

# Campus Compact

## **Chief Academic Officers' Colloquium On Engaged Teaching and Learning**



**Campus Compact**

c/o Brown University Box 1975 • Providence, RI 02912

Copyright 2002 by Campus Compact.

Campus Compact is a national coalition of more than 850 colleges and university presidents devoted to the civic purposes of higher education. Campus Compact works on the national level to promote public and community service, develop resource materials, workshops and institutions, and support a network of 28 state Compacts and one specialized office - the Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges.

This resource material has been produced by Campus Compact with generous support from the Pew Charitable Trusts. No parts of this material may be reproduced without permission from Campus Compact.

Campus Compact is a subsidiary of Brown University.

This resource material was compiled by the Campus Compact Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study.

Project Director, John Saltmarsh (jsaltmarsh@compact.org)

Campus Compact  
Brown University, Box 1975  
Providence, RI 02912  
Tel. 401-867-3928  
Fax 401-867-3925  
Web address: [www.compact.org](http://www.compact.org)

## Readings

- I. Introduction: Creating a Framework for the Engaged Campus p 4
- II. Boyer, Ernest L. (1996) “The Scholarship of Engagement.”  
Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1,1: p. 11-20 p 7
- III. Holland, Barbara (1999). “Factors and Strategies that Influence  
Faculty Involvement in Public Service.” *The Journal of Public  
Service and Outreach*, 4.1, p. 37-43. p 15
- IV. Holland, Barbara and Sherril Gelmon (1998). “The State of the  
‘Engaged Campus’: What Have We Learned About Building and  
Sustaining University-Community Partnerships. *AAHE Bulletin*, October. p 21
- V. Hollander, Elizabeth, John Saltmarsh, and Edward Zlotkowski (2001).  
“Indicators of Engagement,” in Simon, L.A., Kenny, M., Brabeck, K.,  
& Lerner, R.M. (Eds.), *Learning to Serve: Promoting Civil Society  
Through Service-Learning*. Norwell. MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers. p 27
- VI. Campus Compact, *Presidents' Fourth of July Declaration on the  
Civic Responsibility of Higher Education* p 45
- VII. Campus Assessment of Civic Responsibility p 52

## **Introduction: Creating a Framework for the Engaged Campus**

The readings for this workshop are intended to provide a framework for connecting the pedagogy of service-learning to wider institutional transformation aimed at civic education and community renewal. Central to that framework is an understanding of the convergence of two trends that have had a significant impact on higher education:

- the development of service-learning over the past two decades, and
- a pervasive sense of a national need of civic renewal.

Service-learning is not the same thing as community service. Community service was embraced by both students and campus administrators as a counterweight to the characterization of students as part of a self-centered generation of youth in the 1970's who were described as the "me generation." The response by students in creating COOL (Campus Outreach Opportunity League) in 1984 and by college and university presidents in establishing Campus Compact in 1985 implicitly acknowledged that students were seeking and that campuses were willing to provide opportunities for altruistic, socially responsible activity--*community service*.

*Service-learning* emerged in the late 1980s as it became apparent that for service to broadly infuse academic culture and to have a deeper cognitive and civic dimension it would have to be closely linked to the central educational enterprise of higher education. Service-learning marked the shift from community service to service that was integrated with academic study. During the early 1990s, service-learning spread across college campuses as a pedagogy of action and reflection that connected student's academic study with problem-solving experiences in local community settings. As increasing numbers of faculty became involved in redesigning their curriculum to incorporate service-learning, new questions emerged surrounding larger institutional issues regarding

- the definition of faculty roles and rewards,
- community-based teaching and research,
- faculty professional service,
- community partnerships, and
- the role of the university in assisting community renewal.

These developments in service-learning converged with a critique--pedagogical, epistemological, institutional, and political--of institutions of higher education. The contemporary public perception of higher education sees campuses as disconnected from social concerns and unresponsive to public needs, and for public institutions, deficient in meeting their social obligation. When the National Commission on Civic Renewal issued their 1998 report on civic disengagement, it offered no role for higher education in providing solutions aimed at rebuilding civic life. Their report in many ways echoed what the community organizer Saul Alinsky had written in the late 1950s about university's relationship to community building, that "the word 'academic' is often synonymous with irrelevant."

While the institutions of higher education were highly relevant to meeting the needs of a national crisis defined by the cold war, they were in large part structured and organized around the political, economic, and scientific demands of the military-industrial complex. Their success in addressing that crisis meant that they were shaped in a particular way in the era following WW II

that is not readily adaptable to meeting the need of transforming civic life. The structure, organization, administration, and academic culture of campuses embraced science and technology, emphasized a cult of objectivity and detachment, and elevated the role of the scientifically educated expert over ordinary citizens in public affairs.

The ethos of professionalism and expertise that defined higher education's response to the national crisis of the cold war now contributes to public disillusionment with institutions that represent and legitimize a system that no longer addresses the most pressing national needs. The crisis of the 1990s is a crisis in our civic life. As institutions of higher education struggle to reshape their institutions to meet the needs of civic renewal, they often return to their founding missions, serving the democracy by educating student for productive citizenship.

Service-learning is a powerful pedagogy of engagement that reaches beyond methods of teaching and learning, recognizing that democracy is a learned activity and that active participation in the life of a community is a bridge to citizenship. Service-learning has the potential to be a bridge to civic education as it surfaces a broader vision of an engaged campus. A campus that is centrally engaged in the life of its local communities reorients the core missions of academia - teaching, scholarship, and service - around neighborhood transformation.

- Pedagogy is transformed to that of engaged teaching, connecting structured student activities in community work with academic study, decentering the teacher as the singular authority of knowledge, incorporating a reflective teaching methodology, and shifting the model of education, to use Freire's distinctions, from "banking" to "dialogue."
- Scholarship of engagement is oriented toward community-based action research that addresses issues defined by community participants and that includes students in the process of inquiry.
- Service is expanded beyond the confines of department and college committees and professional associations to the offering of one's professional expertise to addressing community-defined concerns.

If the possibility of wider democratic practice is to be more than a reorientation of professional culture, the engaged campus must extend beyond the academic mission of the university to its institutional structure and organization--engagement compels institutional change. Reciprocal, long-term relationships in local communities require institutional structures--what Mary Walshok calls "enabling mechanisms" -- to connect the campus to the community. Faculty roles need to be redefined, as does the reward structure, to acknowledge, validate, and encourage a shift in teaching, scholarship, and service toward community engagement. Additionally, traditional divisions on campus between student affairs and academic affairs, between disciplines and departments, need to be broken down to encompass a broader view of educating students as whole individuals whose experience in community life is not defined by disciplinary distinctions. Further, the institution as a whole must be realigned toward a view of community that includes the campus as part of, not separate from, the local community. This kind of alignment would reorient the resources of the college or university toward community resources, raising questions of community economic development and the investment of capital for community revitalization.

In a framework of civic education, higher education would address the questions: To what extent does our institution create and sustain long-term partnerships with communities and civic

bodies? To what extent can our civic partners point to long-term, positive experiences with our campus? Are these partnerships framed in ways which reflect the college or university's commitments to and self-interests in community building and civic vitality, that integrate community experience into the learning of students and the professional service opportunities for staff, and that fully understand and appreciate the public dimensions of scholarly work? These are the questions at the heart of service-learning in the late 1990s. It is our hope that your work as educators will shape their answers in a way that deepens the practice of service-learning and makes our institutions of higher education more responsive to community renewal.

Campus Compact, October 1999

## The Scholarship Of Engagement

**Ernest L. Boyer, Ph.D.**

**Former President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching**

*Editor's note: Dr. Boyer, slated to contribute to the first issue of JPSO, passed away in December 1995. Before his death, he had approved this submission, which was sent to JPSO by his staff.*

American higher education is, as Derek Bok once poetically described it, "a many-splendored creation." We have built in this country a truly remarkable network of research universities, regional campuses, liberal arts and community colleges, which have become, during the last half-century, the envy of the world.

But it's also true that after years of explosive growth, America's colleges and universities are now suffering from a decline in public confidence and a nagging feeling that they are no longer at the vital center of the nation's work. Today, the campuses in this country are not being called upon to win a global war, or to build Quonset huts for returning GIs. They're not trying to beat the Soviets to the moon or to help implement the Great Society programs. It seems to me that for the first time in nearly half a century, institutions of higher learning are not collectively caught up in some urgent national endeavor.

Still, our outstanding universities and colleges remain, in my opinion, one of the greatest hopes for intellectual and civic progress in this country. I am convinced that for this hope to be fulfilled, the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems, and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I call the scholarship of engagement.

The truth is that for more than 350 years, higher learning and the larger purposes of American society have been inextricably interlocked. The goal of the colonial college was to prepare civic and religious leaders, a vision succinctly captured by John Eliot, who wrote in 1636: "If we nourish not learning, both church and commonwealth will sink." Following the revolution, the great patriot Dr. Benjamin Rush declared in 1798 that the nation's colleges would be "nurseries of wise and good men, to adapt our modes of teaching to the peculiar form of our government." In 1824, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute was founded in Troy, New York, and RPI was, according to historian Frederick Rudolph, a constant reminder that America needed railroad builders, bridge builders, builders of all kinds. During the dark days of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln signed the historic Land Grant Act, which linked higher learning to the nation's agricultural, technological, and industrial revolutions. And when social critic Lincoln Steffens visited Madison in 1909, he observed, "In Wisconsin, the university is as close to the intelligent farmer as his pig-pen or his tool-house."

At the beginning of this century, David Starr Jordan, president of that brash new institution on the West Coast, Stanford, declared that the entire university movement in this country "is toward reality and practicality." Harvard's president, Charles Eliot, who was completing nearly forty years of tenure, said America's universities are filled with the democratic spirit of "serviceableness." And in 1896, Woodrow Wilson, then a 40-year-old Princeton University professor, insisted that the spirit of service will give a college a place in the public annals of the nation. "We dare not," he said, "keep aloof and closet ourselves while a nation comes to its maturity."

Frankly, I find it quite remarkable that just one hundred years ago, the words "practicality" and "reality" and "serviceability" were used by the nation's most distinguished academic leaders

to describe the mission of higher learning which was, to put it simply, the scholarship of engagement. During my own lifetime, Vannevar Bush of MIT formally declared, while in Washington serving two presidents, that universities which helped win the war could also win the peace, a statement which led to the greatest federally funded research effort the world has ever known. I find it fascinating to recall that Bush cited radar and penicillin to illustrate how science could be of practical service to the nation. The goals in the creation of the National Science Foundation which led to the Department of Defense and the National Institutes of Health were not abstract. The goals were rooted in practical reality and aimed toward useful ends.

In the 1940s, the GI Bill brought eight million veterans back to campus, which sparked in this country a revolution of rising expectations. May I whisper that professors were not at the forefront urging the GI Bill. This initiative came from Congress. Many academics, in fact, questioned the wisdom of inviting GIs to campus. After all, these men hadn't passed the SAT, they'd simply gone off to war, and what did they know, except survival? The story gets even grimmer. I read some years ago that the dean of admissions at one of the well-known institutions in the country opposed the GIs because, he argued, they would be married, many of them; they would bring baby carriages to campus, and even contaminate the young undergraduates with bad ideas at that pristine institution. I think he knew little about GIs, and even less about the undergraduates at his own college.

But, putting that resistance aside, the point is largely made that the universities joined in an absolutely spectacular experiment, in a cultural commitment to rising expectations, and what was for the GIs a privilege became, for their children and grandchildren, an absolute right. And there's no turning back.

Almost coincidentally, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, at a commencement exercise at Harvard in 1947, announced a plan for European recovery, and the Marshall Plan sent scholars all around the world to promote social and economic progress. Ten years later, when the Soviets sent Sputnik rocketing into orbit, the nation's colleges and universities were called upon once again, this time to design better curricula for the nation's schools and to offer summer institutes for teachers.

And one still stumbles onto the inspiration of that time. I remember as commissioner, having lunch in Washington. We thought we were talking privately about the federal program to help teachers under the Eisenhower administration, only to find we were being overheard at the next table, which you should always assume in Washington. And the man stopped by and said, "I just wanted to tell you that I was one of the NDA fellows at that time, and I've never had a better experience in my life." And the inspiration of the teachers who came back from the summer institutes touched teachers all across the country. The federal government and higher education had joined with schools toward the renewal of public education.

Then in the 1960s, almost every college and university in this country launched affirmative-action programs to recruit historically bypassed students and to promote, belatedly, human justice.

I've just dashed through three and half centuries, more or less. What I failed to mention were the times when universities challenged the established order, when they acted appropriately both as conscience and social critic, and that, too, was in service to the nation. And there were other times when campuses were on the fringes of larger national endeavors, standing on the sidelines, failing to take advantage of opportunities that emerged.

Still, I am left with two, inescapable conclusions. First, it seems absolutely clear that this nation has throughout the years gained enormously from its vital network of higher learning institutions. And, at the same time, it's also quite apparent that the confidence of the nation's campuses themselves has grown during those times when academics were called upon to serve a larger purpose: to participate in the building of a more just society and to make the nation more civil and secure.

This leads me, then, to say a word about the partnership today. To what extent has higher learning in the nation continued this collaboration, this commitment to the common good?

I would suggest that in recent years, the work of individual scholars, as researchers, has continued to be highly prized, and that also, in recent years, teaching has increasingly become more highly regarded, which of course is great cause for celebration. But I believe it's also true that at far too many institutions of higher learning, the historic commitment to the "scholarship of engagement" has dramatically declined.

Almost every college catalog in this country still lists teaching, research, and service as the priorities of the professoriate; yet, at tenure and promotion time, the harsh truth is that service is hardly mentioned. And even more disturbing, faculty who do spend time with so-called applied projects frequently jeopardize their careers.

Russell Jacoby, in a fascinating book titled *The Last Intellectuals*, observes that the influence of American academics has declined precisely because being an intellectual has come to mean being in the university and holding a faculty appointment, preferably a tenured one, of writing in a certain style understood only by one's peers, of conforming to an academic rewards system that encourages disengagement and even penalizes professors whose work becomes useful to nonacademics or popularized, as we like to say. Intellectual life, Jacoby said, has moved from the coffee shop to the cafeteria, with academics participating less vigorously in the broader public discourse.

