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2001 AS TURNING POINT: 
THE COMMUNITY-HIGHER EDUCATION-
SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP IDEA BECOMES A 
NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL 
MOVEMENT

Lee Benson & Ira Harkavy
University of Pennsylvania

When the first four-page issue of Universities and Community Schools was published in 1989, the idea of genuinely collaborative, mutually beneficial, partnerships among communities, higher education institutions (“higher-eds” for short), and public schools was in its visionary, experimental stage. To mix metaphors shamelessly, this 141 page issue of the journal demonstrates that by 2001 that visionary idea had taken firm root, spread widely, and flourished in an impressive variety of innovative forms. Developed in the United States, it is now radiating out to such distant countries as South Africa and Australia.

Though subsequent issues of Universities and Communities Schools will contain reports from other countries, this issue limits itself to American examples. But as the paper by the two of us which follows this introduction demonstrates, American higher eds are now closely collaborating with higher eds in other countries to develop “The Role of Community-Higher Education-School Partnerships in Educational and Societal Development and Democratization.” That lengthy title was specified by The Joint Education Trust, which commissioned the paper for presentation to the Department of Education, South Africa. It specified that title in order to make clear the tripartite nature as the foundation of its comprehensive long-term plan to help overcome severe post-apartheid problems and significantly improve the democratic quality of life in South Africa.

Before commissioning us to write the paper, delegations from South Africa had made several visits to the University of Pennsylvania, and had been impressed by the positive results achieved by the higher education-assisted community schools it had helped develop in West Philadelphia. They had also become convinced that the partnerships model which Penn had developed with its local community and public schools was relevant enough and flexible enough to be highly effective in South Africa. Copies of the paper were widely circulated in advance of a three-week visit to South Africa by one of us, Ira Harkavy, in the summer of 2000 and served as the basis of stimulating, fruitful discussion with high-ranking South African academics and government officials. Those discussions lead to the conclusion that the community-higher ed-school partnership idea could indeed be creatively adapted to the needs and resources of societies other than the United States. Subsequently, similar collaborative relationships have been developed between Penn and Australian universities and the Australians are now in the process of adapting the basic community-higher ed-school partnership model to their own particular needs and resources.
The second paper in this issue is by Francis E. Johnston and Amelia Rosenberg Weinreb of the University of Pennsylvania, “Linking Intellectual Resources and Community Needs at the University of Pennsylvania.” As that title suggests, it presents a systematic, intensive candid evaluation of how well Penn’s resources have been used to meet the needs of its local community, West Philadelphia, with particular attention to the community’s public schools. The third paper by Eric M. Anderman, of the University of Kentucky, “Motivation During the Middle School Years: The Case of Community Schools,” reports on another evaluation study of university-school partnerships. In this instance, the study focused on the results of a partnership between the University of Kentucky and a middle school with which it worked to test the utility of the higher ed-assisted community school model.

The next paper by Stephen L. Percy and Mary Jane Brukardt of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, “To Change a University, Start With the Community,” focuses on the changes produced in a university when it reorganizes itself to use its resources to help improve the quality of life in its local community, in this case the entire city of Milwaukee. Appropriately enough, the paper which follows it by Jilaine W. Fewell, Christine G. Overtoom, and Oliver P. Jones, “Organizing the Campus To Be In Partnership With Schools and the Community: Ohio State’s Campus Collaborative,” also reports the results of collaboration between a university, Ohio State, and its neighboring communities in Columbus, Ohio.

The next paper by Hal Lawson of the State University of New York at Albany, “Beyond Community Involvement and Service Learning to Engaged Universities,” doesn’t report on specific university-community relationships; instead it examines the general problems universities confront when they try to transform themselves into “engaged universities.” It is followed by a paper authored by a quintet of faculty at Virginia Commonwealth University, “Integrating Services and Training,” that examines the specific problems a university confronts when it develops and implements an “interdisciplinary training experience for professional students in nursing, social work, and child clinical psychology” working to provide health services for a local elementary school. This issue concludes with a paper by Nick Cutforth of the University of Denver and Don Hellison, of the University of Illinois at Chicago, whose title is virtually self-explanatory, “Capitalizing on the Popularity of Sport and Physical Activity Among University Youth: Breaking New Ground in University/Community Cultures.”

Taken together, we believe that the papers in this issue strongly support our introductory proposition that by 2001 the visionary community-higher education-school partnership idea “had taken firm root, spread widely, and flourished in an impressive variety of innovative forms.”
It is not possible to run a course aright when the goal itself is not rightly placed.

—Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum* (1620)

Democracy has been given a mission to the world, and it is of no uncertain character. I wish to show that the university is the prophet of this democracy, as well as its priest and its philosopher; that in other words the university is the Messiah of the democracy, its to-be-expected deliverer.

—William Rainey Harper, *The University and Democracy* (1899)

The truth of a scientific proposition, finding, or an abstract ethical principle is not a matter of personal opinion or subjective preference. It is an objective fact to be discovered and made true by actions [original emphasis]. .

—Shirley Strum Kenny, President, State University of New York, Stony Brook

To begin this action-oriented, real-world problem-solving paper, we sketch a classic good news/bad news scenario. In our scenario’s optimistic version, the 21st century becomes the global Democratic Century—the century which witnesses practical fulfillment of the democratic promise long heralded by progressive prophets and visionaries. In its pessimistic version, a radically different outcome materializes: the 21st century becomes hunkering down in its last strongholds. But Dahl essentially wished for radical changes, he didn’t do the hard thinking needed to realize them. Dewey essentially wished for radical changes, he didn’t do the hard thinking needed to realize them. Dewey essentially wished for radical changes, he didn’t do the hard thinking needed to realize them. Dewey essentially wished for radical changes, he didn’t do the hard thinking needed to realize them.
higher educational institutions, particularly research universities, will have both the capacity and the motivation to function as the strategic agents powerful enough, determined enough, to create integrated real-world problem-solving schooling systems and democratic cosmopolitan neighborhood communities. Later in the paper, we sketch our reasons for believing that they can be realized in practice. Here we simply note that our overall strategy derives from this basic assumption: In the global era of an irrefutable, accelerating communication/information revolution where great capacity for knowledge-production and use really is power, American universities (broadly conceived) can be persuaded that their primary mission should be to help bring about the participatory democratic society John Dewey envisioned as the optimally intelligent, optimally moral, form of human social organization. To justify the Neo-Deweyan priority we give to universities as systems agents of progressive societal change, we turn to the “Dewey-Plato debate.”

1. Education and Society: John Dewey vs. Plato

Plato was the philosopher John Dewey most liked to read. Though he admired Plato, their worldviews differed radically. For our purposes, we need note only two basic differences: Plato’s world was aristocratic and contemplative, Dewey’s was democratic and activist. Despite their many differences, in certain crucial respects Dewey shared Plato’s views about the relationships between education and society. To make the point economically, we quote Steven M. Cahn, a leading philosopher of education. According to Dewey:

“Education was to Plato, above all, a means of preparing men for the business of ruling; to Dewey, above all, a means of preparing men for the business of living. Plato said ‘true knowledge is something to be had for nothing’; to Dewey, it is something to be paid for.”

Note that other philosophers also emphasized the importance of education, Cahn quoted Kant’s proposition that “the greatest and most difficult problem to which man can devote himself is the problem of education.” Cahn then observed that he knew of:

only two major philosophers who exemplified this principle in their philosophical work, one was Dewey, the other was Plato. He too found it difficult to discuss any important philosophic problem without relating it to the appropriateness of various subjects of study, methods of teaching, strategies of learning. But while Dewey’s philosophy of education rested on his belief in democracy and the power of scientific method, Plato’s philosophy of education rested on his belief in aristocracy and the power of pure reason. Plato proposed a planned society. Dewey a society engaged in continuous planning. Plato considered dialectical speculation to be the means toward the attainment of truth. Dewey maintained that knowledge is only acquired through intelligent action. Suffice it to say that John Dewey is the only thinker ever to construct a philosophy of education comparable in scope and depth to that of Plato.

Summarized even more starkly: Plato’s philosophy of education aimed to achieve aristocratic order, Dewey’s to achieve democratic community. Like the ancient Greek philosopher, Dewey theorized that education and society were dynamically interactive and interdependent. It followed, then, that if human beings hope to develop and maintain the particular type social order or society they regard as the optimum form of human social organization, they must develop and maintain the particular type of education system conducive to it. Stated in negative propositional form: No participatory democratic schooling system logically required by his participatory democratic philosophy of society. Put another way, he took no action to institute the democratic “American Academy” necessary to overthrow Plato and bring about the participatory democratic society he deeply believed in and passionately wanted to help construct the type of society based upon the belief that democracy as an ethical ideal can be realized only by action motive men and women to build communities in which the necessary opportunities and resources are available for every individual to realize fully his or her particular capacities and powers through participation in political, social and cultural life.

In our judgment, democratic American academics should stop indulging in never-ending, hermeneutic debates over what “true” American education is all about. That is, why observe the work of Dewey, the major American guiding light of our time. Dewey is not the only word in American education. He is simply the most important one. To quote Dewey himself, “Theory is not enough; theory-guided, theory-testing, theory-developing experimentation is necessary.”

Specifically, how do we transform the overall American schooling system so that it actually functions as the “democratic public work” which Dewey, in effect called for? Remember, we overthrew Plato and successfully implement Dewey’s democratic schooling theory so that it becomes true in real-world practice, not simply in abstract principle? Most critically, how do we develop and implement democratic pedagogy and democratic schools for democratic citizenship? Those are terribly hard problems. They require terribly hard thought and work. To focus attention on them and stimulate sustained, integrated theoretical debate and experimental action, we sketch out our “solutions.”

2. Democracy, Democratic Schooling and the American Research University

The path toward democratic schooling begins with and runs through the American research university. Moreover, as suggested above, we view the American research university as the primary Agent to advance societal democratization by moving from democratic thinking and communication to democratic action. More specifically, to “wimp out” and leave the action-taking to progress beyond him and practically solve the problems he evaded. Theory is not enough; theory-guided, theory-testing, theory-developing experimentation is necessary.

Specifically, how do we transform the overall American schooling system so that it actually functions as the “democratic public work” which Dewey, in effect called for? Remember, we overthrew Plato and successfully implement Dewey’s democratic schooling theory so that it becomes true in real-world practice, not simply in abstract principle? Most critically, how do we develop and implement democratic pedagogy and democratic schools for democratic citizenship? Those are terribly hard problems. They require terribly hard thought and work. To focus attention on them and stimulate sustained, integrated theoretical debate and experimental action, we sketch out our “solutions.”

Breaking free from scholastic deconstruction and disputation, democratic American academics should constructively pay homage to Dewey by acting to progress beyond him and practically solve the problems he evaded. Theory is not enough; theory-guided, theory-testing, theory-developing experimentation is necessary.

Specifically, how do we transform the overall American schooling system so that it actually functions as the “democratic public work” which Dewey, in effect called for? Remember, we overthrew Plato and successfully implement Dewey’s democratic schooling theory so that it becomes true in real-world practice, not simply in abstract principle? Most critically, how do we develop and implement democratic pedagogy and democratic schools for democratic citizenship? Those are terribly hard problems. They require terribly hard thought and work. To focus attention on them and stimulate sustained, integrated theoretical debate and experimental action, we sketch out our “solutions.”
subsystem, which, on balance, has the greatest “multiplier” effects, direct and indirect, short and long-term. We think it equally axiomatic that uni-
versities—particularly elite research universities with highly selective arts and science colleges—function as the primary shapers of the overall American schooling system. The powerful role of research universities stems not only from their enormous prestige and power—they serve, in effect, as the reference group that defines and shapes the entire schooling hierarchy—but from their far-reaching role in educating teachers.

At the turn of the twentieth century, William Rainey Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago (1892-1906), identified the urban “Great University” (his term) as the most strategic organizational innovation of modern society. To build a great university and help realize in practice the democratic promise of America, Harper argued that the University of Chicago must take serious responsibility for designing and implementing solutions to active engagement with the severe problems confronting its dynamically growing city, particularly its public school system. Criticized by a university trustee for sponsoring a journal focused on pop culture, Harper responded, “As a university we are interested above all else in ped-
agogy” [emphasis added]. Harper’s devotion to ped-
agogy logically derived from two propositions cen-
tral to his truly Messianic vision for the University of Chicago in particular, for American universities in general, and (eventually) for universities throughout the world.

