

CHAPTER 3

**Towards Creating the Truly Engaged,  
Responsive University: Penn's Partnership  
with the West Philadelphia Community as an  
Experiment in Progress**

*Ira Harkavy*<sup>1</sup>

Associate Vice President and Founding Director  
Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships,  
University of Pennsylvania

*Rita A. Hodges*

Assistant Director

*Joann Weeks*

Associate Director

**Abstract**

The authors argue that a truly responsive university is deeply and democratically engaged with its neighbours in significant, sustained and mutually transformative partnerships. They emphasize the importance of the inclusion and active involvement of community members in identifying and solving locally manifested universal problems such as poverty, poor schooling, lack of affordable housing and inadequate health care. To illustrate and support their arguments, the authors describe the evolution of the Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania, with a focus on the centre's development of academically based community service and university-assisted community schools. Examples are provided of academically based community service courses that involve collaborative real-world problem solving and have helped to embed engagement into the academic mission of the university. This chapter also summarises the Netter Center's efforts to build regional, national and global networks of individuals and institutions of higher education that are committed to democratic civic and community engagement, in particular the development of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy. Providing concrete examples from nearly 35 years of work, the authors conclude the chapter by updating John Dewey's famous

proposition about the relationship between democracy and community; they argue that *democracy (and responsiveness) must begin at home, and its home is the truly engaged neighbourly university and its local community partners.*

### **Keywords**

Engaged University – Anchor Institution – Service Learning – Local Engagement – University-Assisted Community School – Community Voice – Democratic Process – Participatory Action Research – Implementation Research – Community Development – Collaborative Problem-Solving – Community Health

"Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community."

John Dewey (Dewey, 1927/1981)

"The great universities of the twenty-first century will be judged by their ability to help solve our most urgent social problems."

William R. Greiner, former president, State University of New York at Buffalo (Greiner, 1994)

"To be a great university we must be a great local university."

Shirley Strum Kenny, former president, State University of New York at Stony Brook (Ellin, 1999)

"We cherish our relationships with our neighbors, relationships that have strengthened Penn academically while increasing the vitality of West Philadelphia."

Amy Gutmann, president, University of Pennsylvania (Gutmann, 2004)

### **Introduction**

The extreme poverty, persistent deprivation and pernicious racism afflicting communities in the shadows of powerful, wealthy urban universities raise troubling moral issues, as well as questions about higher education's contribution to the public good. It is essential that universities, as key anchor institutions, significantly contribute to radically reducing the pervasive, ongoing and seemingly intractable problems of our inner cities (Harkavy et al., 2009; Harkavy, 2016).

Conditions in Philadelphia – the city of the University of Pennsylvania (Penn) – are an example of a more general phenomenon of urban distress. At 25.7 percent, the poverty rate is the highest among the nation's ten largest cities. About 400,000 residents – including roughly 37 percent of the city's children under the age of 18 – live below the federal poverty line, which is an annual income of US \$19,337 for an adult living with two children. In addition, nearly half of all poor residents are in deep poverty, which is defined as having an income of 50 percent below the federal poverty line. At the same time, Philadelphia (and many other cities) is home to a key resource that can help to change these conditions. It has one of the highest concentrations of anchor institutions, with "eds and meds" <sup>2</sup> representing 12 of the 15 largest private employers, and the Philadelphia metropolitan area contains more than 100 colleges and

universities (Select Greater Philadelphia, 2016; The Pew Charitable Trusts, 2017).

Simply put, the revitalisation of Philadelphia, and of cities in general, depends on the effective, thorough engagement of higher education institutions.

A simple typology helps to illustrate our assessment of the current state of university–community engagement and points to what could and should be done. An urban university’s interaction with its local community might usefully be placed within the following four categories:

- Gentrification and the displacement of low-income residents,
- Disregard and neglect,
- Partially engaged (frequently indicated by the involvement of the academic *or* the institutional/corporate component of the university, but not both),
- Truly engaged (involving the comprehensive, significant, serious and sustained involvement of *all* aspects of the university with the community, including the integration of academic and institutional resources).

We argue for the development of truly engaged, truly responsive universities, in which a very high priority is given not only to significantly improving the quality of life in the local community, but also to working *with* the community respectfully, collaboratively and democratically. In addition, helping to develop and implement solutions to strategic, community-identified local problems functions as a curriculum, text and performance test for a truly engaged university’s research, teaching and learning activities. No US urban university, as far as we can tell, presently meets these criteria. Nonetheless, progress has occurred over the past 30 years, with an increasing number of universities taking meaningful, if insufficient, steps in the right direction.

Fortunately, what might be termed a ‘higher education democratic civic and community engagement movement’ has developed across the United States and around the world to better educate students for democratic citizenship and to improve both schooling and the quality of life in communities surrounding higher education institutions. Service learning, engaged scholarship, community-based participatory research, volunteer projects and community economic development initiatives are some of the means that have been used to create mutually beneficial partnerships designed to make a positive difference in the community and on the campus.<sup>3</sup>

Over the past three decades, the academic benefits of community engagement have also been illustrated in practice, and the intellectual

case for engagement has been effectively made by leading scholars and educators, including Ernest Boyer and Derek Bok, as well as current and recent university presidents such as Nancy Cantor (Rutgers University-Newark), James Harris (University of San Diego), Eduardo Padrón (Miami Dade College) and Penn's current president, Amy Gutmann. That case can be briefly summarised as follows: When institutions of higher education give very high priority to actively solving real-world problems in and with their communities, a much greater likelihood exists that they will significantly advance learning, research, teaching and service, and thereby simultaneously reduce barriers to the development of mutually beneficial higher education–community partnerships. More specifically, by focusing on solving universal problems that are manifested in their local communities (such as poverty, poor schooling, lack of affordable housing and inadequate health care), colleges and universities will generate knowledge that is both nationally and globally significant, and be better able to realise the primary mission of higher education in the US and perhaps elsewhere of contributing to a healthy, democratic society (Benson et al., 2017).

Some of the most promising initiatives today are built on deep, ongoing partnerships between colleges and universities and their local communities. These partnerships also involve the development of substantive and substantial efforts that draw together faculty, students and community members to address community-identified real-world problems. They provide rich opportunities for students to develop the skills they need to be effective, democratic-minded citizens. They give rise to research activities that link the expertise within the university with the expertise outside its walls – that is, the expertise embodied in community members who deeply understand the local context in which problems are situated. Sustained partnerships of this kind not only foster the civic development of students, they also strengthen democracy at the local level. It is worth noting that on these campuses, a serious commitment to such partnerships has led to changes in the colleges and universities themselves – altering assumptions about how we should teach and whose knowledge counts, and encouraging new and broader understandings about what faculty work is important and what kind of research matters (Cantor, 2018; Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2018; Pribbenow, 2014). For us, a truly responsive university is deeply and democratically engaged with its neighbours in significant and sustained mutually transformative partnerships.

### **Democratic Purpose, Process, and Product and the Inclusion of Community Voice**

We strongly believe that when the principles of democratic purpose, process and product are put into practice – principles that were identified by higher education leaders (including Harkavy) at a 2004 conference sponsored by the Kellogg Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good – they can contribute powerfully to successful university–community partnerships and university responsiveness. These principles are defined as follows:

- Purpose: An abiding democratic and civic purpose is the “rightly placed”<sup>4</sup> goal if higher education is to truly contribute to the public good. More specifically, participatory democracy, not just democracy as defined by voting or a system of government, should be the primary goal. The educator and philosopher John Dewey defined democracy as “a way of life” (1939/1993, p. 229) in which all citizens actively participate in all the communal, societal, educational and institutional decisions that significantly shape their lives (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007).
- Process: Members of both the higher education institution and the community should treat each other as ends in themselves rather than as means to an end.<sup>5</sup> The relationship itself and the welfare of the various partners are the preeminent value, not simply developing a specified programme or completing a research project. Democratic processes also involve inclusivity, transparency and openness. These are the types of collaborations that tend to lead to a relationship of genuine respect and trust, and most benefit the partners and society.
- Product: A successful partnership also strives to make a positive difference for all partners – this is the democratic product. Contributing to the well-being of people in the community (both now and in the future) through structural community improvement should be a central goal of a truly democratic partnership for the public good. Research, teaching, learning and service should also be strengthened as a result of a successful partnership. Indeed, working with the community to improve the quality of life in the community may be one of the best ways to improve the quality of life and learning within a higher education institution (Harkavy & Hartley, 2009).