But, what I find most disturbing—as almost the mirror image of that description—is a growing feeling in this country that higher education is, in fact, part of the problem rather than the solution. Going still further, that it's become a private benefit, not a public good. Increasingly, the campus is being viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty get tenured, while the overall work of the academy does not seem particularly relevant to the nation's most pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems. Indeed, it follows that if the students are the beneficiaries and get credentialed, then let students pay the bill. And I've been almost startled to see that, when the gap increases in the budget, it's the student, and the student fees, that are turned to automatically after all—it's a private benefit, and let the consumer, as we like to say, pay the bill.

Not that long ago, it was generally assumed that higher education was an investment in the future of the nation—that the intellect of the nation was something too valuable to lose, and that we needed to invest in the future through the knowledge industry.

I often think about the time when I moved, almost overnight, from an academic post in Albany, New York, to a government post in Washington, D.C. These were two completely separate worlds. At the university, looking back, I recall rarely having serious dialogues with "outsiders"—artists, or "popular" authors, or other intellectuals beyond the campus. And yet, I was fascinated by Derek Bok's observation, on leaving his tenured post at Harvard, that the most consequential shifts in public policy in recent years have come not from academics, but from such works as Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, Ralph Nader's *Unsafe at Any Speed*, Michael Harrington's *The Other America*, and Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*—books which

truly place the environmental, industrial, economic, and gender issues squarely in a social context.

I teach occasionally at the Woodrow Wilson School, in the public policy center, and I open the first class by asking, "How is public policy shaped in America? Where does it originate? How does the debate get going?" And almost always the undergraduates will start with the president, then Congress, or they might think of the state legislature. Then I ask them, has anyone ever heard of Rachel Carson, or Michael Harrington, and a kind of bewildered look appears. And yet the truth is that out of the seminal insights of such intellectuals public discourse begins, and very often Congress is the last, not the first, to act, trying to catch up with the shifting culture. So it is with the academy. One wonders why discourse between faculty and intellectuals working without campus affiliation can't take place within the academy itself.

But, on the other hand, I left Albany and went to Washington, and I must say that I found government to be equally—or I'll go one step further—even more startlingly detached. In Washington, we did consult with lawyers and political pressure groups, driven usually by legislative mandates, and certainly by White House urges. But rarely were academics invited in to help put our policy decisions in historical, or social, or ethical perspective. And looking back, I recall literally hundreds of hours when we talked about the procedural aspects of our work and the legal implications, but I do not recall one occasion when someone asked, "Should we be doing this in the first place?," a question which I suspect could have been asked only by a detached participant with both courage and perspective.

Recently, I've become impressed by just how much this problem, which I would describe as impoverished cultural discourse, extends beyond government to mass communication where, with the exceptions of "MacNeil/ Lehrer News Hour" and "Bill Moyer's Journal," the nation's most pressing social, economic, and civic issues are endlessly discussed primarily by politicians and self-proclaimed pundits, while university scholars rarely are invited to join the conversation.

Abundant evidence shows that both the civic and academic health of any culture is vitally enriched as scholars and practitioners speak and listen carefully to each other. In a brilliant study of creative communities throughout history, Princeton University sociologist Carl Schorske, a man I greatly admire, describes the Basel, Switzerland, of the nineteenth century as a truly vibrant place where civic and university life were inseparably intertwined. Schorske states that the primary function of the university in Basel was to foster what he called "civic culture," while the city of Basel assumed that one of its basic obligations was the advancement of learning. The university was engaged in civic advancement, and the city was engaged in intellectual advancement, and the two were joined. And I read recently that one of the most influential commentators didn't achieve his fame from published articles, but from lectures he gave in the Basel open forum.

I recognize, of course, that "town" is not "gown." The university must vigorously protect its political and intellectual independence. Still, one does wonder what would happen if the university would extend itself more productively into the marketplace of ideas. I find it fascinating, for example, that the provocative PBS program "Washington Week in Review" invites us to consider current events from the perspective of four or five distinguished journalists, who, during the rest of the week, tend to talk only to themselves. And I've wondered occasionally what "The Week in Review" would sound like if a historian, an astronomer, an economist, an artist, a theologian, and perhaps a physician, for example, were asked to comment. Would we be listening and thinking about the same week, or would there be a different profile

and perspective? How many different weeks were there that week? And who is interpreting them for America?

What are we to do about all of this? As a first step, coming back to the academy itself, I'm convinced that the university has an obligation to broaden the scope of scholarship. In a recent Carnegie Foundation report titled *Scholarship Reconsidered*, we propose a new paradigm of scholarship, one that assigns to the professoriate four essential, interlocking functions. We propose, first, the **scholarship of discovery**, insisting that universities, through research, simply must continue to push back the frontiers of human knowledge. No one, it seems to me, can even consider that issue contestable. And we argue, in our report, against shifting research inordinately to government institutes, or even to the laboratories of corporations that could directly or indirectly diminish the free flow of ideas.

But, while research is essential, we argue that it is not sufficient, and to avoid pedantry, we propose a second priority called the **scholarship of integration**. There is, we say, an urgent need to place discoveries in a larger context and create more interdisciplinary conversations in what Michael Polanyi of the University of Chicago has called the "overlapping [academic] neighborhoods," or in the new hyphenated disciplines, in which the energies of several different disciplines tend enthusiastically to converge. In fact, as Clifford Geertz of the Institute for Advanced Study has argued, we need a new formulation, a new paradigm of knowledge, since the new questions don't fit the old categories.

Speaking of bringing the disciplines together, several years ago, when physicist Victor Weisskopf was asked what gives him hope in troubled times, he replied, "Mozart and quantum mechanics." But where in our fragmented intellectual world do academics make connections such as these? We assume they live in separate worlds, yet they may be searching for the same interesting patterns and relationships, and finding solutions both intellectually compelling and aesthetic. I remember during the days of the lift-offs at Cape Kennedy, I was always fascinated when the rockets lifted successfully into orbit. The engineers wouldn't say: "Well, our formulas worked again." They would say, almost in unison, the word "beautiful." And I always found it fascinating that they chose an aesthetic term to describe a technological achievement. But where do the two begin and end?

Beyond the scholarship of discovering knowledge and integrating knowledge, we propose in our report a third priority, the **scholarship of sharing knowledge**. Scholarship, we say, is a communal act. You never get tenured for research alone. You get tenured for research and publication, which means you have to teach somebody what you've learned. And academics must continue to communicate not only with their peers but also with future scholars in the classroom in order to keep the flame of scholarship alive. And yet, the truth is that on many campuses it's much better to prepare a paper and present it to colleagues at the Hyatt in Chicago than to present it to the students on campus, who perhaps have more future prospects than one's peers.

Finally, in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, we call not only for the scholarship of discovering knowledge, the scholarship of integrating knowledge to avoid pedantry, and the sharing of knowledge to avoid discontinuity, but also for the **application of knowledge**, to avoid irrelevance. And we hurriedly add that when we speak of applying knowledge we do not mean "doing good," although that's important. Academics have their civic functions, which should be honored, but by scholarship of application we mean having professors become what Donald Schön of MIT has called "reflective practitioners," moving from theory to practice, and from

practice back to theory, which in fact makes theory, then, more authentic—something we're learning in education and medicine, in law and architecture, and all the rest. And incidentally, by making knowledge useful, we mean everything from building better bridges to building better lives, which involves not only the professional schools but the arts and sciences as well.

Philosophy and religion also are engaged in the usefulness of knowledge, as insights become the interior of one's life. Recently I reread Jacob Bronowski's moving essay on science and human values, which was written after his visit in 1945 to the devastation of Hiroshima. In this provocative document, he suggests that there are no sharp boundaries that can be drawn between knowledge and its uses. And he insists that the convenient labels of pure and applied research simply do not describe the way that most scientists really work. To illustrate his point, Bronowski said that Sir Isaac Newton studied astronomy precisely because navigating the sea was the preoccupation of the society in which he was born. Newton was, to put it simply, an engaged scholar. And Michael Faraday, Bronowski said, sought to link electricity to magnetism because finding a new source of power was the preoccupation of his day. Faraday's scholarship was considered useful. The issue, then, Bronowski concludes, is not whether scholarship will be applied, but whether the work of scholars will be directed toward humane ends.

This reminder that the work of the academy ultimately must be directed toward larger, more humane ends brings me to this conclusion. I'm convinced that in the century ahead, higher education in this country has an urgent obligation to become more vigorously engaged in the issues of our day, just as the land-grant colleges helped farmers and technicians a century ago. And surely one of the most urgent issues we confront, perhaps the social crisis that is the most compelling, is the tragic plight of children.

In his inaugural address, President George Bush declared as the nation's first education goal that by the year 2000, all children in this country will come to school "ready to learn." Yet, we have more children in poverty today than we did five years ago. Today, a shocking percentage of the nation's nineteen million preschoolers are malnourished and educationally impoverished. Several years ago, when we at The Carnegie Foundation surveyed several thousand kindergarten teachers, we learned that thirty-five percent of the children who enrolled in school the year before were, according to the teachers, linguistically, emotionally, or physically deficient. One wonders how this nation can live comfortably with the fact that so many of our children are so impoverished.

These statistics may seem irrelevant in the hallowed halls of the academy or in the greater world of higher learning, yet education is a seamless web. If children do not have a good beginning, if they do not receive the nurture and support they need during the first years of life, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to compensate fully for the failure later on. My wife, a certified midwife, has convinced me that the effort has to be made not only before school, but surely before birth itself, during the time when nutrition becomes inextricably linked to the potential later on.

To start, higher education must conduct more research in child development and health care and nutrition. I do not diminish this role at all. This, too, is in service to the nation. But I wonder if universities also might take the lead in creating children's councils in the communities that surround them. The role of the university would be to help coordinate the work of public and private agencies concerned with children, preparing annually, perhaps, what I've chosen to call a "ready-to-learn" report card—a kind of environmental impact statement on the physical, social, and emotional conditions affecting children—accompanied by a cooperative plan of action that would bring academics and practitioners together. James Agee, one of my favorite

twentieth-century American authors, wrote that with every child born, regardless of circumstances, the potential of the human race is born again. And with such a remarkably rich array of intellectual resources, certainly the nation's universities, through research and the scholarship of engagement, can help make it possible for more children to be "ready to learn." Perhaps universities can even help create in this country a public love of children.

As a second challenge, I'm convinced colleges and universities also must become more actively engaged with the nation's schools. We hear a lot of talk these days about how the schools have failed, and surely education must improve, but the longer the debate continues, the more I become convinced that it's not the schools that have failed, it's the partnership that's failed. Today, our nation's schools are being called upon to do what homes and churches and communities have not been able to accomplish. And if they fail anywhere along the line, we condemn them for not meeting our high-minded expectations. Yet, I've concluded that it's simply impossible to have an island of excellence in a sea of community indifference. After going to schools from coast to coast, I've also begun to wonder whether most school critics could survive one week in the classrooms they condemn. While commissioner of education, I visited an urban school with a leaky roof, broken test tubes, Bunsen burners that wouldn't work, text books ten years old, falling plaster, armed guards at the door, and then we wonder why we're not world-class in math and science, or, for that matter, in anything.

Especially troublesome is our lack of support for teachers. In the United States today, teachers spend on average \$400 of their own money each year, according to our surveys, to buy essential school supplies. They're expected to teach thirty-one hours every week, with virtually no time for preparation. The average kindergarten class size in this country is twenty-seven, even though research reveals it should be seventeen. And, in one state, the average kindergarten size is forty-one. I've never taught kindergarten or first grade, but I do have several grandchildren, and when I take them to McDonald's or some other fast food spot, I come home a basket case just from keeping mustard off the floor and tracking all the orders that keep changing every thirty seconds. And I'm not even trying to cram them for the SATs. I'm just trying to keep body and soul together. Class size does matter, especially in the early years, and it correlates directly with effective learning.

About a dozen years ago, the late Bart Giomatti invited me to evaluate what was called the Yale-New Haven Teacher's Institute. I was delighted to discover that some of Yale's most distinguished scholars directed summer seminars based on curricula teachers themselves had planned. And, incidentally, teachers in that program were called Yale Fellows. I was startled to discover that they were even given parking spaces on campus, which is about the highest status symbol a university can bestow. I'm suggesting that every college and university should view surrounding schools as partners, giving teaching scholarships to gifted high school students, just as we give athletic scholarships, and offering summer institutes for teachers, who are, I'm convinced, the unsung heroes of the nation.

During my Yale visit, I dropped in on a sixth-grade classroom in New Haven. Thirty children were crowded around the teacher's desk, and I thought it was a physical attack; I almost ran to the central office for help. But then I paused and discovered they weren't there out of anger, but intense enthusiasm. They had just finished reading Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*, and they were vigorously debating whether little Oliver could survive in their own neighborhood, speaking of relating the great books and intellectual inquiry to the realities of life. The children concluded that while Oliver had made it in far-off London, he'd never make it in New Haven, a much

tougher city. I was watching an inspired teacher at work, relating serious literature to the lives of urban youth today.

This leads me to say a word about higher education in the nation's cities. It's obvious that the problems of urban life are enormously complex; there are no simple solutions. I'm almost embarrassed to mention it as a problem because it is so enormously complex, but we live in cities. They determine the future of this country. Our children live there, too. And I find it ironic that universities which focused with such energy on rural America a century ago have never focused with equal urgency on our cities. Many universities do have projects they sponsor in urban areas such as Detroit, Buffalo, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, just to name a few. But, typically, these so-called model programs limp along, supported with soft money. Especially troublesome is the fact that academics who participate are not professionally rewarded.

Higher education cannot do it all, but Ira Harkavay of the University of Pennsylvania soberly warns that our great universities simply cannot afford to remain islands of affluence, self-importance, and horticultural beauty in seas of squalor, violence, and despair. With their schools of medicine, law, and education and their public policy programs, surely higher education can help put our cities and perhaps even our nation back together.

Here, then, is my conclusion. At one level, the scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers, and to our cities, just to name the ones I am personally in touch with most frequently. You could name others. Campuses would be viewed by both students and professors not as isolated islands, but as staging grounds for action.