1. “Education is the basis of all democratic progress. The problems of education are, therefore, the problems of democracy.”
2. “More than any other institution, the uni-
versity determines the character of the society and the system of human values.” To quote him: “Through the school system, the char-
acter of which, in spite of itself, the uni-
versity determines and is in a larger meas-
ure controls...through the school system every family in this entire broad land of ours is brought into touch with the uni-
versity, for from it proceeds the teach-
ers or the teachers’ teachers.”

Has Harper’s vision been realized? On bal-
ance, has the American higher educational system positively contributed to the successful functioning of the American schooling system? To answer that question, we obviously must first determine how best to conceive and measure “successful functioning.” Do scores on standardized tests, for example, really tell us much about the state of American schooling? Does the widening chasm in the educational achievement of urban, largely minority (primarily African-American and Latino) youth and their largely white suburban counter-
parts tell us much more? To answer such very hard questions requires us to think very hard and to specify explicitly the aim(s) and methods of schooling.

Once again, Dewey’s work, with its strong emphasis on education for democracy, provides a good theoretical beginning. In a recent article on “Democracy and Inquiry,” Charles Anderson perceptively summarized Dewey’s position:

Dewey thought that democratic citizenship could be understood as the unifying aim of edu-

cation [emphasis added]. But Dewey thought of democracy as but one manifestation of a power that was vested in and distinctive in humanity. That power was inquiry... Inquiry, Dewey taught, was the method of democracy. It was also the method of science. And as the century wore on, it in fact became the method of management, of the law, of edu-

cation itself.

Here then is a theme that can unify edu-

cation as it unifies the spheres of everyday life [emphasis added]. Citizenship now carries enhanced meaning. It pertains not just to pub-
lic affairs but to our performance in every realm of life [original emphasis].

Informed by Dewey’s theory of “inquiry-
based, real-world action-oriented, participatory democratic schooling for participatory demo-
craty citizenship” (our lengthy term for Dewey’s powerfully set of concepts), we are convinced that, on balance, American universities have had, and continue to have, harmful effects on the American public school system. Rhetorically proclaiming democratic purposes, American higher education has strongly tended to function in practice as an essentially Platonic, elitist, anti-democratic sys-
tem. Put another way, Plato (updated by Vilfredo Pareto and his modern Machiavellian theory of circulating elites) still dominates the American university and helps ensure the inability of pub-
lic schools to perform their roles well, particularly their critical role of effectively providing
democratic schooling and democratic pedagogy for a democratic society. To “prove” (sic) that complex theoretical proposition would require a long paper. Here we simply call attention to the direct and indirect harmful effects resulting from: (1) the powerful university pressures to produce high school graduates suitable for admission to essentially Platonic prestigious colleges; (2) the “deliberate choice” of leading Graduate Schools of Education to largely ape the much more pres-
igious Schools of Arts and Sciences, thereby “dis-
tancing themselves from both the task of training teachers for elementary and secondary schools and that of addressing the problems and needs of those schools.”

Our position is simple, unequivocal: no dem-
ocratic radical reform of American higher educa-
tion, no successful democratic schooling reform, no truly democratic society. Summarized suc-
cinctly: Participatory democratic societies require the development of participatory democracy uni-
versities. The radical reform of higher education will most likely occur, we hypothesize, in the cru-

dential universities—particularly elite research universities—of Chicago (1892-1906), identified the urban “Great University” (his term) as the most strategic organizational innovation of modern society. To build a great university and help realize in practice the democratic promise of America, Harper argued that the University of Chicago must take serious responsibility for designing and implementing solutions to active engagement with the severe problems confronting its dynamically growing city, particularly its public school system. Criticized by a university trustee for sponsoring a journal focused on pop culture, Harper responded, “As a university we are interested above all else in pedagogy” [emphasis added]. Harper’s devotion to pedagogy logically derived from two propositions central to his truly Messianic vision for the University of Chicago in particular, for American universities in general, and (eventually) for universities throughout the world.

1. “Education is the basis of all democratic progress. The problems of education are, therefore, the problems of democracy.”
2. “More than any other institution, the university determines the character of the society and the system of human values.” To quote him: “Through the school system, the character of which, in spite of itself, the university determines and is in a larger measure controls...through the school system every family in this entire broad land of ours is brought into touch with the university, for from it proceeds the teachers or the teachers’ teachers.”

Has Harper’s vision been realized? On balance, has the American higher educational system positively contributed to the successful functioning of the American schooling system? To answer that question, we obviously must first determine how best to conceive and measure “successful functioning.” Do scores on standardized tests, for example, really tell us much about the state of American schooling? Does the widening chasm in the educational achievement of urban, largely minority (primarily African-American and Latino) youth and their largely white suburban counterparts tell us much more? To answer such very hard questions requires us to think very hard and to specify explicitly the aim(s) and methods of schooling.

Once again, Dewey’s work, with its strong emphasis on education for democracy, provides a good theoretical beginning. In a recent article on “Democracy and Inquiry,” Charles Anderson perceptively summarized Dewey’s position:

Dewey thought that democratic citizenship could be understood as the unifying aim of education [emphasis added]. But Dewey thought of democracy as but one manifestation of a power that was vested in and distinctive in humanity. That power was inquiry... Inquiry, Dewey taught, was the method of democracy. It was also the method of science. And as the century wore on, it in fact became the method of management, of the law, of education itself.

Here then is a theme that can unify education as it unifies the spheres of everyday life [emphasis added]. Citizenship now carries enhanced meaning. It pertains not just to public affairs but to our performance in every realm of life [original emphasis].

Informed by Dewey’s theory of “inquiry-based, real-world action-oriented, participatory democratic schooling for participatory democracy citizenship” (our lengthy term for Dewey’s powerfully set of concepts), we are convinced that, on balance, American universities have had, and continue to have, harmful effects on the American public school system. Rhetorically proclaiming democratic purposes, American higher education has strongly tended to function in practice as an essentially Platonic, elitist, anti-democratic system. Put another way, Plato (updated by Vilfredo Pareto and his modern Machiavellian theory of circulating elites) still dominates the American university and helps ensure the inability of public schools to perform their roles well, particularly their critical role of effectively providing democratic schooling and democratic pedagogy for a democratic society. To “prove” (sic) that complex theoretical proposition would require a long paper. Here we simply call attention to the direct and indirect harmful effects resulting from: (1) the powerful university pressures to produce high school graduates suitable for admission to essentially Platonic prestigious colleges; (2) the “deliberate choice” of leading Graduate Schools of Education to largely ape the much more prestigious Schools of Arts and Sciences, thereby “distanting themselves from both the task of training teachers for elementary and secondary schools and that of addressing the problems and needs of those schools.”

Our position is simple, unequivocal: no democratic radical reform of American higher education, no successful democratic schooling reform, no truly democratic society. Summarized succinctly: Participatory democratic societies require the development of participatory democracy universities. The radical reform of higher education will most likely occur, we hypothesize, in the crucial years of the 1980s and 1990s. This time, however, it was primarily led by university president and administrator, What seems to bode promise and public life in their local communities. (History some-
cially and collaboratively are now beginning to work together, enthusiasti-
cally and collaboratively.)

During the 1960s, it will be recalled, angry rebellious students demanding “relevance,” “part-
ticipation,” and “community,” fought unsuccessfully to get universities to take appropriate responsibility for the quality of life in their local communities. Dormant for more than a decade, the movement was revived during the 1980s and 1990s. This time, however, it was primarily led by university presi-
dents and administrators. What seems to bode particularly well for the durability and future strength of the revived movement is this unprece-
dented development: In remarkable contrast to the 1960s, university presidents, faculty, and students are now beginning to work together, enthusiastically and collaboratively, to improve the quality of life in their local communities. (History some-
times does “teach lessons” that some human beings sometimes do learn.)

Following Donald Kennedy’s stimulating lead in a recent book, Academic Duty, we view American higher education as now in the early stages of its third “revolution.” The first revolu-
tion, of course, occurred in the late 19th century. Beginning at Johns Hopkins in 1876, the acceler-
ating adoption and uniquely American adaptation of the German model revolutionized American higher education. By the turn of the century, the uniquely American research university had essen-
tially been created. The second revolution began in 1945 with Vannevar Bush’s “endless [research] frontier” Manifesto and rapidly produced the Big Science, Cold War, Entrepreneurial University. The third revolution, we believe, can be dated (somewhat arbitrarily) as beginning in 1989. The fall of the Berlin Wall, the crack-up of the Soviet Union, and the end of the Cold War provided the necessary condition for the “revolutionary” emergence of the Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic University—the radically new type of “Great University” which William Rainey Harper prophesied would be capable of advancing democratic schooling and practical realization of the democratic promise of America for all Americans.

How can we credibly explain the emergence of the Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic University a century after Harper first envisioned it? Largely (though oversimply), as a defensive response to the increasingly obvious, increasingly embarrassing, increasingly immoral, contradiction between the increasing status, wealth, power, and dominant role of American higher education in American society—particularly its elite research university component—and the increasingly pathological state of American cities.

To paraphrase Oliver Goldsmith’s late 18th century lament for The Deserted Village, while American research universities flourished in the late 20th century as the “fortress of the true, wise and honored American city, to hastening ills a prey.” If American research universities really were so great, why were American cities so pathological? After the Cold War ended, the contradiction became increasingly obvious, troubling, indefensible, immoral.

Put another way, the manifest contradiction between the power and the performance of American higher education signals the failure of the Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic University. Knowledge is Power. Power means—or power based on great capacity for knowledge-production...
Accelerating external and internal pressures forced research universities, therefore, to recognize (very, very reluctantly) that they must function as moral/intellectual institutions simultaneously; symbolically engaged in the advancement of universal knowledge and the improvement of local well being. Put still another way, after 1989, the combination of external pressure and enlightened self-interest increasingly spurred American research universities to recognize that they would benefit greatly, optimally democratically and biotically, engaged in the advancement of universal and as local institutions of higher education, i.e., democratic cosmopolitan civic institutions not only in but of and for their local communities.

To reduce (if not avoid) misunderstanding, we emphasize that we view the “third revolution” as still in its early—very early—stages. As the old academic joke has it, American universities constitute such remarkably self-contradictory, internally-competitive and conflictual, institutions that they tend to move with all the speed of a runaway glacier. But things are changing, in the right direction. One indicator of positive change is the accelerating number and variety of “higher eds”—a less cloying on some term than “higher educational institutions”—which now publicly proclaim their desire to collaborate actively with their neighboring public schools and local communities. Predictably, to-date, public proclamations of collaboration far surpass tangible, interactive, mutually respectful and mutually beneficial, collaboration. Nevertheless, progress is being made.

In the short run, we concede, our proposed mission change would require higher eds to experience the trauma entailed by any attempt to change academic priorities and cultures radically. In effect, we are calling on higher eds to reallocate the largest share of their intellectual (and other) resources to the immediate improvement of their neighboring public schools and communities. Given their present intrinsically competitive, “pure research” orientation (fixation?), how in the world could we possibly expect higher eds to answer our call positively rather than derisively, dismissively, contemptuously? Is our proposal to change academic priorities so lacking in good sense, so “revolutionary,” so anarchonistically ultra-leftist, that readers will angrily reject it as irresponsible, self-defeating, delusional utopianism? To pun a phrase: Are we nuts?

To help accelerate progress to the point where major changes become firmly institutionalized and produce really significant results, we call for acceptance of this radical proposition: All higher eds should explicitly make solving the problem of the American schooling system their highest institutional priority; hence, contributions to its solution should count heavily both in assessing their institutional performance and in responding to their requests for renewed or increased financial support. Actively helping to develop an effective, integrally democratic, pre-K through higher ed schooling system, we contend, should become the collaborative primary mission of, and primary performance test for, American universities and their local communities.

