we learn about those characteristics? Do we assume all communities are alike, or do we approach each community as similar **and** different? Do we understand a community from the perspective of its own individual dynamics, characteristics and potential? Should we take a similar approach to learning as multicultural professionals and researchers suggest with cross-cultural groups?

The literature in multiculturalism generally supports viewing each culture with openness and without stereotyping. It could be quite instructive to take key principles that are applied to multicultural groups and apply the same principles to communities. In other words, we might approach communities as we would approach an ethnic or cultural group that is not one's own.

Practical utilization of these multicultural principles when entering into community-higher education partnerships would involve using the following framework in the partnership:

- 1) having a concern and respect for the uniqueness of a community,
- 2) emphasizing a community's worth and dignity,
- 3) helping communities place a priority on achieving their own goals (which may differ from the university's goals), and
- 4) helping the community explore its own traits, characteristics and potential.

With these points in mind, a community should be viewed as a culture into itself. When working in communities, we should approach learning about the culture of community as multicultural researchers and professionals suggest when working across cultures.

Ethnic minorities are greatly overrepresented in many economically disadvantaged communities, and for many of these individuals, their lives may be characterized by negative life circumstances and hardships, such as low income, unemployment, little or no savings, and little property ownership. In contrast, many university students come from middle-class and upper-middle-class families and are not likely to have similar experiences. If students at colleges and universities are unaware of these different life experiences, they may appear insensitive to the issues of a community. However, students must also enter into communities with an open mind and not generalize or project stereotypes onto residents.

Minority Serving Institutions by definition enroll a critical mass of ethnic minority students and, as a result of their student composition, MSIs benefit from non-White ethnic and racial demographics with regard to community partnerships. Students and communities need to develop a stronger identification with each other in order to open up communication and enhance relationships. These stronger relationships have the potential to eventually develop stronger outcomes for TWIs, students, and communities, alike.

Conclusion

In summary, any model of university-community partnership that assumes a vast power and resource differential between the university and the community is inconsistent with the history of Minority Serving Institution and their communities. Given the post-civil war origins of the majority of HBCUs and the lingering legacy of "separate but equal" in higher education,⁵ the faculty, staff, and students at these institutions are more like the members of the community than they are different from the community residents. Concerns such as those expressed throughout the Wingspread conference, wherein a university must be careful not to dominate its community partners, would not be particularly applicable to MSI-community partnerships. Certainly the very fine nuance in the meanings of collaboration and cooperation are distinctions without practical significance in the type of mutually dependent projects that characterize typical MSI-community partnerships.

Furthermore, it may be more useful to contemplate a Diaspora model of college/university-community partnerships to reflect the engagement of MSIs with their often poor and disaffected urban and/or rural communities. In such a model the central idea is a mutually beneficial relationship, where the goal of the partnership is the contemporaneous strengthening of the MSIs as well as their surrounding communities. In this way, the institutional mission of educating the children of the Diaspora also forms the foundation of MSI-community partnerships.

The conversations that took place over the time the MSI working group spent together were quite valuable. We were able to examine the ways in which present models of community-higher education partnerships may work for some institutions, but may also fall short and not meet the needs of other communities or institutions. The thoughts in this essay represent the thoughts of individuals at very different institutions—a Hispanic Serving Institution, a Traditionally White Institution, and a Historically Black Institution. Our perspectives are diverse and not intended to

capture the diverse perspectives of the hundreds of Minority Serving Institutions in the U.S. The size, geographical location, historical ties with the community, and whether the institution is public or private all affect the types of partnerships Minority Serving Institutions will have. Within this essay we discuss community-Minority Serving Institution partnerships from the perspectives with which we are most familiar. Our thoughts presented in this piece should be considered in this light. We believe they accurately reflect our present positions, but also acknowledge that as institutions of higher education change, so will the models of community involvement.

Finally, it should be noted that the voice of a Tribal College Leader was sincerely missed at this Wingspread conference and within the MSI working group. Much of what was offered about MSIs in this chapter may be applicable to Tribal Colleges; however, this was not confirmed by a leader at a TCU at the Wingspread conference. Within discussions about Minority Serving Institutions it is important to keep in mind that Tribal Colleges and Universities, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Hispanic Serving Institutions are distinctly different institutional types with important differences among them.

Footnotes

¹ David Maurrasse's *Beyond the Campus* details Hostos Community College, which derived its funding from various sources including local activism to raise funds from the State of New York and the Bronx borough.

² See www.ed.gov/about/inits/list/whhbcu/edlite-list.html for a list of the 105 public and private colleges and universities included among the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities.


³ Morris Brown College, well known for its marching band, was featured in the popular movie *Drumline* and lost its accreditation shortly after the movie's release.

⁴ For example, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), in whose jurisdiction a number of HBCUs are located, identify "Warning" and/or "Probation" as two such sanctions. "Warning" is the lesser of the two sanctions and is applied where an institution fails to make "timely and significant progress" toward correcting deficiencies. Probation is invoked as the last step before an institution is removed from membership. See www.sacscoc.org/pdf/Sanctions.pdf.

⁵ For example, the issues involving Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment around Mississippi's three HBCUs and five white universities were first filed in 1975. The case reached the Supreme Court in the case of *Ayers v. Fordice*, 505 U.S. 717 (1992). This year, almost 30 years after its initial filing, the Supreme Court finally approved the settlement of the case. A number of states, including Maryland, continue to operate their higher education systems under desegregation agreements enforced by the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights.

References

- Jones, B. W. (1998). Rediscovering our heritage: Community service and the historically Black college. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education* (pp. 109-123). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Maurrasse, D. (2001). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Rowley, L. L., Hurtado, S., Ponjuan, L., & Mawila, K. (2003, May). *Defining the engaged campus*. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Tampa, FL.



CIC Working Group Participants: Victor Bloomfield, John Burkhardt, Hiram Fitzgerald, Edgar Lucas, Paul Pribbenow, Steven Schomberg, and Ryan Smerek

Chapter 6

Research Universities Working Together to Serve Multiple Communities: The Committee on Institutional Cooperation Engagement Initiative

John C. Burkhardt & Rachel Lewis

Introduction

As stated in the prefatory materials for this conference at Wingspread, universities respond to the “high expectations from the societies of which they are a part.” The fact that this observation is attributed to a consultative document issued by the Association of Commonwealth Universities offers some suggestion as to the complex meaning of the word societies in this context. Just as the universities once associated by membership in the British Commonwealth, previously organized on a specific educational model and with similar empire-related goals, have kept “society” with one another after decades of decolonization and independence, so too do colleges and universities in the United States choose to “judge, and learn to judge themselves, by the variety and the vitality of their interactions with society” (at large) but also by the society of their institutional peers.

The theme of this conference at Wingspread offered a chance to focus on inter-institutional collaboration that might foster engagement activities within colleges and universities as well as to examine particular challenges to engagement that are associated with various institutional missions, cultures and traditions. This purpose, and the method chosen for organizing the work of the three-day discussion, reinforced the understanding of multiple “societies” to which every institution belongs and for which every institution owes some form of leadership and service. Consistent with that theme and with previous work at Wingspread at which research universities were convened to discuss their role in modeling and promoting engagement, several members from Midwestern research institutions (Minnesota, Michigan State, Illinois and Michigan) were invited to the conference and met as a group during several of the small sessions. They were joined by a community leader and by a private college president in their discussions.

This set of institutions, with their peers, had been working together for approximately one year prior to the conference on a joint analysis and a set of recommendations for improving engagement activities on their campuses. Their work together was organized under the auspices of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC). The Committee on Institutional Cooperation, established in 1958, is the academic consortium of twelve major teaching and research universities in the Midwest. While the CIC member institutions include the members of the Big Ten Athletic Conference plus the University of Chicago (which originally competed in the conference), its programs and activities extend to all aspects of university activity except intercollegiate athletics. The CIC is headquartered at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the office is supported through member university dues.

The effect and scope of the CIC has been vast and continues to grow. The twelve institutions themselves enroll over one-half million undergraduate, graduate and professional students and employ more than 33,000 full time faculty members. They also provide educational and political leadership within key Midwestern and Mid-Atlantic states. The eight CIC states made up 24% of the total U.S. college enrollment in the fall of 1999 (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, cited in Chronicle of Higher Education, 2002). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2000), more than 13.6

million children are enrolled in preschool through twelfth grade in the eight states that comprise the CIC region. According to the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) 1988:2000 conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), approximately half of all high school completers will earn at least an associate's degree within eight years (NCES, 2005). NELS data also suggest that about 75% of eighth graders finish high school, which means that if 10.2 million finish high school, only 5.1 million will earn a college degree (NCES, 2005).

It was at the request of the chief academic officers of the member institutions that a special Committee on Institutional Engagement be formed in 2002 to advise the provosts regarding opportunities for enhancing and extending engagement efforts on their campuses, and providing some basis for defining and benchmarking engagement activities across the CIC. The charge of the Committee on Institutional Engagement is to frame what is meant by engagement, benchmark strategies for public engagement across the CIC, identify performance measures, and advise CIC members' Committee on collaborative opportunities that could be included in the CIC strategic plan.

The special committee on engagement is organized under the chairmanship of Hiram F. Fitzgerald who represents Michigan State University. Other members of the committee include campus representatives with various titles including deans, vice-chancellors, and vice-provosts of institutional concerns such as extension, public engagement, and outreach. The mix of titles and institutional functions is one of the first forms of evidence that the work of engagement goes by many names and many definitions within the participating schools.

Background to the Appointment of a CIC Special Committee on Engagement

The work of the CIC committee is not occurring in a vacuum. For some time, there has been interest, perhaps even more accurately described as pressure, building in research universities to more effectively define and promote the types and forms of engagement that are consistent with their special institutional missions. It is not for a lack of engagement within these institutions that the attention was focused on them. Many of the institutions, particularly those in the CIC, have historic traditions of service to their states owing to Land Grant roots. In addition, some of the most ardent proponents and most imaginative examples of engagement activities are based in the region. One of the works considered to be among the most influential in the field has a Wingspread genesis and a CIC connection. *The Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University*, documented in June of 1999, calls upon leaders of research universities to help catalyze and lead a national campaign or movement to reinvigorate the public purposes and civic mission of American higher education. Many CIC schools have been leaders in service, outreach and engagement work for many years.

Considerable attention had been centered on the idea of engagement by the work of a national commission funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in the late 1990s. The Kellogg Commission brought together presidents and chancellors from the nation's Land Grant institutions to focus on the vitality and future prospects for a covenant between institutions of higher education and the publics they serve.

The Kellogg Commission (2001) called upon public universities to renew their commitments to society and to redesign their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become more productively involved with their communities within the context of the institutional mission and faculty reward structure. The Kellogg Commission concluded that:

Our tried-and-true formula of teaching, research, and service no longer serves adequately as a statement of our mission and objectives. The growing democratization of higher education, the greater capacity of today's students to shape and guide their own learning, and the burgeoning demands of the modern world require us to think instead of *learning, discovery, and engagement*. (p. 27)

But neither the Wingspread Declaration, nor the six reports of the Kellogg Commission, nor the increasing forms of scholarship that were shaping the field provided sufficient guidance to academic officers to provide clear objectives for institutional leadership or outcome measures to help monitor excellence within their institutions. Furthermore, there was some initial discussion underway within the North Central Association, the regional accrediting body for the Midwest, of the possible inclusion of measures for outreach and engagement as part of the institutional self-study process. Hence, responding in part due to the strong influence of the larger higher education environment, but also

to practical and immediate concerns, the CIC members felt that greater specificity regarding definitions and benchmarks for engagement was needed.

The Work of the Special Committee

To provide a basis for generating benchmarks to allow CIC institutions to monitor their effectiveness in achieving the goals of engaged universities, the Committee drew on several member institutions' definitions of outreach and engagement and other national resources to develop the following definition (CIC, 2005):

Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

The Special Committee constructed a survey of institutional practices consistent with their newly adopted definition. Each institution was asked to provide responses to approximately thirty general items that probed issues of organization, activities and programs, faculty incentives, relationship to promotion standards, learning connections and communities served. The responses to this survey provided a very rich description, but not one that could be easily summarized in columns and rows. It was at this point, once again, that the considerable differences between institutions were made apparent. It would be expected, for instance, that a private institution such as The University of Chicago or Northwestern University might approach engagement in different ways than, for example, the University of Illinois. And yet, despite the differences in governance, mission and culture, all of these three schools serve the city of Chicago in important ways. Predictably the people and organizations of the city of Chicago as a community and region might hold similar expectations of all of these institutions despite their notably different traditions and their public or private missions. In a similar vein, despite their location within the same state and the presumption that Michigan residents might expect similar services from their two leading institutions, there were significant differences between the University of Michigan and Michigan State University in the ways they conceptualized and organized for engagement activities. There were differences noted between the two great state-serving university systems based at Penn State and Minnesota, despite their shared histories as Land Grant institutions and statewide responsibilities. It is important to note that while those of us who work in the society of higher education see and expect differences between institutions based on their history and formation, the public often sees big, powerful, educational institutions.

In spring 2003, the CIC Committee and the Council of Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) agreed to work together to generate benchmarks that all universities could use to assess institutional effectiveness and service to society. Further, at about the same time, the North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission revised its "Criteria 5: Engagement and Service" accreditation standards by developing operational components and definitions of engagement, and by establishing engagement benchmarks.