But, at a deeper level, I have this growing conviction that what's also needed is not just more programs, but a larger purpose, a larger sense of mission, a larger clarity of direction in the nation's life as we move toward century twenty-one. Increasingly, I'm convinced that ultimately, the scholarship of engagement also means creating a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other, helping to enlarge what anthropologist Clifford Geertz describes as the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life for all of us.

Many years ago, Oscar Handlin put the challenge this way: "[A] troubled universe can no longer afford the luxury of pursuits confined to an ivory tower...[S]cholarship has to prove its worth not on its own terms, but by service to the nation and the world." This, in the end, is what the scholarship of engagement is all about.

*Note: This essay is adapted from a speech delivered at the Induction Ceremony of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, MA, October 11, 1995.*

Ernest L. Boyer. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1,1 (1996): 11-20.

# **Factors and Strategies that Influence Faculty Involvement in Public Service**

**Barbara A. Holland**

**Associate Provost for Strategic Planning and Outreach, Northern Kentucky University**

Fundamental questions about the role of public service as scholarly work persist among many faculty members. Institutional leaders feel challenged in their search for effective strategies to encourage faculty involvement in public service activities. In part, mysteries remain because much of the material on public service is experiential, and has been based on individual cases or individual institutional models.

While individual experiences and campus reports can offer inspiration and good ideas for further experimentation, they often lack the compelling impact of more systematic, broad-scale research studies that may help us see patterns, or suggest answers to persistent questions. Faculty and administrators alike have resonated to recent works that take a broader view of institutional challenges and issues of implementing public service activities by considering the experiences of multiple institutions (Burack 1998; NASULGC 1999).

Since 1995, several national research and evaluation projects involving a total of thirty-two diverse institutions have provided useful evidence about the conduct of public service activities (Holland 1997, 1999a, 1999b; Gelmon, Holland, and Shinnamon 1998). Each project has in common an examination of attitudes toward the role of public service from the perspective of faculty, students, community, and the institution. Because they look separately and in-depth at the actions and attitudes of each of these constituent groups, these multi-institutional studies are especially helpful in understanding individual and collective motivations, and the factors that inhibit or facilitate a decision to participate in public service activities. Patterns emerged from faculty data, and can best be presented by considering these questions about service activities:

- What motivates faculty involvement in service/outreach?
- What do faculty cite as obstacles to involvement?
- What can institutions do to facilitate faculty involvement?

## **The Sources of Faculty Motivation**

Most faculty who are already involved in public service and outreach report that they are motivated by personal values structures; they see mostly intrinsic rewards. Many answered this question by referring to their initiation into social activism in the 1960s! Others cited family, spiritual, community, or cultural experiences and values that have inspired their commitment to a life of service. As highly-educated individuals, they see themselves as having a responsibility to apply their knowledge toward the betterment of society. These faculty engage in both voluntary and professional service and often were found to be campus leaders in discussions about the role of outreach in the academy. They engage in service because it is the right thing to do and because it allows them to link their personal and professional lives.

Other faculty said that outreach and public service is relevant to the success of their discipline and the quality of their teaching and research agenda. These are faculty in disciplines with logical connections to external issues and audiences: social work; nursing, medicine, and other health professions; public administration; education, and so forth. In some cases, a program's accreditation may require evidence of public engagement for students and/or faculty.

Finally, motivation among faculty who more recently have become active in outreach programs often arises from their direct observation of respected institutions or colleagues, availability of incentives or rewards for participation, or evidence of the positive impact of outreach activities on organizational factors that they value, such as:

- academic prestige of individual faculty, departments, or of the institution;
- learning outcomes for students;
- public and private funding including new revenues, grants and gifts; and
- improved public image of the institution.

Faculty motivation is, therefore, found to be strongly influenced by personal experiences, individual and collective professional objectives, and evidence of positive outcomes on organizational outcomes they value. Different factors are of greater importance to different faculty and different disciplines.

### **The Common Obstacles to Faculty involvement**

Obstacles cited by faculty included concern about the time it takes to create new activities, cultivate partnerships, organize the logistics of service activities, and recruit students or other participants. Resources to support new activities were sometimes a problem, though many faculty learned that some outreach efforts can be resource-generating. Time in the curriculum or in a course was also a frequent obstacle for those specifically seeking to introduce service learning into a syllabus.

Across higher education, we lack a common understanding of the language of public service. A confusing myriad of terms has arisen, and the rhetoric of public service is not clear to everyone. Faculty are often deeply concerned about the lack of clear and comparable definitions of terms such as service, public service, professional service, outreach, public engagement, community service, service learning, internships, practica, and so on. Some terms have different meanings in different campus contexts, and some may be seen locally as pejorative because of unhappy past campus experiments with outreach. Confusion over these terms was found to constrain faculty involvement and to make effective documentation and evaluation difficult.

A lack of confidence with the skills and techniques of outreach and service was cited by some faculty as an obstacle to participation. The graduate experience teaches faculty to be experts in their field and to be accomplished scholars judged by their peers. Often a discussion among faculty about what is valued by their colleagues or their department is really about faculty

feeling confident and competent that they will be seen as successful. They want to pursue outreach with the same clarity of method and process they feel they have in the arena of research. Involvement in community partnerships where reciprocity and mutuality are expected can especially challenge faculty because they must learn to share the role of expert with non-academic partners. In addition, this kind of scholarly work involves collaboration including shared responsibility for outcomes and shared ownership of findings; this too is unfamiliar to many faculty and their disciplinary traditions. A companion concern was a lack of faculty experience with techniques for evaluating and documenting service activities, or a coherent campus policy regarding such documentation.

In addition, institutional mission and leadership matters to many faculty. The perception of the role of public service as a legitimate component of the institution's purposes is critically important to those faculty who do not have personal or disciplinary motivations for engagement. If a commitment to outreach is not articulated by institutional leadership and colleagues, and reflected in strategic plans and budgetary allocations, an environment of acceptance is unlikely to form for this kind of scholarly work. Not surprisingly, systems of rewards, as in promotion and tenure guidelines, were cited as obstacles to faculty involvement in outreach by junior faculty much more than senior faculty. This was related to the lack of clear procedures for documentation and evaluation, and with departmental or institutional experience with the scholarly value of public service. Formal rewards were far less important to senior faculty. Overall, faculty expressed less concern about promotion and tenure than the other obstacles mentioned in this essay.

### **The Relationship of Motivation to Effective Institutional Strategies**

These findings regarding motivation and obstacles can be linked to a pattern of effective organizational strategies used at institutions that have made advances in encouraging faculty involvement in public service. The strategies involve various aspects of campus policy, philosophy, budgets, programs, and organizational structure and actions. Not all are present at every institution. Faculty and administrators made it clear that programmatic strategies must reflect each institution's mission, history, capacity, and its academic strengths and objectives. Multiple strategies were employed by most institutions in order to match the diversity of faculty motivations for involvement or their perception of obstacles to participation. The basic idea is that each institution must bring its formal and informal rhetoric about the role of public service into alignment with its policies and practices regarding faculty involvement.

**1. Clear Mission** - Institutional leaders and respected faculty must articulate strong concurrence on a vision for the role of public service in the institution's mission and its relationship to individual and institutional prestige and academic excellence.

**2. Infrastructure Support** - Public service is time and labor intensive and the institution must reflect the value it places on public service in the investment it makes in supportive infrastructure. Infrastructure can take many forms and assume many duties, according to the institution's characteristics. Generally, faculty require and expect assistance with matters of logistics, planning, evaluation, and communications.

**3. Faculty Development - Building competence and confidence in the techniques of public service requires an investment in faculty development. Most effective were peer development activities where faculty partnered to learn from each other. A critical component of faculty development requires institutional attention to the development of a common campus language for public service activity, and specific methods of documentation and evaluation (Lynton 1995; Driscoll and Lynton 1999).**

**4. Incentives and Rewards - Faculty were found to have different motivations and different expectations regarding recognition and rewards, so their interests in incentives and rewards were different as well. Successful institutions or departments use diverse approaches including, for example, financial incentives; recognition through publicity, awards or special titles; support for dissemination activities; or support in fund raising or grant making to support public service projects. Institutions that began a campus discussion of the role of public service by addressing the formal promotion and tenure system made little progress. It is nearly impossible for faculty to understand the scholarly elements of public service in the abstract. Direct observation and experience lead faculty to understand how public service relates to other elements of their scholarship. Few institutions have made specific alterations in their reward systems, though some recognized faculty involvement in public service by linking it to the roles of teaching or research, depending on the nature of the activity. The best current practice is to offer many kinds of rewards, and to build a consistent framework for documenting and evaluating service.**

**5. Self Selection - Not all faculty need to, are interested in, or are qualified to pursue public service activities. Public service does not suit all faculty or all disciplines. Understanding the diverse forms of faculty motivation helps institutions create the incentives and rewards, and the supportive systems that will attract faculty involvement. The goal is to identify areas of emphasis and importance in public service, articulate the role of public service in the overall institutional mission, and then attract sufficient numbers of the most motivated faculty to become engaged.**

**6. The Role of Curriculum and Service Learning - For many faculty, involvement in public service is unfamiliar; the relevance to their scholarly agenda is not immediately clear to them. Faculty reported that the curricular environment is an area where they feel comfortable exploring the possibilities of public service. For example, incentives that encourage faculty to create service learning components in courses gives them experience in working with community partners, observing the effects of public service, and understanding the broader relevance of public service to their overall scholarly agenda. In addition, students become advocates for institutional commitment to public service. Service learning in the curriculum is an effective learning experience for faculty as well as students, and a good approach to building faculty confidence and interest in public service (Zlotkowski 1998).**

**7. Community Involvement and Partnership Themes - The visibility of community issues and the level of community participation in institutional planning for public service signals a level of commitment and importance for the role of public service to faculty. The degree of involvement of community representatives in advisory boards, project planning, campus-community events, and public service evaluation needs to be an accurate and balanced reflection of the institution's public service objectives. Some campuses have found it helpful to conspicuously focus on a few public service needs or themes that link academic strengths of the institution to external needs**

and challenges. This helps demonstrate the relevance of public service to other academic priorities and faculty roles as articulated by the institution. For example, my own institution has focused its early efforts in public engagement on urgent issues of our K-16 educational system and on economic/work force development. These priorities are reflected in recent academic program initiatives, grant proposals, and strategic objectives. In addition, we are building on our commitment to serving as an arts and cultural resource for the region by taking more events off-campus, and by partnering with new regional museum initiatives.

8. Budgeting and Planning - As in all organizational initiatives that represent change or new priorities, efforts to promote faculty involvement in public service require that institutional budgets must be demonstrably linked to institutional objectives. This includes making necessary investments in the elements of infrastructure, incentives and rewards, and faculty development at a level that reflects institutional aspirations and expectations. Engaging faculty from across the campus in a collective exploration of the role of public service in the campus mission can lead to strategic objectives for service activities. Administration must do its part by incorporating those objectives into financial choices.

## **Conclusion**

A coherent picture of the elements related to faculty motivations and attitudes toward public service is beginning to emerge as patterns of faculty attitudes and actions across multiple and diverse institutions become clear. Understanding the role of motivation in faculty decisions regarding public service helps point to the selection of effective strategies for creating an institutional environment that promotes and supports faculty involvement.

A good single watchword to guide the efforts of institutions to encourage faculty involvement in public service may be "consistency." Consistency across elements of mission definition, strategic priorities, budget actions, recognition and rewards, definitions of terms, internal and external communications, faculty development objectives, curricular philosophy, and community relationships sends a clear signal of the level of institutional commitment to public service. Such consistency is essential to encouraging many faculty to view service as a legitimate and valued component of their scholarly life and work, whatever their individual source of motivation for participation.

## **References**

- Burack, C. A. 1998. Strengthening and sustaining faculty service. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*. 3 (2): 42-47.
- Driscoll, A. and E. A. Lynton. 1999. Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Gelmon, S. B., B. A. Holland, and A. F. Shinnamon. 1998. Health professions schools in service to the nation: 1996-98 Final Evaluation Report. San Francisco: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.

Holland, B. A. 1998. Analyzing institutional commitment to service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4 (Fall): 30-41.

B. A. 1999a. From murky to meaningful: The role of mission in institutional change. In *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*. Edited by R. G. Bringle, R. Games, and E. A. Malloy. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

B. A. 1999b. Implementing urban missions project: Evaluation report. Work-in-progress for the Council of Independent Colleges.

Lynton, E. A. 1995. Making the case for professional service. Washington D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. 1999. Returning to our roots: The engaged institution. Report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities.

Zlotkowski, E. 1998. A Service Learning Approach to Faculty Development. In *Service Learning Pedagogy and Research*. Edited by J. P. Howard and R. Rhodes. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## **The State of the “Engaged Campus”**

### **What Have We Learned About Building and Sustaining University -Community Partnerships?**

**by Barbara A. Holland and Sherril B. Gelmon**

Dozens of institutions have discussed, pondered, argued, and waffled over the importance of university community relationships and their relevance to the academic core and mission. What forms should these partnerships take? Is this scholarly work? How do we avoid being overwhelmed by community needs? Why and how should we apply our intellectual energies to community issues?

Fortunately, there is a growing understanding of how intrinsic and extrinsic community-university partnerships might enhance the academy. While university-community interactions may not be relevant to the mission of all institutions, for many they have become a way to build relationships with the immediate community, improve image and support, and increase funding or recruitment and retention of students.

University- community interactions usually take basic and now familiar forms, such as service- learning, internships, practica, and capstones - all involving students in community-based learning. Faculty are also key to these learning strategies, and the partnership with community representatives often leads to additional opportunities for faculty to engage in a wide variety of scholarly activities, such as applied research, technical assistance, evaluation, and participatory action research.

But what do we know about the form and nature of the partnership relationships themselves? The many essays and articles written in the last few years have been dominated by "calls to action" that describe the importance and value of directing higher education's attention and intellectual assets toward our various communities and cities. These essays often focus on imponderable questions about how such partnerships should be developed and maintained.