Primary mission, of course, doesn’t mean sole mission. Obviously, American higher eds now have—and will continue to have—important missions other than collaboratively helping to solve the problem of the American schooling system. If space permitted, we would try to show in detail how those other missions would benefit greatly from successful collaborative work on the schooling problem. Here we restrict ourselves to bare-bones statement of three corollary propositions.

1. Given the radically disruptive, complex consequences (e.g., political, economic) of the extraordinarily rapid development of information societies throughout the world, given the critical role schooling must play in such societies, solving the schooling system problem should now constitute American society’s highest priority. (2) Solving the overall problem of the schooling system must begin with changes at the higher ed level. (3) If higher eds genuinely take responsibility for solving the overall schooling system problem, in the long run, directly and indirectly, they will secure much greater resources than they now have to carry out all their important missions.

3. Penn’s Engagement with Local Public Schools as a Practical Example of “Democratic Devolution Revolution”

Since 1985, Penn has increasingly engaged itself with its local public schools in a comprehensive school-community-university partnership, the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC). In its fifteenth year of operation, the project, has evolved significantly. Moreover, it has helped spawn a variety of related projects which also engage Penn with public schools in its local community, West Philadelphia. From its inception, we conceptualized Penn’s work with WEPIC as deriving from and serving to forge a mutually respectful, morally citizens, necessary to develop and maintain an optimally democratic society. At bottom, we are convinced, American universities and academic priorities other than collaboratively helping to solve the moral and intellectual institutions

For nearly a generation, John Gardner, the effective functioning of organizations and the haphazard devolution of functions: conceptualizing that work in much broader terms; namely, to advance, preserve, and sustain the moral citizens, necessary to develop and maintain an optimally democratic society. At bottom, we are convinced, American universities and academic priorities other than collaboratively helping to solve the moral and intellectual institutions
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A major component of the strategy being developed by Penn (as well as by an increasing number of other urban higher educational institutions) focuses on the development of university-assisted community schools designed to help educate, engage, activate, and serve all members of the community in which the school is located. The strategy assumes that universities can help develop and maintain community schools which function as focal points to help create healthy urban environments and that universities find that worth doing because, among other reasons, they function best in such environments.

Somewhat more specifically, the strategy assumes that, like higher eds, public schools can function as environment-changing institutions and become the strategic centers of broad-based partnerships that genuinely engage a wide variety of community organizations and institutions. Public schools “belong” to all members of the community. They are particularly well suited, therefore, to function as neighborhood “hubs” or “nodes” around which local partnerships can be generated and formed. When they play that role, schools function as community institutions par excellence; they then provide a critical, democratic, community-based response to significant community problems and help develop the democratic, cosmopolitan, neighborly communities Dewey envisioned.

The university-assisted community school reinvents and updates an old American idea, namely that the neighborhood school can effectively serve as the core neighborhood institution—the core institution that provides comprehensive support for community schools. The core institution provides comprehensive services and galvanizes other community institutions and groups. That idea inspired the early settlement house workers; they recognized the centrality of the neighborhood school in community life and hailed its potential as the strategic site for community stabilization and improvement. At the turn of the 20th century, it was worth noting, deeply motivated, socially-concerned, brilliantly-creative settlement house workers such as Jane Addams and Lillian Wald pioneered the transfer of social, health, cultural, and recreational services to the public schools of major American cities. In effect, theoretically-guided, caring, socially engaged, feminist settlement leaders, recognizing that though there were very few settlement houses, there were very many public schools. Not surprisingly, Dewey’s ideas about “The School As... Social Centre” (1902) had been strongly, directly shaped by his enlightening experiences and inspiring discussions with Jane Addams and others at Hull House. In a highly influential, theoretically creative, address, Dewey explicitly paid homage to them:

I suppose, whenever we are framing our ideals of the school as a social Centre, what we think of is particularly the better class of social settlement. What we want is to see the school, every public school, doing something of the same sort of work that is now done by a settlement or two scattered at wide distances through the city.

Dewey failed to note, however, two critically important functions that community schools could perform: (1) the school as the core community institution actively engaged in the solution of basic community problems; (2) the school as a community institution that educates young children, both intellectually and morally, by engaging them in real-world, community problem-solving. He did recognize that if the neighborhood school were to function as a genuine community center, it needed additional human resources and support. But, to our knowledge, Dewey never identified universities as a key source of broadly based, sustained, comprehensive support for community schools.

To suggest the contributions that university-assisted community schools can make to an effective, compassionate, democratic revolution capable of achieving Dewey’s utopian goal of democratic, cosmopolitan, neighborly communities, we summarize briefly some results of the “community school-creating” efforts presently being undertaken by higher eds across the country: Undergraduates, as well as dental, medical, social work, education, and nursing students, are learning as they serve; public school students are also connecting their education to real-world problem solving and providing service to other students and community members; adults are participating in locally-based job training, skill enhancement, and ongoing education; effective integration (as distinct from co-location) of services for school children and their families is now significantly under way in many communities.

It is critical to emphasize, however, that the university-assisted community schools now being developed have a very long way to go before they can effectively help mobilize the potentially powerful, untapped resources of their communities and thereby enable individuals and families to function both as deliverers and as recipients of caring, compassionate local services. To make the point concretely, we briefly recite the “narrative history” of our experience at Penn; it suggests how far we have come and how far we have to go.

4. Penn and West Philadelphia: Public Schools Learning By Reflecting Penn’s development over the past two decades has been a process of painful organizational learning; we cannot overemphasize that our understanding and activities have continually changed over time. For example, Penn has recently embarked on two highly ambitious, ventures: (1) leading a coalition of higher educational institutions, medical and other nonprofit institutions, for-profit firms, and community groups, to improve 25 West Philadelphia public schools; (2) developing a university-assisted public school adjacent to campus, in partnership with the School District of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers. Reaching that level of activity has been neither an easy nor a straight path. Moreover, Penn is only now beginning to tap its extraordinary capacity to serve as a powerful, untapped resource for its community. The role of community-higher education-school partnerships is to catalyze that process; they are an extension of the devolution revolution. In our pro-posed “revolution,” government serves as a powerful catalytic agent and largely provides the funds needed to create stable, ongoing, effective partnerships. But government would function only as a second-tier deliverer of services, with universities, community-based organizations, unions, churches, other voluntary associations, school children and their parents, and community members functioning as the first-tier operational partners. That is, public and private levels of government would guarantee aid and significantly finance welfare services (broadly conceived as “promoting the general welfare”). Local, person-alized, caring services, however, would actually be delivered by the Third (private, non-profit, vol-un tary associations) and Fourth (personal, i.e., family, kin, neighbors, friends) Sectors of society. Put another way, government would not be pri-marily responsible for the delivery of services; it primarily, indirectly, provides general-level responsibilities, including fully adequate provision of funds.

The strategy we propose requires adapting the work of local institutions (e.g., universities, hos-pitals, faith-based organizations) creatively and individually to the needs and resources of local communities. It assumes that colleges and universities, which simultaneously constitute pre-eminent national, and local institutions, potentially constitute very powerful partners, “anchors,” and creative catalysts for change and improvement in the quality of life in American cities and communities. That assumption, it seems worth emphasizing, served as the intellec-tual inspiration for William Ramey Harper’s conception of the urban “Great University” he worked so passionately to construct. In Chicago at the turn of the 20th century.) University” he worked so passionately to construct. Harper’s conception of the urban “Great University” he worked so passionately to construct. Harper’s conception of the urban “Great University” he worked so passionately to construct. Harper’s conception of the urban “Great University” he worked so passionately to construct. Harper’s conception of the urban “Great University” he worked so passionately to construct. (1902) had been strongly, directly shaped by his enlightening experiences and inspiring discussions with Jane Addams and others at Hull House. In a highly influential, theoretically creative, address, Dewey explicitly paid homage to them:
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Dewey failed to note, however, two critically important functions that community schools could perform: (1) the school as the core community institution actively engaged in the solution of basic community problems; (2) the school as a community institution that educates young children, both intellectually and morally, by engaging them in real-world, community problem-solving. He did recognize that if the neighborhood school were to function as a genuine community center, it needed additional human resources and support. But, to our knowledge, Dewey never identified universities as a key source of broadly based, sustained, comprehensive support for community schools.

To suggest the contributions that university-assisted community schools can make to an effective, compassionate, democratic revolution capable of achieving Dewey’s utopian goal of democratic, cosmopolitan, neighborly communities, we summarize briefly some results of the “community school-creating” efforts presently being undertaken by higher eds across the country: Undergraduates, as well as dental, medical, social work, education, and nursing students, are learning as they serve; public school students are also connecting their education to real-world problem solving and providing service to other students and community members; adults are participating in locally-based job training, skill enhancement, and ongoing education; effective integration (as distinct from co-location) of services for school children and their families is now significantly under way in many communities.

It is critical to emphasize, however, that the university-assisted community schools now being developed have a very long way to go before they can effectively help mobilize the potentially pow-
resources in ways which eventually will mutually benefit Penn and its neighborhoods and result in substantial school, community, and university change. Significantly, we have come to see our work as a concrete example of a general theory of democratic, action-oriented, integrated, real-world problem-solving teaching, learning, research, and service. Our real-world strategic problem, we have come to see, has been, and continues to be, radically improving the quality of the entire West Philadelphia schooling system, beginning with Penn. Coming to see our work in terms of what we now conceive as the strategic schooling component of a remarkably complex urban ecological system, we are convinced, constituted a major conceptual and theoretical advance for us.

Ironically, and instructively, when we first began working to change university-community relationships in 1985, we did not envision it in terms of schools, problem-solving teaching and learning, or universities as highly strategic components of urban ecological systems. What immediately concerned us and gave us some reason to think that Penn’s traditionally indifferent (hostile?) attitude towards its local community might change for the better, was the then rapidly and visibly deteriorating, with devastating consequences for the University. West Philadelphia’s deterioration, therefore, might be used to spur Penn to creative action to overcome it. But what specifically could Penn do and how could it be induced to do it? (Necessity sometimes is the mother of invention.)

Committed to undergraduate teaching, convinced by our experiences during the 1960s that undergraduates might function as catalytic agents to help bring about university change, we designed an Honors Seminar which aimed to stimulate Penn’s best strategy to remedy its rapidly deteriorating “environmental situation” was to use its enormous internal and external resources to help radically improve West Philadelphia public schools and the neighborhoods in which they are located. Most unwittingly, during the course of the seminar’s work, we reinvented the community school idea! Public schools, we came to realize (more or less incidentally), could effectively function as core community centers for the organization, education, and transformation of entire neighborhoods. They could do that by functioning as neighborhood sites for a West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC) consisting of school personnel and neighborhood residents who would receive strategic assistance from Penn students, faculty, and staff. Put another way, the seminar helped invent WEPEC to help transform the traditional West Philadelphia public school into a “revolutionary” new system of university-assisted, community-developing, community-centered, community resource-mobilizing, community problem-solving, schools.

5. Translating the University-Assisted Community School Idea into Practical Action

Given Penn’s long, deep-rooted, institutional resistance to serious involvement with West Philadelphia’s problems, the limited resources available to us, and the intrinsic difficulty of transforming conventional, inner-city public schools into community schools, we decided that our best strategy was to try to achieve a visible, dramatic success in one school rather than marginal, incremental changes in a number of schools. While continuing the WEPEC program at other schools, therefore, we decided to concentrate initially on the John P Turner Middle School, largely because of the interest and leadership of its principal. Previous experiments in community schools and community education throughout Pennsylvania and graduate students; they are now integrating their teaching and research with the Turner program, or with other WEPEC programs in West Philadelphia public schools. Even more significantly, Anthoro 210 not only affected the anthropology department (which has recently developed an academic track in Public Interest Anthropology); its success has radiated out to other departments and schools. Undoubtedly, it—and Professor Johnston—have played major roles in the increasingly successful campaign to expand strategic, academically-based, community service at Penn. At present, 100 such courses, working with schools and community-based organizations developed and are “on the books” at Penn, with 43 being offered during the 1999-2000 academic year. Moreover, an increasing number of faculty members, from an increasingly wide range of Penn schools and departments, are now seriously considering how they might revise existing courses, or develop new courses, which would enable their students to benefit from innovative curricular opportunities to become active learners, creative real-world problem-solvers, and producers, not simply consumers, of knowledge.