Based on an integrative assessment of the work occurring through NASULGC and North Central, and further informed by the work of Barbara Holland (2001) and James Votruba (2003), the CIC Committee adopted a set of engagement benchmarks and measures that would allow universities to assess fulfillment of their engagement and public service missions. These benchmarks were intended for both internal application and external use. In fact the committee identified three applications for their benchmarks:

- 1) Mission fulfillment
- 2) Articulation of Engagement to External Audiences
- 3) Guidance for Tenure and Promotion Programs for Faculty

Mission Fulfillment and Communication with External Audiences

One of the frequently cited concerns in the committee meetings was the challenge of articulating to the public and to key constituencies the value and importance of engaged efforts by the university. This is somewhat of an irony. It is curious that colleges and universities have to make a case that their service to society should be valued. But the challenge might be best served by seeking an understanding of the connections people make between higher

education and the public good. A survey of public opinion conducted in 2002 through Kellogg Research and Consulting found that, in general, the public thinks the main role of higher education is to educate students for careers. Beyond that, promoting active citizenship is seen as a secondary and non-formalized part of the experience. Further, some focus group and survey respondents worried that a stronger focus on creating active citizens would impose outside values on students and make additional demands on them.

Members of the public, especially in the context of focus group research, can describe ways in which they are served by university programs, but they do not seem to have a general language to describe this, and in turn, are misled or confused by some of the language often utilized by academics in the field of higher education. The term “outreach” in particular may suggest to them a questionable, politically charged, and directionally skewed notion.

Therefore the committee hoped that the guidelines might serve as the basis for gathering economic development and technology information and building support for higher education among legislators, donors, and the public. Such measures also provide departments with criteria for including scholarly engagement activities for faculty and instructional academic staff as part of the tenure and promotion processes.

Guidance for Faculty Evaluation

It was hoped that these guidelines might address one of the tougher problems facing the provosts—faculty tenure and promotion decisions that needed to be changed if engagement activities were to be embraced as evidence of faculty scholarship and teaching. The problem here is that the criteria for these decisions vary considerably from institution to institution, from discipline to discipline and from department to department. There is arguably not much standardization across existing and relatively well-established forms of teaching and scholarship—a circumstance that is acknowledged but hardly celebrated across academe. To create any form of useful standard out of a multi-institutional committee and lacking a disciplinary context as well might have been too much to expect.

In fact, the special committee presented its recommendations with the hope that they might address no fewer than seven issues faced by chief academic officers and five challenges faced by departments and individual members of the faculty. This was ambitious indeed.

Table 1: *Intended Applications of Committee Recommendations*

- A means of assessing an institution’s fulfillment of its engagement/public service mission
- A management and planning tool for ensuring that academic units contribute to the institution’s overall engagement commitment
- Evidence of organizational support for engagement
- Economic development and technology transfer data
- A basis for telling the engagement story and building support for higher education among legislators, donors, and the public
- A new engagement rubric for comparing peer institutions nationally
- A means of assessing student awareness of civic responsibility
- Rewards system for faculty and academic staff that include an engagement dimension
- Curricular impacts of student engagement
- Applications of the dissemination of research and transfer of knowledge
- Meaningful engagement with communities
- Applications of the evidence of partnership satisfaction

Recommendations of the Special Committee - Institutional Benchmarks

The Committee issued the following recommendations as indicators to “which all CIC institutions can aspire as they advance their engagement commitments.” The committee allowed that each institution will be at a “different place in realizing its goals.” The committee offered a distinction between the “benchmarks” and the “indicators” that described and followed each benchmark: benchmarks applied to all the CIC institutions; the outcome indicators were meant only to be illustrative and would likely vary by institutional context.

1. *Evidence of Institutional Commitment to Engagement*
 - 1.1. The institution’s commitment is reflected throughout its administrative structure.
 - 1.2. The institution’s commitment is reflected in its reward structure for faculty and staff.
 - 1.3. The institution’s commitment is reflected in its policies and procedures designed to facilitate outreach and engagement activities.
 - 1.4. The institution’s commitment is reflected in its policies and procedures that are responsive to students.
2. *Evidence of Institutional Resource Commitments to Engagement*
 - 2.1. The institution shows evidence of leadership for engagement and outreach activities.
 - 2.2. The institution shows evidence of financial support for engagement through its budgetary process.
 - 2.3. The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff time is devoted to outreach and engagement activities.
 - 2.4. The institution includes engagement activities as part of its programs for faculty, student and staff development.
3. *Evidence that Students are Involved in Engagement and Outreach Activities*
 - 3.1. The institution shows evidence that engagement is both an implicit and an explicit component of the curriculum and co-curricular activities.
 - 3.2. The institution shows evidence that it attends to diverse communities, peoples and geographic areas.
 - 3.3. The institution shows evidence that students are engaged in projects and programs that are centered in communities.
 - 3.4. The institution provides educational opportunities that clarify the engaged nature of research and scholarship.
4. *Evidence that Faculty and Staff are Engaged with External Constituents*
 - 4.1. The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff are involved in scholarly activities related to the institution’s engagement mission.
 - 4.2. The institution shows evidence that faculty and staff are engaged in community well being and economic development initiatives in partnership with external constituents.
 - 4.3. The institution shows evidence that there is translation and transfer of new knowledge to external audiences.
 - 4.4. The institution has policies regarding intellectual property rights that foster the availability of knowledge and research as a public good.
5. *Evidence that Institutions are Engaged with their Communities*
 - 5.1. The institution shows evidence that it has established university-community partnerships with diverse entities.
 - 5.2. The institution shows evidence that it participates in environmental scanning in order to determine critical social needs.
 - 5.3. The institution shows evidence that communities have access to and use university resources and programs.
 - 5.4. The institution shows evidence that its partnerships strive to improve community well being.
6. *Evidence of Assessing the Impact and Outcomes of Engagement*
 - 6.1. The institution shows evidence that it has assessment tools and assessment plans developed in collaboration with external partners.
 - 6.2. The institution shows evidence that its experiential learning programs are evaluated in partnership with constituents served.
7. *Evidence of Resource/Revenue Opportunities Generated through Engagement*
 - 7.1. The institution shows evidence that it generates additional tuition and fee revenues from educational experiences that serve external audiences.
 - 7.2. The institution shows evidence that it generates economic impact from its engagement activities.

At the conclusion of its report to the chief academic officers, the special committee requested further instruction as to how they might continue to be helpful. Among four suggested areas of follow up, the committee included an offer to conduct a three-year evaluation study of the benchmarks on one or more campuses. The committee also suggested that a formal attempt be made to determine “best practices” across the consortium, build a web-based tool for promoting engagement work, and seek funding for joint activities.

The Discussion at Wingspread

The October 2004 Wingspread gathering occurred at a most pivotal time in the effort to define, extend and enhance engagement activities at CIC institutions. As described previously, there was substantial external attention given to the idea of engagement on these campuses. Second, the institutions themselves, especially the state supported schools, had experienced several years of successive cuts in funding. Engagement work seemed to be especially vulnerable to cuts of this sort, and in a number of states, extension services, once thought untouchable, were on the chopping block in institutional and state-level discussions. Third, there were higher education commissions at work in several of the states. These commissions, typically convened by the state governor, were increasingly focused on the ability of higher education to create jobs for the state. A state commission had recently completed its work in Ohio. In Michigan a similar commission was developing its report to meet a mid-December timeline.

Within this context the CIC Committee on Engagement had prepared its report and recommendations to the chief academic officers, who were to discuss them on December 8th, about one month later. The Wingspread gathering provided the chance for several members of the committee to think beyond their final report and to plan what might be next in their work together. They were also challenged to consider the information and perspectives that had been introduced at the general sessions at Wingspread earlier that same week. In particular, a new emphasis on reciprocity and mutual benefit in higher education-community relationships was taking shape through the presentations and the reading materials organized for the conference.

For these reasons, it was of great benefit that the CIC member representatives were joined in the Wingspread discussions by Edgar P. Lucas Jr., the leader of a Chicago non-profit organization, Renacer West Side Community Network. Mr. Lucas, whose article on college-community partnerships, *Mutual Awareness, Mutual Respect: The Community and the University Interact* (Mayfield & Lucas, 2000), provided a particularly helpful backdrop for his observations, described the benefits and the pitfalls of university work in communities. His guidance to the committee and his generous participation in the formal and informal discussions held at Wingspread over three days was timely and valuable. It also served as a potent reminder that the community partners to an engagement effort have their own sense of “best practice” and perhaps benchmarks of their own to suggest.

While at Wingspread, the CIC members were introduced to other consortial groups, both formal and informal, that were coming together to explore opportunities for improving their service to society. One group in particular, representing the institutions of North Carolina and represented by a faculty delegation from Chapel Hill, suggested the potential for other partnerships among research universities. There were also representatives from Hispanic Serving Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). While these institutions differed significantly in size and mission from the CIC research universities, they brought special and unique lessons regarding the role of the institution in preserving cultural identities, in serving special constituencies, and in promoting access and opportunity for first generation students.


Follow up on the Recommendations and Wingspread Discussions

In the month that followed the meeting at Wingspread, the chief academic officers of the CIC reviewed the report and the recommendations of the special committee on engagement. They were generally quite pleased with the report and appreciated the special efforts to integrate the findings and directions of the various professional groups that were at work in this area. They accepted and endorsed the report in general, but they asked the committee to go back and give further thought to the applications and then limits to which the recommendations might be extended. Further, the provosts wanted to make sure that one of the hallmarks of engagement with the research university was that it be grounded in scholarship. It was argued that the same rules of evidence be brought to bear on outreach activities as are at work in the laboratory or in the classroom. This reminder that, while forms of scholarship may differ, rigor and a basis in evidence are consistent expectations seems prudent and appropriate.

Several institutions within the CIC consortium have pledged to conduct benchmarking studies over the next several years. Consistent with the suggestions of the special committee, activities to better describe and promote best practices across the member institutions are being organized and several collaborative funding proposals have been discussed and will be submitted to major foundations to support work across the region.

References

- Chronicle of Higher Education. (2002). *The nation*. Retrieved March 28, 2003, from www.chronicle.com/weekly/almanac/2002/maps/states_share.htm
- Committee on Institutional Cooperation. (2005). *Resource guide and recommendations for defining and benchmarking engagement*. Champaign, IL: Author.
- Holland, B. (2001, November). *Measuring the role of civic engagement in campus missions: Key concepts and challenges*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, VA.
- Kellogg Commission. (2001). *Returning to our roots: the engaged university. Executive summaries of the reports of the Kellogg Commission on the future of State and Land-Grant Universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Mayfield, L., & Lucas, E. P., Jr. (2000). Mutual awareness, mutual respect: The community and the university interact. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 5(1), 173-184.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2005). Retrieved May 16, 2005, from the Data Analysis System at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/das>
- US Census Bureau (2000). *American Factfinder Tool*. Retrieved May 16, 2005, from <http://www.census.gov>
- Votruba, J. C. (2003, October). *Plenary session: Defining public engagement*. Paper presented at the Outreach Scholarship Conference, Madison, WI.



North Carolina Working Group Participants: Penny Pasque,
Thomas Ross, Michael Smith, Ron Strauss, and Judith Welch Wegner

Chapter 7

Partnering with the Old North State

Judith Welch Wegner

Partnerships between colleges and communities can take many forms, as participants in the recent Wingspread Conference and colleagues elsewhere have come to know. Often such partnerships link campuses and their surrounding communities through discovery of mutual interests and dynamic interchanges that meld teaching, research, and service of many sorts. A delegation affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (“Carolina”¹) and leaders from the state’s non-profit sector² participated in the gathering, as part of a continuing effort to learn about “best practices” from the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good and others around the country.³

Although UNC-CH, like others in attendance, values important partnerships with individual non-profit groups and communities around the state, the delegation had a somewhat different focus, for it sought to answer the question, “How does a great public university build strong and enduring partnerships with the state from which it springs?” This essay proceeds in two parts to address that question. It first sketches some of the key forces that have shaped the university’s partnership with North Carolina over the past two hundred years. It then offers reflections on some of the challenges facing faculty leaders⁴ as they seek to understand and strengthen the University’s social compact with the state’s people and key institutions in changing times.

Past as Prologue

Many factors have contributed to Carolina’s commitment to the Old North State⁵ and the state’s commitment to Carolina. Three key factors may be particularly significant for the purposes at hand: the shared narrative, the students, and the faculty.

The Shared Narrative

Founding

The University of North Carolina was envisioned from the state’s first conception. Section XLI of the North Carolina Constitution of 1776 linked elementary and higher education and commanded the legislature to create requisite institutions,

A school, or schools, shall be established by the legislature for the convenient instruction of youth, with such salaries to the masters, paid by the public, as may enable them to instruct at low prices: and all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities. (para 41)

After the Revolution, a group of visionary leaders including William Richardson Davie and Samuel Ashe (who had served in the war, participated in the national Constitutional Convention, and emerged as a leading jurist) were charged as trustees with carrying out this mandate. The General Assembly ratified the University charter in December 1789, stating in its preamble that

in all well regulated governments it is the indispensable duty of every legislature to consult the happiness of a rising generation, and endeavor to fit them for an honorable discharge of the social duties of life by paying the strictest attention to their education, and that, a University, supported by permanent funds and well endowed, would have the most direct tendency to answer the above purpose.

The Trustees rode out by horse to identify a propitious site for the University's setting, and settled upon Chapel Hill after sitting while sitting under a tree (still cherished as the "Davie Poplar"). After struggling to raise funds, the state's leaders laid the cornerstone for the University's first building (Old East) in 1793. In January 1795 the University opened its doors, and in February its first student, Hinton James, arrived, having walked from near Wilmington (a journey that now takes about three hours on the Interstate by car).

The Civil War

The Civil War proved traumatic for the state in many ways, as the population was split between the views of those in the mountains (with greater affinity to the Union) and those at the coast (with greater affinity to the Confederacy). Deaths ran high and the economy was ruined. The University remained open through this period, though with modest numbers of students and faculty. The campus and the "state" were wedded (literally), when Elizabeth Swain (daughter of the then university president) married the leader of the occupying Union army in the war's aftermath, to the scandal of many. The University closed its doors during Reconstruction on two occasions: In 1868 when state's new Republican leadership replaced President Swain and the war-time faculty with their own allies, and in 1871 after the state's elite refused to send their children there and financial problems ensured. The University reopened in 1875. During this period, as was true earlier and later, the fates of the University and the state were closely linked.