For the purpose of this chapter, we highlight the issue of democratic process. Our argument, simply put, is that an inclusive epistemology that involves the knowledge possessed ‘on the ground’ by community members is required for the effective solution of locally manifested

universal problems. This epistemology expands the definition of expertise and knowing to include other voices – those not necessarily steeped in professional credentials or academic knowledge, but in lived-experience of the conditions and actualities under examination (Ahlstrom-Vij, Kappel, & Pederson, 2013; Giampietro, 2006). What is needed is a movement away from a narrow definition of an 'expert' to a 'community of experts' – a broadening of context to include indigenous place-based knowledge (Cantor & Englot, 2013). Community members with indigenous place-based knowledge must also be *actively* involved when the problem is defined and remain involved through the development and implementation of solutions (Whyte, Greenwood, & Lazes, 1989).

In describing the set of assumptions involved in participatory action research, a form of research particularly appropriate for place-based academic-community partnerships, William Foote Whyte argues that “the standard model does not represent the one and only way to advance scientific knowledge” (Whyte, 1989, p. 383). Instead, he encourages a “research strategy that maximises the possibility of encountering creative surprises [which] are most likely to occur if we get out of our academic morass and seek to work with practitioners whose knowledge and experience is quite different from our own” (Whyte, 1989, pp. 383–384). Furthermore, there is a significant difference between researching as a detached observer versus as an active participant, whose work genuinely matters to the local population. As participants, researchers are much more likely to develop trusting relationships with community members, which is a requisite for having access to insider knowledge (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 2000; Whyte 1989; Whyte, Greenwood, & Lazes, 1989).

Although there are numerous benefits to involving diverse community voices in research projects, especially place-based research projects, it is difficult to perform. It requires doing research differently and rejecting the assumption that applied and theoretical research should be distinct. Understanding that application and theory are necessarily interconnected and mutually enhancing in place-based, problem-solving projects is fundamental. This integrative approach can be usefully described as 'implementation research'.

Implementation research, as stated, involves the integration of theory and practice.<sup>6</sup> The primary test of the effectiveness of place-based implementation research is whether it contributes to the solution of locally manifested universal problems, such as poor schooling, educational attainment gaps, eroding environments, inadequate healthcare, poverty and high levels of economic

inequality. This approach assumes that human beings learn by doing, and from and through implementation. It also assumes that research designed to realise large societal goals through developing and implementing programmes on the ground with community partners, refining these programmes, and engaging in an iterative process leads to significant learning, high-level theoretical advances, and improved practice. The core rationale for implementation research is perhaps best expressed in a well-known maxim attributed to psychologist Kurt Lewin: “If you want to truly understand something, try to change it” (1943/1999, p. 336).

To briefly summarise our argument:

- Locally manifested universal problems cannot be solved without the inclusion and active involvement of community members residing in the locality that is the focus of engagement and study.
- The inclusion and active engagement of community members will result in better, more innovative and transformative research and better, more decent and just communities and societies.
- Developing place-based implementation research projects that are carried out with community members and focus on locally manifested universal problems is a promising strategy to help achieve the advancement of knowledge and the continuous improvement of the human condition.<sup>7</sup>

To illustrate these claims, we now turn to the case we know best, the University of Pennsylvania and its Netter Center for Community Partnerships, which has been recognised as a leader for its ongoing work with Penn’s local geographic community of West Philadelphia (Davis, 2015; Harkavy, Hartley, Hodges, & Weeks, 2016).

### **Penn, the Netter Center and the West Philadelphia community**

#### ***Organisational Learning***

Admittedly, the history of Penn’s work with the community of West Philadelphia has been a process of painful organisational learning and conflict; we cannot overemphasize that we have made many mistakes and our understanding and activities have continually changed over time (Benson et al., 2017; Etienne, 2012; Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Maurrasse, 2001; Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2008; Puckett & Lloyd, 2015; Rodin, 2007). Penn is only now beginning to tap its extraordinary resources in ways that could mutually benefit both Penn and its neighbours and result in truly radical school, community and university change.

Our work was particularly inspired by Benjamin Franklin's founding vision for Penn, which promoted the pursuit of learning and knowledge for the betterment of humanity, seeking to instil in students "an *Inclination* join'd with an *Ability* to serve Mankind, one's Country, Friends, and Family [emphasis in original]" (Franklin, 1749/1962; Reinhold, 1968, p. 224). Franklin's vision was rooted in the Enlightenment idea, powerfully expressed by Francis Bacon, that "knowledge is power" for "the relief of man's estate."<sup>8</sup> We also came to see our work as a concrete example of the educator and pragmatic philosopher John Dewey's general theory of learning by means of action-oriented, collaborative, real-world problem solving (Benson & Harkavy, 1991).

What had immediately concerned us in the early years was that West Philadelphia was rapidly and visibly deteriorating, with devastating consequences for community residents as well as the university. These consequences included increased blight, crime and poverty, as well as concern about Penn's ability to continue to attract and retain outstanding faculty, staff and students. Given that "present situation" (as Dewey phrased it), we asked, what should the university do? (Dewey, 1916/1978, p. 222). Committed to undergraduate teaching, one of the authors, Ira Harkavy, and distinguished Penn historian Lee Benson designed an honours seminar aimed at stimulating undergraduates to think critically about what Penn could and should do to remedy its 'environmental situation'. Intrigued with the concept, Sheldon Hackney, then the president of the university and also a historian, joined them in teaching that seminar in the Spring semester of 1985. The seminar's title suggests its general concerns: *Urban University-Community Relationships: Penn–West Philadelphia, Past, Present, and Future as a Case Study*, a class that Harkavy teaches to this day.

We need not recount the process of trial, error and failure that led Benson, Harkavy and their students to see that Penn's best strategy to remedy its rapidly deteriorating environmental situation was to use its enormous internal and external resources to help radically improve both West Philadelphia public schools and the neighbourhoods in which they are located. Most unwittingly, during the course of the seminar's work, they reinvented the community school idea. They developed a strategy based on the following proposition: universities can best improve their local environment if they mobilise and integrate their great resources, particularly the 'human capital' embodied in their students, to help develop and maintain university-assisted community schools that engage, empower and serve not only students, but also all other members of the community and function as focal points for creating healthy urban environments.

Observing the work of the Penn students and their partners in the West Philadelphia community schools over a number of years led Benson, Harkavy and their colleagues to develop a key principle that has guided their thinking and practice in a wide variety of ways and situations. That principle can be formulated as follows: at all levels (primary, secondary, and higher education), collaborative, community-based, problem-solving, action-oriented projects – which by their nature innovatively depart from customary, teacher-dominated school routines – allow and encourage both teachers and students to participate democratically in school and classroom governance and functioning. Such projects create spaces in which school and classroom democracy can grow and flourish. In our judgment, that general principle can be instrumental in inspiring and developing effective programmes for democratic citizenship in a wide variety of schools (at all levels) and communities.

Over time, the seminar inspired a growing number of Academically Based Community Service (ABCS) courses (Penn's term for service learning) in a wide range of Penn schools and departments, developed and implemented under the auspices of the university's Netter Center for Community Partnerships. To understand Penn's engagement with its local community, it is necessary to briefly describe the creation, growth, and development of the Netter Center.

Many centres at Penn are fully dependent on external resources. The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, however, has been institutionalised within the university's formal administrative structure since its inception in 1992. Its director and administrative staff are funded by Penn's Office of the President and the School of Arts and Sciences, with direct reporting lines to both these offices, as well as a dotted-line report to the Provost's Office.<sup>9</sup> The centre's longevity – nearly 28 years at the time of this writing – is properly attributed to its fidelity to the university's academic mission; in fact, ABCS courses offered by the university's faculty in multiple schools and departments are a hallmark of Penn.