6. The Center for Community Partnerships and Presidential and Faculty Leadership

Encouraged by the success of the university’s increasing engagement with West Philadelphia, in July 1992, President Hackney created the Center for Community Partnerships. To highlight the importance he attached to the Center, he located it in the Office of the President and appointed one of us (Ira Harkavy) to be its director (while continuing to serve as director of the Penn Program for Public Service created in 1988).

Symbolically and practically, creation of the Center constituted a major change in Penn’s relationship to West Philadelphia/Philadelphia. The university as a corporate entity now formally committed itself to finding ways to use enormous resources (broadly conceived) to help improve the quality of life in its local community—not only in respect to public schools but to economic and community development in general. Very broadly conceived, the Center is based on the assumption that one efficient way for Penn to carry out its academic missions of advancing universal knowledge and effectively educating students is to function as a metropolitan community school of higher education.” Stated somewhat more specifically, Penn’s research and teaching would focus on universal problems, e.g.,
schooling, health care, economic development, as these universal problems manifest themselves locally in West Philadelphia/Philadelphia. By efficiently integrating general theory and concrete practice, Penn would symbolically improve both the quality of life in its local ecological community and the quality of its academic research and teaching. Put another way, the Center assumes that when Penn is creatively conceived as a "cosmopolitan community school," it constitutes in the best sense both a universal and a local institution of higher education.

The emphasis on partnerships in the Center’s name was deliberate; it acknowledged, in effect, that Penn could not try to go it alone, as it had long been (arrogantly) accustomed to do. The creation of the Center was also significantly internally. It meant that, at least in principle, the president of the University would now strongly encourage all components of the University to seriously consider the roles they could appropriately play in Penn’s efforts to improve the quality of its off-campus environment. Implementation of that strategy accelerated after Judith Rodin became president of Penn in 1994. A native West Philadelphian and Penn graduate, Rodin was appointed in part because of her deeply felt commitment to improving Penn’s local environment and to transforming Penn into the leading American urban university.

Rodin made radical reform of undergraduate education her first priority. To achieve that far-reaching goal, she established the Provost’s Council on Undergraduate Education and charged it with designing a model for Penn’s undergraduate experience in the 21st century. Following the lead of Penn’s patron saint, Benjamin Franklin, the Provost’s Council emphasized the action-oriented union of theory and practice and “engagement with the material, ethical, and moral concerns of society and community defined broadly, globally, and also locally within Philadelphia.” The Provost’s Council defined the 21st century undergraduate experience as:

...[providing] opportunities for students to understand what it means to be active learners and active citizens. It is an experience of learning, knowing, and doing that will lead to the active involvement of students in the process of their education.

To apply this Franklinian-inspired orientation in practice, the Provost’s Council designated academically-based community service as a core component of Penn undergraduate education during the next century.

Building upon themes identified by the Provost’s Council, Rodin’s 1994-95 annual report was entitled, The Unity of Theory and Practice: Penn’s Distinctive Character. Describing the university’s efforts to integrate theory and practice, President Rodin observed that:

...there are ways in which the complex interrelationships between theory and practice transcend any effort at neat conceptualization. One of those is the application of theory in service to our community and the use of community service as an academic research arena for students. Nowhere else is the interactive dimension of theory and practice so clearly captured [emphasis added].

For more than 250 years, Philadelphia has rooted Penn in a sense of the “practical.” Rodin reminded us that service to humanity, to our community is, as [Benjamin] Franklin put it, “the great aim and end of all learning.” Today thousands of Penn faculty and students realize the unity of theory and practice by engaging West Philadelphia elementary and secondary school students as part of their own academic course work in disciplines as diverse as history, anthropology, classical studies, education, and mathematics.

For example, anthropology professor Frank Johnston and his undergraduate students educate students at West Philadelphia’s Turner Middle School about nutrition. Classical studies professor Ralph Rosen uses modern Philadelphia and fifth century Athens to explore the interrelationships between community, neighborhood, and family. And history professor Michael Zuckerman’s students engage West Philadelphia elementary and secondary school students to help them understand together the nature—and discontinuities—of American national identity and national character.28

The 1994-95 annual report illustrated and advanced a fundamental, far-reaching cultural shift that had begun to take place across the university. By the end of her first year in office, Penn’s president had significantly increased the prominence of undergraduate education, defined as the integration of theory and practice (including theory and practice derived from and applied within the local community) as the hallmark of Ben Franklin’s University, and identified academically-based community service focused on West Philadelphia and its public schools as a powerful integrative strategy to advance university-wide research, teaching, and service. Penn was entitled to expect that it was the faculty members who develop and sustain the courses and research projects which durably link a university to its local schools and community. More specifically, it is through faculty teaching and research that the connection to local schools and communities is ultimately—and durably—made. We gave high priority, therefore, to increasing the number and variety of academically-based community service courses. Thanks in large measure to President Rodin’s strong support, the number of academically-based community service courses has grown exponentially; from 11 when the Center was founded in 1992 to 100 in the Fall of 2000. As a result of the highly positive reaction to those courses, the long term process of radically changing Penn’s undergraduate curriculum has gained accelerating momentum. In addition to the development of the Public Interest Anthropology track described above, after years of complex negotiations, a new interdisciplinary minor in Urban Education has recently been created and hailed by undergraduates. A joint program of the School of Arts and Science (SAS) and the Graduate School of Education (GSE), the new minor includes faculty advisors from Anthropology, Classical Studies, Education, English, History, Linguistics, Mathematics, Sociology and Urban Studies. Appropriately enough, in the Fall 1998 issue of the School of Arts and Sciences alumni publication which focused on the urban crisis, Dean Samuel Preston voiced his strong support for the Urban Education track: “It is deceptively simple to increase the number of academically-based community service courses: Together with the Graduate School of Education, SAS is offering a new interdisciplinary minor in Urban Education. The minor explores the crises in public education in course work, in field research, and in hands-on study that uses the network of neighborhood schools the University has developed. SAS has been closely involved with the West Philadelphia community through Penn’s Center for Community Partnerships. A number of our faculty focus their research on Philadelphia communities and regularly teach courses that put our students in touch with students at local schools. Penn students join with the students from surrounding neighborhoods to gather data, conduct interviews, and explore community problems such as inadequate nutrition or the presence of lead and other toxins in homes. These service learning courses are one way that Penn mobilizes its academic resources in mutually beneficial partnerships with its neighbors. Surveys have shown that students are enthusiastic about how community service experiences enrich their Penn undergraduate education. Arts and Sciences aims to develop more of these service learning approaches to education because of their value to students and their benefits to the community [emphasis added].30

The Dean of the College, Richard Beeman, enthusiastically echoes Dean Preston’s support. Until recently, Beeman, an early American historian and a long-time friend and colleague of ours, had been openly skeptical of the value of academically-based community service at a major research university. But in a Spring 1998 speech to faculty and students, “Academically-Based Community Service: From Skeptic to Convert,” he publicly “confessed” (sic) that he had undergone something like a mind-and-spirit “conversion” experience. Translating his “personal conversion” into “institutional action,” Dean Beeman is now leading the development of an experimental college within the College of Arts and Sciences in which problem-solving learning and academically-based community service will function as central components. To quote his statement in the SAS alumni publication cited above:

I really cannot tell you how much I believe in the value of that which is being done in those courses. They give our students a problem-oriented experience in learning, and all the research literature shows that the best learning takes place, not in studying theories and abstract forms, but in solving concrete problems. I am committed to getting faculty and students involved in that effort as an important definition of their contribution to undergraduate education at Penn [emphasis added].

The School of Arts and Sciences is one of several Penn schools which, in recent years, have strengthened their connection with West Philadelphia public schools. The School’s institutional commitment has also dramatically increased. Increasingly, President Rodin has made the Urban Agenda a centerpiece of her administration and
emphasized five major areas of activity for Penn’s work in West Philadelphia: physically attractive, safe, socially and culturally diverse and exciting neighborhoods; retail improvement; improved housing; enhanced economic development; and, most centrally, excellent public schools.

Practicing what she preached, in June 1998, President Rodin announced that Penn would accept the leadership of two Cluster Resource boards which serve the public schools in West Philadelphia and enter into an innovative partnership with the School District of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers to establish a new preK-8, university-assisted, public school in West Philadelphia. Leadership of the Cluster Resource boards involves Penn working closely with the School District, nonprofit institutions, for-profit firms, and community groups, to coordinate, leverage, and advocate for needed services and supports for children and families from 25 West Philadelphia public schools. Each cluster includes one comprehensive high school and its “feeder” elementary and middle schools.

7. Democratic Partnerships and Communal Participatory Action Research

The significant development of academically-based community service learning and research courses at Penn's school of itself does not necessarily denote an ongoing democratic partnership with West Philadelphia schools and communities. The WEPIC project, however, has provided the integrative, community-focused educational vehicle that helps these courses make a practical difference in West Philadelphia schools and their communities. The courses, therefore, are a key component (probably the key component) of a wider university-school-community partnership (probably the key component) of a comprehensive high school and its “feeder” elementary and middle schools.
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program to overcome the difficulties observed in the Wilson school children.

Encouraged by the work of the of the Spring 1998 semester, Professor Labov decided to expand the project considerably during the 1998-1999 academic year. To do that, he taught (and contin-

ues to teach) four linguistic courses (undergradu-

ate and graduate) around the reading improvement program and extended it to another public school in West Philadelphia, the Charles Drew School. One focuses on the experiences of Penn undergraduates in developing linguistically and culturally appropri-

ate narrative texts and illustrations to teach read-

ing to inner-city African-American children. Another course trains Penn students to work as tutors in the Wilson and Drew schools. To help develop linguistically and culturally appropriate materials, an innovative goal of Linguistics 161 is to understand the role that Hip-Hop music plays as a socializing influence on African-American youth. In current and future seminars, undergraduates will study in detail how elementary school children actually acquire and use Hip-Hop lan-

guage. The undergraduates and Professor Labov will then try to design a more effective program to teach standard English by developing new cur-

ricula which use Hip-Hop materials as a cultur-

ally valuable learning tool.

Professor Labov’s courses are connected to after-school programs at both the Wilson and Drew schools. Initially, undergraduates had designed the after-school program at Wilson in one of our seminars as a peer-tutoring program. Among other things, it involved Penn undergrad-

uates who supervised students from the West Philadelphia High School, who, in turn, tutored Wilson students. Begun in the spring of 1996, the potentially promising program was, according to teachers and Penn students, at best only a modest success; by the end of the year, only three of the 40 subjects were caught up to their grade lev-

els and a matched control group. The intervention Jerry Jons Informal Reading

program…at Wilson…All of the 40 subjects’ one to two years behind in reading grade level before participating in...[the] extended day program...at Wilson...All of the 40 subjects...IPI scores increased by one grade level after 3.5 months’ enrollment in the program, which met 4 days per week for 1.5 hours per day. Thirty-three of the 40 subjects were caught up to their classroom reading grade level (approximately 2 grade reading levels). Three of the seven sub-

jects who were not caught up to their grade level-

es were recently from Ethiopia (ESL students) and one was in a learning support (IPI) pro-

gram. There was a statistically significant increase in average IPI reading scores of spe-

cial education participants. The 4th grade par-

ticipants had the most significant gains, 25 points on SAT-9 reading scores. The student’s average SAT-9 achievement test scores increased from “below basic” to “basic levels on the test.” We hesitate to make too much of “early round” statistical successes—work of this kind can only be carefully evaluated over the very long haul. But the impressive results cited above help explain the program’s rapid expansion. As of 1998-1999, the extended day program enrolled 40 students at Wilson and 40 students at Drew. Staffing the programs (and illustrating the resources potentially available for such programs) are 76 Penn America Reads work-study students, 13 Penn volunteers, and 9 elementary school teachers. Activities include literacy tutoring, help with homework, and literacy-based enrichment.