It was also during this period that language was introduced into the State Constitution that has become part of the fundamental narrative regarding the University's social compact with the citizens. Among other things, the 1868 Constitution reiterated the role of education as a foundation for civic good and collective happiness, linked public elementary and secondary education inextricably with higher education, introduced new funding strategies, and pledged access and opportunity to future generations that has echoed down the years. The Education Committee of the Constitutional Convention recommended the incorporation of the following language that resonates in key provisions of the state constitution to this day, notwithstanding the turmoil and bloody personal and political divisions that followed Reconstruction.

SECTION 1. Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to the good government and happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education, shall forever be fostered and encouraged.

SEC. 2. The General Assembly at its first session under this Constitution, shall provide for a general and uniform system of Public Schools, wh[e]rein tuition shall be free of charge to all the children of the State between the ages of six and twenty-one years.

SEC. 5. The General Assembly shall make such provisions by taxation or otherwise, as will secure a thorough and efficient system of Public Schools throughout the State.

SEC. 6. The University of North Carolina, with its lands, emoluments and franchises, is the property of the State, and shall be held to an inseparable connection with the Free Public School system of the State.

SEC. 7. The General Assembly shall provide that the benefits of the University, as far as practicable, be extended to the youth of the State free of expense for tuition; also, that all the property which has heretofore accrued, or shall hereafter accrue from escheats to the State, or distributive shares of the estates of deceased persons, shall be appropriated to the use and benefit of the University.

SEC. 17. As soon as practicable after the adoption of this Constitution, the General Assembly shall establish and maintain in connection with the University a Department of Agriculture, of Mechanics, of Mining, and of Normal Instruction.

SEC. 18. The General Assembly is hereby empowered to enact that every child of sufficient mental and physical ability shall attend the Public Schools during the period between the ages of six (6) and eighteen (18) years, for a term of not less than sixteen months, unless educated by other means.

This language—particularly the requirement that “the benefits of the University, as far as practicable, be extended to the youth of the State free of expense for tuition”—and the associated sentiments have proved a beacon of hope for generations of North Carolinians who have come to see the University as a window of opportunity that will be open based on merit, whatever their means. Although it took many more years before this pledge was broadened to encompass not only White men, but also people of color and women, it nonetheless provides vital clarity to the partnership between the University, political leaders, and the state’s people today. Acting on this commitment, state policy requires Carolina to enroll 82% of its entering undergraduates from among North Carolinians, and these energetic and energizing students play a critical role during their college years and long thereafter in assuring that Carolina maintain its commitment to the state from which it sprung.

Wartime Leaders

In the twentieth century, two crucial University leaders reshaped and added to this core narrative: Edward Kidder Graham (who served as University President during World War I) and Frank Porter Graham (who served as President during the Great Depression, World War II, and its aftermath, and is in memory revered as the University’s patron saint).

Edward Kidder Graham attended the University and was called back to serve on its English faculty, progressing through the ranks to chair, dean of the College of Liberal Arts and in 1915 its President. He was a beloved teacher who called forth the best in his students, and set high expectations for the student body generally, asserting that they must exercise self-governance if they were to be accorded responsibility. Speaking in 1914, while acting President, he stressed that, “We hope to make the campus co-extensive with the boundaries of the State” (cited in Snider, 1992, p. 160). In his inaugural address the following year he asserted that the

state university is the instrument of democracy for realizing all high and healthful aspirations of the state... Research and classical culture are as deeply and completely service as any vocational service... too precious to be confined to the cloisters and sufficiently robust to inhabit the walks of man. (cited in Snider, 1992, p. 160)

In his speeches and travels Edward Kidder Graham stressed the ways that the University could serve the state by fostering its economic and social development. Appointing a professor of economics allowed him to create momentum toward creation of a school of business. After a bequest from Lily Kenan Flagler Bingham, he encouraged faculty and alumni to dream about how the state might be better served, and proposals emerged for programs in public health, public administration, social science research and more. Graham also established an extension bureau, and a chair in rural social economics. He created an elected faculty advisory committee, and brought alumni more closely into the fold. Before war broke out he created a voluntary military training program. When war came he focused the campus’ energy toward winning by sending students off to fight after reminding them that Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence “are not empty phrases. Cut them and they bleed with the blood of men and women and little children” (Snider, 1992, p. 168). In October 1918, after influenza broke out on the campus, Edward Kidder Graham fell ill and died of pneumonia five days later, at the age of 42. Cut down in the prime of life, on the eve of Armistice, he cast a long shadow that resonated with the times. Many he touched went on to shape the University in his image, building upon the commitment to public service that he has espoused during his all-too-short time at the helm.

Another Graham—Frank Porter Graham—served as university leader from 1930-1949. A cousin to Edward Kidder Graham, he was known for his idealism and student activism (as president of the campus Y, student body president, campus paper editor, and cheerleader) during his student days. Graduating from Carolina in 1909, he taught, earned his masters degree in history, served in the Marines during World War I, then returned to his alma mater where he became the university’s first dean of students before joining the history faculty. He worked with University President Harry Chase, assisted in defeating legislation designed to limit the teaching of evolution, supported expansion of public libraries, fostered adoption of workers’ compensation legislation, and drafted an “industrial bill of rights” in support of union rights to organize and better working conditions. He was drafted as University chancellor in 1930, contrary to his expectations and predilections, and began an impassioned defense of the university’s budget, bringing

to bear his gifts as a teacher in lobbying the state legislature. The loyalty he commanded within the campus was legendary, and his vision of the University as a “stronghold of learning and an outpost of light and liberty for the people of a free state” (cited in Snider, 1992, p. 210) has resonated down the years.

Graham was known for hewing to conscience despite potential ruffling of feathers. He supported free speech on campus by the likes of Langston Hughes and Bertrand Russell, ordered that a Jewish student be admitted to the medical school (the dean resigned), urged significant reform of college athletics, and insisted that student leaders involved in a major cheating scandal be suspended. He was ever the friend of students, opening his home on Sundays for an open house. He helped smooth the path for establishment of a “consolidated” university system composed of Carolina, NC State, and Greensboro with each campus claiming particular specialties, as a means of addressing economic challenges, notwithstanding faculty and public dissention including dissention from some leading Chapel Hill trustees. Graham became known for his ties to the Roosevelt administration, assisting with creation of consumers’ councils to foster economic recovery, chairing the group that helped develop the Social Security System, and developing strategies for federal aid to education. During World War II, he was responsible for bringing a navy pre-flight training facility to the campus. While continuing in his role as university president, he also served on the war labor board from 1942-1945. After the war, he convinced the governor and legislature to fund creation of a four-year medical program in Chapel Hill, and with the help of others fostered support for linking the program to health centers in rural areas.

Graham was repeatedly called to national service in the years that followed. He was granted a leave to serve as mediator for the United Nations with regard to disputes between the Netherlands and forces in Indonesia (international work of the sort he subsequently pursued in connection with the conflict in Kashmir and elsewhere in the last years of his life). When Graham was elected as president of the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies, his affiliations with progressive groups were cited by commentators who unsuccessfully argued for him to be denied requisite security clearance. Graham denied Communist sympathies, and insisted that no Carolina faculty had such ties. His outspoken leadership had drawn the respect of many, and in 1949, he was appointed to the United States Senate to fill a short-term vacancy, stepping down from his post at Chapel Hill. Running in the Democratic primary for a full term in 1950, he initially prevailed despite red-baiting, but was narrowly defeated in a race marked by race-baiting and dirty tricks.

Graham’s devotion to students and their devotion to him marked a generation of Carolina graduates in critical times. He embodied the potential for public service to which a great public university could aspire. He made the case for support of public higher education in the hardest of economic times. He was known for his courage and conscience even by those who rejected his viewpoints. He was an intellectual and personal champion of those in trouble with limited means. He drew widespread support among his faculty colleagues and permitted or supported new public-service ventures they brought forth. His gifts as a teacher touched those on campus and elsewhere, and his commitment to the greater good (rather than his own) gave him heroic proportions that grew ever larger in what many still remember as vicious and unfounded political defeat. In many respects, the Frank Porter Graham story—devotion to the state’s young people, courage in articulating important ideas, unselfish service in times of need—are central to Carolina’s self-image and public persona, notwithstanding the passage of years.

The University’s Public Face

Numerous other leaders played important roles in embodying Carolina’s commitment to public service throughout the years. Commitments to public service and public education often emerged as signal attributes in the policies espoused by Carolina graduates who entered political life. Examples include Governor Luther Hodges (who served as John F. Kennedy’s Secretary of Commerce after creating the “Research Triangle Park” that has fueled the state’s economy through links with its research universities). Hodges (1960) said,

Many have asked, ‘Why is the University of North Carolina outstanding? Why is it unique?’ . . . I would suggest that the University is outstanding because it is a leader. It has exercised leadership in the unceasing fight for higher standards of education throughout North Carolina, and its influence has been felt in every corner of the state. (para 1)

Hodges was followed by other progressive governors with Carolina ties. Governor Terry Sanford created the state's community college system, supported K-12 education, addressed poverty, and later served as president of Duke and as a member of the United States Senate. Governor James Hunt played a critical role within the state and nation in improving pre-school and K-12 education. Leaders such as these—as well as business and civic leaders dispersed throughout the state's 100 counties, in business, professional, political, and civic roles—have provided a clear nexus between public higher education and the social benefits that flow to the state.

The links between Carolina and the public good have also been embodied in other media, however. One notable example is the long service in multiple venues of William C. Friday, who served as president of the consolidated university system from 1957-1986 (See Snider, 1992). Friday presided over many changes as the University system came to encompass 16 diverse campuses (including those which has been historically limited to people of color), navigated desegregation, and fought against the Speaker Ban. He became a national leader in higher education, serving as president of the Association of American Universities, a member of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, and prominent proponent of the Knight Commission's efforts to spur intercollegiate athletics reform.

Friday's long service and enormous talents gave the university an enduring public face during three decades of significant changes (See Link, 1997). Friday's strong sense of the public service mission of Carolina and other campuses in the expanded public higher education system cemented public and political understandings of its special role as a contributor to the public good. When he retired, Friday became president of the William R. Kenan, Jr. fund with offices based on the Carolina campus. In his new role, Friday continued to embody the traditions and values of the great public university, focusing on such issues as the need to improve reading literacy, address poverty, and foster integrity in the corporate sector.

Friday also cemented shared understandings and mutual commitment between the University and the state in another guise. Beginning in 1971, he hosted a weekly public television interview program ("North Carolina People") that featured him in dialogue with political, business, civic, and academic leaders from around the state. This series has continued for more than three decades and has proved an indelible symbol of constructive dialogue between the university and the people of the state.

Charles Kuralt, a proud son of the University, provided another such symbol. During his years "On the Road" for CBS, he modeled the kind of gentle inquiry, humor, perspective, learning, and common-sense sensibilities in which Carolina takes special pride. Kuralt's involvement with the University was extraordinary particularly in his later years when he assisted in fundraising for the School of Social Work which his father had attended. During the University's Bicentennial celebration, he framed the following tribute, which continues to be recited and shown on television during basketball games and more.

What is it that binds us to this place as to no other? It is not the well or the bell or the stone walls. Or the crisp October nights or the memory of dogwoods blooming. Our loyalty is not only to William Richardson Davie, though we are proud of what he did 200 years ago today. Nor even to Dean Smith, though we are proud of what he did last March. No, our love for this place is based on the fact that it is, as it was meant to be, the University of the people. (Kuralt, Ruffin, & Howe, 1994)

The widespread sense, both on campus and elsewhere, is that Kuralt "got it right." Kuralt's words captured the institution's tradition and aspirations ("the people" love Carolina because "it is, as it was meant to be"), and the invigorating force that the state's population have provided as generations of young people have come to take a precious place with the best and brightest of their generation, here "on the hill."

In sum, for more than 200 years, the people of North Carolina, Carolina's academic leaders, and public spokespeople have shared a powerful narrative that emphasizes the fundamental interrelationship between the common good and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. As the sections that follow illustrate, that narrative has been brought to life by generations of students and faculty, cementing the partnership between the campus and the state.

Students

Educating the State's Youth

The students who attend Carolina have shaped its character in many ways. The campus has long treated undergraduate education as central to its mission, but has grown to encompass expansive graduate and professional school programs as well. Of the nearly 19,000 applicants for the first year class that entered in fall 2004, about 3,600 ultimately enrolled. Students at Carolina are predominantly White (73% of the student body overall, with 10% African-American, 0.8% Native American, 5.8% Asian, 2.5% Hispanic, 4.7% non-resident alien, and 3% "other").

The University system's Board of Governors has long struck a balance calling for 82% of freshmen to be drawn from North Carolina residents (of approximately 8,000 North Carolina applicants, 57% were admitted, while of nearly 11,100 non-resident applicants, only 20% were accepted). This commitment to the resident population has meant that talented residents have an excellent chance of admissions, and that the strong preponderance of the student body mirrors the state. Students at Carolina in fall 2003 were drawn from all 100 North Carolina counties. All but one state was represented, with enrollment most heavily representing states in the southeast and the Atlantic coast.

Carolina's graduate and professional student population numbers about 10,000, with a more complex mix of resident and non-resident populations (the preponderance of graduate students in many departments are non-residents, but many establish residency in due course). The University is home to a remarkable array of professional school programs (in medicine, pharmacy, nursing, public health, dentistry, education, business, journalism library/information science, government, social work, business, and law) while those in many of the larger professional school programs are drawn more significantly from in-state. Many of the professional school programs deliberately maintain a strong preponderance of students drawn from within North Carolina, and many of their graduates also remain in-state following graduation, thereby cementing the University's ties with the state.