Once the notion of the engaged campus took hold, many institutions looked for partnerships that would serve their own interests by allowing them to use the community and its problems as study subjects. This one-sided approach to linking the academy and the community is a deep-seated tradition that has, in fact, led to much of the estrangement of universities and colleges from their communities. Those very communities - necessary to fulfill the state of engagement -resent being treated as an experimental laboratory for higher education and resist the unidirectional nature of the campus efforts. As academics, we are trained as experts and tend to imagine community partnerships in which the institution identifies a need and offers an expert solution to the otherwise apparently hapless (or helpless) community.

Some faculty are skeptical about the appropriateness of applying knowledge to community issues and express concern about losing their scholarly agendas to nonacademic interests. Questions are raised about the relationship of this new kind of scholarly work to more traditional scholarly priorities. However, faculty and administrators alike see the potential for enhancing

community relations, student learning, and overall scholarly performance of the institution through applied scholarship and various forms of community-based learning.

Many institutions - public and private, large and small, urban and rural - have taken up the idea of more active community engagement and have been pioneers in exploring mutually beneficial relationships. They have had to do so without the guidance of prior research or experience; they have acted largely on faith that community interactions would prove to be valuable and rewarding for faculty and students. As a result, much has been learned on a trial-and-error basis.

### **Learning From Multiple Initiatives**

During the last two years, we have been involved in several national projects and local studies that permitted an in-depth exploration of many examples of university-community relationships. These include:

- The Health Professions Schools in Service to the Nation (HPSISN), funded by the Corporation for National Service and the Pew Charitable Trusts.
- The Interdisciplinary Professional Education Collaborative (IPEC), funded by the Institute for Healthcare Improvement and the federal Bureau of Health Professions.
- The assessment of the impact of service -learning across the curriculum at Portland State University, funded by the Corporation for National Service and internal sources.
- The Healthy Communities initiative of the metropolitan Portland region, one of 25 sites in the national Community Care Network (CCN) program, funded by the WK. Kellogg Foundation and administered by the Hospital Research and Educational Trust.
- Independent research on organizational change and the nature of university-community relationships at a variety of public and private institutions.

In that exploration, we have used a systematic approach that considered the impact of various community-based learning initiatives on the community, the faculty, the students, and the institution. By analyzing each of these constituencies separately and collectively, we have learned a great deal about how campuses can be more successful in building and sustaining community partnerships that are effective for all who are involved.

***When you've seen one partnership, you've seen one partnership.***

We found wide variety in the forms and types of community partnerships, reflecting differences in the history, capacity, culture, mission, and challenges faced by institutions and communities. Institutions must examine their missions and consider the relevance of service to core academic purposes. In addition, the level and types of service activities that a campus can engage in will be shaped by the role of the institution in the community and the nature of the community's capacity to address their own issues. For example, when West Virginia Wesleyan

College, a HPSISN site, set out to design service -learning courses, they discovered that their small rural community had little social service infrastructure to serve as a natural organizing framework for partnerships. Thinking creatively, they began with a door-to-door assessment of community needs and developed a focus for their service -learning activities.

### ***A match made in heaven, or the result of a dating service?***

Partnerships should reflect academic program strengths, and academic programs and scholarly agendas should reflect, at least in part, regional characteristics and challenges. Campuses should develop selected arrays of partnerships and cultivate them well, rather than engage in random activities. Portland State University has devoted considerable effort in the identification of partnerships that meet community-identified needs while also developing academic strengths and meeting curricular objectives. Many partnerships that may begin with a specific service- learning course requirement evolve over time and become the basis for more complex joint planning, evaluation, or other mutually beneficial activity. The Allegheny University of the Health Sciences, an IPEC site, has initiated a major community development project in an underserved area known as the Eleventh Street Corridor in Philadelphia, but only after careful reflection and determination that there was clear potential for mutual benefit.

### ***The community knows who it is; do you?***

A common failing of universities working with communities is the assumption that they can develop a single, uniform definition of who and what the "community" is, or that such a definition is necessary. The definition of community is itself a difficult challenge; *who is the community?* is best answered in the context of each institution and community and each chosen area of shared effort. Again, the community that the university works with is defined in part by the degree of fit with institutional academic strengths. Our findings indicate that the natural development of university-community partnerships begins with work between the university and well-organized local agencies and organizations that have the capacity and sophistication to interface with the more bureaucratic university. Over time, these relationships demonstrate the lasting commitment of the university and contribute to the development of trust. These developmental steps are key to gaining access to the deeper, more complex, informal fabric of the community and key populations.

The community must take a leadership role in defining what the university or college will do in the community setting. Community sites participating in a partnership of the George Washington University and George Mason University (participants in both the HPSISN and IPEC programs) have been carefully selected so that specific populations and contexts complement program goals. However, each community site participates in planning the curricular experiences and in defining needs and designing service activities that match those needs well.

### ***Leadership matters.***

The interpretation of the role of community engagement in an institution's mission must involve a discussion among all levels of campus leadership, including faculty. While it is

critically important that executive administrators consistently articulate the level of institutional commitment, they cannot unilaterally create and sustain partnerships or mandate faculty and student involvement. Community engagement as a core academic and scholarly activity involves the identification and support of faculty leaders and mentors who will sustain partnership activities over time and integrate engagement into their overall scholarly agenda. It is important to keep in mind that institutional involvement in community service does not devalue traditional scholarship, nor does every faculty member have to adopt service as part of their agenda. Community engagement requires a broader view of scholarship so that those faculty for whom service makes scholarly sense can be evaluated and rewarded for their efforts.

Each institution must decide the level and type of engagement that best reflects its mission and then test that decision by listening to the community. Then campus leaders must work to ensure that a critical mass of faculty have the skills and support to fulfill that commitment. Leaders also contribute by ensuring adequate infrastructure to support the partnerships. The community-based teaching activities at many institutions, such as the University of Kentucky, the University of Scranton, Portland State University, and the University of Utah, are strengthened by a campus-wide center for service or volunteerism that provides faculty development programs and other assistance to faculty and students.

### ***It's the curriculum, stupid!***

We found partnerships that incorporate aspects of student learning to be the most mutually sustainable and comfortable paths to creating and testing relationships between the campus and the community. The community feels a sense of reciprocity in helping students develop civic responsibility and respectful understanding of critical human issues while learning new skills and exploring careers. For faculty, engagement in community-based learning through course instruction is less threatening than partnerships that may seem to impinge on their research agendas or may not be recognized by reward systems. Experimentation with community relationships through teaching allows faculty to explore linkages to the rest of their scholarly work. Students report that they learn much more about the community and find links to their academic goals when service is done as part of a course and not as an extracurricular volunteer activity. Students who participate in required course-based service-learning show greater personal transformation than those in optional programs. However, the issue of required service-learning remains controversial.

### ***We all have something to give and something to gain.***

Most people understand that successful partnerships focus on mutual benefits. We describe effective partnerships as knowledge-based collaborations in which all partners have things to teach each other, things to learn from each other, and things they will learn together. We have seen that an effective partnership builds the capacity of each partner to accomplish its own mission while also working together.

Sustainability is directly associated with an ongoing sense of reciprocity related to the exchange of knowledge and expertise. The University of Utah (a HPSISN site) places pharmacy and nursing students as companions in a seniors housing facility. Not only did students remark

on what they gained from their service -learning experiences but the housing manager also played a role in the classroom as a facilitator of structured reflection, a key element of service -learning.

In many campus settings, community partners began with the view that they would not be accepted as coteachers because of their different experiences and credentials. Both they and faculty were often surprised at how professional expertise, extensive social and communication networks, and entrepreneurial skills allowed community partners to assume key roles in the student learning experience.

*The learning never stops.*

As knowledge-based organizations focus on learning, collaborations inevitably evolve and change. Effective partnerships require a shared commitment to ongoing, comprehensive evaluation from the earliest stages of the relationship. A commitment to evaluation helps build trust and confidence between partners, especially when the community sees that the campus is open to criticism and that there is an authentic commitment to improvement.

Advisory groups were organized at most institutions as a way of gaining input. When advisory groups also played a strong role in evaluation, the partnership tended to expand into new community networks and collaborations. As a community-based organization, the Portland Healthy Communities initiative (a CCN site) has relied heavily on student and faculty participation since its inception. The nature of university involvement has varied over time, depending on the initiative's view of community needs. Projects have included strategic planning, staffing of action groups, membership on an oversight council, administrative and policy support, evaluation, use of geographic mapping and information systems technologies, website development, and facilitation of community meetings. The range of activities in the partnership is not limited but is designed to reflect both assets and needs. Evaluation has been critical to tracking those evolutionary changes and supporting improvement in the relationship.

## **Conclusion**

While partnerships take many purposes and forms, there are common features associated with "success, which most define as sustainability.

Sustainable partnerships have the following characteristics: (1) there are mutually agreed-upon goals; (2) success is defined and outcomes are measured in both institutional and community terms; (3) control of the agenda is vested primarily in community hands; (4) effective use and enhancement of community capacity are based on clear identification of community resources and strengths; (5) the educational component has clear consequences for the community and the institution; and (6) there is an ongoing commitment to evaluation that involves all partners.

The challenge facing higher education is twofold: first, making the changes in curricula and institutional culture that encourage partnerships with communities based on mutual learning as well as mutual benefit; and second, learning how to do this well.

The notion of the engaged campus will, no doubt, be sustained as a critical aspect of the mission of many institutions. We hope others involved in partnership evaluations will share their findings and learning widely so that higher education may grow in its effectiveness in working beside and within communities to develop rewarding and sustainable relationships.

**Barbara A. Holland, formerly at Portland State University, is associate provost for strategic planning and outreach at Northern Kentucky University and executive editor of *Metropolitan Universities*. Contact her at Lucas Administrative Center 812, Nunn Drive, Highland Heights, KY 41099; hollandba@nku.edu.**

**Sherril B. Gelmon teaches health management and policy as an associate professor of public health at Portland State University and is a senior fellow at the Center for the Health Professions of the University of California-San Francisco. Write to her at P.O. Box 751 -PA, Portland, OR 97207-0751; gelmons@pdx.edu.**

## **Indicators of Engagement**

**by Elizabeth L. Hollander, John Saltmarsh, and Edward Zlotkowski  
Campus Compact**

Hollander, Elizabeth, John Saltmarsh, and Edward Zlotkowski (2001). "Indicators of Engagement," in Simon, L.A., Kenny, M., Brabeck, K., & Lerner, R.M. (Eds.), *Learning to Serve: Promoting Civil Society Through Service-Learning*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

### **Abstract**

As institutions of higher education reshape their organizational and administrative structures and functions in alignment with community-based education and civic renewal, there has emerged a framework for the "engaged campus." This essay traces the emergence of the engaged campus in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century as the developments in service-learning converged with widespread recognition of a national crisis defined by civic disintegration. Working from the conceptual framework of an engaged campus, the authors identify and provide current examples of ten critical "indicators" of community and civic engagement that indicate that an institution is establishing the essential foundations for engagement.

## Indicators of Engagement

### I. The Emergence of the Engaged Campus

Campus engagement with local communities can take many forms, emerge from a variety of motivations, and have vastly different roots depending upon institutional culture, history, and geography. A historically black college has a rationale for engagement that differs significantly from that of a land grant university, which differs again from that of a private university in an urban center. From decade to decade, to a greater or lesser degree, holding close to or wavering from their mission, each institution shapes its public purpose accordingly. Over time, experiments in engagement have produced highly successful examples of programs, policies, and organizational and administrative structures that in concrete and visible ways can be identified as “indicators” of engagement. These indicators have emerged from experience with a range of institutional engagement strategies over the past quarter-century.

From the perspective of Campus Compact, a national coalition of nearly 700 college and university presidents committed to the civic purposes of higher education, a portrait of an engaged campus has emerged from the experiences and examples of hundreds of institutions across the United States. At its beginning, Campus Compact’s perspective on campus engagement was focused on community service, which was embraced by both students and campus administrators as a counterweight to the characterization of contemporary students as a self-centered “me generation.” Students’ creation of COOL (Campus Outreach Opportunity League) in 1984 and the Compact’s founding by college and university presidents in 1985 implicitly affirmed that students were seeking and that campuses were willing to provide opportunities for altruistic, socially responsible activity through community service (Morton and Troppe, 1996; Stanton, et al, 1999).

By the late 1980s service-learning had risen to prominence, marking a distinct evolution from community service to service that was integrated with academic study. During the early 1990s, service-learning spread across college campuses as a pedagogy of action and reflection that connected student’s academic study with public problem-solving experiences in local community settings. As increasing numbers of faculty became involved in redesigning their curricula to incorporate service-learning, new questions emerged regarding such larger institutional issues as the definition of faculty roles and rewards, the value of community-based teaching and research, definitions of faculty professional service, strategies for maintaining community partnerships, and the role of the university in assisting community renewal (Zlotkowski, 1998; Jacoby, 1996; Rhoads and Howard, 1998, Eyler and Giles, 1999).

By the mid 1990s, these service-learning developments had converged with a range of critical and often contested issues -- pedagogical, epistemological, institutional, and political -- in higher education. Campuses were widely viewed as disconnected from social concerns and unresponsive to public needs, indeed, as largely deficient in meeting their civic obligations. When the National Commission on Civic Renewal issued their 1998 report on civic disengagement, it offered no role for higher education in providing solutions aimed at rebuilding civic life. (National Commission on Civic Renewal, 1998; Damon, 1998) Instead, the report in many ways echoed what the community organizer Saul Alinsky had written in the late 1940s about higher education’s relationship to community building; namely, that “the word ‘academic’ is often synonymous with irrelevant” (Alinsky, 1946). However, while a contemporary could have objected that Alinsky’s critique failed to reflect the significant contribution higher

education was making to meeting the country's international crisis during the 40s, no such mitigating consideration was available in the 90s.

Indeed, institutions of higher education were highly responsive in helping to meet the needs of the country as defined by the cold war, and allowed themselves to become in large part structured and organized around the demands of the military-industrial complex. This meant that their culture celebrated science and technology, their faculty emphasized objectivity and detachment, and their value system elevated the role of the scientifically educated expert over that of ordinary citizens in public affairs (Bender, 1993; Mathews, 1998).