The creation of the Netter Center was based on the assumption that one highly effective and efficient way for Penn to serve its institutional self-interest and simultaneously carry out its academic mission was to focus research and teaching on universal problems – problems of schooling, health care and economic development, for example – that were manifested locally in West Philadelphia and the rest of the city. By focusing strongly and strategically on universal problems and effectively integrating general theory and concrete practice, as Franklin had advocated in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Penn would symbiotically improve both the quality of life in its urban ecological community and its research and teaching.

As it was optimistically envisioned, the Netter Center for Community Partnerships would constitute a far-reaching innovation within the university. To help overcome the remarkably competitive institutional fragmentation that had developed after 1945 as Penn evolved and became a large research university (Puckett & Lloyd, 2015), the centre would identify, mobilise and integrate Penn's vast resources in order to help transform West Philadelphia, particularly by improving its public schools.

### ***Integration of Engagement into the Academic Mission***

During Hackney's presidency, the centre developed two key strategies that continue to underpin its work today. The first strategy is *academically based community service* (ABCS): community service rooted in and intrinsically connected to research, teaching and learning. The second, *university-assisted community schools* (UACS), is a comprehensive approach to neighbourhood and school improvement that educates and engages students, their family members and other members of the community, and provides an organising framework for bringing university resources, including ABCS courses, to West Philadelphia schools.

The Netter Center has developed well over 200 ABCS courses, seminars and internship programmes in 29 departments in all of Penn's 12 schools – the Annenberg School for Communication, Arts and Sciences, Dental Medicine, Education, Engineering, Law, the Perelman School of Medicine, Nursing, Social Policy and Practice, Veterinary Medicine, the Weitzman School of Design and the Wharton School.

In local public schools, ABCS courses have contributed to curricular and co-curricular activities in such areas as reading, nutrition and disease detection/prevention, dance and physical activity, urban environmental issues (including lead toxicity and brownfields), urban gardening and landscaping (vest-pocket park design, for example), housing renovation, music, social-base mapping, transit-oriented development, African American culture and history, and the STEM disciplines: science, technology, engineering, and maths. ABCS courses have also supported professional development for teachers, college-access programmes and community arts.

An example of innovative ABCS teaching is the work of Karen Detlefsen, Professor of Philosophy and Education. Her research focuses on early modern philosophy, including the history of the philosophy of science, the history and philosophy of education, and women in the history of philosophy. Detlefsen is leading Penn's Project for Philosophy for the Young, whose goal is to bring philosophy systematically into the pre-college classroom across Philadelphia, as a

model for other school districts in the US and beyond. ABCS courses are core to both the development and ongoing implementation of the programme partnership between Penn and Philadelphia public schools. Detlefsen has developed four of these courses since 2015. One of them, PHIL 249: Philosophy 249: “Philosophy of Education” engages Penn undergraduates in studying a variety of topics in philosophy with the aim of developing curricula and lesson plans for delivery in university-assisted community schools in West Philadelphia.

One iteration of this course saw Penn undergraduates transforming their own instruction in the Philosophy of Education into lessons for high school students; these high school students eventually wrote and presented their own original papers at a conference on Penn’s campus. More recently, Penn students have worked with Detlefsen – as well as with a teacher in West Philadelphia’s Tilden Middle School and a curricular planner from Penn’s Graduate School of Education – to develop a series of one-hour lessons in philosophy, which they then taught to local fifth grade students. The course aims to provide the fifth grade students with the opportunity to explore philosophical ideas and improve their critical thinking skills, while at the same time providing Penn students with the opportunity to develop their teaching and communication skills, and deepen and solidify their understanding of philosophical concepts and methods through teaching. The latest iteration of the course resulted in Philadelphia’s first regional Ethics Bowl in February 2020, where six local high school teams competed for a chance to participate on a national level. A hallmark of Penn’s Project for Philosophy for the Young, mirrored in the ABCS Ethics Bowl course, is the cultivation of collaborative partnerships among school district teachers and Penn’s faculty and students.

Detlefsen’s graduate students have also co-taught ABCS courses, as well as researched and helped develop age-appropriate philosophy curricula for high school and middle school students, which they have then taught in a range of after-school clubs. Detlefsen is also the faculty advisor of one of the inaugural (2019) Provost’s Graduate Academic Engagement Fellows at the Netter Center, Michael Vazquez. This two-year fellowship is open to PhD. students across all schools and fields at Penn. It is designed to support graduate students whose work centres on ABCS and other forms of engaged scholarship (including locally based community problem-solving, service learning and learning by teaching in public schools), as well as to elevate the education and training of the next generation of academics. The fellowship involves participation in an interdisciplinary faculty-student seminar on community-engaged research and teaching, the

opportunity to design and teach an ABCS course or engage in other kinds of research and teaching in connection with the Netter Center, a \$5000 research fund for each Fellow, additional support to attend and present work at conferences, and a full fellowship in the students' second year. As part of his fellowship, Vazquez developed and taught a new ABCS course in Spring 2020 entitled "Public Philosophy and Civic Engagement", which engaged undergraduate students in philosophical discussions with local high school students related to civic life in democratic society.

The Agatston Urban Nutrition Initiative is an example of an evolving and expanding Netter Center programme that was developed through ABCS. In 1991, Professor Francis Johnston, a renowned expert on nutritional anthropology, decided to redesign the Anthropology 210 course to focus on helping to solve the community-identified problem of poor nutrition. Johnston began work with the community using an approach that embodied democratic purpose, process and product from its inception. The work began at Turner Middle School, where the teachers had recognised that the standard snack of potato chips and coloured sugar water was not contributing to their students' health or academic success. Johnston's redesigned course, "Anthropology 310: Nutrition, Health, and Community Schools", became the prototype for ABCS courses.

The initial class of 18 Penn students worked with Turner Middle School teachers, led by Marie Bogle, an extraordinary educator and organiser, and sixth grade students on a range of small-scale participatory action research projects dealing with healthy foods, physical growth, dietary intake and obesity status. The results were used in planning subsequent activities. The success of Anthropology 310 not only influenced the anthropology department (which went on to develop an academic track on Public Interest Anthropology), but it also inspired other Penn departments and schools to become involved in ABCS (Johnston & Harkavy, 2009).

Over the next few years, a widening circle of Penn faculty and students worked with Johnston, in collaboration with local middle school teachers and students, to understand the nutritional practices in the community and to address the problem through a series of jointly developed projects. These included an educational programme, an in-school market that provided healthy snacks, a school-based garden, and a nutritional outreach programme for the community. Ultimately, Johnston's course led to the development of the Agatston Urban Nutrition Initiative (AUNI) – a central Netter Center programme that currently works with approximately 16 Philadelphia public schools, serving more than 6,000 students, as well

as hundreds of adults, at a variety of West Philadelphia community and senior centres.

Professor Terri Lipman, Assistant Dean for Community Engagement and a faculty member in Penn's School of Nursing, has offered ABCS opportunities with AUNI for nurse practitioner (NP) students. Since 1989, Lipman's research has focused on identifying children with diabetes and increasing the physical activity of underserved populations. In 2005, Lipman began teaching her clinical practicum for NP students, Nursing 723: "Nursing of Children II", as an ABCS course. The NP students received classroom instruction on diabetes in children, racial disparities in children with endocrine disorders, and key aspects of community engagement. In the clinical component of the course, NP students trained and mentored Sayre High School students on obtaining accurate assessments of height and weight, evaluating growth disorders and identifying diabetes risk factors. Together, NPs and high school students assessed the growth and risk factors in elementary school-aged children from the community. From 2005 to 2009, they assessed 240 elementary school children, found 30 percent to be at risk for type-2 diabetes, and made recommendations for follow-up care (Lipman et al., 2011).