Low Tuition and Financial Aid

Entering students are drawn from both lower income and wealthy families, with 26% reporting family incomes of under \$50,000, 23% with incomes of \$100,000 and above, and the rest in between. Carolina's historically low resident tuition levels have played a crucial role in assuring access to all students regardless of family wealth (undergraduate tuition and fees remain just above \$4,400 per year). The university and the state have long been committed to providing ample need-based financial aid for undergraduate students, using a combination of private, state, and federal funds. It is one of the few universities that can boast that the documented need is fully met by a combination of grants and loans for all undergraduates requesting financial assistance. This emphasis has been supplemented by signature merit-based awards, most notably the Morehead Scholars Program (modeled on the Rhodes program, it provides 40-60 full four-year scholarships to students culled from regional screening programs within the state, as well as those from high schools nationwide), and the Robertson Scholars Program (provides a means for top students to gain an education at both Carolina and Duke nearby). These programs together assure that Carolina students are drawn from across the economic and social spectrum in ways that few universities can match.

A recent commitment by Carolina to assure access for those of limited means has resonated with the school's historical commitment to the state and renewed the collective sense of its role in assuring high-quality education to those who might otherwise lack the opportunities that higher education can provide. The "Carolina Covenant" program was launched in 2003 with the commitment that participating undergraduates from families with incomes below 150% of the federal poverty level will be awarded a combination of grants and work-study opportunities that will allow students to graduate without taking on loans. Covenant students can also participate in mentoring programs designed to meet their interests and needs. The fall entering class of Carolina Covenant Scholars included 225 students, with average parental incomes of \$13,400, average GPAs of 4.21, and average SATs of 1209. Sixty percent were students of color, and 55% were first-generation college students. The program was expanded in fall 2004 to students from families earning up to 200% of the federal poverty level, and applies to non-residents and transfer students as well. Chancellor James Moeser (2003) called the Covenant a promise and "an expression of our values at this university" where the "idea of access is deeply embedded in our genetic code" (para 4) as the nation's oldest public university.

Student Involvement in Public Service

Carolina’s undergraduates enter with a substantial commitment to public service, with 93% reporting that they have engaged in community service in high school (UNC National Survey of Student Engagement [NSSE], 2003). They also come with leadership experience (64% of the recent entering class reported founding an organization, captaining a sports team, or serving as student body, class, or club presidents). Recent responses to the National Survey of Student Engagement suggest that Carolina students build upon these instincts and graduate with experiences and commitment to public service that exceed those of many of their peers. The following summary of responses to the 2003 survey demonstrates such student viewpoints. There was a significant difference in the means between the NSSE and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Table 1. *NSSE Results.*

Question (2003 NSSE survey)	Scale	Carolina: mean	NSSE: mean
<i>Have you done or do you plan to do the following by graduation:</i>	0 = no or undecided 1 = yes		
Community service/volunteer work		.88 (frosh) .82 (seniors)	.75 .66
<i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas:</i>	1 = very little 2 = some 3 = quite a bit 4 = very much		
Voting in national, state, local elections		2.10 (frosh) 2.09 (seniors)	1.84 1.85
Contributing to welfare of community		2.50 (frosh) 2.67 (seniors)	2.34 2.40

Organizational Structures Offering Encouragement and Support

Carolina’s students are currently involved in more than 500 student organizations, including several that stand out because of their links to public service. Among these groups, the Campus Y stands out for its history, breadth, and stature. Founded in 1859, “the Y” is no longer affiliated with the YMCA or the YWCA. Instead, the Campus Y is known as a hub for student activism, with a proud history of social protest and activism that has focused on campus integration, opposition to the Vietnam War, and support for campus workers. Operating from a building in the heart of campus, the Y focuses on “the pursuit of social justice through the cultivation of pluralism” (Campus Y, 2005, para 1). It serves to link numerous affiliated groups and initiatives in varied on-campus dialogues and extended off-campus service activities. More than 650 students participate in its work each semester.

Assisting People in Planning Learning Experiences in Service or “a.p.p.l.e.s.” was founded in 1990 by student activists. Its stated mission is to function as “a student-led program at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill engaging students, faculty, and community agencies in service-learning partnerships” with the goal of “foster[ing] socially aware and civically involved students through participation in an enriched curriculum and hands-on experiences that address the needs of North Carolina communities” (a.p.p.l.e.s., 2005, para 4). In the 2003-04 academic year the program worked with 36 faculty members in 16 departments who offered service-learning courses; 759 students served 133 different organizations as a result.

More recently, the Carolina Center for Public Service (CCPS) was established in 1999 as an offshoot of grassroots efforts begun by the “Public Service Round Table” as discussed below. The CCPS “leads the University’s engagement efforts and service to the state of North Carolina and beyond by linking the expertise and energy of

faculty, staff, and students to the needs of the people” (CCSP, 2005, para 1). The CCPS is a major hub of student activity, but plays a broader role as well. It seeks to “advance the quality and sustainability” of public service through “effective practices”; “recognize and celebrate exemplary service”; “share information, strategies, and outcomes of UNC’s service endeavors”; and “facilitate community-based scholarship in addressing community issues” (para 2).

Among its most notable accomplishments, the CCPS has created a substantial, searchable database that provides North Carolinians with information about service and engagement efforts located in each of the state’s 100 counties. The database serves as a means to link faculty, staff and students on campus with each other in order to enhance the efficacy of their efforts in the field and facilitate future engagement efforts that meet community needs. The CCPS also operates grant programs that support service-oriented initiatives by student organizations and faculty, funds summer fellowships in support of service projects, and recognizes significant service accomplishments by leading faculty, staff, students, and student groups through yearly awards. The CCPS sponsors a variety of training opportunities for student leaders, members of the community, and faculty seeking guidance in participatory community-based research.

The CCPS was also responsible for the establishment of the “Public Service Scholars Program” which recognizes Carolina undergraduates who provide exemplary public service through a carefully structured program incorporating training, reflection, and outreach. Full-time students with at least four semesters remaining may enroll in this program. Each participant must complete 300 service hours (tracked through an on-line reporting system), two service-learning classes, and skills-training in four identified skills areas, while also preparing a final service portfolio and maintaining a minimum GPA of 2.5. Those who meet these requirements receive recognition on their academic transcripts (“special recognition of public service” for those with a 2.5 GPA or better, and “public service scholar” for those with a 3.0 or better). The program also provides more intangible benefits, including opportunities to interact with faculty and community members, and the satisfaction of contributing to the betterment of communities around the state. Nearly 300 undergraduate students are participating in this program, with more expected in future years. Graduate and professional students have similar opportunities for public service through “pro bono” efforts and clinical programs that provide opportunities to serve those of limited means.

General Attitudes of Students on Public Higher Education

Against this backdrop, it is worth concluding this section with some examples of Carolina students’ own thinking about what it means to be a “great public university.” At a campus forum in fall 2004, resident and non-resident students offered the following comments on this theme:

- *Going to a public university means that the common citizen has paid for my education, and that also means that I have an obligation to give back to society (through those who paid for me to learn).*
- *[A] public university is a university for everyone. There should not be any limitations on who is able to attend. Everyone is equal.*
- *I think public universities like UNC deserve distinction because they have a responsibility to educate and improve the immediate community, and they have a commitment to consider the interests of their own. They also attract others like out-of-state students that respect their attention to public service and leadership.*
- *I think that what’s unique about UNC-CH as a public university is twofold: history and accessibility. UNC’s posture as the first public university is important and guarantees its place as a perennial leader in higher education policy. Furthermore, as an out-of-state student, I have been struck by the one-of-a-kind attachment that North Carolinians have toward UNC and its ability to serve the state. In doing so, I think it’s vitally necessary for UNC to open its doors to as wide a range of students as is possible to create a society of students that is reflective of the society we would like to live in.*
- *I think there is a distinction between UNC and many private universities in that UNC was founded to serve, educate and better the State of North Carolina, not just the members of the university. I think it causes our campus to have an extremely large commitment to community, even more so than many other state universities that weren’t founded on these beliefs or don’t still have such an influence from their state. My sister went to [great Midwestern public university], and seeing her experience and my experience, both as out-of-state students at top-notch public universities, I think there is a different focus on serving our state.*

Students are thus among the most important elements that have sustained the partnership between the University and the state of North Carolina through the years. Admissions and tuition policies, the sweep of undergraduate and graduate/professional programs, financial aid resources and programs, student interests prior to entering, student characteristics and activities during college, and significant programs and organizations emphasizing public service all contribute to the public service ethic that has permeated Carolina over the years.

Faculty

Faculty have likewise been instrumental in the sustained relationship between the State, its far-flung communities, and Carolina. The faculty commitment to public service plays out in institutional, grassroots, and individual ways.

Institutional Beacons Embodying Public Service Commitment

Carolina is home to numerous public-service-oriented programs that provide important public service. A number of faculty initiatives embody Carolina's responsibility to the leaders and citizens of virtually every community within the state.

The Institute of Government. Carolina's Institute of Government (now also known as the School of Government) was founded by Albert Coates (then a member of the law school faculty) and his wife Gladys in 1931, as a means of providing continuing education for public employees and officials in local communities around the state. Beginning with a focus on training for law enforcement officers (Coates was a criminal law professor), the focus of the Institute expanded over the years to include everyone from notaries public, to newly elected members of town councils and school boards, to city attorneys, county managers, social services directors and more (Coates, 1981). Coates' vision evolved to include publication of readily-understood educational materials targeted to local government employees and the public, provision of training programs and short-courses offered in Chapel Hill and around the state, provision of expert non-partisan advice by phone upon request, provision of state legislative reporting services, and development of research studies in targeted fields.

The faculty of the Institute at the outset were drawn very heavily from lawyers who in many cases had grown up in North Carolina or attended the University in Chapel Hill for at least some of their higher education. Over the years, the faculty of the Institute expanded to include those with public administration, public finance, and other expertise. More recently the Institute's mission has evolved as it became the home of the University's Masters of Public Administration program and was designated by the University as a "School" as well as an "Institute." The School has undertaken initiatives in civic education for the state as a whole, developed focused strength in fields such as judicial education, economic development and government information technology, and provided more extensive training for newly elected state legislators. In the words of its current dean its mission is "to improve government in North Carolina by engaging in practical scholarship that assists public officials in the areas of law, finance, management, and public administration. A distinctive feature of the institute is the generally comprehensive scope of its work, covering all three branches of government and addressing nearly every level of official within each branch" (Smith, 2000, p. 18). The School's continuing work is supported not only through legislative appropriations included in the University's budget, but also through yearly membership contributions of local governments, modest fees for educational programs, sale of publications, and private and foundation support.

North Carolina Area Health Education Centers. A second of the University's signature public service programs is the North Carolina Area Health Education Centers (NCAHEC). NCAHEC was created in the aftermath of a 1970 Carnegie Commission study that documented the need for improved distribution of quality health care services to rural communities. North Carolina itself had come to recognize that there was a significant problem with shortages of primary care physicians in many areas and a need for community-based training of health professionals. The UNC Chapel Hill School of Medicine received an initial federal contract in 1972 to begin development of three regional programs, but the state legislature followed in 1974 by allocating funds to expand the program to nine AHEC regions within the state, with 300 medical residencies distributed in these areas and rotations of students to rural areas.

NCAHEC now frames its mission, "to meet the state's health and health workforce needs by providing educational programs in partnership with academic institutions, healthcare agencies, and other organizations committed to improving the health of the people of North Carolina" (NCAHEC, 2005a, para 1). It focuses its efforts on "improving the distribution and retention of healthcare providers, with special emphasis on primary care and prevention; improving the diversity and cultural competence of the health care workforce in all health disciplines;

enhancing the quality of care and improving healthcare outcomes and; addressing the healthcare needs of underserved communities and populations” (NCAHEC, 2005b, para 3). Faculty from across the Carolina campus (including its five health-related schools: medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, and public health) participate in these efforts, and place students in rotations around the state. As NCAHEC has developed, other universities with health profession education programs (including Duke, East Carolina University, and Wake Forest University) have joined Carolina as major academic partners with the nine regional centers. The responsibility for program coordination remains in Chapel Hill, however, and Carolina faculty and students continue as major contributors, for example, by providing extensive continuing education, preceptor training, student placement, and library support. The interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaboration that characterizes NCAHEC is likewise evident in a host of other programs in the health sciences. For example, Carolina is home to a significant health careers and workforce diversity program targeting minority students and developed in partnership with some of the state’s historically minority universities.

Health-related research initiatives. A number of health-related research institutes and centers have focused their attention on critical health issues facing the state. For example, the Cecil G. Sheps Center for Health Services Research was established in 1968 to improve the health of individuals, families, and populations by understanding the problems, issues and alternatives in the design and delivery of health care services. The interdisciplinary center taps the expertise of more than 100 faculty who participate in research, consultation, technical assistance and training on such topics as accessibility, adequacy, organization, cost and effectiveness of health care services.

The North Carolina Institute of Medicine was established by the state legislature in 1983 to provide a non-political source of health policy analysis and advice regarding potentially controversial health issues, such as the adequacy of the nursing workforce, children’s health insurance, coverage for the uninsured, and health care for the Latino population. The Governor appoints the 100 active members of the Institute for five-year terms, drawing upon government, the academy, business, the legal profession, hospitals, industry, philanthropy, volunteer sector, and members of the public. The Institute undertakes targeted research initiatives with the help of task forces drawn in part from its membership and in part from outside experts, resulting in important reports that are made available to government and private sector decision-makers.