Yet the crisis we now face at the beginning of a new century is a crisis in our civic life. Success in addressing the cold war meant that colleges and universities became shaped in ways that are not necessarily those needed to meet the challenge of transforming our civic life. The ethos of professionalism and expertise that defined higher education's response to the national crisis of the cold war now contributes to public disillusionment with institutions that represent and legitimize a system that no longer addresses our most pressing national needs (Boyer, 2000; Sullivan, 1995). For this reason, many higher education institutions, in their struggle to meet our need for civic renewal, have found themselves returning to their founding missions, which in some part express the aim of serving American democracy by educating students for productive citizenship. At the same time, they look to pedagogies of engagement such as service-learning to prepare students with the knowledge and skills needed for democratic citizenship. Service-learning not only transforms teaching and learning, but also has the potential to surface a broader vision of the engaged campus (Hollander and Saltmarsh, 2000; Campus Compact, 1999A). Such a campus, centrally engaged in the life of its local communities, reorients its core missions - teaching, scholarship, and service - around community building and neighborhood resource development.

\* Pedagogy is centered on engaged teaching; that is, connecting structured student activities in community work with academic study, decentering the teacher as the singular authority of knowledge, incorporating a reflective teaching methodology, and shifting the model of education, to use Freire's distinctions, from "banking" to "dialogue" (Freire, 1970; Dewey, 1916; Saltmarsh 1996).

\* Scholarship of engagement is oriented toward community-based action research that addresses issues defined by community participants and that includes students in the process of inquiry (Boyer, 1990).

\* Service is expanded beyond the confines of department committees, college committees and professional associations to the application of academic expertise to community-defined concerns (Lynton, 1995).

The vision of the engaged campus also suggests a wider democratic practice, one that goes beyond a reorientation of the institution's professional culture and a revisiting of its academic mission to include changes in institutional structure and organization. Reciprocal, long-term relationships in local communities imply institutional structures--what Mary Walshok calls "enabling mechanisms" (Walshok, 1995)--to connect the campus to the community. Faculty roles are reconsidered, as is the reward structure, to acknowledge, validate, and encourage a shift in teaching, scholarship, and service toward community engagement. Additionally, traditional campus divisions such as those between student affairs and academic affairs, and between disciplines and departments are suspended in the interest of a broader view of educating students as whole

individuals whose experience of community engagement is not artificially confined by disciplinary distinctions. Further, the institution embraces a view of the campus as a part of, not as separate from, the local community. Such a view reconceptualizes the resources of the college or university as community-related resources, impacting issues like community economic development, hiring, purchasing and the investment of capital in community revitalization (Ehrlich, 2000). It is this larger sense of institutional alignment that Ernest Boyer had in mind when he employed the concept of “the scholarship of engagement,” by which he meant “connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems.” Higher education, claimed Boyer, “must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems, and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I call the scholarship of engagement” (Boyer, 1996).

## II. Indicators of Engagement

When Campus Compact is called upon to assist a campus in moving toward deeper engagement in a local community, our response is shaped by the experience of our member campuses over years of experiments and challenges, and draws upon a wide range of experiences and examples. We look specifically for the existence of certain institutional activities, policies, and structures. These, as they stand individually, can be considered “indicators of engagement.” Any number of these indicators occurring together on a campus suggests wider institutional engagement and the emergence of an “engaged campus.” However, it is unlikely that all will be apparent on any one campus. These indicators should not be regarded as prescriptive; their value lies in the possibilities they suggest. They include:

1. *Pedagogy and epistemology*: Are there courses on campus that have a community-based component that enhances the acquisition and creation of disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge (service-learning courses)? Is gaining knowledge through experience accepted as an academically credible method of creating meaning and understanding?

2. *Faculty development*: Are there opportunities for faculty to retool their teaching methods to employ a reflective teaching methodology that maximizes the value of integrating community-based experiences with the academic aims of a course? Is there administrative support for faculty to redesign their curricula to incorporate community-based activities and reflection on those activities?

3. *Enabling mechanisms*: Are there visible and easily accessible structures on campus that function both to assist faculty with community-based teaching and learning and to broker the relationships between community-based organizations (community partners) and various curricular and co-curricular activities on campus?

4. *Internal resource allocation*: Is there adequate funding available for establishing, enhancing, and deepening community-based work on campus – for faculty, students, and programs that involve community partners?

5. *External resource allocation*: Is there funding available for community partners to create a richer learning environment for students working in the community and to assist those partners to

access human and intellectual resources on campus? Are resources made available for community-building efforts in local neighborhoods?

6. *Faculty roles and rewards*: Do the tenure and promotion guidelines used at the institution reflect the kind of reconsideration of scholarly activity proposed by Ernest Boyer, whereby a scholarship of teaching and a scholarship of engagement are viewed on a par with the scholarship of discovery (Boyer, 1990)?

7. *Disciplines, departments, interdisciplinarity*: Is community-based education relegated to a small number of social science disciplines, or is it embedded in the arts and humanities, hard sciences, technical disciplines, professional studies, and interdisciplinary programs as well? To what extent does it exist only on the margins of the curriculum, or has it been allowed to penetrate to the institution's academic core?

8. *Community voice*: How deeply are community partners involved in determining their role in and contribution to community-based education, and to what degree can they shape institutional involvement to maximize its benefits to the community?

9. *Administrative and Academic Leadership*: Do the president, provost and trustees visibly support campus civic engagement, in both their words and deeds? To what degree have the president and academic leadership been in the forefront of institutional transformation that supports civic engagement? To what degree is the campus known as a positive partner in local community development efforts?

10. *Mission and purpose*: Does the college or university's mission explicitly articulate its commitment to the public purposes of higher education and higher education's civic responsibility to educate for democratic participation? Are these aspects of the mission openly valued and identified to reinforce the public activities of the campus? Are they viewed merely as rhetoric, or is there substantive reality to match such stated purposes?

What follows are concrete examples of the kinds of activities, policies, and organizational and administrative structures that indicate deepening engagement in local communities. For any of the indicators, the examples provided are not meant to suggest any kind of comprehensive overview but merely to provide specific examples of increasingly widespread practices.

### 1. *Pedagogy and epistemology.*

At the core of wider institutional engagement lies an academic commitment to the kind of teaching, learning, and knowledge creation that foster active civic engagement. Courses with a service-learning or community-based component signify adoption of an engaged pedagogy. Yet, embedded within such a curriculum is a reflective teaching methodology that de-centers the instructor, and in doing so, recognizes that the authority of knowledge in the classroom is shared among faculty members, students, and partners in the community. Since such a reconceptualization of authority necessitates multifaceted reflection upon all knowledge-producing activity, faculty need to develop an array of tools and effective means for encouraging deep reflection by students (Eyler and Giles, 1999).

At Portland State University in Oregon, the university's commitment to community-based public problem solving as part of its Land Grant mission creates a strong academic connection to the community. Students in their second and third years pursue clusters of inquiry dealing with a theme related to their major and relevant to the Portland community. Most of these courses involve some kind of service-learning or action research project. In the fourth year, seniors must complete a capstone experience, a project that uses a team of students from several different disciplines to address a community-based problem or issue. All undergraduate students must make a connection between their academic work and the surrounding community before they graduate. (Campus Compact, 1999 B)

At St. Joseph's College, a small Catholic, liberal arts college in Standish, Maine, over 25% of the full-time faculty embrace service-learning as a legitimate method of gaining knowledge. The College's Vice-President for Academic Affairs has included service-learning in his strategic plan for academic learning with the goal that all students will experience this method of learning during their undergraduate education. Further, he is working with the faculty to infuse service-learning in the core curriculum. At a very different institution, the University of San Diego, approximately sixty classes use service-learning during the academic year, including courses that are offered both semesters and those that have more than one section. Over fifty faculty members have incorporated service-learning into their courses and between 450 and 500 students participate in service-learning courses each semester. Courses are offered in the schools of business and education, and many arts and sciences departments. These include anthropology, biology, chemistry, communication studies, English, fine arts (music and studio arts), foreign languages (French, German, Italian, and Spanish), gender studies, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology. There are service-learning business courses in accounting, economics, information systems, marketing, and management.

## **2. *Faculty Development.***

For community-based education to take hold on campus, faculty must have with, and opportunities to develop new teaching skills. The traditional trajectory for faculty developing their teaching skills results in a lecture-based format that aims at the delivery of a certain content consisting of disciplinary knowledge. For faculty to confidently incorporate community-based learning into their courses, they will need curriculum development grants, reductions in teaching loads and to the opportunity to attend on-campus workshops and seminars, and/or support to attend regional and national institutes and conferences that will help them gain the skills they need to employ an engaged pedagogy. Faculty development must be taken seriously as a component of institutional engagement (Holland, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1998).

An increasingly common faculty development strategy provides faculty stipends to redesign their discipline-based courses to include a service-learning course. In this model, the stipend is accompanied by a commitment by the faculty member to attend a series of workshops on experiential learning theory, reflection, community partnerships, and other key elements of community-based education. Further, the participating faculty commit to teaching their redesigned courses at least twice. The assumptions behind this model are twofold. First, the initial teaching of the course is treated as an experiment and the faculty member is encouraged to reflect on the successes and challenges of the course and make needed adjustments. Second, faculty who develop the competencies of community-based education and realize the enhanced learning potential of such an approach will continue to teach service-learning courses.

Early in the development of service-learning, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI) adopted a model of offering course development stipends to faculty, a model that had been used successfully at University of Notre Dame. Faculty were offered stipends of \$1,000 to support the creation, implementation, or improvement of service-learning courses. Faculty recipients agreed to participate in three campus workshops during the academic year of the award. At the University of San Diego, all faculty members interested in service-learning attend a one-day curriculum development workshop on the foundations and theory of service-learning facilitated by experienced faculty members. During the semester that faculty integrate service-learning for the first time, they attend a second workshop. Faculty members receive \$250 for two days for participating in the workshops. They also receive \$250 for revision of their curricula and \$250 for writing evaluation reports. All beginners have an experienced faculty "facilitator" as a resource person who meets with them several times during the semester and is available for assistance. In this way, the university works toward the goal of building a critical mass of faculty committed to service-learning as a viable pedagogy.

At St. Joseph's College, faculty have been selected to receive course development grants and each semester a faculty development workshop has been offered. Topics have included an introduction to service-learning, reflection and academic integration, assessment of student learning outcomes, working with community partners, and discipline-specific approaches to service-learning. Grant funding was secured to bring in leading national service-learning practitioners and community partners to facilitate the workshops. Additionally, faculty have participated in the problem-based service-learning workshops offered each summer by the Maine Campus Compact, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs has participated in regional meetings of provosts to discuss service-learning and strategies for faculty development.

### **3. *Enabling mechanisms.***

The single most important enabling mechanism for community-based education is a centralized office that performs a wide variety of functions. Indeed, so important is this particular "mechanism" that there exist few, if any, genuinely engaged campuses that do not have one. However, both its location/configuration and functions vary enormously from campus to campus.

Although many schools have some kind of "volunteer center" operating out of student affairs, most schools that become serious about developing a comprehensive engagement profile find it highly advantageous to locate such a center on the faculty affairs side of the institution, or at least to establish formal links between a more traditionally located center and academic administrators. Indeed, the degree to which a center has succeeded in developing effective, widely respected programming linked to scholarship and the curriculum is one important indicator of its institution's commitment to the concept of an engaged campus. Almost every school profiled in *Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education* (Zlotkowski, 1998) features a center under the authority of the provost or academic dean. When a different arrangement is involved, as in the case of the University of Utah, it still features multiple links to those responsible for academic programming.

Aside from the actual location of such a center on the institution's organizational chart, its relationship to other offices responsible for assisting faculty and/or students is another important consideration. Most frequently, an office that facilitates service-learning and other forms of engaged scholarship also facilitates other forms of off-campus work; for example, traditional extra-curricular community service and/or traditional internships. The advantage of bringing together under the same roof different kinds of partnering efforts is that such an

arrangement helps the institution better keep track of and coordinate its relations with the community. On other campuses, the office that facilitates academic partnering is linked with faculty development (Portland State University) or student career services (Michigan State University).

Naturally, the location and linkages that define a center also help define the kinds of services it provides. Clearly its single most common function is to serve as a clearinghouse for faculty-community collaborations. Examples of this function range from a relatively passive indexing of what is available in the off-campus community to providing assistance with transportation, orientation, and reflection to highly proactive attempts to build and sustain long term partnerships based equally on faculty and community needs. However, some centers also assist faculty in learning about what is being done in comparable academic programs at other institutions. An increasingly frequent and especially promising function of many centers is to locate and train students capable of serving as faculty-community intermediaries (University of San Diego and Miami-Dade Community College). Regardless of their specific functions, centers must develop the forms and procedures that allow them to organize and document their work.

#### **4. *Internal Resource allocation.***

Nothing is more common than for a college or university to recognize the benefits of engagement -- and to try to capitalize on those benefits -- without making any substantive investment in the resources such engagement requires. Many potentially fine programs have been initiated with the help of grants, only to crumble away once their external source of funding has dried up. Few schools would consider trying to reap the benefits of corporate or alumni support without first investing in a development or alumni office, and yet, when it comes to community engagement, this is precisely what they often do. Internal institutional funding is, therefore, one significant measure of an institution's commitment to engagement.

This being said, it is important to note that internal resources come in many forms, not the least important of which is space. How much space and where on campus a school is willing to dedicate space to organizing its engagement activities often says more than any catalog copy about the real significance the school attaches to them. Another indication is its willingness to tap already existing resources to strengthen those activities. When Bentley College in Waltham, Massachusetts, first began developing a service-learning program in the early 1990s, its provost not only made it clear that summer scholarship funds should be used to support quality work in this new area, he also made it possible for the program to "employ" graduate students through a reallocation of graduate assistantships and undergraduates through a reorganization of community-focused work-study placements. While the program's operations and staff line items grew modestly over the course of several years, a redistribution of already budgeted resources made it possible for the program to accomplish far more than the growth in those line items would suggest.