In 2012, as a component of her ABCS teaching and research, Lipman partnered with a local dance programme, Inthedance, LLC, to launch Dance for Health (DFH) at the Sayre Recreation Center. DFH aims to increase physical activity by engaging multiple generations in dance in a safe, indoor environment at no cost to participants. NP students in Lipman's ABCS course, now called Nursing 735: "Pediatric Acute Care Nurse Practitioner: Professional Role and Intermediate Clinical Practice: Dance for Health", and Sayre High School students evaluate the participants' height, weight, heart rate and pedometer readings, and survey their perception of endurance and enjoyment of the activity. To date, DFH has engaged over 700 participants at the Sayre Recreation Center, expanded to four additional sites in West Philadelphia, and demonstrated a positive impact on cardiovascular health, memory, social support and anxiety reduction. Teams of Penn NPs and Sayre High School students have also jointly given scientific presentations and received awards at national paediatric nursing conferences across the US.<sup>10</sup>

Professor Lipman and her community partners (Inthedance, LLC co-founders David Earley and Selena Williams Earley) were named as the recipients of the Provost/Netter Center Faculty-Community Partnership Award in Spring 2019. This annual award, chosen by the Provost and the Netter Center Director based upon the recommendations of a review committee comprised of faculty members and a community member, recognises sustained and

productive university-community partnerships, with a \$10,000 prize split between the faculty member and the community partner.

The inaugural award winner of the then-named Netter Center Faculty-Community Partnership Award (prior to joint sponsorship from the Provost's Office) was Herman Beavers, professor of English in the School of Arts and Sciences and the undergraduate and graduate chair in the Department of Africana Studies, and his partners at the West Philadelphia Cultural Alliance (WPCA), particularly WPCA executive and Netter Center Community Advisory Board member Vernoca Michael. Beavers began teaching "August Wilson and Beyond" in 2013 with instructor Suzana Berger. In the course, Penn students and WPCA members discuss a series of ten works by the playwright August Wilson, who focused on the African-American experiences of the 20<sup>th</sup> century through the lens of a Pittsburgh neighbourhood. Through the conversations, they explore the topics of race and class. The Penn students and WPCA members then work together to create original "Community Monologues", which are shared through live performances each semester. In recent years, the class has also enrolled students from Sayre High School, a university-assisted community school in West Philadelphia. The course is designed to help students of all generations gain a deeper understanding of Wilson's writing and of the multi-faceted community surrounding Penn's campus.

In all of the Netter Center's ABCS courses, the primary aim is the well-being of community members now *and* in the future. Although the impact on Penn student learning is important – indeed, critical – if university-community partnerships are to be mutually beneficial, there must be genuine, democratic change in the conditions in the community (Harkavy, 1996; Harkavy, 2004). To expand on the definition we provided above, ABCS involves collaborative real-world problem solving that is rooted in and connected to research, teaching, learning, practice and service; it is designed to advance structural community improvement (for example, effective public schools, neighbourhood economic development and strong community organisations) rather than simply to alleviate individual misery (for example, feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless); and it helps students become creative, compassionate, ethical citizens of a democratic society (Benson & Harkavy, 1998).

Academically based community service has experienced considerable growth since the Netter Center's founding in 1992, when only four such courses were offered. In 2018-19, there were 74 ABCS courses taught by 65 faculty and staff, with approximately 1700 students enrolled. Altogether, ABCS courses, internships and work-study and volunteer opportunities engage approximately 2500 Penn

students each year with West Philadelphia schools and other community organisations.

In the School of Arts and Sciences, ABCS courses are increasingly meeting core foundational and sector requirements for undergraduate students. In the Earth and Environmental Studies Department, a series of ABCS courses work with the schools and community on issues such as lead exposure reduction, asthma trigger reduction and tobacco use prevention. These courses count towards the Environmental Studies major, with several of them helping to directly fulfil major concentration requirements. For at least one of Penn's schools, Dental Medicine, ABCS is fully integrated into graduate education. As noted in the university's online news publication, *Penn Today*, "where dental students once had to fulfil a 35-hour community service requirement, students today now devote at least 134 hours of academically based community service learning over their four years, ensuring a significant experience in providing oral health education and dental care in community settings, as required for accreditation" (Penn Today, 2019).

Curricula change, we believe, is a particularly noteworthy development because it indicates both institutional centrality and the likelihood of sustainability. Quite simply, if something *really* matters in higher education, it appears in the curriculum, in what and how students learn and in what faculty members teach. Moreover, there is wisdom in the old academic saying that "presidents and provosts come and go, but faculty abideth forever." Innovations in higher education that survive over time are those that are rooted in the ongoing work of the faculty.

As noted above, the Netter Center's second strategy is *university-assisted community schools*, which provides an organising framework for bringing university resources, including ABCS courses, to West Philadelphia schools. A definition of community schooling that inspired Benson, Harkavy and Penn Professor of Education John Puckett's early discussions appeared in 1953 in a volume published by the National Society for the Study of Education entitled *The Community School*:

A community school is a school which has concerns beyond the training of literate, "right-minded," and economically efficient citizens who reflect the values and processes of a particular social, economic, and political setting. In addition to these basic educational tasks, it is *directly concerned with improving all aspects of living in the community* [original emphasis] in all the broad meaning of that concept, in the local, state, regional, national, or international community. To attain that end, the

community school is *consciously used* [original emphasis] by the people of the community. Its curriculum reflects planning to meet the discovered needs of the community with changes in emphasis as circumstances indicate. Its buildings and physical facilities are at once a center for both youth and adults who together are actively engaged in analyzing problems suggested by the needs of the community and in formulating and exploring solutions to those problems. Finally, the community school is concerned that the people put solutions into operation to the end that living is improved and enriched for the individual and the community. (Hanna & Naslund, 1953, p. 53)

Based on their evolving understanding of the community school idea, Harkavy and Puckett (1991) presented a neo-Deweyan rationale for university-assisted community schools. We quote here at length:

The key assumption is that schools can be *the* strategic institutions for creating healthy urban communities. They can function as environment-changing institutions – but only as they become centers of broad-based partnerships involving a variety of community organizations and institutions, including universities and colleges. Because they belong to all members of the community, public schools are particularly suited to be the catalytic hubs around which local partnerships are generated and formed. In this partnership role, schools can function as community institutions *par excellence*, providing a decentralized, community-based response to socially significant problems.

The curriculum of the community school is to be community-centered and action-oriented. By *community-centered*, we mean that the academic agenda is wedded to community history, culture, and socially significant problems. These broad thematic areas provide immediate contexts for reading, writing, reflection, and discussion related to the study of academic subject matter. As part of their academic studies, students are involved in ongoing, community-based project work. This strategy builds on the assumption that students' interest in having their work come to fruition as highly visible products will suffuse the educational process with a desire to master *and* to apply the academic knowledge necessary to complete high-quality products... In all its facets the curriculum expressly incorporates the motivational power of students' immediate, real-world, out-of-school experiences. In short, learning is experiential and "hands-on," related in every phase to community issues and concerns. (pp. 564–565)<sup>11</sup>

University-assisted community schools (UACS), like community schools in general, help to educate, engage, activate and serve all members of the community in which the school is located. The model focuses on the school as the core institution – the ‘hub’ – for community engagement and democratic development. School-day curricula and afterschool programmes are connected to each other and focus on solving locally identified, real-world community problems. For neighbourhood schools to function as genuine community centres, they need additional human resources and support. UACS engage universities as lead partners, providing broadly based, comprehensive and sustained support for community schools. This partnership between a higher education institution and a local school and its community is designed to improve both the quality of life in the community and the quality of learning in all levels of schooling.

In 2002, for example, a group of Penn undergraduates participating in an ABCS seminar focused their research and service on one of the most important problems identified by members of the West Philadelphia community – the issue of health. The students’ work with the community ultimately led them to propose establishing a centre focused on health promotion and disease prevention at a public school in West Philadelphia, the Sayre Middle School. (Sayre completed a three-year district transition and became a high school in 2007.)

From their research, the students learned that community-oriented projects often flounder because of an inability to secure stable resources. They postulated that they could accomplish their goal by integrating health issues into the curricula of various schools at Penn and at the Sayre school itself. They emphasized that creating a health promotion and disease prevention programme at the school could serve as a learning opportunity for Penn students across all disciplines.