The North Carolina Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention was established in 1985 to foster interdisciplinary collaboration among the University’s five health affairs schools relating to public health issues. The Center currently focuses on issues relating to the health of women and minorities, tobacco use prevention, children’s health, among others. While its research is not limited to the state, it has developed strong historical partnerships with the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, local health departments, community health centers, medical practices, schools, among others. The North Carolina Institute for Public Health, which serves as the School of Public Health’s means for linking academic research and practice communities, has also emerged as an important means for providing technical assistance and consulting services, as well as addressing a variety of public health issues facing the state such as emergency preparedness and development of public health incubators.

The North Carolina General Assembly has also looked to Carolina to provide the home for other state-wide interdisciplinary research initiatives, such as through its creation of the Institute for Aging in 1996, to promote collaborative applied and basic gerontological research, develop innovative programs of interdisciplinary education and practice, and provide needed information to policy-makers, program managers, service providers, clinicians, and the general public.

Initiatives in academic affairs professional schools. As is true in the health affairs disciplines, Carolina’s other professional schools (encompassing business, education, information and library science, journalism and mass communication, law, and social work) have developed targeted programs for research and outreach benefiting the state. The Frank Hawkins Kenan Institute for Private Enterprise, which is home to centers on urban investment, sustainable enterprise, community capitalism, and economic development. Recent contributions by the Institute have included analysis of North Carolina’s predatory lending laws, studies of business sustainability in areas of the state hard hit by mill shutdowns, work with minority students in inner cities, and consultation with economic development agencies and governments around the state. The School of Education plays a crucial role in supporting the state’s public schools through projects such as “LEARNNC” (an on-line collection of lesson materials) and participation in the Frank Porter Graham Center for Child Development, a multidisciplinary initiative that currently involves 351 people from 15 academic disciplines.

The School of Library and Information Science provides outreach support to public librarians around the state, and is host to “ibiblio” an on-line repository that archives a rich array of resources for the public. The School of Journalism and Mass Communication is home to the Program on Southern Politics, Media, and Public Life, which convenes policy makers, political leaders, and journalists several times a year and provides significant analysis of social and demographic trends. It also provides such services as on-line courses for high school journalism teachers. The School of Law hosts the Center on Civil Rights (which conducts significant research and hosts yearly conferences on such issues as school re-segregation in the south, voting rights, and municipal under-bounding), a Center on Banking (whose initiatives include educating bank directors, conducting and publishing research on key legal and policy issues, and providing continuing education offerings on consumer credit issues among other matters), and a new Center on Poverty, Work, and Opportunity. The School of Social Work’s Jordan Institute for Families undertakes research on many issues affecting families, including those related to mental health, work, welfare, children, and the aged. It also provides outreach training, programmatic evaluation, and technical assistance.

College of Arts and Sciences. The College of Arts and Sciences faculty and graduate students also contribute to the state in a variety of significant ways. For example, many courses offered on-line through the Friday Center for Continuing Education are offered under its auspices, and numerous others are teach service-learning courses through the a.p.l.e.s. program discussed earlier. However, the involvement in public service tends to be less pervasive and more targeted by discipline and individual faculty interest.

The College is home to the Odum Institute for Social Science Research, which was founded by Professor Howard W. Odum in 1924 with the support of funding from Rockefeller. Odum’s goal was that the institute focus on the cooperative study of problems in the general field of social science. Odum defined social science quite broadly and early work included surveys of the textile industry, tenant farming, and race relations that often proved unpopular with external audiences. The Institute has broadened its focus and now provides training and research support to faculty and graduate students across a range of disciplines, as well as serving as home for interdisciplinary faculty working groups on topics such as the living wage. Faculty in other disciplines also often undertake research of considerable importance to the state, for example, exploring the history and current circumstances of Native American peoples, the history of the textile industry, planning and urban development, and southern folklore traditions.

Faculty outside of the social sciences also contribute service to North Carolina. For example, path-breaking research by faculty in chemistry have reduced pollution from dry-cleaning and developed alternative ways to use CO₂ to reduce other forms of environmental pollution and drawn new employers to the state (Desimone, 2005). Carolina’s faculty have also created new outreach programs such as the Destiny Bus, which takes science teaching on the road to students across the state and provide significant leadership to the Morehead Planetarium, Science Center, and the North Carolina Botanical Garden. Arts and humanities faculty also contribute to the state’s broader culture, through programs such as the Institute for Outdoor Drama and outreach by the Ackland Art Museum.

Grassroots Efforts by Faculty

Over the years, grassroots efforts by Carolina faculty have sought to raise the profile and effectiveness of public service at the University. In the early 1990s a group of faculty and staff created the “Public Service Roundtable” as a means of exploring areas of common interest and suggesting approaches to enhancing the University’s efforts. More than 100 faculty and staff participated. The Roundtable conducted a national study to learn how other universities were structured to carry out their public service missions, surveyed students, community organizations, faculty and staff to learn about current service learning opportunities and needs for support, sponsored informal seminars on such issues as faculty roles and rewards relating to public service, and developed a prototype database of campus-based public service. In a 1995 report, the group concluded that, despite widespread commitment to public service, faculty across the campus did not share a single understanding of the term, and urged that further work be done to bridge rhetorical and conceptual divides. In addition, the group urged that an effort be made to develop a more comprehensive inventory of public service activities undertaken by units, faculty, and students in order to facilitate access by members of the public as well as by potential collaborators within the university itself. The Roundtable urged that additional collaborative service efforts be undertaken after further conversations with people around the state and at other universities and colleges. The group also noted the need for a more well-developed structure to support public service efforts in the campus as a whole.

Two years later, the campus Task Force on Intellectual Climate referenced the work of the Roundtable in documenting the interest of faculty members to build a stronger climate of engagement in the state, in keeping with long-standing campus traditions. The Task Force discussed several barriers to these aspirations, including fragmentation within the campus, lack of information, and a campus culture that created disincentives for public service. It accordingly recommended establishment of a pan-University center for public service to coordinate existing activities and programs, develop new service learning opportunities, and publicize and promote service-learning. The Task Force also urged that the reward system for faculty, staff and students be restructured to “make the service mission at Carolina a serious and tangible counterpart to the teaching and research missions, including in hiring, promotion, tenure, and salary decisions; and “encourage departmental commitments to service and community-based learning” (Chancellor’s Task Force on Intellectual Climate, 1997, para 30).

The Carolina Center for Public Service was born in 1999 with support from the Provost’s office and private donors. The Center has now brought to fruition many of the more detailed recommendations of the Roundtable and the Task Force, including creation of a sophisticated database of public service activities in each of the state’s 100 counties; implementation of a Public Service Scholars program that provides students with training and links to public service opportunities as well as recognition for public service contributions on academic transcripts; and creation of grants and awards programs to recognize individual and group excellence in public service.

The Public Service Roundtable also recommended that the Tar Heel Bus Tour be created as a means of introducing new faculty to the state. Beginning in 1997, this program has taken a group of approximately 35 new professors and university leaders per year on the road for the week immediately following spring commencement. The Bus Tour seeks to achieve a number of critical goals including: developing awareness of the state’s geography, economy, culture, history, government, and educational systems; introducing faculty to the communities that are home to many of their students; encouraging public service and applied research on problems facing the state and its population; and fostering bonding among faculty in differing fields. Participants have been limited to those in their first three years at Carolina who apply to the program and receive support from their departments.

A recent research study evaluated the effectiveness of the Tar Heel Bus Tour (Ratterman, 2005). A survey of faculty involved in the program resulted in comments from 64 of the 85 bus tour alumni currently occupying faculty positions at Carolina (40% of respondents from Arts and Sciences, 40% from health affairs, and 20% from academic affairs professional schools). Half of respondents in health affairs and academic affairs professional schools and a third of those from Arts and Sciences reported that they are currently involved in research efforts related to problems facing the state. Nine respondents indicated that they had changed their research focus to address such problems as a result of their participation in the bus tour, and one-third said that the tour had assisted them in developing research topics that pertained to problems in the state. In addition to triggering ideas for engaged research, bus tour participants commented on benefits gained by getting to know their students’ home communities and by gaining friendships and potential collaborations with other bus tour alumni.

Emerging Thinking

In the last two years, Carolina has charted a road map for its future through the development of a new academic plan. One of the plan’s top six priorities is to enhance public engagement. Three major strategies are proposed: providing senior leadership in public engagement, shifting the focus from public service to public engagement, and building partnerships for engagement within and outside the university.

In keeping with this priority, the Chancellor has focused many of his speeches on public engagement and has undertaken a number of “Carolina Connects” visits to communities around the states in order to highlight public engagement activities linking university educational and research programs. A new office of economic and business development has been created within the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research, with the mandate of helping North Carolina communities and businesses access the campus’s economic development resources. More specifically, the office “serves as the primary ‘gateway’ to these resources, matching business, community, and regional needs with university expertise in areas such as technology commercialization, cluster development, small business assistance, community visioning, strategic planning, professional training, and partnering with higher education institutions” (Office of Economic and Business Development, 2005, para 1). Additional funding has also been provided to the Center for Public Service to provide a strong base for its continuing efforts to engage faculty and students from across

the campus. The campus' distance education offerings have also grown, providing added access to far-flung citizens seeking advanced education in such areas as emergency management and literacy studies. Continuing education opportunities of other sorts have also expanded. Research funding in many areas relevant to North Carolina has grown, and a number of critical health-related clinical programs have expanded.

As these central plans have been laid, another grass roots effort has emerged from faculty leaders at Carolina. Beginning in summer 2004, a group of 20-30 faculty and administrative leaders have regularly met to consider ways in which the public engagement mission of the university might be advanced. These discussions have returned to some of the critical issues that have been raised in the past, including the challenges of developing a shared terminology and ideas about the meaning of "public engagement"; impediments arising from the existing faculty role and reward system; the challenges of building meaningful partnerships to address the most pressing issues facing the state; difficulties in assessing the extent and quality of public engagement in order to make continuing progress; and issues of structure, organization, and funding. It is to these difficult questions that leaders of the Carolina community must now turn.

Future Challenges and Opportunities

There are a number of future challenges and opportunities to consider in relation to Carolina's interactions with the State. Our hope is that these initiatives strengthen the role of Carolina for the States' "public good." They are listed below and will further Carolina's ongoing relationship between the Old North State and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

1. Conceptualization (What is public service?): a) Faculty discussions/ambiguity in notions of "service; b) Student comments; c) Facilitated dialogue with external groups by convening a small group of external partners in NC to discuss engagement expectations of a state university; d) Facilitated dialogue with other UNC system campuses; e) Public charter - Development of a white paper designed to generate meaningful conversation about differing understandings of history, mythos, meaning, rationale, and future of the University's "public service" or "public engagement" mission and compact with the society we serve; f) The idea of a public research university: (1) the possibility of a shared idea about the distinctive mission of a public research university (a substantive commitment, not just public relations); (2) the question of whether that mission is to be addressed relatively haphazardly by individual faculty members (as they see fit) or more coherently (at some institutional level); (3) the impediments that may prevent or discourage faculty members from contributing to that mission on an individual or institutional level (e.g. faculty roles and rewards, understandings of how to evaluate "applied scholarship" or "service-learning"); (4) the impediments that may exist in tapping university expertise (or setting priorities about collective university efforts) when viewed from outside (i.e. Who stands for the public? How might the "university" or parts of the university/faculty bring to expertise to bear in areas that the public need most? Who sets the agenda? What measures are needed to assure "nonpartisanship" and academic integrity?); (5) the possible ways to organize ourselves to meet these challenges (we, within the university, and those outside the university).
2. Faculty roles, rewards, incentives: a) Growing concerns with priorities only on research; b) Possible strategies include mentoring, creating peer networks, new track for tenure on engagement, and "best practices" resources; c) Roles and Rewards: Exploration of methods and strategies to remove impediments and facilitate faculty involvement in public service as part of an integrated approach to research and teaching (post-tenure and possibly pre-tenure).
3. Engaging Questions: a) Exploration and sharpening of key questions that face the state (in cooperation with colleagues both inside and outside the academy); b) Using the framework of structured "bus tour" field trips in key areas (such as K-12 education; health; workforce challenges).
4. Tracking progress: "Assessment": Consideration of possible metrics for assessing our institutional challenges and accomplishments in addressing that mission (at the institutional level in ways that might be addressed through "progress reports" relating to the University's "academic plan" or "excellence" and educational programs in ways that might be addressed in connection with learning objectives encompassed by the SACS reaccreditation process).

-
5. Organization of Partnerships: a) Individual units with initiatives; b) Links with CCPS c) External expectations and linkages d) Connections with other colleges and universities e) Building partnerships across generations and across geography.

Footnotes

- ¹ Judith Wegner (Chair of the Faculty and Professor of Law), Michael Smith (Dean of the UNC School of Government), and Ron Strauss (Chair of Department of Dental Ecology, Professor of Social Medicine, and Chair of the Advisory Board of the Carolina Center for Public Service).
- ² Thomas Ross, Executive Director, Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Winston-Salem, NC.
- ³ In summer 2004, Judith Wegner, Michael Smith, Ron Strauss, and Ran Coble (Executive Director of the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research) invited John Burkhardt (Executive Director, National Forum for Higher Education for the Public Good), Penny Pasque, and Lori Hendricks (graduate students at the University of Michigan) to visit Chapel Hill for conversations with approximately 20 faculty, staff, and students involved in public service activities. Materials presented by the Michigan delegation are available at http://www.thenationalforum.org/projects_unc.shtml. More detailed information about these discussions is available from Professor Judith Wegner at Office of Faculty Governance, 201 Carr Building, CB 9170, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-9170 or by e-mail to Judith_wegner@unc.edu.
- ⁴ An extended group of approximately 30 faculty and administrative leaders are developing a white paper on public service at Carolina to be shared for further discussion in fall 2005.
- ⁵ North Carolina is often referred to as “the Great North State.” This reference is embodied in the toast traditionally offered by those who have been inducted into the Order of the Long Leaf Pine in recognition of diverse forms of service to the state. “Here’s to the land/ Of the Long Leaf pines,/ The summer land/ Where the sun doth shine,/ Where the weak grow strong/ And the strong grow great,/ Here’s to “down home,”/ the Old North State!”