#### **5. *External resource allocation.***

Investing resources off campus for community-building has a powerful effect in 1) demonstrating a commitment to the value of reciprocity in campus-community partnerships, and 2) recognizing the erosion of boundaries between the campus and community. The broader educational value of external resource allocation is that the institution, in its economic relations, models the values instilled in community-based academic study.

Increasingly, there are examples of campuses that are investing in their surrounding communities as a way of demonstrating their civic engagement and leveraging other resources for improving challenged communities. These investments are, in some cases, direct financial contributions that may be as large as the \$20 million that Harvard has invested as seed funds for low and moderate income housing development in Cambridge, Massachusetts, or the \$8 million that Trinity College in Connecticut has invested in a “learning corridor” adjacent to their campus, or as modest as the \$150,000 in small business development funds pledged by the President, Theodore Long, of Elizabeth College in Pennsylvania, to the Elizabethtown Economic Development Corporation. Similarly, in 1995, Georgetown University in Washington, DC, purchased \$1 million worth of stock in *City First Bank* of DC. In 1999, *City First* opened its doors to service Washington’s low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, seeking to increase home ownership and establish stable, mixed-income communities, to provide a range of financing needed to upgrade housing stock and commercial centers, and to strengthen the base of local small businesses. In each of these cases, the campus serves as one of a variety of actors (public, corporate and non-profit) that are investing in community improvement.

Development of campus structures designed to serve both campus and community is another increasingly common strategy for external resource allocation. For example, Metropolitan State University in St. Paul, Minnesota, is developing a shared-use building that will be a joint community-university library to include a job resource center, a youth/adult study center, a children’s reading room, and a community learning and meeting room. At DePaul University in Chicago, a downtown department store has been renovated into a mixed-use facility that includes city government office space, a retail mall, and campus classrooms and support facilities. Increasingly, campus athletic facilities are open to community use, particularly in the summer.

Other, more indirect ways in which campuses are extending resources to their communities come in the form of purchasing and hiring policies that favor local residents and businesses. The University of Illinois at Chicago has experimented both with neighborhood hiring and the use of local vendors. The University of Pennsylvania has sought, in all of its construction projects, to increase the participation of minority and female-owned firms.

## **6. *Faculty roles and rewards.***

Faculty are at the core of any higher education institution, and faculty roles and rewards are at the core of faculty life. No matter how genuine a school’s commitment to engagement as articulated in its mission, that commitment will probably amount to little, at least in the long run, if the school is unwilling to address the specific ways in which it formally recognizes a faculty member’s contribution to that commitment. Logistical and technical assistance is essential, as is the availability of other resources, but if, when it comes down to what the faculty as a body regard as valuable, community-based work is nowhere explicitly identified, faculty engagement will perforce remain a peripheral concern.

The last five years, in particular, have seen a recognition of this fact in the ever increasing number of schools that have adopted some variant of Boyer’s expanded understanding of scholarship (Boyer, 1990). West Virginia University, for example, revised its promotion and tenure guidelines in 1998 to allow faculty to renegotiate their contracts. Faculty can now, with the agreement of their department chair and college dean, work to achieve excellence in teaching and service instead of teaching and research. To assess the degree to which this, and other programs on campus, are helping students develop civic competencies and habits, providing opportunities for faculty to engage in true civic partnerships, and encouraging faculty to engage in community-based teaching and action research, the university has begun an evaluation process

that will gradually expand into a full civic assessment program (<http://www.compact.org/resource/>).

Portland State notes that “[s]cholarly accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and community outreach all enter into the evaluation of faculty performance” (Zlotkowski, 1998, G-7). Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) includes in its faculty annual report a category called “Volunteer Community Service” for which it stipulates “voluntary, civic responsibilities...deem[ed] relevant to [one’s] professional work.” Not to be included under this heading is “[s]ervice to the community as a citizen rather than as a professional whose work can be assessed by peers” (IUPUI Faculty and Librarian Annual Report).

### **7. Disciplines, departments, interdisciplinarity.**

No one would deny the importance of quality community-based work in nursing, teacher education, and sociology. However, institutions where the vast majority of engaged projects are located in areas like these can hardly be said to have made significant progress toward campus-wide engagement. While the fact that the anthropology department at the University of Pennsylvania boasts a demonstrated commitment to work in West Philadelphia is commendable, but the fact that the university’s history department can also make such a claim probably tells us more about Penn’s determination to become a truly engaged campus. Colleges and universities need to avail themselves of resources such as the American Association for Higher Education’s 18-volume series on service-learning in the disciplines (1997-2000) and Driscoll and Lynton’s *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach* (1999) to ensure that community-based work is not seen as the concern only of a few “naturally appropriate” disciplines (Driscoll and Lynton, 1999).

Even more difficult to achieve is unit ownership of outreach efforts, regardless of the discipline or department involved. The Compact’s newly launched “Institute on the Engaged Department” represents one of the few resources currently available to help transform engagement from something of interest only to individual faculty practitioners to a commitment made by an entire academic unit. But only when such a commitment has been made can students and community partners rely upon the availability of faculty to maintain the integrity of community-based programs. Although specially endowed units like the Feinstein Center for Public Service at Providence College have for years been able to make this commitment, schools like Calvin College, with its well established record of academically based service, are only now beginning to plan for such a commitment by a range of departments across the curriculum.

Institutionalization of this kind should also lay the foundation for more community-based academic work that draws upon several disciplines. As the AAHE series on service-learning in the disciplines makes clear, we already have many fine examples of community-based capstone experiences in which students are expected to use the natural interdisciplinarity of off-campus work as an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to integrate skills and concepts from different areas of their academic careers. Less common are programs such as Purdue’s EPICS program (Engineering Projects in Community Service) which folds a variety of disciplinary perspectives into an engineering core. But as Boyer suggested in his now famous sketch of “The New American College” (1994), the engaged campus of the future will “organize cross-disciplinary institutes around pressing social issues” as a matter of course.

### **8. Community Voice.**

Establishing and maintaining meaningful community partnerships as part of a broader vision of civic engagement requires the development of trust, long-term commitments, and formal obligations on the part of all involved (Campus Compact, 2000; Holland and Gelmon, 1998). While partnerships take time to develop, there are certain initial strategies that can be implemented from the beginning to foster deeper, more lasting partnerships. A common starting point is the creation of an advisory committee with significant representation from the community. The make-up of such a committee would typically include faculty, administrators, the campus community service director, students, and community partners. The committee can function in such a way as to involve community partners in joint strategic planning and in fostering dialogue between the campus and community, particularly around mutual campus-community understanding. Community partners can also be invited to assist in curricula development and in course instruction.

At IUPUI, community partners have been involved in providing important guidance and feedback in the development and maintenance of the service-learning program. Community representatives have served on the Service Learning Advisory Committee, Service Learning in University College Advisory Committees, Community Service Scholars selection committee and the Universities as Citizens Summer Institute planning team. Agency personnel also work with individual faculty in the design, implementation, and administration of service-learning classes. At Providence College, community partners have played a significant role in strategic planning about community-based education and have been involved in curriculum development. Community partners have also been provided a stipend to team-teach service-learning courses with department faculty.

Similarly, at St. Joseph's College, community partners participate in needs assessment and evaluation meetings, meet with faculty as they have designed courses, supervise and evaluate students, and participate in several workshops offered for their learning on service-learning, effective supervision and partnerships, community asset-mapping, etc.. There are also opportunities for community partners to come into the classroom for orientation and discussion of particular topics, as well as to teach a course.

### ***9. Administrative and Academic Leadership.***

Essential to accomplishing all of the indicators identified here of engagement is leadership from the top that actively endorses and supports engagement efforts. In the best of all possible worlds, the trustees, the president and the provost (or academic equivalent) would all be enthusiasts. The trustees and presidents can raise funds to support civic engagement and can provide a bully pulpit for fostering it. At Swarthmore College, a trustee committee on social responsibility was formed to reflect on the institutional mission to “prepare and motivate students to engage issues of social responsibility facing our communities and societies and to set their own paths as responsible citizens toward shaping a more inclusive, just and compassionate world.” At Tufts University, President John DiBiaggio worked for 10 years to develop a “college” of public service and citizenship and raised \$10 million from the E-Bay corporation to support it. At Alcorn State, Clinton Bristow leads a “communiversity” effort that is common in Historically Black Colleges. At the University of Vermont, Judith Ramaley is leading the effort to increase engagement (building on her experience in transforming Portland State) and has instituted such practices as an “Introduction to Vermont” for new faculty. At Miami-Dade Community College, Eduardo Padron has made real a commitment that his institution is indeed the “community’s college” through such efforts as a technology learning center located in a local church. These presidents are only a few exemplars of many presidential leaders in every type of institution committed to the civic engagement of higher education. Nearly 400 presidents have

signed the Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education (Campus Compact, 1999A).

Academic leadership is also key. At IUPUI, Provost William Plater has led the effort to create a promotion and tenure system that recognizes, documents and rewards the scholarship of engagement. At DePaul University, Richard Meister, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, has built community engagement into the university's five-year strategic plan and reinforced and celebrated engagement at every opportunity (e.g. convocation addresses). Increasingly, development opportunities on civic engagement and the scholarship of engagement are being offered for chief academic officers, primarily by Campus Compact and its state affiliates. This is in recognition of the important role these leaders play in bringing engagement from the "margins to the mainstream" in the academy.

### **10. Mission and Purpose.**

There is hardly a campus in America that does not have a mission statement that speaks in some way to the role of higher education in providing education for civic engagement. In some cases, reference is made to producing leaders or socially useful graduates. For example, Harvard University expects "that the scholarship and collegiality it fosters in its students will lead them in their later lives to advance knowledge, to promote understanding, and to serve society." (Harry R. Lewis, Dean of Harvard College, 2/23/97 from

[http://www.harvard.edu/help/noframes/faq110\\_nf.html](http://www.harvard.edu/help/noframes/faq110_nf.html)). Georgetown University "educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life, and to live generously in service to others"

(<http://www.georgetown.edu/admin/publicffairs/factsheets/mission.html>).

Other campuses have mission statements that make it even more explicitly clear that engagement is a central enterprise. For example, at Antioch College "all programs...aim to develop students and graduates who grow in their commitment to contribute personally to improvement in the human condition through responsible leadership that fosters productive, democratic change in the institutions and communities in which they live and work. "

At California State University, Monterey Bay, "The identity of the University will be framed by substantive commitment to a multilingual, multicultural, intellectual community distinguished by partnerships with existing institutions, both public and private, and by cooperative agreements which enable students, faculty and staff to cross institutional boundaries for innovative instruction, broadly defined scholarly and creative activity, and coordinated community service" (<http://www.monterey.edu/vision/>).

The mere presence of a mission supporting civic engagement does not, of course, ensure that such a mission has a real and dynamic impact on the life of the college and the community. In many cases, colleges that wish to reassert their civic purpose undertake a review of their mission and foster widespread discussion of it. Some, like Olivet College in Michigan, devised an updated vision statement based on the school's founding principles (in this case 1844) and then sought adoption of the vision by key constituencies such as faculty and trustees.

### **III. Self assessment as an engagement strategy**

One of the first challenges facing a campus that wishes to undertake a major initiative to extend and deepen its civic engagement is to discover what already exists on campus. Adopting a conscious process of discovery can be, in itself, a very useful exercise; the process of self-

assessment is as important as the product. If approached with care, this process can honor the faculty, staff and students who are already engaged in the community through volunteerism, service-learning, community-based research or other forms of civic outreach. Because of the decentralized nature of higher education, unearthing what is already going on is not always easy to do. It requires a significant commitment by the administration and time for department-by-department research. Further, any survey of faculty requires assiduous follow up. On a large campus it can take the better part of an academic year to find and document community engagement activities. However, once a report has been compiled and published, it often causes other faculty, staff, and students to step forward because they do not want their course or program to be overlooked. This is particularly true if a sense of excitement and pride has been built on the campus regarding these activities. Increasingly campus inventories are becoming web-based documents that can be added to and changed. Once an inventory of engagement activities is created it can be employed as a valuable campus-wide catalyst for a dialogue about what engagement means and can mean to different constituencies within the institution.

Large universities like the University of Wisconsin, Madison, or the University of Maryland, College Park, or Harvard, each of which has recently done a full inventory of their outreach activities, have benefited from this process (See [www.wisc.edu/wiscinfo/outreach](http://www.wisc.edu/wiscinfo/outreach), [www.umd.edu/academic/partnerships.html](http://www.umd.edu/academic/partnerships.html) and [www.hno.harvard.edu/community/](http://www.hno.harvard.edu/community/)).

Each has found that it gives their institution a way to tell constituents - including board members, legislators, local community activists, and alumni - what the campus is contributing. It also makes clear how strategic or focused these activities are and how much they reflect the particular strengths and mission of the institution.

Two contrasting approaches to institutional self-assessment are those of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee and the University of Minnesota. At Wisconsin, a new Chancellor, Nancy Zimpher, challenged her entire staff and faculty to come up with a series of ways to assist the city of Milwaukee within a 100 days. She then sorted out those ideas and moved aggressively forward to implement the "Milwaukee idea" (based on the famous "Wisconsin idea" [1897] of the engaged campus). She also made herself available to meet with many organizations and leaders from the city to express her school's interest in participating.

The benefits of this approach are that her campus quickly gained a reputation in Wisconsin and across the nation for its interest in being of and for the city in which is located. This has brought funds, has increased student applicants, and has resulted in a range of exciting programs. It has energized both students and faculty. The down side is a concern that the effort has been too driven by publicity and might not last. However, there is presently a Milwaukee Idea office that is charged with broadening and deepening the effort. One specific result of this new commitment to civic engagement is a "Cultures and Communities" initiative to design foundation courses that will "connect students to the rich diversity of our urban communities through a variety of learning" (Cultures and Communities, ND). These courses will be part of an alternative general education option.

At the University of Minnesota, a self-examination of the institution's civic involvement has been modeled on an earlier examination of the need to address cultural diversity. In this model, the charge to the institution from the provost's office has been multi-faceted, including defining civic engagement as well as identifying communities to work with, ways to leverage current civic activities to take advantage of the teaching and research strengths of the university, criteria for strategic investments and practical suggestions for strengthening both undergraduate and graduate students' interest in civic engagement (Charge letter from Bob Bruininks, Exec. VP

and Provost, 9/29/00, web site p. 2). The leaders of this assessment believe that involving the campus broadly in a discussion of both the meaning of civic engagement and its manifestations is most likely to gain the attention of senior faculty.