A school-day program has recently been added. Approximately 70 Penn students, sup-

ported by the America Reads funds, are placed with classroom teachers from grades pre-K through 8 at both schools, at least one day a week. With America Reads tutors, high school students, and staff, as well as students from Professor Labov’s seminars, the program has helped signifi-

cantly to reduce class size during literacy instruc-

tion and after-school activities. Not surprisingly, we have found in practice that reducing class size enables teachers to provide more attention to indi-

vidual students and addresses one of the most significant benefits made possible by an effective university/school partnership.
We think it important to note that Professor Labov’s reading improvement project is extraordinarily comprehensive. It has effectively integrated a faculty-led, theoretically-based, major action research project, a series of Penn undergraduate and graduate seminars, and a volunteer program to develop a highly creative and innovative model. Combining the skill, expertise, and cutting-edge theoretical work of a senior faculty member and the intensive training of graduate and undergraduate students, the program in itself testifies to the value of results that can be achieved when university academically-based community service projects work with local public schools. Given the importance of ending the “minority differential” in reading, the findings from this project have major national significance. So much so, in fact, that the Oakland School Board—the focal point of the Ebonics controversy—California State University-Hayward, and Penn have been generously funded by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Educational Research Innovation (OERI) to further develop and extend Professor Labov’s reading improvement project.

8. Three Higher Ed-Public School Partnerships as Good Evidence of the Accelerating University Civic Responsibility Movement in the United States

We cannot overemphasize the point that the accelerating changes in Penn’s relationship to its local schools are not atypical, not unique to Penn. More or less similar changes throughout the country testify to the emergence of a “University Civic Responsibility Movement”—a national movement designed to construct an optimally democratic schooling system as the strategic means to realize American democracy. To illustrate the point, we will mention one example of the kind of higher ed-inspired local community partnerships supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts. The University of Texas at El Paso now spends significantly more time in public school classrooms than they did before the Collaborative began. The University’s College of Education has also involved arts and sciences faculty members in educating candidates for teaching degrees in academic subjects. The program’s success includes a decrease in the number of low performing schools in the Collaborative’s three districts from 15 to zero, and an increase from 2 in 1994 to 5 in 1997 in the number of El Paso schools recognized as exemplary by the Texas Education Agency. As a result, the Collaborative has attracted attention from higher educational leaders in other states. It is highly significant that Donald N. Langenberg, chancellor of the University System of Maryland, has emphasized this key lesson from the El Paso experience: Successful reform requires collaboratively connecting the overall schooling system from elementary to higher education.

We have come to believe strongly, and elementary and secondary schools have come to believe, that they cannot reform without us. This is not telling them how to do it, but both of us working together to fix what’s wrong with our education systems [emphasis added]. We prepare teachers for the public schools, and we admit their students. So its our problem just as much as theirs [emphasis added].”

9. Summing Up and Looking Forward

Chancellor Langenberg’s observation neatly returns us to the central component of the Harper, Dewey, Gardner, Bok vision sketched above: To educate young people so that they function as highly-skilled, active, informed, intelligent, moral citizens in an optimally democratic society.
requires a highly interactive, collaborative, effectively integrated, optimally democratic schooling system, from preschool through the university and beyond. Alas, American society is a long way from having realized the radically improved schooling system which Harper, Dewey, Gardner, Bok, and (many others) envisioned and, in different ways, worked to achieve. Times are changing, however; signs of progress can be found across the educational landscape. Among other reasons for the change, we suggest, is the emerging revolution in American education and society that now transforms the Big Science, Cold War University into the Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic University—a "new type" of university dedicated to the construction of an optimally democratic schooling system and the development of an optimally democratic society.16

To succeed, revolutions require agents determined enough, wise enough, powerful enough, to implement and act for action. Inspired by Harper, Dewey, Gardner, and Bok (and many others), we propose that American universities play that role. Our "revolutionary" proposal calls on research universities to lead the way in revolutionizing the overall American schooling system. Somewhat more specifically, the "schooling revolution" we propose calls on each higher ed to make its highest priority the radical integration and improvement of the overall schooling system in its "home community," i.e., the community in which is located, the schooling system and community ecological system which it can most directly, most powerfully, affect and which directly, powerfully, now affects its own "health" and functioning.

In this paper, we have focused on the example we know best, Penn’s relationship to the West Philadelphia public schools and community. We did so to share with all the things we have done, still need to do, and (painfully) learned. Building mutually respectful, mutually beneficial, democratic relationships among communities, higher educational institutions, and schools cannot be accomplished by following a standard blueprint or road map. There is no such blueprint or road map to follow. But the Penn example, we trust, can serve as a useful case study from which other institutions might learn as they carefully, painstakingly, work to develop their own appropriate practices. Our fervent hope is that, working together, Penn and the Community Higher Education Service Partnership (CHESP) will help both the United States and South Africa increase their capacity to fulfill their democratic promise and function as free, decent, and just societies for all their citizens.

Endnotes

2 For the citation to Bacon and a discussion of his work, see Lee Benson, "Changing Social Science to Change the World: A Discussion Paper," Social Science History 2 (1978): 427-441. Accelerating worldwide concern with what we have termed Bacon’s Problem helps account for the remarkable renaissance of Bacon studies in recent decades. Among the studies from which we have considerably benefited, see Perez Zagzebski, Francis Bacon (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998); and Ian Bux, The Social Thought of Francis Bacon (Lewiston, Me: Edward Mellons Press, 1989). For Professor Sullivan’s succinct, perceptive analysis, see his Work and Identity (New York: Harper Business, 1995).
3 John Dewey, The Public and its Problems (Denver, Co: Allan Swanlow, 1917/1954). Particularly as historians consider the signs of progress many others) envisioned and, in different ways, have realized the radically improved schooling system desired by “participatory democracy” is from the highly important statement is located at http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~psan-321.
14 We define strategic academically-based community service as service rooted in and intricately tied to teaching and research. It aims to bring about structural community improvement (e.g., effective public schools, neighborhood economic development, strong community organizations) rather than simply to alleviate individual misery (e.g., feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, tutoring the “slow learner”).
20 Ibid.

30 Penn Arts and Sciences, p. 9.


33 An article in the 22 October 1999 Philadelphia Inquirer entitled “Philadelphia Schools Awarded $3.5 Million for Improvements” reported: “Charles Drew School in Philadelphia, showed more improvement on the state’s standardized reading and math than any other school in the state, 1999 results show.” Although there are many reasons for this extraordinarily impressive performance, Penn’s concentrated efforts at Drew, including the projects in health and nutrition and sociolinguistics, would appear to be a significant contributing factor.


36 We are grateful to Jack Foley, Executive Assistant to the President of Clark University, for providing us with material on the University Park Campus School.


38 Much of the discussion on the El Paso Collaborative is based on a packet of material provided by Diane Natalicio, President of the University of Texas at El Paso. We are grateful for her assistance.
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Introduction
Evaluation is an essential component of the design and implementation of any program. An evaluation is a process that develops information about the program that allows those who have a stake in it (the stakeholders) to make judgments about its effectiveness in meeting its goals. The procedures by which the process is carried out will vary from one program to the next, but in all cases is guided by the intent of the stakeholders.

McNamara (1998) list three bases for program evaluations:

1. Goals-based (to what extent did the program achieve its goals?)
2. Process-based (how can the process by which the program worked to meet its goals be understood?)
3. Outcome-based (what results were achieved by the program?)

There is a growing consensus among professional evaluators that both qualitative and quantitative methods have a place in the performance of effective evaluations. Such approaches are called mixed method evaluations because they involve the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods. For example, a mixed method model might involve the application of questionnaires, focus groups, and interviews, all aimed at understanding how a program acted to bring about – or fail to bring about – a particular outcome (Frechtling and Westat, 1997).

This report presents the evaluation of a three-year initiative designed to enhance the relationship between the University of Pennsylvania and those schools in the community of which it is a part, by deepening and expanding partnerships that have been developed since the late 1980's, because of the nature of these partnerships, the evaluation, while focusing on that part funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, covered aspects of evaluation, while focusing on that part funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, covered aspects of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, specifically funded by the Foundation.

September 1996 through August 1999. The “Kellogg Program,” as it came to be known, sought to address concerns of the Foundation regarding the academic experience of undergraduate students in larger, research-oriented institutions. In a letter dated August 29, 1996, to then-Provost of the University, Stanley Chodorov, John Burkhardt noted the Foundation’s “…concern for the coherence of the curriculum, the poor integration between classroom experiences and the social and community experiences of students, and the lack of any meaningful relationship between faculty members and their students.”

These issues and concerns are not new ones and have been at the forefront of discussions over the past two decades regarding the changing nature of higher education and in particular the role of the research university in enhancing its missions of education and service to the community. Any number of writers have spoken to these matters. For example, Cuban (1999) has described the rise in the 20th century of the research-oriented university, in which teaching has lost much of its value and a reward system has emerged that is based on criteria external to the institution. Boyer (1999) redefined the concept of scholarship, taking it beyond the relatively recent and restrictive notion of basic research and its publication to a more comprehensive set of components: discovery, integration, practice, and teaching. And still others, such as Nyden et al (1997), Checkoway (1997), Harkavy (1998), Silka (1999), have discussed the difficulties in bringing universities and communities together into effective partnerships.

The University of Pennsylvania has been a national leader in this area for well over a decade, and its Center For Community Partnerships, founded in 1992, has as its mission building university/community partnerships in ways that are founded in 1992, has as its mission building university/community partnerships in ways that are foundational to the Kellogg Program (1998), these broad questions were framed more specifically as:

- Encourage new and creative initiatives linking the University and the community
- Develop new and effective partnerships between the University and the community
- Encourage new and creative initiatives linking the Penn and the community
- Strengthen regional, national and international networks of higher education institutions committed to engagement with their local communities

While not the only, the primary approach of the Center For Community Partnerships (CCP) to fulfilling its mission is through academically based community service (hereafter referred to as ABCS): service intrinsically tied to teaching and research. With curriculum as the focal point, students, undergraduate and graduate, participate in problem based learning in courses that emphasize the generation of knowledge and theory through active learning and the provision of community service through participatory action research (Harkavy and Benson, 1998). The CCP has been an active and visible entity on the Penn campus since its formation by then-President Hackney.

It is upon this base of activities that the Kellogg Program was instituted in 1996. The program was built on three pre-existing ABCS initiatives – or program areas – that were administered jointly by the School of Arts and Sciences and the Center For Community Partnerships:

1. Culture and Community Studies
2. Environment and Health
3. Nutrition and Health

This report presents the evaluation of the Kellogg Program. Given the range of activities of the CCP within the University in general – and the School of Arts & Sciences in particular – as well as the interrelationships among the various programs in which the Center is involved, it is impossible to restrict the evaluation to the three program areas. The Kellogg Program was not a stand-alone project independent of other Penn initiatives but instead acted an infusion of ideas, energy and personnel into an existing set of activities so as to accomplish two broad goals:

1. to strengthen ABCS at Penn through three existing program areas;
2. to deepen and diversify ABCS and related activities more broadly at Penn.

As a consequence, this evaluation will focus on efforts made possible by the grant from the Kellogg Foundation. But it will also from time to time move into the broader and more complex area of academically based community service at the University of Pennsylvania.

Structure of the Evaluation
The Stakeholders
In an evaluation the stakeholders are “…people who have a stake – a vested interest – in evaluation findings” (Patton, 1997:41). It is the stakeholders for whom the evaluation is conducted, who will judge the effectiveness of the program, and who will make use of the findings, both positive and negative. The list of potential stakeholders may be very short or it can be quite long depending on the scope of the program but ultimately it is the interests of those on the list that shape the evaluation.

Since the aims of the Kellogg Program were broad ones, encompassing the mission of the university and the educational programs of the West Philadelphia schools, the list of potential stakeholders is long. For example parents both of university and school students have an interest in any program that affects the education of their children. And since the program speaks to basic issues in education and social change, the results are certainly of interest to professionals in higher education, public policy, and social science. At the same time, to speak to the interests of all who have a stake in education – and especially academically based community service – at the University of Pennsylvania would be beyond the scope of evaluating specifically the Kellogg Program. Therefore the final list of groups to whom this evaluation is directed consists of the following:

• University of Pennsylvania
  – Faculty and Administration
  – West Philadelphia Schools
• Students
• Faculty and staff

The Evaluation Questions
The most useful evaluation is the one that tells the stakeholders three things about the program:

1. Did it work?
2. Why did it work or why didn’t it work?
3. How can it be modified for future applications?

Following the recommendations of the Kellogg Foundation (1998), these broad questions were framed more specifically as:
• What has worked or not worked?
• For whom and in what circumstances?
• What was the process of development and implementation?
• What stumbling blocks were faced along the way?
• What do the experiences mean to the people involved?
• How do these meanings relate to intended outcomes?
• What lessons have we learned about developing and implementing this program?
• How have contextual factors impacted the development, implementation, success and stumbling blocks of the program?
• What are the hard-to-measure impacts of this program (ones that cannot be easily quantified)? How can we begin to effectively document these impacts?