References

- Assisting People in Planning Learning Experiences in Service. (2005). Retrieved April 4, 2005, from <http://www.unc.edu/apples/about/index.html>
- Campus Y. (2005). Retrieved April 4, 2005, from <http://campus-y.unc.edu>
- Carolina Center for Public Service. (2005). *Mission*. Retrieved April 4, 2005, from <http://www.unc.edu/cps/about/mission.htm>
- Chancellor’s Task Force on Intellectual Climate. (1997). *Report of chancellor’s task force on intellectual climate*. Retrieved April 17, 2005, from <http://www.unc.edu/chan/intclim/chapV.htm>
- Coates, A. (1981). *The story of the institute of government: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. Chapel Hill: Institute of Government Press.
- DeSimone, S. (2005). *Research in the DeSimone lab*. Retrieved April 17, 2005, from <http://www.chem.unc.edu/people/faculty/desimonejm/jmdgroup>
- Graham, E. (1914). *Carolina quotables*. Retrieved April 12, 2005, from <http://www.lib.unc.edu/ncc/ref/unc/cq/graham.html>
- Hodges, L. (1960). *Carolina quotables*. Retrieved April 12, 2005, from <http://www.lib.unc.edu/ncc/ref/unc/cq/hodges.html>

-
- Kuralt, C, Ruffin, T. (Producer), & Howe, T. (Director). (1994, October 12). *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Bicentennial Convocation* [videorecording]. University of North Carolina Center for Public Television in cooperation with University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Retrieved April 12, 2005, from <http://www.lib.unc.edu/ncc/ref/unc/cq/kuralt.html>
- Link, W. (1997). *William Friday: Power, purpose, and American higher education*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Moeser, J. (2003). *Carolina covenant*. Retrieved April 4, 2005, from <http://www.unc.edu/carolinacovenant>
- North Carolina Area Health Education Centers. (2005). Retrieved April 17, 2005, from <http://www.ncahec.net>
- North Carolina Constitution. (1776). Retrieved April 12, 2005, from <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/states/nc07.htm>
- Ratterman, M. (2005). *Assessing the impact of the Tar Heel Bus Tour on faculty scholarship*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Smith, M. (2000). The Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 112, 17-26.
- Snider, W. D. (1992). *Light on the Hill: A history of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- University of North Carolina Board of Trustees. (1789). *University of North Carolina Charter*. In the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina Records #40001, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Acts of the General Assembly and Ordinances of the Trustees, for the Organization and Government of the University of North Carolina: Electronic Edition. University of North Carolina (1793-1962). Retrieved April 12, 2005, from <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/unc/unc.html>
- University of North Carolina, National Survey of Student Engagement. (2003). Retrieved April 17, 2005, from http://www.unc.edu/inst_res/irweb/assessment/NSSE/FINAL.html

About the Wingspread 2004 Conference Participants and Authors

Victor Bloomfield

Victor Bloomfield has been vice provost for research at the University of Minnesota since 1998, was associate dean of the Graduate School from 1998-2002, and assumed the position of interim dean of the Graduate School in July 2002. He has been a faculty member at the University of Minnesota since 1970, in the Department of Biochemistry in CBS (now Biochemistry, Molecular Biology and Biophysics) with a graduate faculty appointment in Chemistry, and was head of Biochemistry from 1979-1991. He has held a number of other responsible positions at the U of MN, including founding director of the Biotechnology Institute, a member of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Council of Liberal Education, and member and chair of the Faculty Coordinating Committee. He was a founding member of the U's Council on Public Engagement, and currently serves as a member of its Steering Committee and co-chair of its Committee on Assessment. He has had a successful scientific career, with over 200 papers in peer-reviewed journals, three co-authored books, and steady grant support from NIH and NSF. He has trained 24 graduate students and 32 postdoctorals, has served on NIH and NSF study sections, was editor of *Biophysical Journal* and President of the Biophysical Society, and has been honored as a Fogarty Scholar at NIH and by election as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In addition to these efforts at the University of Minnesota, Bloomfield has been active in the CIC Graduate Deans group on such topics as the crisis in scholarly publishing, trends in international student applications, the role of graduate schools in postbaccalaureate certificate programs, and as the U's representative to the CIC Committee on Civic Engagement.

Grace Lee Boggs (Community Partner)

Grace Lee Boggs is an activist, writer and speaker whose sixty-three years of political involvement encompass the major U.S. social movements of the 20th century. Since the 1960s, when she taught in the Detroit public schools and was active in the Black Power and Community Control of Schools movement, she has been exploring solutions to the deepening schools crisis. In 1992, with her late husband, James Boggs, Shea Howell and others, she co-founded Detroit Summer, an intergenerational, multicultural youth program/movement to rebuild, redefine and respirit Detroit from the ground up. Her autobiography, *Living for Change* (University of Minnesota Press, 1998), is widely used in university classes in Detroit history and in African American and Asian American Studies. Her columns on Freedom Schooling in the weekly *Michigan Citizen* have been compiled in a 48-page pamphlet.

John C. Burkhardt

John C. Burkhardt is a professor of higher education and the director of the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good at the University of Michigan. From 1993-2000, John was program director for leadership and higher education at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, where he led several major initiatives focused on transformation and change in higher education and participated in a comprehensive effort to encourage leadership development among college students. John serves on the editorial board of the *Journal of Leadership Studies*, is a senior fellow at the James McGregor Burns Academy for Leadership at the University of Maryland, and is a trustee of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership. He also is treasurer of the Eastern Michigan University Foundation, in Ypsilanti, Michigan. Dr. Burkhardt earned a bachelor's and master's degrees in psychology, and a master's and a doctoral degree in education. He received his Ph.D. from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan in 1986. John has been honored as an exemplary alumnus of the U of M School of Education, an Institute for Educational Leadership Fellow (1986), and a Kellogg National Fellow (1989-1992).

Tony Chambers

Tony is the associate director of the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good and adjunct associate professor in the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan. He was formerly the program officer and founding director of the Fetzer Fellows Program at the John Fetzer Institute, a non-profit operating foundation that explores the relationship between mind, body and spirit. Prior to joining the Fetzer Institute, Tony served for 17 years as an administrator and faculty member at several higher education institutions. Tony's professional interests include leadership development, the influence of spirituality in higher education, and organizational and social transformation. Tony is a senior fellow at the James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership and national advisor with the Heartland Center for Leadership Development in Lincoln, Nebraska. He

was awarded the Kellogg National Fellowship from 1993-1996 (Group XIII). Tony received a bachelor's and master's degree from Illinois State University, and a doctorate degree from the University of Florida.

David Cox

Dr. David Cox serves as executive assistant to the president at The University of Memphis and holds the rank of professor in the Division of Public Administration. Dr. Cox served on loan from the University as director of the Office of University Partnerships for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1998-99. Dr. Cox's research, outreach, and publications have centered on the effect of urban governance structures on the responsiveness, equity, and effectiveness of public policies and on strategies for interorganizational collaboration. His work has been supported by over \$7,000,000 in national and regional competitive research and outreach awards. Recent recognition he has received includes the 1994 Superior Performance in University Research Award, the 2003 University of Memphis College of Arts and Sciences Distinguished Research Award, the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Human Rights Award from the National Conference on Community and Justice in 2000, the Certificate for Superior Accomplishment in Community-University Partnerships from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1999, and the National Outstanding Community Commitment Award from the Chicago Communication Network in 2000. He is chairman of the board of the National Association for Community-Higher Education Partnerships and is a charter member of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement.

Art Dunning

Dr. Art Dunning serves as the vice president for public service and outreach at the University of Georgia. He is responsible for developing and communicating a vision for public service and outreach that is consistent with the needs of a changing society, while ensuring that this vision is integrated into the University's research and instruction missions. Dunning provides leadership to the broad array of public service and outreach programs at the University of Georgia, including coalition-based initiatives aimed at issues that affect the society and economy of Georgia and beyond. Current initiatives at UGA address: persistent poverty in the South; the growing Latino population in Georgia; economic development; service learning opportunities for UGA students; and international public service and outreach. Prior to coming to the University of Georgia, Dunning spent nine years with the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. As vice chancellor for services, he was responsible for all matters related to public service, outreach, and international programs at the system's 34 institutions. Dunning served three years as the C.E.O. of the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education and has held academic posts at the University of Alabama. Dunning holds a doctorate in Higher Education Administration from the University of Alabama.

Brigid Dwyer

Brigid Dwyer is a second year doctoral student in the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education program at the University of Michigan. Currently she works as a research assistant the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good. At the Forum, Brigid has worked on a number of different projects, including strategic communication and Access to Democracy. However, she primarily works as a member of the evaluation team for the Minority Serving Institutions Leadership Fellows Program. Her academic and research interests lie in area of access to higher education for racially and ethnically underrepresented students and the ways in which higher education institutions as well as high schools can facilitate access to college for these students. In addition to her academic pursuits and her work at the National Forum, Brigid has been involved extensively throughout the University of Michigan campus in efforts focused on social justice and multiculturalism. This year Brigid serves as the president of the Students of Color of Rackham (SCOR) which is an "Educated, United, Diverse, Supportive, Active, Powerful" organization that provides service, activism, social, cultural, educational, and professional development opportunities for graduate students of color at U-M. In addition, she has worked at the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs in the School of Education and developed a volunteer experience for U-M students in conjunction with the 50th Anniversary of the Brown v. Board of Education court case. Prior to coming to the University of Michigan, Brigid worked in athletics with the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles, and in the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Athletics Department.

Hiram Fitzgerald

Hiram Fitzgerald is the assistant provost, university outreach and engagement and the university distinguished professor in the Department of Psychology at Michigan State University.

Edwin Fogelman

Edwin Fogelman is professor and former chair of the Political Science department at the University of Minnesota. He has been chair of the provost's Task Force on Civic Engagement and is currently chair of the Council on Public Engagement (COPE), charged with incorporating public engagement across the full range of university activities and strengthening a culture of engagement. Further information about COPE is available at www.umn.edu/civic.

Richard Guarasci

Richard Guarasci is president at Wagner College. Prior to his presidency, Dr. Guarasci was provost and vice president for Academic Affairs and held the rank of professor of Political Science, teaching in the areas of democracy, citizenship and American diversity. At Wagner, Dr. Guarasci founded *The Wagner Plan for the Practical Liberal Arts*, the new four-year curriculum for all undergraduates that draws together a substantive liberal arts core into a series of learning communities. Each community cluster includes semester-long community-based and service-learning courses emphasizing the integration of ideas and experiences with the civic arts of democratic culture. Communication, participation and social action serve as central elements in the Wagner Plan, with its goal of producing educated citizens committed to lives as reflective practitioners. Dr. Guarasci was dean and professor of Political Science at Hobart College from 1992 to 1996. There he formed a major in community-based and service learning as well as an eighteen-course curriculum in diversity and citizenship. Previously he served as dean and founding director of the First Year Program at St. Lawrence University, a nationally celebrated model of democratic living and learning program required for all first-year students that joined first year housing to a two semester curriculum. Dr. Guarasci is the author of *Democratic Education in the Age of Difference: Redefining Citizenship in Higher Education* (Jossey-Bass, 1997) and numerous other publications. In this recent book, he argues that it is imperative that higher education explicitly educate students for intercultural citizenship. He served on the national board of directors of the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), and he was named a fellow in the Society for Values in Higher Education (SVHE). Dr. Guarasci serves on the board of directors of the Institute of Experiential Learning as well as the advisory board for SVHE's Models for Democracy Project, which is developing best campus practices that underscore the democratic arts and values, and is co-chair of New York State Campus Compact. In addition, Dr. Guarasci is a PEW fellow for National Leadership on Developing Learning Communities under the auspice of the Washington Center for Learning. His most recent publication appears in the magazine *About Campus* under the title "Developing the Democratic Arts."

Ira Harkavy

Ira Harkavy is associate vice president and founding director of the Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania. An historian with extensive experience building university-community partnerships, Harkavy teaches in the departments of history, urban studies, Africana studies, and city and regional planning. Harkavy has been actively involved in working to involve colleges and universities in democratic partnerships with local public schools and their communities. The West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC), a nineteen-year partnership to create university-assisted community schools that connect the University of Pennsylvania and the West Philadelphia community, emerged and developed from seminars and research projects he directs with other colleagues at Penn. Harkavy is executive editor of *Universities and Community Schools* and an editorial board member of the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. He served as consultant to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to help create its Office of University Partnerships and is a senior fellow of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics. Harkavy is a member of numerous international, national, regional, and local boards, including Widener University; the International Consortium on Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy (co-chair); National Coalition for Community Schools (chair); Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development (co-chair); West Philadelphia Partnership; and the Board Policy Committee of Campus Compact. He is the recipient of Campus Compact's Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service Learning (2002) and the University of Pennsylvania's Alumni Award of Merit (2004); and, under his directorship, the Center for Community Partnerships received the inaugural William T. Grant Foundation Youth Development Prize sponsored in collaboration with the National Academy of Sciences' Board on Children, Youth and Families (2003) and a Best Practices/Outstanding Achievement Award from HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (2000).

Jeffrey Higgs (Community Partner)

Jeffrey Higgs is currently the executive director of the Community Develop Corporation at Lemoyne-Owen College in Memphis, Tennessee.