More difficult than compiling an inventory of activities is undertaking an assessment of the quality and depth of its efforts. How can a campus think about the quality and depth of its civic engagement? What should a campus be considering: the student learning experience, the faculty research agenda, the community impact and the extent to which the community is determining what needs to be addressed? Several discovery and assessment tools have recently been developed that can help a campus start a conversation about its level and type of engagement as well as inventory and assess its activities (Bringle and Hatcher 1999; Holland, 1997). Campus Compact has devised a civic self-assessment instrument that is framed as a series of questions a campus can ask about the student experience, faculty and staff culture, presidential leadership and institutional engagement (Campus Compact, 1999A). Campuses that have used this instrument include the University of Maryland, College Park, and the University of Utah. While no two campuses will answer the questions posed in the civic self-assessment in the same way, the process will enable each campus to see their public role in a new light.

As institutions of higher education continue to shape their civic identities and define their public purposes, they will adopt strategies of engagement that will, to a greater or lesser degree, transform their campuses. An engaged campus is not a vague, amorphous idea that escapes concrete definition and form. Over the last decade, here have emerged clear indicators of civic engagement have been identified, and they are increasingly visible at colleges and universities around the country.

(The authors would like to thank Erin Swezey, Richard Cone, and Keith Morton for their assistance in providing institutional examples of engagement activities. We are also grateful to Brooke Beaird and Kerri Heffernan for their critical insights and thoughtful reading of the essay.)

About the authors:

Elizabeth Hollander is the executive director of Campus Compact. Previously, 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 served as the president of the Government Assistance Program in Illinois and is the former director of planning for the city of Chicago under Mayor Harold Washington. Hollander is the author, most recently, of "Civic Renewal in Higher Education: The State of the Movement and the Need for a National Network," in Thomas Ehrlich, ed., *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, (Orynx, 2000).

John Saltmarsh is the Project Director of Integrating Service with Academic Study at Campus Compact. He taught for over a decade at Northeastern University and as a Visiting Research Fellow at the Feinstein Institute for Public Service at Providence College. His essays on service-learning and experiential education have appeared in *the Michigan Journal for Community Service Learning*, the *Journal of Experiential Education*, the *National Society for Experiential Education Quarterly* and the *Journal of Cooperative Education*. He is also the author of "Emerson's Prophecy," in Ira Harkavy and William Donovan, eds., *Connecting Past and Present: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in History*, Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education (2000).

Edward Zlotkowski is Senior Faculty Fellow at Campus Compact and directs the Compacts initiative on service-learning in the disciplines. He is a Professor of English at Bentley College, in Waltham, MA, where he founded the Bentley College Service-Learning Project in 1990. He has written extensively on service-learning and is the author of *Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education* (Anker, 1998) and is the series editor for the American Association for Higher Education 18 volume Series on *Service-Learning in the Disciplines*. He is also a Senior Associate at the American Association for Higher Education.

## References

- Alinsky, Saul D. (1946). *Reveille for Radicals*. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Bender, Thomas (1993). *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States*. Baltimore:Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boyer, Ernest (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York; The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, Ernest (1994). "The New American College." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A48.
- Boyer, Ernest (1996). "The Scholarship of Engagement." *The Journal of Public Service and Outreach*. 1:1, pp. 11-20.
- Boyte, Harry (2000 ). "The Struggle Against Positivism." *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, July August, 86:4, p. 46-51.
- Bringle, Robert and Julie Hatcher (1999). *Campus Assessment of the Scholarship of Engagement*, Center for Public Service and Leadership, Indiana University, Purdue University, Indianapolis.
- Bruinicks, Bob (2000) Charge letter from Bob Bruininks , Exec. VP and Provost, To the Civic Engagement Task Force, 9/29/00, web site p. 2) [www1.umn.edu/civic/index.html](http://www1.umn.edu/civic/index.html)
- Campus Compact.(2000). *Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships*, Campus Compact, Providence, RI,.
- Campus Compact (1999 A). *The Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*, Providence, RI.
- Campus Compact. (1999 B). *Service Matters: The Engaged Campus*, Campus Compact, Providence, RI,.
- "Cultures and Communities: Learning for the New Century," University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, ND: [WWW.UWM.EDU/MILWAUKEEIDEA/CC](http://WWW.UWM.EDU/MILWAUKEEIDEA/CC)
- Damon, William. (1998)"The Path to Civil Society Goes Through the University," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. October 16, B 4-5.
- Dewey, John (1916) *Democracy and Education*. New York; The Free Press (1944).

Driscoll, Amy and Ernest Lynton (1999). *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Ehrlich, Thomas, ed. (2000). *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Phoenix, Arizona; Orynx Press.

Eyler, Janet and Dwight Giles (1999). *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Freire, Paulo (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Holland, Barbara (1997). Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. Fall, pp. 30-41.

Holland, Barbara (1999). "Factors and Strategies that Influence Faculty Involvement in Public Service." *The Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4.1, p. 37-43.

Holland, Barbara and Sherril Gelmon (1998). "The State of the 'Engaged Campus': What Have We Learned About Building and Sustaining University-Community Partnerships. *AAHE Bulletin*, October.

Indiana University – Purdue University at Indianapolis (2000). Faculty and Librarian Annual Report. N.P.

Stanton, Timothy, and Dwight Giles and Nadine Cruz (1999). *Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice and Future*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hollander, Elizabeth and John Saltmarsh (2000). "The Engaged University." *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*. July August, 86:4, p. 29-31.

Jacoby, Barbara, and Associates (1996). *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lynton, Ernest A. (1995). *Making the Case for Professional Service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Mathews, David (1998). "Creating More Public Space in Higher Education." The Council on Public Policy Education.

Morton, Keith, and Troppe, Marie (1996). From the Margins to the Mainstream: Campus Compact's Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 15, No. 1, January.

National Commission on Civic Renewal (1998). *A Nation of Spectators: How Civic Disengagement Weakens America and What We Can Do About It*. University of Maryland, [www.pauf.umd.edu/civicrenewal](http://www.pauf.umd.edu/civicrenewal).

Rhoads, Robert, and Jeffery Howard (eds.) (1998). *Academic Service-Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, (73), Spring.

Saltmarsh, John A. (1996) Education for Critical Citizenship: John Dewey's Contribution to the Pedagogy of Service-Learning. *Michigan Journal of Service Learning*, Vol. 3, p. 13-21.

Sullivan, William M. (1995) *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*. New York: Harper Collins.

Zlotkowski, Edward (1998). A Service Learning Approach to Faculty Development, in Robert A Rhoads and Jeffrey Howard eds., *Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, p. 81-90.

Walshok, Mary L. (1995) *Knowledge Without Boundaries: What America's Research universities can do for the Economy, the Workplace, and the Community*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Zlotkowski, Edward (ed.) (1998). *Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education*, Bolton, MA: Anker.

## Presidents' Fourth of July Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education

The following statement was drafted by Thomas Ehrlich, senior scholar, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and president emeritus, Indiana University, and Elizabeth Hollander, executive director of Campus Compact, with the advice and input of a distinguished Presidents' Leadership Colloquium Committee composed of: Derek Bok, president emeritus of Harvard University; Dolores Cross, president of Morris Brown College; John DiBiaggio, president of Tufts University; Claire Gaudiani, president of Connecticut College; Stanley Ikenberry, president of the American Council on Education; Donald Kennedy, president emeritus of Stanford University; Charles Knapp, recent past president of the Aspen Institute, Edward A. Malloy, president of the University of Notre Dame; Frank Newman, president of the Education Commission of the States; and Eduardo Padrón, president of Miami-Dade Community College.

The purpose of this statement is to articulate the commitment of all sectors of higher education, public and private, two- and four-year, to their civic purposes and to identify the behaviors that will make that commitment manifest. It was reviewed, refined and endorsed at a Presidents' Leadership Colloquium convened by **Campus Compact** and the American Council on Education at the Aspen Institute on June 29-July 1, 1999.<sup>1</sup>

---

As presidents of colleges and universities, both private and public, large and small, two-year and four-year, we challenge higher education to re-examine its public purposes and its commitments to the democratic ideal. We also challenge higher education to become engaged, through actions and teaching, with its communities.

We have a fundamental task to renew our role as agents of our democracy. This task is both urgent and long-term. There is growing evidence of disengagement of many Americans from the communal life of our society, in general, and from the responsibilities of democracy in particular. We share a special concern about the disengagement of college students from democratic participation. A chorus of studies reveals that students are not connected to the larger purposes and aspirations of the American democracy. Voter turnout is low. Feelings that political participation will not make any difference are high. Added to this, there is a profound sense of cynicism and lack of trust in the political process.

We are encouraged that more and more students are volunteering and participating in public and community service, and we have all encouraged them to do so through curricular and co-curricular activity. However, this service is not leading students to embrace the duties of active citizenship and civic participation.<sup>2</sup> We do not blame these college students for their attitudes

---

<sup>1</sup> We are deeply indebted to the drafters of the **Wingspread Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Research Universities**, crafted by Harry Boyte of the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota and Elizabeth Hollander, with the commentary of a distinguished group of scholars, administrators, foundation personnel, and others gathered by Barry Checkoway at the University of Michigan in December of 1998. Many ideas and some of the language have been used here with the authors' permission.

<sup>2</sup> (UCLA American Council on Education Study 1999; National Association of Secretaries of State 1998).

toward the democracy, rather we take responsibility to help them realize the values and skills of our democratic society and their need to claim ownership of it.

This country cannot afford to educate a generation that acquires knowledge without ever understanding how that knowledge can benefit society or how to influence democratic decision making. We must teach the skills and values of democracy, creating innumerable opportunities for our students to practice and reap the results of the real, hard work of citizenship.

Colleges and universities have long embraced a mission to educate students for citizenship. But now, with over two-thirds of recent high school graduates, and ever larger numbers of adults, enrolling in post secondary studies, higher education has an unprecedented opportunity to influence the democratic knowledge, dispositions, and habits of the heart that graduates carry with them into the public square.

Higher education is uniquely positioned to help Americans understand the histories and contours of our present challenges as a diverse democracy. It is also uniquely positioned to help both students and our communities to explore new ways of fulfilling the promise of justice and dignity for all, both in our own democracy and as part of the global community. We know that pluralism is a source of strength and vitality that will enrich our students' education and help them to learn both to respect difference and work together for the common good.

We live in a time when every sector—corporate, government and nonprofit—is being mobilized to address community needs and reinvigorate our democracy (Gardner, 1998). We cannot be complacent in the face of a country where one out of five children sleeps in poverty and one in six central cities has an unemployment rate 50% or more above the national average, even as our economy shows unprecedented strength. Higher education—its leaders, students, faculty, staff, trustees and alumni—remains a key institutional force in our culture that can respond, and can do so without a political agenda and with the intellectual and professional capacities today's challenges so desperately demand. Thus, for society's benefit and for the academy's, we need to do more. Only by demonstrating the democratic principles we espouse can higher education effectively educate our students to be good citizens.

How can we realize this vision of institutional public engagement? It will, of course, take as many forms as there are types of colleges and universities. And it will require our hard work, as a whole, and within each of our institutions. We will know we are successful by the robust debate on our campuses, and by the civic behaviors of our students. We will know it by the civic engagement of our faculty. We will know it when our community partnerships improve the quality of community life and the quality of the education we provide.

To achieve these goals, our presidential leadership is essential but, by itself, it is not enough. Faculty, staff, trustees and students must help craft and act upon our civic missions and responsibilities. We must seek reciprocal partnerships with community leaders, such as those responsible for elementary and secondary education. To achieve our goals we must define them in ways that inspire our institutional missions and help measure our success. We have suggested a Campus Assessment of Civic Responsibility that will help in this task. It is a work in progress. We ask you to review the draft and to ask yourself what aspects of this can work on your campus and also to share with others practices that are not on this list.

We ask other college presidents to join us in seeking recognition of civic responsibility in accreditation procedures, Carnegie classifications, and national rankings and to work with Governors, State Legislators, and State Higher Education Offices on state expectations for civic engagement in public systems.

We believe that the challenge of the next millennium is the renewal of our own democratic life and reassertion of social stewardship. In celebrating the birth of our democracy, we can think of no nobler task than committing ourselves to helping catalyze and lead a national movement to reinvigorate the public purposes and civic mission of higher education. We believe that now and through the next century, our institutions must be vital agents and architects of a flourishing democracy. We urge all of higher education to join us.

### Signatories as of January 19, 2001

We invite you to add your campus to this list. If the president or chancellor wishes to sign on they should send an e-mail to [ehollander@compact.org](mailto:ehollander@compact.org).