**Methods**

The evaluation utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods so as to produce the best picture possible of the way the Kellogg Program carried out its aims. Quantitative methods involved surveys of students that had and had not participated in ABCS courses. Qualitative methods included both interviews and focus groups. The surveys were designed, administered, and analyzed as part of an undergraduate seminar in Anthropology: Monitoring and Evaluating Social Programs. Ten participants in this seminar also conducted a small number of focus groups with Penn students designed to clarify the results of the surveys. The interviews and the focus groups with school teachers and students and with Penn faculty and administrators were conducted by an advanced doctoral student in anthropology, trained and experienced in the range of qualitative methods.

**Description of the Kellogg Program**

**Historical Overview of Penn’s Kellogg Program: University and Community Context**

The foundation upon which the Kellogg Program to Link Intellectual Resources and Community Needs is typified by the following statement:

Building upon the principles of Benjamin Franklin, the University of Pennsylvania has made a serious commitment to integrate theory and practice in academic coursework and research by working to solve real-world problems in West Philadelphia. This effort is largely being achieved through service learning courses that actively engage our local communities. These academically based community service courses, part of ongoing participatory action research projects, bring University of Pennsylvania students and faculty together with local public school teachers and students to work in partnerships to solve genuine problems such as environmental lead hazards, childhood obesity, and educational challenges faced by urban public schools.

This statement typifies the program as conceptualized by the university. It also served as the template for the design and operationalization of its specific components. However, Kellogg was not only a curricular initiative, it also aimed specifically at contributing to the solution of the problems of the West Philadelphia community through a process of mutual engagement and participation. For this reason not only is the community context important, it is vital to understanding the implementation of the program as well as evaluating its success. The community context becomes more complicated and subjective as time progresses, as more hours are spent in community settings and as deeper relationships are developed with community members.

**Community Context: Overview of the Economic, Social and Political Environment of the Community and Program Setting**

In purely geographic terms, the border separating Penn from the rest of West Philadelphia is ambiguous. Nominally, “University City” has become the way to identify the area that surrounds the campus, demarcating it on maps, street signs, and informal conversation. Socially and politically, however, the boundary between Penn and the West Philadelphia community is clearer. The stereotype has been that the Penn community considers West Philadelphia poor, black, dangerous, and disadvantaged, whether or not Penn students, faculty, and staff actually spent any time there or had personal contact with anyone from the community. On the other hand, to West Philadelphia public school students, Penn has been perceived either as an elite fortress, or more often remained an unknown entity. Even though it may be less than a mile away from their schools, some West Philadelphia students are unaware of where Penn is, or exactly what happens there. Those adult community members who were familiar with Penn sometimes had hostile feelings about it as an institution. In particular this was because of the way it had disrupted their neighborhood and displaced families during Penn’s first “urban renewal” development projects in the 1960s and early 1970s, when Penn bought up and cleared land in what is considered an effort to create a “buffer zone” between the University and community.

With this often-tense history serving as a foundation, successfully designing and implementing projects that rely on community engagement and involvement were seen as dubious, at best. Nevertheless, over time, Penn has worked to reduce tensions. Often these efforts involved individuals or small groups acting unofficially or in a volunteer capacity. However in the past 10-15 years there have been more formal, large scale partnerships between the community, e.g., the West Philadelphia Partnership, the Penn Program for Public Service, Volunteers in Public Service, the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps, and the Center for Community Partnerships. This chronological, admittedly partial, list provides an important context for the evaluation that follows, because one of the most frequently mentioned reasons for Kellogg’s success on Penn’s campus was that there was already a solid underpinning on which to build a program linking “intellectual resources and community needs” as the Kellogg program was named to do.

**The Structure of the Kellogg Program**

The Kellogg Program utilized academically based community service to improve the quality of the undergraduate (and graduate) experience at Penn, and to enhance the effectiveness of the university’s engagement with the local community to the benefit of all. While a more complete description of activities may be seen in the annual reports (Appendix 1), the program may be summarized briefly through the following initiatives:

- The development of new ABCS courses that combined collaborative community projects with academic courses. These courses were part of the regular university curriculum, located within appropriate academic departments, and with few exceptions taught by members of the standing faculty. Course development was stimulated by small (up to $5,000) grants to assist faculty in planning courses, organizing community projects, and in presenting the course itself. In the majority of cases, funds were used to support graduate students doing background library research and in developing syllabi.
- The establishment of Kellogg Fellows, undergraduates selected on the basis of their standing in the university and their commitment to learning through service. Fellows worked within the three program areas and were engaged in various activities, e.g., working on community projects, acting as undergraduate Teaching Assistants in ABCS courses.
- Summer Institutes, held at local schools, in which undergraduates, funded by the Kellogg grant, joined with interns funded by other sources in a summer-long program built around an intensive seminar on the relationship of the Penn university and the local community and various kinds of curricular and planning activities with the staffs of local schools.
- A Penn to university-wide Kellogg Conference that focused on a relevant topic, with presentations by student teams. The conferences were held in local schools and involved the participation of middle and senior high students and faculty.

**Program areas**

As noted above there were three program areas around which the Kellogg Program was built. While many of the ABCS courses developed during this time fell outside of these areas, and while a range of community projects were carried out, these three represented the major thrust in linking Penn’s resources to community needs.

**Environment and Health**

The Environment and Health program area seeks to enhance the understanding of the urban environment and its interaction with the humans who inhabit it. One component of this area deals with the risks to health and behavior associated with the ingestion of environmental lead, and the design and implementation of measures to reduce lead exposure. The second component deals with the local history of a neighborhood located within the West Philadelphia community located along what was Mill Creek, a stream that was diverted to an
underground storm sewer in the 19th century. These courses were taught jointly on the Penn campus and at local middle schools and involved the participation of university and middle school students. Also involved in this area were courses ranging in areas such as the development of an outdoor art project and a study of Brownfields in aging, once-industrialized areas of Philadelphia.

Culture and Community Studies: This program area was begun with Teaching American Studies a course given in the English department that combines the study of American culture with high school teaching. It has since grown through bringing together faculty from a variety of disciplines, all with the common interest of increasing the access of local school students to the humanities and humanistic concerns so as to include courses taught by faculty in history, anthropology, linguistics, social work, and classics. One significant research project that developed within this program has grown out of a course taught by Professor William Labov of the Linguistics department on African-American vernacular English. Penn and local school students work together to understand the relationships between this particular vernacular and reading achievement.

Nutrition and Health: The program area in Nutrition and Health is linked to courses in nutrition, health, and disease taught primarily in the Department of Anthropology. The research component of this area began as the Turner Nutritional Awareness Project. Since renamed the Urban Nutrition Initiative, UNI has been expanded to include two additional schools. The core course is Anthropology 310, Nutrition, Health, and Community Schools, that involves a service component that seeks to enhance diet and nutritional status of elementary, middle, and secondary school children through the development of urban gardening, school stores, child and adult exercise programs, and nutritional knowledge.

Results of the Evaluation

The Curriculum

The effects of the Kellogg Program on the curriculum of the university may be assessed through ABCS initiatives as seen in courses, departments, and faculty. Figure 1 presents the number of new ABCS courses, undergraduate and graduate, along with the total number of ABCS courses offered each academic year from 1991-92 through 2000-01. The asterisks illustrate the data for the years that reflect the impact of the Kellogg grant. (Since the development of new courses resulting from enhanced activities associated with the newly available funds lagged by one year, course development monies available for the 1996-97 academic year funded courses offered during the 1997-98 academic years.)

The impact of the Kellogg Program on ABCS courses is readily apparent in the figure. In the three years attributable to Kellogg funding, 61 new courses were developed, while in the six prior years the total was 47. For the 10 years presented here, 51% of the ABCS courses at Penn (61 of 120) were developed during the years attributable to Kellogg.

Another measure of the impact of the Kellogg Program on the ABCS component of the curriculum may be seen in the number of faculty that have opted to teach such courses. These data are given in Figure 2, which shows the number of new faculty, as well as the cumulative numbers, teaching ABCS courses each year. As before, the years attributable to Kellogg funding are starred. As with the number of courses, the number of faculty involved in service learning courses increased significantly during these years. From 1991-96, 80 faculty taught ABCS courses, while in academic years 1997, 1998, and 1999, 152 did so.

A final measure of the impact of the Kellogg Program on the curriculum is the number of Schools and Departments of the University that offer ABCS courses. In particular, if academically based community service is to become entrenched within the core mission of the university, then it is imperative that courses be located in as many departments as possible, and especially those whose mission is not so closely identified with social issues. Figure 3 presents the number of new departments in which ABCS courses were taught each academic year as well as the cumulative number. Prior to the period attributable to the Kellogg Program, 22 departments across the university offered ABCS. During the Kellogg period 15 new departments were added.

Clearly the three-year period covered by the Kellogg Program was one which saw a significant addition to the number of courses along with increase in the number of faculty teaching them, and the number of departments in which they were offered. As of the 2000-01 academic year, 100 members of the standing and adjunct faculties have taught 120 different academically based community service courses in 37 different departments. Because of the structure of the Penn curriculum the majority of these courses are offered in the 24 departments of the School of Arts and in the Sciences. However courses are also offered in the Schools of Graduate Schools of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Nursing, Communications, Fine Arts, Social Work, Dental Medicine, Medicine, Law, and Education.

The impact of the Kellogg Program on the three curriculum indicators may also be seen in Figure 4. The cumulative values of each indicator were regressed on the academic year and based on the overall relationships, a predicted – or expected – value generated. The straight, or trend, lines indicate the expected values and the squares, the actual for that year. The arrows point to the three years attributable to the Kellogg Program.

The graph for the number of ABCS courses shows the impact of Kellogg Funding on the number of courses. Relative to the overall trend, there is a clear upswing in courses in the three years attributable to Kellogg. The same trend is apparent...
for the number of faculty involved in ABCS courses, though the effect due to the Kellogg Program is less. Insofar as academic departments are concerned, no inflection in departments due to Kellogg is apparent. While there is a steady upward trend in the number of departments involved from 1991-92 through 2000-01, efforts associated with the Kellogg Program are less clear. Summarizing the impact of the Kellogg Program on ABCS courses at Penn, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. The number of Academically Based Community Service Courses increased throughout the 10-year period surveyed. For the three-year period where an impact of Kellogg-funded programming would be expected, there was a significant increase in the number of courses. The number of new courses offered in the year following Kellogg funding dropped markedly from 36 in 1999-00 to 2000-01.

2. The number of faculty teaching ABCS courses increased throughout the 10-year period, with an inflection associated with Kellogg funding. While this inflection was not as marked as the inflection associated with courses, it was nonetheless significant and indicates that, while new faculty have been drawn steadily to service-learning courses at Penn, the Kellogg Program accelerated this trend. As with courses, the number of new faculty dropped between 1999-00 and 2000-01.

3. ABCS courses continue to be offered in more and more departments of the university, from 4 in 1992-93 to a total of 37 in 2000-01. This trend is steady and indicates a continued broadening and deepening of ABCS courses as courses are taught in increasingly more departments and more courses are taught in individual departments. In the case of departments, there was neither an acceleration nor a drop-off in the trend associated with the Kellogg Program.