Barbara A. Holland (Wingspread 2004 Facilitator)

Barbara A. Holland, Ph.D., is the director of the National Service Learning Clearinghouse (NSLC), which is funded by the Learn and Serve America program of the Corporation for National and Community Service. NSLC is located at ETR Associates, a non-profit organization in Santa Cruz, CA. Dr. Holland also holds appointments as a senior scholar in the Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) and as adjunct professor at the University of Western Sydney and Australian Catholic University. Before joining NSLC, she served as a loaned executive from IUPUI to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in the role of visiting director of the Office of University Partnerships. While at HUD (2000-2002), she managed a portfolio of \$40 million in competitive grant programs encouraging higher education's involvement in communities and engaged in research on the program's partnerships. Previously she was a senior academic executive at Northern Kentucky University ('98-'00) and Portland State University ('91-'98) where she contributed to major reforms of curricula, faculty roles, and civic engagement programs. Since 1997 she has served as executive editor of Metropolitan Universities Journal, the quarterly journal of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities. Her scholarly interests focus on organizational change in higher education with special emphasis on the institutionalization and assessment of civic engagement programs, service-learning, and community-university partnerships. Her bachelor's and master's degrees were earned at the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Journalism, and she holds a Ph.D. in higher education policy from the University of Maryland-College Park.

Elizabeth Hollander

Elizabeth Hollander is the executive director of Campus Compact, a national coalition of over 900 college and university presidents who support the expansion of opportunities for public and community service in higher education and the importance of integrating service into academic study. Prior to her appointment to this position in 1997, Hollander served as executive director of the Monsignor John J. Egan Urban Center at DePaul University, which works with the University to address critical urban problems, alleviate poverty, and promote social justice in the metropolitan community through teaching, service, and scholarship. She also was the president of the Government Assistance Program in Illinois and the director of planning for the city of Chicago under Mayor Harold Washington. While in Chicago, Hollander served on the boards of trustees at Chicago State University and the Illinois Institute of Technology. Since 1992 she has been a member of the Truman Regional Scholarship Committee. She is a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration. Hollander also serves on advisory board of the American Association of Colleges & Universities Diversity Web, the advisory board of the online Journal of College and Character, the American Committee of the International Consortium on Higher Education, and the advisory board of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) at the University of Maryland. Hollander received an honorary doctorate from Millikin University in 2001 and DePaul University in 2003.

Theodore L. Hullar

Dr. Theodore L. Hullar is director of higher education programs for The Atlantic Philanthropies (USA) Inc. In this work, he has emphasized information technologies, learning, faculty, and interdisciplinarity, along with other factors affecting higher education (HE) performance including HE economics, governance, policy, and diffusion and adoption of innovations. He served as chancellor of the University of California, Davis (1987-94) and the University of California, Riverside (1985-87) and concurrently as professor of Environmental Toxicology and Biochemistry (1984-97), respectively. Throughout his life-long work in HE, he has emphasized senior executive management and HE-community engagement, along with biomedical research and the environment, serving as professor and director of the Cornell Center for the Environment (1997-2000), director of the Cornell Agricultural Experiment Station (1981-84), deputy commissioner for programs and research in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (1975-1979), and founding commissioner for environmental quality for Erie County, N.Y. (1974-75). He has been coordinator and chair of the National Water Initiative, a partnership among universities, government, and the private sector for advancing research and application for important national water issues, and he is a member of federal advisory committees for the environment. He was the founding chair of the California Council for Science and Technology. Educated at the University of Minnesota where he earned his B.S. (1957) and his Ph.D. (1963) degree in biochemistry, in 1964 he joined the faculty of medicinal chemistry in the State University of New York at Buffalo after a National Science Foundation Post-Doctoral Fellowship. He is a fellow of the AAAS. He is married (Joan) and they have two sons.

Rachel Lewis (co-author only)

Rachel Lewis is a full time employee of the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good. She graduated from the University of Michigan with her B.A. in English and Spanish in 2004 and looks forward to beginning graduate work in English next year at the University of Arizona. She plans to concentrate in rhetoric and composition.

Anne Kohler-Cabot

Anne joined the National Forum in January of 2004 as the Access to Democracy project manager and is a member of the strategic development team. She has worked in education in a variety of capacities: as an admissions counselor, AmeriCorps volunteer, and academic support coordinator for a living-learning community at the University of Michigan. Anne received her master's degree at the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education and her undergraduate degree in biology from Middlebury College.

Edgar Lucas (Community Partner)

Edgar Lucas is currently the executive director of the Renacer Westside Center in Chicago, Illinois. He is also the national vice-president of the Association for Community and Higher Education Partnerships (ACHEP). He served as a member of University delegation representing Chicago at the United Nations Conference in Human Settlements in Istanbul, Turkey, and is executive producer and host of "Discuss It," a live call-in cable television talk show.

Bruce Mallory (Wingspread 2004 Facilitator)

Bruce L. Mallory was appointed provost and executive vice president for Academic Affairs at the University of New Hampshire in July 2003. Previously, he was vice provost and dean of the Graduate School at UNH (1997-2003). Dr. Mallory has been a professor of education (early childhood and special education) since 1979; he chaired the UNH Department of Education from 1987 to 1993. Dr. Mallory received his Ph.D. in Special Education and Community Psychology from George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University. Earlier experience includes service as a public school teacher, VISTA volunteer (Volunteers in Service to America), director of Head Start programs, and legislative researcher. His work at UNH has concentrated on the design of programs and social policies that support young children with disabilities and their families, cross-cultural research in developed and developing countries regarding disability and child care policy, and reconceptualizations of early childhood special education theory and practice. Most recently, he has been co-principal investigator of a major investigation of the socio-cultural construction of home-school relations in five Italian cities. Dr. Mallory has been a leader in school reform initiatives in New Hampshire, especially with respect to professional development of school administrators and the design of school improvement programs. Dr. Mallory directs the UNH Public Conversations Project, which fosters civic engagement and democratic participation related to public education and related social challenges. Recent publications and conference presentations have addressed the role of dialogue and civic engagement in higher education reform. Dr. Mallory serves on several community and national boards, including the Children's Alliance of New Hampshire, Inc. and the Topsfield Foundation.

Cheryl A. Maurana

Cheryl A. Maurana, Ph.D., senior associate dean for public and community health at the Medical College of Wisconsin, has received national recognition for her work in public health research and community partnerships. At the Medical College of Wisconsin, she has built a number of partnerships both within the College and with communities for improving health in the Milwaukee community and the state of Wisconsin. A professor of Family and Community Medicine, Dr. Maurana is responsible for expanding the Medical College's community efforts, fostering collaboration among existing centers focused on community and public health, and facilitating partnerships, both urban and rural. For the past five years, she has played a leadership role in the Advancing a Healthier Wisconsin Program, a statewide community-academic partnership, research and education initiative with a specific focus on the Healthier Wisconsin Partnership Program (35% of the funds). This initiative was funded by the \$300-million dollar endowment from the recent conversion of Blue Cross/Blue Shield United of Wisconsin to for-profit status. The website for the community-academic partnership component is <http://www.mcw.edu/display/router.asp?DocID=433>. Dr. Maurana joined the Medical College in 1995 and directed the statewide Area Health Education Center Program (AHEC), leading it through a major strategic planning and reorganization process. She founded the College's Center for Healthy Communities in 1997. In 1999, she received the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health Leadership Award for national leadership in building community-academic partnerships. Her academic work has focused on building community-academic partnerships to improve

the health of the public. She has been principal or co-investigator on more than 30 federal and foundation grants. She also served as chair of the founding board of the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, a national organization that has experienced significant growth in the past six years. Dr. Maurana received her Ph.D. from Purdue University and completed a four-year U.S. Public Health Service Fellowship in health services research. She received her undergraduate degree in the honors program from Seton Hill College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, where she recently received the Distinguished Alumnae Award.

Lori McQueen

Lori McQueen has served as an assistant to the president at American Humanics since March 2004, responsible primarily for developing the academic curriculum for the undergraduate nonprofit management program. She has worked for 20 years in higher education as a faculty member, academic administrator, student affairs administrator, and an assistant to the president at two universities. A native New Yorker, Lori also has a background in athletics, having worked for the NFL, NCAA, and Golden Bear International, the business entity of golfer Jack Nicklaus. She completed her doctorate in higher education at Florida State University, and has degrees from St. Thomas University and SUNY Cortland.

Caryn McTighe Musil

Dr. Caryn McTighe Musil is senior vice president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and heads the office of Diversity, Equity, and Global Initiatives, where she focuses on diversity and global issues, civic engagement, and women in higher education. As such she has directed many projects in AAC&U's hallmark American pluralism initiative, American Commitments: Diversity, Democracy, and Liberal Education that involved 140 colleges and universities. Racial Legacies and Learnings and Community Seminars, both projects of American Commitments, were organized around campus-community dialogues. Dr. Musil is co-director of a new AAC&U Center on Liberal Education and Civic Engagement launched in 2003 in partnership with Campus Compact. The Center argues that a quality liberal education must provide students with the knowledge and commitment to be socially responsible citizens in a diverse democracy and interconnected but highly stratified world. The Center just launched a project for which 140 campuses applied called Journey Towards Democracy: Voice, Power, and the Public Good. Under AAC&U's more recent overarching global initiative, Shared Futures: Global Learning and Social Responsibility, Dr. Musil serves as Project Director for a FIPSE-funded three year grant, Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy. Dr. Musil received her B.A. from Duke University and her M.A. and Ph.D. in English from Northwestern University. Before moving into national-level administrative work in higher education, she was a faculty member for eighteen years. An author of numerous books and articles, Dr. Musil has also been an educational consultant and outside evaluator at many colleges and universities.

Leonard Ortolano

Leonard Ortolano is the Peter E. Haas director of Stanford University's Haas Center for Public Service and the UPS foundation professor of Civil Engineering. Before assuming his post at the Haas Center in June 2003, Ortolano served for twenty-three years as director of Stanford's Program on Urban Studies. As the Urban Studies director, Ortolano worked closely with Haas Center staff to establish the community organization track within the Urban Studies major and the Urban Summer Fellowship program for Stanford undergraduates. He has been working to augment significantly the Center's partnership with the Stanford School of Education and the Ravenswood City School District in East Palo Alto, CA. He is also a part of the Center's efforts to expand student research that meets needs of community organizations.

Sandra Pacheco

Sandra Pacheco is a native Texan, born and raised in Houston. She received an undergraduate degree from the University of Houston, an M.S. in psychology from Oklahoma State University and a Ph.D. in counseling psychology from the University of Texas at Austin. Pacheco came to St. Edward's University in May 1981 as a psychological counselor. She was director of the Counseling Center from 1982-1989 until she became a dean for student development. In 1993 she was promoted to associate vice president. Presently she is vice president for Student Affairs. In 2004 Pacheco was selected to participate in the Kellogg Minority Serving Institution Leadership Program by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). The program is designed to increase the number of Hispanic senior-level leaders at Hispanic-serving institutions. Pacheco was one of 10 fellows selected by HACU.

Penny A. Pasque

Penny Pasque is a candidate in the Ph.D. program at the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan. She is the 2005-2006 Gail Allen Scholar through the Center for the Education of Women at U-M. Currently, Penny is a research assistant at the National Forum for the Public Good. She served as the program director of a living/learning program at the University of Michigan that focused on identity development, social justice, leadership, community service learning and academic excellence for undergraduate students. Prior to her arrival at U-M, Penny coordinated the Faculty Programs at Cornell University with over 100 faculty members connecting the faculty with undergraduate students. Penny has served as a faculty member and keynote speaker on issues of social justice, service-learning, balancing stewardship and research, and more. She has presented at statewide, national, and international conferences in the field of higher education. Nationally, Penny served on the Executive Council of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) as the chair of the Standing Committee for Women and currently serves as a member of the ACPA Research Task Force and ACPA Ethics Committee. Locally, Penny serves on the Social Justice and Educational Equity graduate student committee in the School of Education at U-M. She co-edited the book *Engaging the Whole of Service-Learning, Diversity and Learning Communities* and her recent article, "The Intersections of Living-Learning Programs and Social Identity as Factors of Academic Achievement and Intellectual Engagement," will be published in the *Journal of College Student Development* later this year.

Melissa Pearce (Community Partner)

Melissa Pearce has served on seven boards, one of which is the UNDC (University Neighborhood Development Corporation), which was established to revitalize the community around the University of Memphis. She has established contacts in city government and acted as a liaison between groups. She helped reestablish soured communications between the University of Memphis and the community. She trained and taught techniques on how the government system works and which offices will most affect community members, such as Office of Planning and Development. She trained the groups to identify assets in the community and build on them while also addressing problem areas. She also helped facilitate identifying and applying for grants and awards. She set up websites, newsletters, email groups, and phone lists and has assisted in building relations with Developers for Smart Growth. As Melissa Pearce states, "One of the greatest assets a community has around an Institution of Higher Education are the resources it brings to the city as well as the community. If a good relationship is established it is pivotal to the strengthening of not only the community that surrounds it but also the city which it is in or near."

Paul C. Pribbenow

Paul Pribbenow, the 16th president of Rockford College, is recognized as one of the country's most thoughtful and engaging commentators and teachers on issues of philanthropy, ethics, and American public life. Before coming to Rockford College, Pribbenow served as research fellow for the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College (Indiana) and as senior consultant for Johnson, Grossnickle, & Associates, a fundraising and management consulting firm. In his work as a college administrator, he has served as dean for College Advancement and secretary to the board of trustees at Wabash College, vice president of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, and associate dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Committed to serving the community in which he lives, President Pribbenow serves on the boards of the Council of 100, Keith School, Crusader Clinic Health Foundation, Rotary Club, and the Golden Apple Foundation. He also chairs the state board of the Illinois Campus Compact. Pribbenow was named a McCormick Presidential Civic Leader Fellow for 2003-04. President Pribbenow, who received his B.A. from Luther College (Iowa) and his M.A. and Ph.D. in social ethics from the University of Chicago, is the author of numerous articles on the professions, ethics, and not-for-profit management. He publishes a bi-monthly e-mail newsletter entitled *Notes for the Reflective Practitioner*, writes a regular column for *Contributions Magazine*, and has edited two collections of essays entitled *Serving the Public Trust: Insights for Fund Raising Research and Practice*, Volumes 1 and 2 (Jossey-Bass, 2000 and 2001). He currently is at work on a book manuscript entitled *Public Service: Philanthropic Fundraising as a Calling*.