This programme quickly took root at Sayre and helped inform the long-term goal of creating an on-site primary health care centre. The Sayre Health Center was formally opened in 2007 as a federally qualified health centre and was named the Dr Bernett L. Johnson, Jr. Sayre Health Center in 2010, after the Senior Associate Dean for Diversity and Community Outreach of Penn's Medical School who played a central role in the health centre's creation and development. Today, it is a central component of a UACS designed both to advance student learning and democratic development and to strengthen families and institutions within the community. Penn faculty members and students in medicine, nursing, dentistry, social policy and practice, arts and sciences, law, business, and design have worked at

the Sayre school as part of their coursework, internships and research projects.

The Netter Center's work has grown in recent years to include children and families at nine UACS in West Philadelphia. Expansion to additional sites has resulted from interest and requests from principals, as well as new funding opportunities that arose from the Netter Center's positive track-record in West Philadelphia (Harkavy et al., 2016). A Netter Center site director is based at a particular school full-time and collaborates closely with that school and its community to determine activities that best serve their specific needs and interests. In addition to coordinating the programmes, UACS site directors serve as liaisons between the university and the school, as well as between school teachers and the afterschool programme. Staff from the Center's thematically based programmes, such as the Agatston Urban Nutrition Initiative, Moelis Access Science (STEM outreach), UACS Sports and our College Access/Career Readiness programmes, also regularly work in the schools.

Much more work remains to be done in order to fully and effectively involve all aspects of the university as a democratic anchor institution within the community and to better integrate currently siloed, disconnected efforts.<sup>12</sup> Lots of organisational learning and learning from others will be required for Penn to do this well.

### **From Local to Regional, National and Global: Sharing and Learning from and with Others**

Since the Netter Center's inception, one of its objectives has been to cultivate regional, national and international networks of individuals and institutions of higher education that are committed to democratic civic engagement with their communities. The Netter Center builds these networks in order to learn from and work with others, to stimulate change in other localities and to help develop a higher education democratic civic and community engagement movement. In our judgment, creating, developing and sustaining a large movement is necessary to transform communities and universities for the better.

For example, in 1987, Penn and two other Philadelphia universities, Temple and La Salle, founded the Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development (PHENND), a consortium of colleges and universities in the greater Philadelphia area dedicated to helping revitalise local communities and schools and to fostering civic responsibility among the region's institutions of higher education. At the time of this writing, PHENND's membership includes more than

25 colleges and universities. PHENND and its staff are housed at the Netter Center. The Netter Center director was the organisation's co-founder and serves on the Steering Committee.

From the early 1990s, a number of institutions across the US began to express an interest in the model of university-community-school collaboration being developed by the Netter Center and its school and community partners. With private and governmental support, 23 adaptation sites were funded and provided with technical assistance. The Netter Center's adaptation work helped to shape a framework that informs the development of UACS, and numerous colleges and universities continue to adapt model.

With the 2007 naming gift from Edward and Barbara Netter, a Penn alumnus and his spouse, the centre's strategy for adaptation shifted from funding individual university-assisted community school partnerships to creating regional training centres based at higher educational institutions that have demonstrated significant experience in and commitment to the work. Regional centres have been supported on three-year cycles at the University of Oklahoma-Tulsa (2008), Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis (2011), the University of Connecticut (2014) and the University of California, Los Angeles (2017).

A UACS network was also formed in 2015 by the Netter Center, in collaboration with the Coalition for Community Schools and Rutgers University-Camden, in response to the growing number of institutions of higher education that are engaged with community schools. Over 70 colleges and universities are now participating. Colleagues share their work during monthly video conference calls on topics such as their institution's specific model, evaluation and professional development, as well as how they might engage more of their university's resources with UACS sites.

Comprehensive democratic engagement of universities and other anchor institutions is at the core of what is now called the Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF). In 2009, the Task Force on Anchor Institutions (an ad hoc national panel chaired by Harkavy), advised the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on how the agency could strategically "engage urban anchor institutions, particularly institutions of higher education and academic medical centers ('Eds and Meds'), in collaborative partnerships" to help revitalize their local communities and regions (Harkavy et al., 2009, p. 147). Soon after the task force submitted its report, *Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies*, it became a permanent, formal organisation, namely the Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF), with the mission of forging democratic civic partnerships involving anchor institutions.

AITF, which has now grown to include approximately 1,000 individual members, is guided by the core values of collaboration and partnership, equity and social justice, democracy and democratic practice, and commitment to place and community (Marga Incorporated, 2010). Marga Inc. administers AITF, with Harkavy continuing to serve as chair. Significantly, the development of this group as a permanent organisation has increasingly helped to bring the idea of anchor institutions into national and international academic and policy discussions. To that end, AITF and the Council of Europe (CoE) have organised four meetings on universities as local actors to explore the creation of a European anchors network, which has resulted in plans to convene a larger group that can stimulate ideas for future action.

The most significant and enduring global organisational development has been the formation of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy (IC) in 1999 to work in cooperation with the CoE. The purpose of the IC is to advance the contributions of institutions of higher education to democratic development on campus, as well as in local communities and the wider society. The CoE, established in 1949, defends human rights, democracy and the rule of law, develops continent-wide agreements to standardise member countries' social and legal practices, and promotes awareness of a European identity across cultures based on shared values. The IC works in collaboration with the CoE, comprised of 47 member countries, and its Steering Committee for Educational Policy and Practice. The Steering Committee includes an additional three countries that are also signatories of the European Cultural Convention. This treaty provides the framework for the CoE's work in education policy and practice.<sup>13</sup>

In Spring 2018, the Organization of American States (OAS) joined the cooperation between the IC and CoE. The OAS was established in 1948 "in order to achieve among its member states – as stipulated in Article 1 of the Charter – 'an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence.' Today, the OAS brings together all 35 independent states of the Americas and constitutes the main political, juridical, and social governmental forum in the Hemisphere" (Organization of American States, n.d.). The organisation uses a four-pronged approach based on its main pillars of democracy, human rights, security and development.

In Autumn 2019, the International Association of Universities (IAU) joined the CoE/IC/OAS cooperation. The IAU, created under the auspices of UNESCO in 1950, is a membership-based organisation

servicing the global higher education community and currently represents more than 640 institutions, organisations and affiliates across 120 countries. The IAU “acts as the global voice of higher education to UNESCO and other international higher education organisations, and provides a global forum for leaders of institutions and associations.... The Association advocates for policies and practices that respect diverse perspectives and promote social responsibility” (International Association of Universities, n.d., online).

The IC/CoE/OAS/IAU cooperation undertakes cross-national research projects, joint meetings and the sharing of best practices as part of its efforts to advance higher education’s contribution to building democratic societies. The Netter Center houses the executive offices of the IC; the Netter Center director chairs the Consortium, and its associate director serves as Executive Secretary. The IC comprises the United States (represented by a Steering Committee from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, Anchors Institutions Task Force, Association of American Colleges and Universities, Campus Compact, Democracy Commitment, and NASPA-Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education); Australia (represented by Engagement Australia); the United Kingdom (represented by the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement); Ireland (represented by Campus Engage Ireland); South Africa (represented by Universities South Africa); and the Magna Charta Observatory based in Italy.