Adelphi University	Bluffton College
Adrian College	Boise State University
Albion College	Bradford College
Allegheny College	Brandeis University
Alma College	Brenau University
Alvernia College	Brevard Community College
Alverno College	Briar Cliff College
Antioch College	Briarwood College
Antioch NE Graduate School	Bridgewater College
Antioch University - Seattle	Bridgewater State College
Aquinas College	Brookhaven College
Arizona State University	Brown University
Ashland University	Butler County Community College
Auburn University	Butler University
Augsburg College	Cabrini College
Baldwin-Wallace College	California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly)
Ball State University	California State University, Bakersfield
Barnard College	California State University, Dominguez Hills
Barstow Community College District	California State University-Fresno
Bates College	California State University-Fullerton
Beaver College	California State University – Hayward
Bellarmino College	California State University, Los Angeles
Bennett College	California State University-Monterey Bay
Bentley College	California State University, Sacramento
Berea College	Calvin College
Berkshire Community College	
Bethany Lutheran College	
Blackfeet Community College	

Carleton College	East Tennessee State University
Castleton State College	Eastern Connecticut State University
Cedar Crest College	Eastern Michigan University
Central College	Eastern Washington University
Central Florida Community College	Eastfield College
Central Washington University	Eckerd College
Century College	Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Chaminade University	El Centro College
Chatham College	Elizabethtown College
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	Elon College
Chicago State University	Emory University
Claremont Graduate University	Emory & Henry College
Clemson University	The Evergreen State College
College for Life Long Learning	Fergus Falls Community College
College of Mount St. Joseph	Fitchburg State College
College of Saint Benedict	Flathead Valley Community College
The College of St. Catherine	Florida Atlantic University
College of St. Scholastica	Florida Gulf Coast University
Collin County Community College	Florida State University
Colorado College	Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College
Colorado Mountain College	Fort Lewis College
Columbia University	Franklin & Marshall College
Community College of Denver	Franklin Pierce College
Community College of Rhode Island	Franklin Pierce Law Center
Community College of Vermont	Frostburg State University
Concord College	Gateway Community College
Concordia College	Goddard College
Concordia University	Goshen College
Connecticut College	Grand Rapids Community College
Converse College	Grand Valley State University
Cornell College	Greenfield Community College
Cornell University	Hamline University
Cornerstone University	Hampshire College
Dakota County Technical College	Hartwick College
Dartmouth College	Harvard University
Davenport College	Harvey Mudd College
Dean College	Heidelberg College
Defiance College	Helena College of Technology of the University of Montana
Delaware Valley College.	Hennepin Technical College
Del Mar College	Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Denison University	Hocking College
DePaul University	Holy Cross College
DePauw University	Holyoke Community College
Duke University	
Dunwoody Institute	
Earlham College	

Hibbing Community and Technical College  
 Hofstra University  
 Hunter College of the City University of New York  
 Illinois State University  
 Indiana State University  
 Indiana University  
 Indiana University Kokomo  
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
 Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI)  
 Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne  
 Indiana University East  
 Indiana University South Bend  
 Indiana University Southeast  
 Itasca Community College  
 John Carroll University  
 Johnson & Wales University  
 Kalamazoo College  
 Kansas State University  
 Kapi'olani Community College - University of Hawai'i  
 Kennebec Valley Technical College  
 Kent State University  
 Keuka College  
 Keystone College  
 King's College  
 La Sierra University  
 Lake Superior College  
 Lansing Community College  
 Lasell College  
 Latter-Day Saints Business College  
 Lawrence University  
 Lesley College  
 Lincoln University  
 Linfield College  
 Little Big Horn College  
 Loyola Marymount University  
 Loyola University  
 Macalester College  
 Madonna University  
 Magdalen College  
 Maine College of Art  
 Manchester College  
 Marian College of Indianapolis  
 Marygrove College  
 Maryland Institute, College of Art  
 Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts  
 McPherson College  
 Mesa Community College  
 Messiah College  
 Metropolitan State University, Minnesota  
 Miami-Dade Community College  
 Middlebury College  
 Middlesex Community College  
 Miles Community College  
 Milligan College  
 Millikin University  
 Mills College  
 Minneapolis Community and Technical College  
 Minnesota State University, Mankato  
 Minnesota State University Moorhead  
 MiraCosta College  
 Montana State University – Billings  
 Montana State University – Bozeman  
 Montana State University College of Technology – Great Falls  
 Montana State University-Northern  
 Montana Tech of the University of Montana  
 Montclair State University  
 Moravian College  
 Morgan State University  
 Morris Brown College  
 Mount Holyoke College  
 Mount Ida College  
 Mount Union College  
 Mount Wachusett Community College  
 Muskingum College  
 Nazareth College of Rochester  
 New England College  
 New Hampshire College  
 New Hampshire Community Technical College – Nashua/Claremont  
 New Hampshire Institute of Art  
 Newmann College  
 Newman University  
 Niagara University

Normandale Community College	St. Cloud Technical College
Northampton Community College	St. Cloud State University
North Central College	Saint John's University
North Hennepin Community College	St. Lawrence University
Northeastern University	St. Mary's College
Northern Virginia Community College	Saint Mary's University of Minnesota
Northwestern College	St. Olaf College
Northwestern Health Sciences	St. Thomas Aquinas College
University	St. Xavier University, Chicago
Northwestern University	Sacred Heart University
Norwich University	Salisbury State University
Notre Dame College	Salish Kootenai College
Oakton Community College	Salve Regina University
Ohio Dominican College	San Diego State University
Ohio University	San Francisco State University
Ohio Wesleyan University	San Jose/Evergreen Community College
Olivet College	District
Otterbein College	San Jose State University
Pace University	San Juan College
Pacific University	Santa Clara University
Paradise Valley Community College	Santa Monica Community College
Pima Community College	District
Pine Manor College	Sarah Lawrence College
Pitzer College	Seattle University
Plymouth State College	Skagit Valley College
Portland Community College	Skidmore College
Portland State University	South Florida Community College
Princeton University	South Seattle Community College
Pueblo Community College	Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Purdue University	Southern Illinois University-
Purdue University North Central	Edwardsville
Campus	Southern Maine Technical College
Quinsigamond Community College	Southern Vermont College
Rainy River Community College	Southwest Missouri State University
Raritan Valley Community College	Southwest State University
Regis College	Spelman College
Regis University	State Center Community College
Richland College of the Dallas County	District
District	Stephen F. Austin State University
Rivier College	SUNY - Delhi
Rochester Community and Technical	SUNY, Geneseo
College	Susquehanna University
Rockford College	Swarthmore College
Rocky Mountain College	Taylor University
Rollins College	Thomas More College
Rust College	Trinity College (Connecticut)

Tufts University  
Tulsa Community College  
Tusculum College  
Union College  
Unity College  
University of Akron  
University of Alaska  
University of Alaska Anchorage  
University of Arizona  
University of California, Berkeley  
University of California, San Francisco  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
University of Colorado at Denver  
University of Denver  
University of Evansville  
University of Florida  
University of Georgia  
University of Great Falls  
University of Hartford  
University of Indianapolis  
University of Maine at Farmington  
University of Maine at Orono  
University of Maine at Presque Isle  
University of Maryland, Baltimore  
County  
University of Maryland, College Park  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
University of Massachusetts, Boston  
University of Michigan-Flint  
University of Minnesota, Duluth  
University of Minnesota, Morris  
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities  
University of Montana at Missoula  
University of Nebraska at Omaha  
University of New England  
University of New Hampshire  
University of North Carolina at  
Asheville  
University of North Carolina, Charlotte  
University of North Florida  
University of Notre Dame  
University of Pennsylvania  
University of Portland  
University of Richmond  
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)  
University of Scranton

University of Southern Colorado  
University of Southern Maine  
University of Southern Mississippi  
University of Utah  
University of Vermont  
University of Virginia  
University of West Florida  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
University of Wisconsin-Parkside  
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point  
Utah State University  
Valparaiso University  
Vassar College  
Vermont Technical College  
Walla Walla Community College  
Walters State Community College  
Wartburg College  
Washtenaw Community College  
Wayne State College  
Wayne State University  
Waynesburg College  
Wellesley College  
West Virginia Wesleyan College  
Western Montana College of the  
University of Montana  
Western State College of Colorado  
Western Washington University  
Westmont College  
Wheaton College  
Wheelock College  
White Pines College  
Whitworth College  
Willamette University  
William Paterson University  
Williams College  
Wilmington College  
Winthrop University  
Wofford College  
Woodbury College  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

## **Campus Assessment of Civic Responsibility**

July 15, 1999 draft. This is a work in progress. We welcome your feedback.

The next important step for each president endorsing the Fourth of July Declaration is to conduct an assessment on your own campus of your current activities to promote civic responsibility. Each of us is urged to gather a diverse group of trustees, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community partners on your campus to develop measures of successful civic engagement that are consistent with the mission of your particular institution. To assist you, we have compiled this list of questions for your use in framing your discussions.

We know that every campus will fulfill its civic mission in its own unique way. In fact, each campus will make a unique contribution to refining what it means to be an engaged campus. The following questions are designed to inspire you in that enterprise. We look forward to learning in a year what you have done and will circulate a document summarizing various campus efforts.

- **PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP**

- a) In what ways am I leading my campus in articulating and implementing a civic mission that calls upon us to prepare our students for engaged citizenship? Is that mission widely known and understood by our trustees, faculty, administration, alumni, students and our larger community?
- b) How well have I, as president, personally and actively engaged in community or public policy development? How well do I articulate the philosophical and intellectual meaning of higher education as an agent of democracy? Do I help to highlight the specific and unique quality and character of my particular institution, and make visible the public work and contributions of faculty, staff, and students?

## **II. CAMPUS CONSTITUENCIES**

### **A. STUDENTS**

#### Curriculum

- a) How well does our curriculum help students develop civic competencies and civic habits? These habits include the arts of civil public argument, civic imagination, and the ability to critically evaluate arguments and information. They also include the capacities and curiosity to listen, interest in and knowledge of public affairs, and the ability to work with others different from themselves on public problems in ways that deepen appreciation of others' talents.

- b) Are our students given multiple opportunities to do the work of citizenship through real projects of impact and relevance, linked to their academic learning?
- c) Do we seek to measure student' knowledge of American democratic institutions at matriculation and/or at graduation?
- d) How well have we worked to increase opportunities for community-based learning, including community-based research and curricular-based community engagement (service-learning)?
- e) How well do we prepare our future teachers – for K-12 and higher education—to integrate civic learning into their teaching?

#### Co-Curricular Activities

- f) How well do our campus's co-curricular activities provide opportunities for civic engagement? Do these activities include participation in political campaigns and/or other change-oriented activities?
- g) To what extent do our co-curricular activities include a regular time and place for reflection about how such experiences might shape students' view of the world and their future careers and life work?

#### Campus Culture

- h) How well does our campus's culture support students' participation in genuine, vigorous, open dialogue about the critical issues of their education and the democracy?
- i) To what extent are students on campus able to help build and sustain genuinely public cultures full of conversation, civil argument, and discussion about the meaning of their learning, their work, and their institutions as a whole?
- j) How well does our campus promote voter registration and participation? Do we regularly invite elected officials to campus to speak, and support public forums on critical issues of the day?

#### Campus Diversity

- k) How diverse is our student body? Do our financial aid and admissions policies reflect our desire for a diverse student body?
- l) How do we enable students to encounter and learn from others different from themselves in experience, culture, racial background, gender, sexual orientation, ideologies and views?

#### Student Careers

- m) To what extent do our career offices provide opportunities for public and nonprofit career choices?

- n) At what stage is our campus in preparing students for, and providing financial aid programs to support career choices in the public and nonprofit sectors?

## **B. FACULTY**

### Faculty Culture

- How well does our campus provide opportunity for faculty to create, participate in, and take responsibility for a vibrant public culture on campus, which values faculty and students moral and civic imagination, judgment, and insight?
- Is our faculty encouraged to participate in genuine civic partnerships based on respect and recognition of different ways of knowing and different kinds of contributions in which expertise is “on tap, not on top”?
- Is our faculty encouraged to discuss the need to develop student citizenship skills and debate what those skills and habits are and how they might be developed?

### Faculty Development and Rewards

- Do faculty hiring, development opportunities, promotion and tenure policies encourage and support teaching that includes community-based learning and undergraduate action research? Do these systems support and reward faculty who link their research and service to community needs and concern?
- How well are faculty members prepared to pursue “public scholarship” relating their work to the pressing problems of society, providing consultations and expertise, and creating opportunities to work with community and civic partners in co-creating initiatives of public value?
- How well do we orient new faculty members to the community of which the campus is a part, developed in collaboration with community leaders? Do we have ongoing programs to introduce faculty to community issues and community perspectives on those issues?
- Do faculty, deans, and the chief academic officer have knowledge of and access to discipline-based development materials regarding engaged scholarship and teaching?

## **C. ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF**

- a) How well do our administrators create and improve structures that sustain civic engagement and public contributions in many forms?
- b) Do our administrators seek to find their own ways to be publicly engaged?
- c) To what extent are our hiring practices driven by a desire to achieve broad representation and social diversity, not simply out of moral imperative but out of full

recognition that a diversity of backgrounds, cultures, and views is essential to a vital public culture?

- d) To what extent does our staff receive recognition for the often extensive ties that many have with the local community?
- e) To what extent are those ties seen as a resource for community-university partnerships, for student learning, for engaged scholarship, and for the broad intellectual life of the institution?
- f) To what extent do our administration and faculty view the staff as an integral part of the process to educate students for democracy?
- g) To what extent is our staff encouraged to work with faculty to examine and change the campus culture to support engagement?

#### **D. TRUSTEES AND ALUMNI**

- a) Are trustees engaged in discussing the importance of the civic responsibility of the institution in all its dimensions?
- b) Are alumni educated about the institutions' civic engagement and encouraged to support those activities through their own actions and their financial support?

### **III. THE INSTITUTIONAL ROLE IN CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY**

#### **Democratic Practice on Our Campus**

- a) Does our campus model democratic behavior? Do we engage all of our campus constituencies in our governance, our promotion of robust debate, in the ways in which we use tensions and controversies as teachable moments to demonstrate the value of rigorous, not rancorous discourse?

#### **Campus/Community Partnerships**

- b) How well does our institution create and sustain long-term partnerships with communities and civic bodies? Do we share resources with our partners? Do we allocate resources to support these activities? Can our civic partners point to long-term, positive experiences with our campus?
- c) Are our partnerships framed in ways which reflect the campus' commitments to community building and civic vitality, that integrate community experience into the learning of students and the professional service opportunities for staff, and that fully understand and appreciate the public dimensions of scholarly work?

#### **Communications with our Community**

- d) How well does our campus promote awareness that civic engagement is an essential part of our mission?
- e) How well does our campus create structures that generate a more porous and interactive flow of knowledge between campus and communities?

#### Community Improvement

- f) To what extent have we improved the condition of the communities surrounding our campuses?
- g) To what extent is a public measure of campus success the condition of the surrounding community and the measurable difference the campus has made in improving the physical and human condition of neighborhood residents?
- h) How well do we think about procurement and employment practice and use of physical plant as opportunities to enhance our local communities?

#### Campus Engagement

- i) How well do we make sustained efforts to track civic engagement activity by students, staff, or faculty and make an effort to deploy these activities in strategic ways that make maximum impact on the community's improvement agenda?

Users:ASPEN PLC -1999:Presidents' Declaration:DECLARATION-FINAL