### The Curriculum and the Three Program Areas

The discussion on the curriculum has been centered on courses and departments. However, as noted above, the Kellogg Program was built upon three cross-disciplinary and cross-departmental initiatives: Culture and Community Studies, Environment, Nutrition and Health. As described above, these areas provided for topical continuity that extended beyond individual ABCS courses and deepened the involvement of students and faculty. In some instances, existing projects or study groups associated with each area could be enlarged and in others, new projects developed. Over the 3 years of the Kellogg Program, 41 one-year internships were awarded to undergraduate and 14 to graduate students. There were some particularly noteworthy developments in these areas. Within the Cultural and Community Studies area, the Kellogg Program funded a semester-long faculty/graduate student seminar on anthropology and the public interest. This seminar provided the stimulus for a course—Anthropology 216, Public Interest Anthropology—that developed a core of interest in anthropology and the public interest.

### Curriculum Quality

An increase in the number of ABCS courses associated with the Kellogg Program is an indicator of its impact, an impact consistent with the university’s goal of expanding and deepening the service-learning experiences of its students. But along with quantity goes quality. Are ABCS courses equal in quality to non-ABCS ones? How do education experiences of students in the two kinds of courses compare?

One of the most uniformly positive responses of interviewees regarding the Kellogg Program has been its impact on undergraduate education at Penn as perceived by Penn students, professors and public school teachers. Most interviewees cited Kellogg-funded courses as excellent examples of holistic, experiential learning, as life changing to the students who attend them, and as profoundly impacting the decisions student make about their careers. For many students, the personal experience permeating the boundary between Penn and the community is eye opening and gives them priceless insight into connections and commonalities between themselves and the students who they assumed would be so different from them. For example, as one Penn student in a focus group described:

I went in with the impression that these low-income kids would be skinny and wearing torn t-shirts. I was surprised to see that they were kids not unlike the ones I’d grown up with . . . A positive thing about the project is the individual connections formed with the kids and breaking down barriers between Penn and the community. Kids are interested in Penn and ask about college.

Elaborated a public high school teacher:

I know this has changed the lives of Penn students, many of whom, after this experience, have wanted to become urban teachers . . . although there is still a great divide between Penn and the high school 100% [sic] African American population, many barriers have been broken down through this project, especially myths and stereotypes.

Figure 5 shows the responses of 59 students to the following question: “To what extent have your ABCS classes or, if you have not taken any, your Penn courses increased your ability to…”

The figure gives the percentage of students who responded either Very Much or Extremely for each ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear differences between ABCS and non-ABCS courses</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in understanding your environment</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand your Penn courses increased your ability to...</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a volunteer in the community</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act morally</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an understanding of urban areas</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a concern about urban areas</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop research skills</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-ABCS courses were judged more effective only in obtaining job skills. There were no differences between the courses in helping students be competitive in their careers or learn how to act in their lives.

These patterns are not necessarily surprising since one of the characteristics of ABCS courses is a focus on the local community and its problems. Hence one measure of their success would be increasing civic and moral awareness.
However, two responses are significant to this evaluation. First is the observation that non-ABCS courses were more likely to increase job skills than were ABCS courses (50% to 34%). Schools such as the University of Pennsylvania are highly discipline-centered, emphasizing a course of study that will lead to a degree in a tightly defined area of scholarship (see Cuban, 1999, for a discussion of the emergence of this emphasis in American higher education). ABCS courses, on the other hand, while they are located within departments and while they may count toward the major, are by their nature problem-centered and cross-disciplinary.

For example, History 443, American National Character, is an ABCS course that was taught five times between 1995 and 2000. The course examines the concept of national character in the USA and if such knowledge can help solve the problems of Philadelphia. Students serve as mentors for University City High School students in the development of recreation programs. Such a course might not be seen by History majors as increasing their job skills as historians. Though certainly a debatable point, the response to the questionnaire points to the problems of integrating traditional courses of study with those that are more likely to be used in real life.

Responses of students to the question of the development of research skills are also significant. ABCS courses were seen as increasing such skills by 47% of students, and in the case of non-ABCS courses, only 36%. The difference is not as great as in other questions but nonetheless indicates that the structure of ABCS courses, which consciously link learning with the production of knowledge, are seen as positive in areas beyond civic consciousness.

It needs to be emphasized that these are the subjective responses of students and are not based on objective measures of skills or other attributes. But they do point to fundamental differences in the ways that courses are perceived by the students that take them.

Still, some Penn students find the Kellogg program flawed because they see it as presenting oversimplified and exaggerated expectations of social change. As one student in a nutritional class put it:

The project seems too idealistic. It does not address widespread problems. Giving kids fruit everyday isn’t going to save the world, solve problems or help people live long lives.

Furthermore, some students questioned the level of sustainability of some programs as social interventions and were critical of the design and validity of the data collected. Professors see their programs as extending beyond a single semester. They perceive this as sustainability and as a draw for students because it “alleviates ethical pain.” Penn students experience about temporary intervention and the rich-getting-richer while the local students get nothing. That the program continues over time mitigates this.” Clearly there is a need for a better communication to students of how ABCS-based programs extend through time even within the constraints of an academic semester. The lack of effective communication is responsible for the uncertainty voiced by some Penn students about their role in an ongoing program. This can lead to questioning the results of work carried out in ABCS courses:

A semester’s time feels half-assed. The project isn’t really a longitudinal study, but a series of qualitative studies strung together. I am not so sure how valid or great the data will be.

Time constraints of the sole semester create problems. For example, the survey based on attitudes couldn’t be that accurate because you can’t measure significant change in that time.

The rebuttal to this lack long-term perspective as explained by an administrator committed to Kellogg from its inception is:

Student’s only see a slice of what is going on—it looks imperfect, they want to see things work, but they can’t be there for the long view, so they don’t really know how projects develop.

The interviews and focus groups conducted indicate that Penn students see perhaps the major problem of academically based community service: integrating service, learning, and research. Though not always the case, the contemporary research university avoids facing this issue by segregating its components. This segregation is seen in the structure of courses, the conduct of research, and the provision of community service. If ABCS is to succeed then initiatives such as the Kellogg Program must do a better job of helping students to see the benefits of integration rather than segregation. While this task starts with the faculty and administration, ABCS can be a powerful learning tool for students, rooted in the theory and concepts of the problem based learning that is becoming increasingly common in professional schools.

Graduate student teaching assistants describe ABCS courses in the following way:

Compared to other [traditional] classes, ABCS classes provide practical experience and contextualized reading. Applied projects that happen in these courses are the equivalent to an engineering student building a car. Graduating seniors have published articles. They change the undergraduate education experience by combining academic rigor, the intellectual, the practical, the theoretical. These courses are as rigorous as any others. Knowledge gain is easy, but these courses force students to consider their own behavior.

A classics professor, whose course involved Penn students teaching material in the high school classroom which they have first been taught in the University classroom, described how this process reinforces learning:

I think that students learn more and have a better command of the material even though we cover less volume. They get more out of half the classes in a situation where they are forced to articulate the material. When they rearticulate, their memory will be stronger. At a cocktail party speaking with other people who have studied the same material, they would be more engaged.

Another professor explained:

The students in this class have been writing brilliant things; they are going through a transformational experience. They will continue to be involved in community service. White kids from Scarsdale [upper-class suburb in New York] say for the first time, “I can see myself in these kids.” It’s stunning.

What kinds of students take ABCS courses?

Generally, University stakeholders agree that the growing number of ABCS courses, sustained and developed through Kellogg’s support, have attracted students to Penn who are interested in community service. Furthermore, they have increased the number and depth of graduate and undergraduate research projects, and have created an ABCS “community” which some believe is serving as a prototype for other institutions as well as contributing to changing academic culture at large.

Further information as to the differences between ABCS and non-ABCS students is shown in Figure 7. Survey participants were asked to indicate how concerned they were about the 11 social
problems indicated along a 5-category scale: extremely, very much, somewhat, a little bit, not at all. The figure shows those students who ranked their concern about a particular problem as either extremely, very much, or somewhat. There are clear differences between the ABCS and non-ABCS groups. The four problems about which ABCS students were most concerned were:

- quality of public education 72%
- poverty in the urban environment 66%
- income disparity 56%
- race relations 56%

For non-ABCS students, the top four were:

- race relations 64%
- crime and violence 59%
- quality of public education 59%
- poverty in the urban environment 55%

Of greater interest is to compare the responses of the two groups relative to particular problems. Relative to non-ABCS students, those taking ABCS classes were more concerned about:

- homelessness
- income disparity
- urban poverty
- quality of public education
- quality of public health

Non-ABCS students were more concerned about:

- crime and violence
- race relations
- uncontrollable diseases
- drug use

In short, students taking ABCS courses were more concerned about problems which impact on society as a whole (e.g., income disparity, urban poverty, homelessness), while non-ABCS students show greater concern about public safety issues that impact more on them as individuals (e.g., crime, violence, race relations). It is tempting to conclude that students taking ABCS courses exhibit a greater social awareness while those not taking such courses exhibit the fears of most persons living in an area characterized by high rates of crime and poverty.

The Public Schools—Students And Teachers

The impact of the Kellogg Program on the public schools was investigated by means of interviews, focus groups, and participant observation in school settings. In addition, questionnaires were distributed to 26 middle school and 30 high school students as a basis for focus groups and interviews.

In general public school students reported enjoying the presence of Penn students in their classrooms and in their lives and felt the programs helped them advance their skills. They get a lot out of working with Penn students, and their presence allows teachers to give more individualized attention to their students. Several students said that they considered Penn students to be their friends. However one teacher stressed that Penn students must work a minimum of 3 hours per week in the schools to make a positive impact on both school and Penn students.

The reason most cited by public school students for enjoying Kellogg programs was that it gave them the opportunity to engage in experiential education in a way that they did not in their day-to-day classrooms and provided them with practical skills. For example, students involved in the fruit and vegetable stand through the nutrition program enjoyed the entrepreneurial elements of the project: selling produce and making profits and being in a position where they can give directions and be in charge. They also enjoyed the opportunity to work with other people and use other skills that they did not feel were always part of their normal classroom experience: being helpful, and communicating and sharing ideas while they are working. During a focus group sixth-graders explained:

> It's like skipping class! TNAP is during classroom time, but it doesn't happen in the classroom. It's not like class because you don't use a pencil or a pen and it's fun.

High school student's described their experiences in the greenhouse in the following way:

> I enjoy working with agriculture, watching stuff grow, learning about plants and edible flowers, planting and seeing a garden grown form patches in the earth and getting rid of rodents and bugs. It gives me an opportunity to work with other students. I'm learning really useful skills now.

Another student reflected upon how she feels working in the greenhouse and an upcoming community plant sale:

> Being in the greenhouse makes me feel relaxed and peaceful. I am not too worried about the money made during the sale. I like that the sale gives back to the community.

However the involvement of Penn students in the local schools is not problem-free. One teacher commented that Penn students are not always prepared to teach the classes and that they do much better when they work with students individually.

Teaching school is a challenging task under the best of circumstances. Most University of Pennsylvania students lack formal training in the theory and method of classroom instruction and consequently are not always ready to deal with middle and high school students in such a setting, let alone in an inner-city classroom where the social and ethnic differences may be marked.

Penn students are an elite group, chosen from the best applicants across the USA and frequently with little exposure to children and youth from less-advantaged settings. Some of them have made hasty judgments about the school and teachers without having been there long enough to understand the complex nature of the social problems that are attacked by ABCS. Some school faculty are suspicious of Penn's motives, accusing its faculty of using West Philadelphia to further their own research without caring about the school or the students. However other teachers point out that those who complain about Penn's involvement don't have Penn students working in their classroom and at least one teacher stated that "negativity comes from a sense of jealousy."

Both critics and supporters of the Kellogg Program question the degree to which Kellogg programs impact either the long-term educational achievement or behavior of Philadelphia public school students. Even the children themselves are not sure if the program affects their actions. Nevertheless, there is a general consensus that the participatory structures of Kellogg-sponsored projects in the classroom engage students and make them feel more positive about learning and about school in general.

This uncertainty concerning the impact of programs does highlight a weakness Penn's implementation of Kellogg. Although there have been scattered attempts at measuring and evaluating program impacts, mainly in the form of small studies conducted by Penn undergrads as final projects in their Kellogg courses in which they are enrolled, there has been a lack of cohesive, systematic, unified data collection on things like school profiles, graduation rates or long-term behavioral change of public school students involved, making it difficult for Penn to boast it's service or partnerships in any quantitative terms. Some people would argue that this is not the point, and instead of pouring energy into measurement, spending quality time with children and developing lasting relationships in the community should remain the focus. Even so, finding a balance between spending time on assessing outcomes in order to insure social change and working on community partnerships, could potentially be a strength of this program.