Santos Rivera

Santos Rivera is the acting vice president for Student Affairs at Northeastern Illinois University and is participating in the Kellogg Minority Serving Institution Leadership Program.

Thomas Ross

Thomas Ross is the director of the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, located in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The Foundation is a private philanthropic grant-making organization with assets approaching 400 million dollars. Prior to

January 2001, Tom served as the director of the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts from June 1999-December 2000 and as a North Carolina superior court judge from January 1984 to November 2000. Before 1984, he served as the administrative assistant to a U.S. Congressman, a partner in a law firm, and an assistant professor of Law and Government at the School of Government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In November 2000, Tom was presented the William H. Rehnquist Award for Judicial Excellence. This award, named for U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist, is presented annually by the National Center for State Courts to one state court judge nationally. In 1994, he was one of ten people in the United States selected as “Public Official of the Year” by *Governing Magazine*. In 1995, he received one of nine Foundation for the Improvement of Justice Awards presented nationally. In 1996, Tom was named “North Carolina Trial Judge of the Year.” Most recently, in 2001, he was awarded the Distinguished Alumni Award by Davidson College where he received a B.A. degree in 1972. Tom also has a J.D. degree with honors from the University of North Carolina in 1975 and is a 1985 graduate of the National Judicial College. He lives in Winston-Salem, North Carolina with his wife, Susan, and has two grown children.

Jane Rosser

Jane Rosser has worked in international higher education for over 20 years in the U.K. and the U.S.A. She has a B.A. degree from the University of Sussex, U.K., in Politics and English and American Studies an M.A. degree from the University of Texas at Austin in Political Science, and a Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration and a Graduate Certificate in Women's Studies from Bowling Green State University. Her research interests include access and diversity issues in higher education, gender issues and feminist theory, organizational change, qualitative research methods, and civic engagement and public scholarship. She currently works at Bowling Green State University where she is the assistant director of partnerships for community action and the coordinator of the Office of Service-Learning Initiatives. Dr. Rosser also serves as a faculty member in the Division of Teaching and Learning and teaches in the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs. She currently serves on the board of the Wood County Humane Society and Northwest Ohio Community Shares and is working with a consortium of Wood County agencies to develop an AmeriCorps program for the county as part of her work in campus-community partnership building. She is the recipient of The BGSU President's Award for Distinguished Service.

Steven Schomberg

Steven Schomberg is the vice chancellor, public engagement and institutional relations, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Dr. Schomberg earned his bachelor of arts in European literature and thought at the University of Iowa in 1966, a master of divinity degree at Union Theological Seminary (1969), and a doctorate in higher education at the University of Minnesota (1978). Vice Chancellor Schomberg began working at Illinois in 1988 as associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and director of Continuing Education and Public Service, a position he held until 1996, when he was named associate chancellor and continued to hold the position of director of Continuing Education and Public Service. While associate vice chancellor for academic affairs at Illinois, Schomberg co-wrote a report titled “A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process.” He was appointed associate chancellor by then-chancellor Michael Aiken to implement Partnership Illinois, a coordinated effort at public engagement called for in Aiken’s strategic plan, “A Framework for the Future.” Under Schomberg’s leadership, a web-based index of public engagement programs was created, a seed and sustaining-grant program was developed, online programs were started, and programs were created in DuPage County and Chicago. Recently, Schomberg has published two articles with chancellor Nancy Cantor: “Creating Playfulness and Responsibility in a Liberal Education,” published in the November/December 2002 edition of *Change Magazine* and “Posed Between Two Worlds: The University as Monastery and Marketplace,” published in the March/April 2003 edition of *Educause Review*. Dr. Schomberg also is a member of the board of directors of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges as a representative of extension and continuing education professionals. He is a member of the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation. From 1976 to 1988, Dr. Schomberg held administrative positions at the University of Minnesota where he directed undergraduate experimental program development in University College, served as academic planner in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and directed Summer Session.

Sarena Seifer (co-author only)

Sarena Seifer has been a member of the faculty at the University of Washington School of Public Health since 1999. She directs Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, a national nonprofit organization dedicated to fostering partnerships between communities and educational institutions that improve health professions education, civic

responsibility and the overall health of communities. She received her B.A. from Washington University in biology, her M.S. in physiology from Georgetown University, and her M.D. from the University of California, San Francisco.

Ryan Smerek

Ryan Smerek is currently a doctoral student at the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan. His interests are in leadership, organization theory, and the financial management of colleges and universities. He graduated with a degree in economics from Dartmouth College (2000) and was a research analyst in financial services at Dove Consulting in Boston. He recently graduated with a master's in Education from Harvard's Graduate School of Education (2004) with an individualized focus on Higher Education and Leadership Development. While attending school he worked full-time at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government for three years, serving as the database administrator for the Registrar's Office.

Michael Smith

Mike Smith is dean of the School of Government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The School's mission is to improve the lives of North Carolinians through practical scholarship that helps public officials improve state and local government. It is carried out through tenure-track faculty members who teach, advise, and write in the areas of public law, public administration or public management. The School is unique because most of its students are North Carolina local and state officials rather than traditional students seeking an academic degree. In operating at the convergence of scholarship and practice, the School's values and practices reflect the philosophy underlying the scholarship of engagement. Mike was named director of the Institute of Government in 1992, and he has been dean since it became the School of Government in 2001. He has worked to increase the School's and the university's capacity for public service. Within the School he has provided leadership for many new initiatives, including the Civic Education Consortium to increase civic participation in North Carolina by improving civic education for its young people. Within the university he co-chaired the Public Service Roundtable, a volunteer group of administrators, faculty, staff, and students who successfully expanded the university's capacity for public service. Mike earned his B.A. from the University of Michigan and his J.D. from the University of North Carolina. As a faculty member he has written, taught, and advised extensively in two fields—civil liability of public officials and legal aspects of corrections.

Ron Strauss

Ron Strauss is a dentist specializing in the care of craniofacial birth conditions and a Sociologist of Medicine, with doctoral training in both from the University of Pennsylvania. In 1974, he joined the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he is currently Dental Friends Distinguished Professor and chair in the School of Dentistry's Department of Dental Ecology and professor in the School of Medicine's Department of Social Medicine. Since 1977 he has been the dental director of the UNC Craniofacial Center. Ron Strauss's research focus has been on the social impacts of chronic health problems with specific interests on stigma, craniofacial anomalies, and HIV/AIDS. His works on the psychological and social impacts of cleft lip/palate and other craniofacial anomalies reflect a combination of clinical and social science/ethical interests. He is core director of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Core of the UNC CFAR (Center for AIDS Research). Current investigations include an oral health disparities research project in Hawai'i, a study of oral health promotion in low income workplaces in Eastern North Carolina, a study that examines stigma experience related to TB and HIV in Thailand, and a multi-site project that evaluates quality of life in adolescents with facial deformities. In recent years, Ron Strauss has been the president of the American Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Association and served as a co-author in the Surgeon General's report entitled "Oral Health in America." Ron teaches in the Schools of Medicine and Dentistry, and is course director of a large interdisciplinary campus-wide course on AIDS. Ron has worked on several projects that have explored new models for service roles within the public research university. He was principal investigator on the Pew and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Health of the Public Project and leads the current RWJ Dental Pipeline Project at UNC. He has extensively participated in faculty governance and serves as chair of the advisory board of the Carolina Center for Public Service.

Maurice C. Taylor

Maurice C. Taylor is the dean of the School of Graduate Studies at Morgan State University. He is president of the Council of Historically Black Graduate Schools, and a member of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) Board Services Committee. Dr. Taylor also serves on the board of trustees at Juniata College and is a member of the board of trustees for Mercy High School. He earned a doctorate (Ph.D.) in Sociology from Bowling Green State University

and the juris doctorate (J.D.) from Duke University's School of Law. Among the positions that he has held in higher education are: assistant professor of Criminal Justice at Trenton State College; chairperson of the Department of Sociology, Social Work and Criminal Justice and director of the Division of Social Sciences at Hampton Institute; assistant dean for the College of Arts and Sciences at Morgan State University; assistant vice president for Academic Affairs at Morgan State University; vice president for Academic Affairs/Provost at St. Augustine's College; and special assistant to the president at Morgan State University. Dr. Taylor received continuing professional training through Harvard University's Institute for Educational Management (IEM) and as a Fellow in the NAFEO Kellogg Leadership Program for Minority Serving Institutions.

Judith Welch Wegner

Judith Welch Wegner is a professor of law and chair of the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Born in Windsor, Connecticut, she received her B.A. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and her J.D. from UCLA. She was an attorney with the United States Department of Justice and special assistant to United States Secretary of Education Shirley Hufstедler from 1979-1980, before joining the UNC faculty in 1981. She was an elected member of the Carrboro, North Carolina Board of Aldermen and has written and taught in the area of state and local government law, land use, the professions, property law, disability law, and other fields. She served as dean of the law school from 1989-99, and was president of the Association of American Law Schools in 1995. She also served as a senior scholar with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from 1999-2001. Wegner has been working with colleagues at UNC for many years to sharpen and deepen the University's public service mission. She was co-chair of the campus's Public Service Roundtable, a grass-roots effort of more than 100 faculty, which led to the implementation of a new faculty bus tour and creation of a Center for Public Service. She is currently working with colleagues to "re-imagine" the role of a great public research university for the 21st century, and invited John Burkhardt with other National Forum colleagues to Chapel Hill for discussions in summer 2004 to learn more about best practices and develop ideas for possible focused collaboration on related efforts.

About the Wingspread 2004 Conference Sponsors

The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good's mission is to significantly increase awareness, understanding, commitment, and action relative to the public service role of higher education in the United States. It was established by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to the University of Michigan in 2000. Activities are organized around three broad strategies: Leadership Development, Connections between Research and Practice, and Public Policy and Public Stewardship. This social, professional and community engagement agenda of the National Forum provides a powerful complement to the extensive scholarship and teaching capacities of the *Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education* at the University of Michigan.

The Johnson Foundation

The Johnson Foundation's mission is to cultivate ideas that sustain community – people living in harmony with one another and their environment. Their strategic interests are Education, Sustainable Development and Environment, Democracy and Community, and Family. Wingspread was built in 1939, in Racine, Wisconsin. Frank Lloyd Wright designed Wingspread for the family of H.F. Johnson, Jr., who lived there from 1939 to 1959. In 1959, Mr. Johnson established The Johnson Foundation, designating Wingspread as its educational conference facility. Over the years, the Foundation has sponsored thousands of conferences on issues ranging from arms control to education to sustainable development, and much more. National Public Radio has its roots in a Wingspread conference, as do the National Endowment for the Arts and numerous other organizations and movements. Eleanor Roosevelt and Presidents Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter top the long list of distinguished conference participants.

Atlantic Philanthropies


The Atlantic Philanthropies have recently redefined their purpose as the following: To bring about lasting changes in the lives of disadvantaged and vulnerable people. They concentrate their grant investments in four program fields: Aging, Disadvantaged Children & Youth, Health of Populations in Developing Countries, and Reconciliation & Human Rights. Mr. Charles F. Feeney, the co-founder of Duty Free Shoppers Group, Ltd., established The Atlantic Foundation, the first of The Atlantic Philanthropies, in 1982, and he later dedicated his wealth to its charitable mission.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation


The W.K. Kellogg Foundation mission is "To help people help themselves through the practical application of knowledge and resources to improve their quality of life and that of future generations." W.K. Kellogg, the cereal industry pioneer, established the Foundation in 1930. Since its beginning the Foundation has continuously focused on building the capacity of individuals, communities, and institutions to solve their own problems. Programming activities center around the common vision of a world in which each person has a sense of worth; accepts responsibility for self, family, community, and societal well-being; and has the capacity to be productive, and to help create nurturing families, responsive institutions, and healthy communities.

Other Publications by the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good


Publications may be found on the National Forum website: <http://www.thenationalforum.org/>




The Role of Public Understanding, Public Support and Public Policy in Reflecting and Shaping the Covenant between Higher Education and Society. A Report by Scott London. April 2002.




Educating for the Public Good: Implications for Faculty, Students, Administrators and Community. A Report by Scott London. May 2002.



Practical Strategies for Institutional Civic Engagement and Institutional Leadership that Reflect and Shape the Covenant between Higher Education and Society. A Report by Scott London. June 2002.



Higher Education for the Public Good: A Report from the National Leadership Dialogues. A Report by Scott London. 2003.



Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Higher Education for the Public Good. Magdalena Martinez, Penny A. Pasque, and Nick Bowman, Editors. Number 1, 2005.

“WE CANNOT LAY CLAIM TO GREATER PUBLIC INVESTMENT - TO WHICH WE MUST LAY CLAIM IF WE ARE TO SERVE OUR FUNCTION IN A KNOWLEDGE-INTENSIVE SOCIETY THAT ALSO SUBSCRIBES TO DEMOCRATIC VALUES- UNLESS WE ARE SEEN TO SERVE THE PUBLIC GOOD”.



National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good
School of Education, Suite 2339
University of Michigan
610 East University Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

<http://www.thenationalforum.org>

“SERVING SOCIETY IS ONLY ONE OF HIGHER EDUCATION’S FUNCTIONS, BUT IT IS SURELY AMONG THE MOST IMPORTANT. AT A TIME WHEN THE NATION HAS ITS FULL SHARE OF DIFFICULTIES...THE QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER UNIVERSITIES NEED TO CONCERN THEMSELVES WITH SOCIETY’S PROBLEMS BUT WHETHER THEY ARE DISCHARGING THIS RESPONSIBILITY AS WELL AS THEY SHOULD.”