Complementary developments in the United States and Europe laid a strong foundation for the initial IC/CoE cooperation, including the CoE’s *Budapest Declaration for a Greater Europe without Dividing Lines*, adopted on the organisation’s 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary in May 1999, which designated the education system as the major societal means for democratic development. In July 1999, 51 college and university presidents in the United States signed a *Presidents’ Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*, sponsored by Campus Compact. Nearly 600 universities have now signed the declaration, which highlights the university’s central role in citizenship education.<sup>14</sup>

The IC/CoE collaboration first launched a cross-national research project on “Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Responsibility”. Beginning in 1999, a team of European and US researchers assessed the activities of institutions of higher education that supported democratic values and practices, and helped to disseminate those activities. Working groups were established to develop the methodology and protocols for the research project. Fourteen European and 15 US universities completed the pilot study, whose US component was funded by the National Science Foundation

(NSF). The CoE published the research findings in *The University as Res Publica: Higher Education Governance, Student Participation and the University as a Site of Citizenship* (Bergan, 2004). The cooperation has hosted six global forums, and the CoE has published monographs on the conference themes, including *Higher Education and Democratic Culture: Citizenship, Human Rights, and Civic Responsibility* (2008), *Higher Education for Modern Societies: Competencies and Values* (2010), *Reimagining Democratic Societies: A New Era of Personal and Social Responsibility* (2013), *Higher Education for Democratic Innovation* (2016), *Higher Education for Diversity, Social Inclusion, and Community: A Democratic Imperative* (2018), and *Academic Freedom, Institutional Autonomy, and the Future of Democracy* (2020). Additional partners were involved in planning the conferences, among them being the International Association of Universities, the European Wergeland Centre, the European Students' Union, the University of Oslo, Queen's University–Belfast, the Australia Catholic University and LUMSA University.

Other major global networks also promote the civic and social responsibilities of institutions of higher education: the Talloires Network has 402 institutional members representing 78 countries, the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi) has 227 members representing 80 countries, and the University Social Responsibility Network (USRN) has 16 members across six continents. The Open Society University Network (OSUN) was founded in 2020 to advance knowledge and critical thinking, promote civic engagement and expand access to higher education across a global network.<sup>15</sup>

Among the major defects Francis Bacon attributed to universities, their internal divisions and their failure to collaborate closely ranked high. We quote this passage from his work *The Advancement of Learning* (Bacon, 1605/1999):

As the progress of learning consists not a little in the wise ordering and institutions of each university, so it would be yet much more advanced if there were a closer connection and relationship between all the different universities of Europe than now there is. For we see there are many orders and societies which, though they be divided under distant sovereignties and territories, yet enter into and maintain among themselves a kind of contract and fraternity, in so much that they have governors (both provincial and general) whom they all obey. And surely as nature creates brotherhood in families, and arts mechanical contract brotherhoods in societies, and the anointment of God superinduces a brotherhood in kings and bishops, and vows and regulations make a brotherhood in religious orders; so in like

manner there cannot but be a noble and generous brotherhood contracted among men by learning and illumination, seeing that God himself is called “the Father of Lights”. (p. 54)

In our judgment, the International Consortium and networks such as Talloires, GUNi, USRN, and OSUN are a positive response to Bacon’s proposal that institutions of higher education should collaborate across cultures and national boundaries in order to advance learning and human welfare.

### **Obstacles to Developing and Sustaining Democratic University-Community Partnerships**

Although the work described at Penn and the growing national and global movement for democratic university–community engagement are indicators of genuine progress, Penn and others still have a *very* long way to go to comprehensively and effectively engage and align their various components and substantial resources in democratic, sustained, mutually transformative partnerships with their local communities. Significant obstacles have impeded the development of truly engaged universities.

These impediments – including commercialism and commodification, misplaced nostalgia for traditional, elitist, ‘ivory tower’ liberal arts education, and intellectual and institutional fragmentation – have slowed Penn and other institutions’ development as truly democratic, engaged, civic universities.

The neoliberal entrepreneurial university is a model that has gained increasing currency and power throughout the world, contributing to increasingly savage inequalities and a diminished sense of public purpose. Education for profit, not virtue, students as consumers, not producers of knowledge, academics as individual superstars, not members of a community of scholars – all of these developments reflect the commercialisation of higher education, which contributes to an overemphasis on institutional competition for wealth and status and has a devastating impact on the values and ambitions of students (Bok, 2003). When institutions openly pursue commercialisation, their behaviour legitimises and reinforces the pursuit of economic self-interest by students and amplifies the widespread sense that they are in college or university *exclusively* to gain career-related skills and credentials. Student idealism and civic engagement are strongly diminished when students see their universities abandon academic values and scholarly pursuits to function as competitive, profit-making corporations. Commercialism and the development of the

entrepreneurial university foster an environment in which higher education is seen as a private benefit, not a public good.

Partly in response to galloping commercialism, some make a case for a return to traditional liberal arts education – an essentialist approach with roots in Plato's anti-democratic, elitist theory of education (Mulholland, 2015). What is needed instead is, to quote Carol Geary Schneider, "a new liberal art" involving "integrative learning – focused around big problems and new connections between the academy and society" (Schneider, 2005, p. 13). The concept of a new liberal art resonates with John Dewey's rejection of abstract contemplation and his call for an engaged, problem-solving approach to scholarship and learning. In *Reconstruction in Philosophy*, he wrote: "The social philosopher, dwelling in the region of his concepts, 'solves' problems by showing the relationship of ideas, instead of helping men solve problems in the concrete by supplying them hypotheses to be used and tested in projects of reform." (Dewey, 1920/1978, pp. 189–190).

"Communities have problems, universities have departments," stated a report published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development titled *The University and the Community* (Center for Educational Research and Innovation, 1982, p. 127). Beyond being a criticism of universities, that statement neatly indicates another major reason why universities have not contributed to communities as they should. Quite simply, their unintegrated, fragmented, internally conflictual structure and organisation impede understanding and developing solutions to highly complex human and societal problems.

Colleges and universities need to significantly decrease the fragmentation of disciplines, overspecialisation, and division between and among the arts and sciences and the professions, since these departmental and disciplinary divisions have increased the isolation of higher education from society itself. Compounding this problem is what might be called the 'disciplinary fallacy' afflicting US universities – namely, the misconception that faculty members are duty-bound to serve only the scholastic interests and preoccupations of their disciplines and have neither the responsibility nor the capacity to help their universities keep their longstanding promise to prepare undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility.<sup>16</sup>

### Reducing the Obstacles

So, what is to be done to reduce the negative effects of dysfunctional traditions, commercialism and commodification, ivory tower nostalgia, and intellectual and institutional fragmentation?

Simply put, universities need to engage locally. As colleges and universities work collaboratively with members of their local communities on universal problems that are manifested locally (such as poverty, health inequities, substandard housing and inadequate, unequal education), they will be better able to advance learning, research, teaching and service.

The benefits of a local community focus for college and university civic engagement programmes are manifold. Ongoing, continuous interaction is facilitated through work in an easily accessible location. Relationships of trust, so essential for effective partnerships and effective learning, are also built through day-to-day work on problems and issues of mutual concern. In addition, the local community provides a convenient setting in which service learning courses, community-based research courses and related courses in different disciplines can work together on a complex problem to produce substantive results. Since it facilitates interaction across schools and disciplines, work in a university's local community can also create interdisciplinary learning opportunities. Finally, the local community is a democratic real-world learning site in which community members and academics can pragmatically determine whether or not the work is making a real difference and whether or not *both* the neighbourhood and the institution are improved as a result of common efforts.

A focus on local engagement is an extraordinarily promising strategy for realising an institution's mission and purpose. When colleges and universities give very high priority to actively solving strategic, community-identified, real world problems in their local community, a much greater likelihood exists that they will significantly advance knowledge, learning and democracy. More specifically, as increasing numbers of faculty focus on helping to solve *universal* problems that are manifested in their institutions' local communities, as well as share the lessons learned across cultures and national boundaries, colleges and universities will be better able to realise Bacon's proposal that higher education institutions should closely collaborate to advance human welfare. As elegantly expressed by Paul Pribbenow, president of Augsburg College, the "intersections of vocation and location" provide wonderful opportunities for both the institution and the community (Pribbenow, 2014, p. 158).

## Conclusion

In this chapter, we have tried to provide the rationale for a truly responsive university engagement strategy for advancing teaching and research and improving the quality of life in our local communities. We have provided a brief overview of the work of Penn's Netter Center to create sustainable, mutually transformative partnerships with the university's neighbours in West Philadelphia, as well as summarised the centre's efforts to build regional, national and global networks of institutions of higher education working collaboratively with their local communities. We have also emphasized the importance of the inclusion and active involvement of community members in identifying and solving locally manifested universal problems.

While the approaches described above have helped Penn and other institutions become increasingly engaged anchor institutions, they remain insufficient. For universities and colleges to fulfil their great potential as democratic anchor institutions and really contribute to developing a decent, inclusive, just and democratic society, they will have to do things very differently. To begin with, changes in 'doing' will require recognition by higher education institutions that as they now function, they – particularly research universities (including Penn) – have not made the kind of contribution they could and should to improving human life for the better. In fact, they often unintentionally contribute to the savage racial and socioeconomic inequalities that the COVID-19 pandemic has laid bare. To become part of the solution, they must give full-hearted, full-minded devotion to the painfully difficult task of transforming themselves into socially responsible civic universities and colleges dedicated to producing knowledge and educating ethical, empathetic students for just and sustainable democratic societies. To do so, they will also have to radically change their institutional cultures and structures, democratically realign and integrate themselves, and work with community partners and public officials to develop a comprehensive, realistic strategy.

As discussed above, we believe an increased focus on local, democratic engagement is an extraordinarily promising strategy for realising an institution's mission and purpose and improving the quality of life in some of our most vulnerable communities. The powerful, evocative epigraph to E. M. Forster's *Howard's End* – "Only connect!" (1911, front matter) – captures the essence of our argument: that the necessary transformation of research universities is most likely to occur in the crucible of significant, serious, sustained engagement with local schools and their communities.

To conclude by placing our argument in a larger context, we turn again to the work of John Dewey, who famously wrote: “Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community” (1927/1981, p. 368). He emphasized that democracy has to be built on face-to-face interactions in which human beings work together cooperatively to solve the ongoing problems of life. In effect, we are updating Dewey’s theory and advocating the following proposition: Democracy (and responsiveness) must begin at home, and its home is the truly engaged neighbourly university and its local community partners.

### References

- Ahlstrom-Vij, K., Kappel, K., & Pedersen, N. (2013). The epistemology of inclusiveness. *Synthese*, 190, 1185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-013-0265-5>
- Bacon, F. (1597/1984). *Meditationes sacrae*. In B. Montagu (Ed.), *The works of Francis Bacon, Volume 1*. New York: Worthington. [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Meditationes\\_sacrae](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Meditationes_sacrae)
- Bacon, F. (1605/1999). The advancement of learning. In R.-M. Sargent (Ed.), *Selected Philosophical Works*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Bacon, F. (1620/1858). *Novum Organum*. In J. Spedding, R. L. Ellis & D. Heath (Eds.), *The works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England*. London: Longmans.
- Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (1991). Progressing beyond the welfare state. *Universities and Community Schools*, 2, 2–28.
- Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (1998). Communal participatory action research and strategic academically-based community service: The work of Penn’s Center for Community Partnerships. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education* (pp. 127–128). Boston, MA: Anker.
- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey’s Dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., Puckett, J., Hartley, M., Hodges, R., Johnston, F., & Weeks, J. (2017). *Knowledge for social change: Bacon, Dewey and the revolutionary transformation of research universities in the twenty-first century*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bergan, S. (Ed.) (2004). *The university as res publica: Higher education governance, student participation and the university as a site of citizenship*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Cantor, N. (2018). Anchor institution–community engagement in Newark: Striving together. *Anchor Institutions Advancing Local and Global Sustainable Community Development: 2017–2018*. (pp. 89–95). Rutgers University–Camden.
- Cantor, N., & Englot, P. (2013). Beyond the ‘ivory tower’: Restoring the balance of private and public purposes of general education. *The Journal of General Education: A Curricular Commons of the Humanities and Sciences*, 62(2–3), 121.
- Center for Educational Research and Innovation. (1982). *The University and the community: The problems of changing relationships*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Davis, H. A. (2015, July 2). Penn recognized for commitment to economic inclusion. Penn Today: <https://penntoday.upenn.edu/2015-07-02/latest-news/penn-recognized-commitment-economic-inclusion>
- Dewey, J. (1916/1978). Democracy and education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works of John Dewey, 1899–1924*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Dewey, J. (1920/1978). Reconstruction in philosophy. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works of John Dewey, 1899–1924* (digitally reproduced in Larry Hickman (Ed.), *The collected works of John Dewey, 1882–1953: The electronic edition, Vol. 12*. Charlottesville, VA: InteLex, 1996). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Dewey, J. (1927/1981). The Public and its problems. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works of John Dewey, 1925–1953 Vol. 2*. (digitally reproduced in Larry Hickman (Ed.), *The collected works of John Dewey, 1882–1953: The electronic edition, Vol. 12*. Charlottesville, VA: InteLex, 1996). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Dewey, J. (1939/1993). Creative democracy – the task before us. In D. Morris & I. Shapiro (Eds.) (1993), *John Dewey: The political writings* (pp. 240–245). Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Ellin, A. (18 August 1999). Notebook; A New Accent on Business. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/1999/08/18/us/notebook-a-new-accent-on-business.html>.
- Etienne, H. F. (2012). *Pushing back the gates: Neighborhood perspectives on university-driven revitalization in West Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fish, S. (2008). *Save the world on your own time*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Forster, E. M. (1911). *Howard’s end*. Toronto: William Briggs.
- Franklin, B. (1749/1962). Proposals relating to the education of youth in Pennsylvania [sic]. In J. H. Best (Ed.), *Benjamin Franklin on education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Giampietro, A. E. (2006). Toward an inclusive epistemology. In M. J. Cherry (Ed.), *The death of metaphysics; The death of culture: Epistemology*,

- metaphysics, and morality*. Philosophical Studies in Contemporary Culture Vol. 12. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Greiner, W. R. (1994). In the total of all these acts: How can American universities address the urban agenda? *Universities and Community Schools*, 4(1–2).
- Gutmann, A. (2004, October 15). Inaugural address. University of Pennsylvania.  
<http://www.upenn.edu/secretary/inauguration/speech.html>
- Hanna, P. R., & Naslund, R. A. (1953). The community school defined. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), *Fifty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II: The community school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harkavy, I. (1996, Summer). Back to the future: From service learning to strategic, academically based community service. *Metropolitan Universities*, 57–59.
- Harkavy, I. (2004). Service learning and the democratic development of universities, democratic schools, and democratic good societies. In S. H. Billig, & M. Welch (Eds.), *New perspectives in service learning: Research to advance the field* (p. 5). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Harkavy, I. (2016). Engaging urban universities as anchor institutions for health equity. *American Journal for Public Health*, 106(12), 2155–2157.
- Harkavy, I., Alperovitz, G., Axelroth, R., Birch, E., Cantor, N., Clancy, G., Coletta, C., Cox, D., Dubb, S., Geevarghese, S., Hahn, A., Harris, J., Howard, T. Murrasse, D., Padrón, E., Patton, C., Perry, D., Rubin, V., Sharpe, E., . . . Wiewel, W. (2009). Anchor institutions as partners in building successful communities and local economies. In P. C. Brophy & R. D. Godsil (Eds.), *Retooling HUD for a catalytic federal government: A report to Secretary Shaun Donovan* (pp. 147–169). Philadelphia, PA: Penn Institute for Urban Research, University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from <http://www.margainc.com/initiatives/aitf>
- Harkavy, I., & Hartley, M. (2009, Summer). University-school-community partnerships for youth development and democratic renewal. *New Directions in Youth Development*, 122, 7–18.
- Harkavy, I., Hartley, M., Hodges, R. A., & Weeks, J. (2016). The history and development of a partnership approach to improve schools, communities and universities. In H. A. Lawson & D. van Veen (Eds.), *Developing community schools, community learning centers, extended-service schools and multi-service schools: International exemplars for practice, policy and research* (pp. 303–321). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J. L. (1991). Toward effective university–public school partnerships: An analysis of a contemporary model. *Teachers College Record*, 92(4), 556–581.

- Hodges, R. A. & Dubb, S. (2012). *Road half traveled: University engagement at a crossroads*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- International Association of Universities (n.d.). <https://www.iau-aiu.net/Vision-Mission>
- Johanek, M. C., & Puckett, J. L. (2007). *Leonard Covello and the making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if citizenship mattered*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Johnston, F. E., & Harkavy, I. (2009). *The obesity culture: Strategies for change: Public health and university–community partnerships*. Cambridgeshire, UK: Smith-Gordon.
- Kant, I. (1795/1993). *Grounding for the metaphysics of morals*. Translated by J. W. Ellington (3rd ed.). Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett.
- Lazarsfeld, P., & Reitz, J. (1975). *An introduction to applied sociology*. New York: Elsevier Publishing, Co.
- Lewin, K. (1943/1999). Psychology and the process of group living. In M. Gold, (Ed.) *The complete social scientist: A Kurt Lewin reader*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10319-015>
- Lipman, T., Baier, S., Deatrick, J. A., Holmberg, T. H., McGrath Schucker, M., & Ratcliffe, S. J. (2011, January/February). Diabetes risk factors in children: A partnership between nurse practitioner and high school students. *American Journal of Maternal Child Nursing*, 36(1), 56–62. doi: 10.1097/NMC.0b013e3181fc0d06
- Marga Incorporated (2010). *Anchor Institutions Task Force: Task Force statement*. New York: Marga, Inc. [https://www.margainc.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/anchor\\_task\\_force\\_statement.pdf](https://www.margainc.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/anchor_task_force_statement.pdf)
- Maurrasse, D. (2001). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. New York: Routledge.
- Mulholland, J. (10 December 2015). Academics: Forget about public engagement, stay in your ivory towers. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2015/dec/10/academics-forget-about-public-engagement-stay-in-your-ivory-towers>
- Netter Center for Community Partnerships (2008). *Anchor Institutions toolkit*. (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania. [www.nettercenter.upenn.edu](http://www.nettercenter.upenn.edu)
- Netter Center for Community Partnerships (2018). Conversation between Penn President Amy Gutmann and Ira Harkavy. <https://www.nettercenter.upenn.edu/about-center/video-president-gutmann-ira-harkavy>
- Organization of American States. (n.d.). [http://www.oas.org/en/about/who\\_we\\_are.asp](http://www.oas.org/en/about/who_we_are.asp)

- Penn Today (2019, March 15). Bringing healthy smiles to Philadelphia communities. <https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/bringing-healthy-smiles-philadelphia-communities>
- Pribbenow, P. (2014). Lessons on vocation and location: The saga of Augsburg College as urban settlement. *World and Word*, 34(2).
- Puckett, J. L. & Lloyd, M. F. (2015). *Becoming Penn. The pragmatic American university, 1950–2000*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Reinhold, M. (1968). Opponents of classical learning in America during the Revolutionary period. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 112(4).
- Rodin, J. (2007). *The university and urban revival: Out of the ivory tower and into the streets*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Schneider, C. G. (2005). Making excellence inclusive: Liberal education and America's promise. *Liberal Education*, 91(2).
- Select Greater Philadelphia Council. (2016). *At the heart of good business: Greater Philadelphia: The place to establish and grow your business*. <http://www.selectgreaterphiladelphia.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/SGP-Report-2016-lowres.pdf>
- The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2017). *Philadelphia 2017: The state of the city*. [http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2017/04/pri\\_philadelphia\\_2017\\_state\\_of\\_the\\_city.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2017/04/pri_philadelphia_2017_state_of_the_city.pdf)
- Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. (2000). *Unobtrusive measures* (Revised edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Whyte, W. F. (1989, September). Advancing scientific knowledge through participatory action research. *Sociological Forum*, 4(3), 383–384.
- Whyte, W. F., Greenwood, D. J., & Lazes, P. (1989). Participatory action research: Through practice to science in social research. In W. F. Whyte, (Ed.), *Action research for the 21st Century: Participation, reflection, and practice*, special issue of *American Behavioral Scientist*, 32(5), 513–551.

- 1 This chapter draws significantly from several existing publications written by the authors – most notably *Knowledge for social change: Bacon, Dewey and the revolutionary transformation of research universities in the twenty-first century* (Benson, Harkavy, Puckett, Hartley, Hodges, Johnston and Weeks, 2017).
- 2 'Eds and meds' denotes college and universities as well as academic medical centers and hospitals.
- 3 Community-engaged work is happening at colleges and universities in small town and rural areas as well as urban centers in the United States. Campus Compact has a national membership of over 1000 colleges and universities that are "committed to the public purpose of higher education. We build democracy through civic education and community development" (<https://compact.org/who-we-are/>). For a more detailed overview of the civic and community engagement movement and its impact across higher education see Chapter 5 in Benson et al. (2017).
- 4 The phrase "rightly placed" is from Francis Bacon's admonition that to

- improve things for the better required a worthy goal: "It is not possible to run a course aright when the goal itself has not been rightly placed" (Bacon, 1620/1858, p. 79).
- 5 This approach resonates with Kant's second categorical imperative: "Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end" (Kant, 1785/1993, p. 30).
  - 6 The intellectual benefit of integrating theory and practice is succinctly captured by Lazarsfeld and Reitz (1975, p. 10): "Nothing is more conducive to innovation in social theory than collaboration on a complex practical problem."
  - 7 For a discussion of the connection between the advancement of knowledge and the continuous improvement of the human condition, see Benson et al. (2017).
  - 8 Although Bacon actually wrote "knowledge itself is a power," the famous statement "knowledge is power" captures Bacon's meaning and is widely attributed to him. See Bacon (1597/1984). The phrase for "the relief of man's estate" can be found in Bacon (1605/1999, p. 29).
  - 9 The Netter Center director reports to Penn's president through the Vice President for Government and Community Affairs.
  - 10 Penn NPs and Sayre High School students have continued to present together each year at the National Pediatric Nursing Conference (a total of 20 poster presentations and two oral presentations) and have gained seven national awards. They have also been honored for their service to the community through citations from Philadelphia City Council and a proclamation from the Mayor of Philadelphia.
  - 11 For a project funded by the Spencer Foundation in 1991–92, Puckett traced the community school idea in the US from its roots in the Progressive Era settlement house movement to the present. Noting the episodic rise and fall of community school movements in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, he advised Benson, Harkavy and other Netter Center colleagues on the lessons of this history, notably the critical importance of an institutional anchor for community schools. For a history and critique of America's community schools in their varied forms, see Johanek and Puckett (2007).
  - 12 Not to minimise the accomplishments described in this chapter, academic engagement alone is insufficient to make meaningful change. The involvement of the entire university is needed if genuine progress is to be made. The Netter Center currently closely partners with the Office of Executive Vice President on issues of community economic development that help to advance Penn's role as an anchor institution that works with its community in positive and mutually beneficial ways. These efforts have helped Penn to become an increasingly engaged anchor institution, but they remain insufficient.
  - 13 For information on the International Consortium and the Council of Europe, see [www.internationalconsortium.org](http://www.internationalconsortium.org) (accessed June 4, 2019).
  - 14 In March 2016, as part of its 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations, more than 350 presidents and chancellors signed the Campus Compact's new Action Statement. The Action Statement advances the "public obligations" of higher education and "commits campuses to specific steps to deepen their engagement for the benefits of students, communities, and the broader public." Each campus is developing a Campus Civic Action Plan as part of this effort. See <http://compact.org/actionstatement/>.
  - 15 In 2005 Innovations in Civic Participation worked with Tufts University to organise the Talloires Network, an international consortium of institutions of

higher education committed to promoting the civic roles and social responsibilities of their institutions, as well as deepening engagement with local and global communities. GUNi was formed in 2009 as an international network, supported by UNESCO, the United Nations University and the Catalan Association of Public Universities, that emphasizes the social commitment of higher education. The University Social Responsibility Network, initiated in 2015 at Hong Kong Polytechnic University, has members from across six continents who collaborate to advance the university social responsibility efforts of member institutions and to advance the global movement. The Open Society University Network was co-founded by the Central European University and Bard College in 2020 with a \$1 billion gift from George Soros and the Open Society Foundations. See more at <http://talloiresnetwork.tufts.edu/>, <http://www.guni-rmies.net/>, <http://www.usrnetwork.org>, and <https://osun.bard.edu>.

- 16 Stanley Fish is arguably the most outspoken proponent of the 'disciplinary fallacy' (Fish, 2008).