Teachers are crucial institutional stakeholders, primarily because University of Pennsylvania initiatives in the public schools are, for the most part, implemented through them. The majority expressed positive feelings concerning Kellogg Programs. In a focus group with teachers whose classrooms are involved in a Kellogg-funded gardening group through the Nutrition and Health cluster described:

> We see improvement in our students' cooperation skills because they are motivated to go out to the garden, thus more willing to work together as a group. One boy, who has a tendency to act up in class, became really involved and excited about the gardening project and how much he has accomplished with it.

Communicating the impact of a Kellogg Program a high school teacher stated:

> The course adds extra work, but it is a tremendous support to teachers and offers the kids a window into another world and role models. They become more interested in college, in computers…

While teachers’ views are critical to understanding how Kellogg’s implementation has functioned in the schools, public school administrators also play an important role because of their political power and potential hold on public relations. Among public school administrators, there has generally been a positive response Kellogg's
effort. One Middle School administrator, who had been collaborating with Penn on for nearly ten years, described the process of implementation:

It was a totally new concept, not driving a particular political agenda, but born of the idea that the university would work with the public school, outside of the ivory tower, giving back, instead of continually taking. The project was presented as something that was going to work with you, for you not on you, educating community children and parents working with stepping-stone issues of prevention.

Furthermore, the projects are seen as a permanent fixture of schools:

The sustainability is because teachers realized there was a different way of teaching (experiential, hands-on participatory) and that kids learned. The kids had to demonstrate what they learned.

In many ways this statement represents the essence of Penn’s hope that the use of Kellogg funds would inspire: collaboration, participation and creating change through tangibly linking “intellectual resources to community needs.” As a high school teacher described a Penn professor with whom she worked over time “he treats urban teachers as intellectuals. He respects and engages them,” also highlighting mutual respect and reciprocity.

However, not all those working in the public schools have the same “success story” attitudes concerning Penn’s involvement, and not all projects have benefited from long-term collaborators. Here are some other comments from those who have experience with the public schools. As one teacher explains:

The projects in schools have not come monotonous to most elite institutions: the “publish-or-perish” at Penn, which is common to most elite institutions.

Most stakeholders realize that change is slow to happen and recognize that long-term involvement is crucial for creating substantive change. Liaisons and links are crucial for working effectively with public schools. Described one Penn professor about his course:

The classroom teacher [in the Public School] didn’t have the necessary degree of ownership in order for the project to be successful, and it was the essential that we had a liaison that knew the politics and mechanics of schools. I’ve spent my whole life in the academy, the Ivy League at that, and I’m not a good resource in that way.

Said another professor who has been involved in the same English literature academically-based community service course for ten years:

What I have learned from this experience is that everyone needs someone who is familiar with the system, who can do it without taking on the word, “liaison,” who has contacts, who does an enormous amount of setting-up. This makes it so much easier for students to walk into an ongoing program.

There lies a tension, however, between the benefits of having involved, informed people working on projects for an extended period of time on the one hand, and becoming reliant upon them as individuals rather than focusing on institutional change on the other. While liaisons have proven to be important in general, depending too heavily on specific liaisons whose presence is momentary (as it is the case when a professor or teacher leaves the institution or retires, or a student graduates), as this can compromise the overall sustainability of the program. As a general rule, Kellogg courses are not considered foundational to be limited without continuous support explained:

The projects in schools have not come around as fast as we would like. The volume of resources—human, intellectual, monetary—is the single best way of bringing about change in K-12.

A Penn professor who has had long-term involvement in an academically based community service course working with a public high school knows that:

Some public school teachers are deeply supportive, the “usual suspects,” but there are still a lot of bust-out totally done teachers who will never innovate.

This class is not considered fundamental or essential to the department. With the downsizing of course-loads in order for professors to publish more, if I am not determined to keep it, I will go by the wayside.

The University of Pennsylvania—Faculty and Administrators

Some who have had experience with community interventions see Kellogg as different than the program for them. One professor, who has conducted extensive archival work on University-community history, explained that compared to other efforts, immersion in the community, the consciousness it raised, and participation of community members themselves in program planning made the Kellogg program stand out:

Kellogg has created change where there has been a lack of moral and civic awareness in the University at large. It used to be white people sitting around talking about poor black folks, but they touched nothing. The disadvantaged themselves were not involved.

An administrator who has strong faith in the Penn’s Kellogg Program explained Kellogg’s success in a lineage of projects in positive terms:

We are building on the precious University culture of the early Wharton School and our Franklinian heritage of making theory applied and useful, developing theory to apply it, and focusing on real problems. Kellogg, although following a tradition we already had, had a profound impact on advancing teaching, research and service...What Kellogg’s has done is make sustainability institutionalized...There has to be a whole change in the nature of Penn-community relationships. There have to be long-term relationships and Kellogg has helped.

On the other hand, it is clear that others consider Penn’s efforts through Kellogg less successful. Another administrator, for example, whose Kellogg-funded program existed successfully prior to Kellogg, but who has been and involved with Kellogg since its start-up, is particularly skeptical of its real impact and sees its efforts as ineffective, redundant, and not creating any notable change. He also believes that the programs actually cost very little to run, so does not see Kellogg as necessary:

The bottom line is that the [Kellogg] grant did not raise questions or solve problems categorically or qualitatively. The University had already been addressing the questions in order to initiate or support such projects. Kellogg didn’t change the nature of the conversation... Kellogg provided nothing and didn’t solve anything.

Reconciling these conflicting views of members of the university community renders difficult the task of making a cohesive assessment. In summary, while University stakeholders that had an interest in continuing to develop relationships with the community, and were thankful for funds that would allow them to do that, the majority do not see Kellogg’s presence as providing a marked innovation in the area of community relations. Rather, Kellogg’s contribution was an important supplement that helped sustain continuing efforts, perhaps with modest growth.

Communicating the Kellogg Program

Explain the difference in your project administrator who sees Kellogg programs’ ability to thrive without explicit institutional direction as a positive attribute:

Kellogg has helped create faculty student research with legs of its own. UNI, TNP has become its own animal. There are examples of sustainable projects that you don’t know if you should say “Kellogg,” but the street tree and garden project are definitely Kellogg spinoffs. There is a cascading effect—something is Kellogg-inspired but runs on its own.

Not all stakeholders feel that such “cascading effects” and “spinoffs” are beneficial. For example, some interviewees were not entirely sure that Kellogg was even supporting them, and only knew that their money was dispensed through the Center for Community Partnerships. Other people involved in ABCS projects have been supported over the years by grants, and have trouble keeping track of where money is coming from. This is especially the case when funds from different sources are administered by the Center for Community Partnerships and not by the recipients home department.

Even explicit attempts to increase communication have been unsuccessful. A professor depicted these attempts:
One weakness of Kellogg has been some of the “star-gazing” conferences that happen on Campus. There is generally a lack of communication between parties involved. I still don’t know all who are involved or really what they are doing.

Another professor also expressed her disappointment that communication is a weak point and offered a basic suggestion to resolve this:

The coordination between Center and the departments has not always been adequate. I am disappointed that there is no web page coordinating or publicizing Kellogg Programs nor is there an updated web page for things the center does or offers. I think Kellogg should recommend to their grant recipients that they put on the web the way funds are being used and maintain it throughout the semester as a way of publicizing philanthropy.

Parenthetically it is important to note that there are web pages for the CCP the Kellogg Program, and many of the projects and courses that have been supported by it. The disappointment expressed reflects a failure of information flow rather than a lack of information itself.

Penn students involved with Kellogg as undergraduates who then sub-matriculated into graduate programs on the management and distribution of funds explained that:

It has been unclear and inconsistent what money has been available, and what has been spent where. Kellogg has been spread too thin. It would be better if stakeholders would help plan the budget, and if more people were involved in designing the budget…Teachers should have more input into the spending of grant money. Teachers have the insight into what is needed in terms of books, supplies and tools for their projects…There should be an advisory board that represents stakeholders. Funds should be focused, like on four classes, not as broad in scope.

Comments of this sort reflect a structural issue in graduate education generally. Students identify with their advisors, their committees, and their departments, which become the source of knowledge and a training ground for their discipline and ultimately their profession. The Center For Community Partnerships is not an educational initiative but rather an entity that, through its programs and the grants that support them, provides resources to departments and to their students. This problem is not unique to the CCP or to Penn, but reflects the interactions between departments, focusing on disciplines, and centers, focusing on topical problems.

Discussion

The Kellogg Program was a joint initiative of the University of Pennsylvania and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The university’s agenda was to improve the quality of education, to deepen the extent of its engagement with the surrounding community, and to bring the scholarly its resources to bear on the problems of the community. This was to be accomplished by the integration of these three aims into, if not a new, then a more highly refined academic endeavor titled Academically Based Community Service. The Foundation aimed to develop ways to help universities improve the coherence of their curriculum, integration better classroom and community experiences of students, and enhance relationships between faculty and students. These two sets of aims were highly congruent and led to the Foundation’s funding the Kellogg Program to Link Intelectual Resources and Community to acute students.

The Kellogg Program was never seen as a new initiative, a stand-alone project with a specific beginning and end. Rather the program represented an addition to a set of activities varying considerably in structure and coherence that had been in operation for up to 10 years. Kellogg was to provide resources to develop new programs based on the university’s developing commitment to ABCS, to expand and rejuvenate existing programs, and to disseminate the results to appropriate groups. As a result, and as noted above, any evaluation must of necessity assess the success ABCS activities prior to the implementation of the Kellogg Program.

Impact of the Kellogg Program

The impact of the Kellogg Program is clear, significant, and likely to be sustained into the foreseeable future. Of these, the most striking are the effects on the curriculum. From its inception in 1990, and the first ABCS course offered in 1991, service learning programs consciously affiliated with ABCS has grown such that 139 separate ABCS courses have been offered a total of 304 times.

Also impressive is the involvement of faculty and the departments in which their appointments rest. One hundred five faculty members from 37 academic departments have taught ABCS courses and the numbers have increased throughout the 10 years of ABCS at Penn.

What proportion of these changes in curriculum can be attributed to the Kellogg Program and what proportion to the enhanced involvement of activities that is likely to have continued in the absence of Kellogg? This is difficult to judge since there has been a steady increase in the commitment to the ideals and practice of academically based community service through the 1990’s. However the analyses presented above provide evidence for significant impact on the number of courses and the number of faculty teaching them.

Case studies such as the development of the Urban Nutrition Initiative and the PhD focus in Public Interest Anthropology also provide evidence of significant enhancements to academic programming and to community partnerships that certainly would not have occurred as expeditiously – if at all – without the support given to ABCS by Kellogg. Admittedly these are success stories but they serve to demonstrate the impact that the Program has made upon the university.

With regard to academic departments, the Kellogg Program has made significantly in continuing to introduce ABCS into more departments of the university. In these efforts, the program’s impact has been seen in fostering a trend that has existed since the early 1990’s rather than in accelerating the rate of increase of new departments.

Some departments have made a major commitment and offer a large number of courses. For example, in the School of Arts and Sciences, History; 15; Anthropology; 12; Urban Studies: 11. Others offer no courses, or perhaps only one. These latter instances tend to be associated with the sciences and include Chemistry and Physics (nine) and Biology and Psychology (one). There are many reasons why certain departments and their faculty opt not to take part in ABCS at Penn. Cuban (1999) has discussed the tension between the loyalties of faculty to their university and its broader educational objectives, and their loyalties to their discipline, which involve narrower and more focused objectives frequently external to university objectives. This tension is not necessarily automatic for any type of institution or any particular department though it is found most often in disciplines that emphasize focused training of students in settings such as laboratories that result in withdrawal from the surrounding community. And it is found where the educational process deals with theory and method as divorced from particular societies and communities.

The Kellogg Program has also made an impact on the quality of the curriculum through its role in accelerating the rate of increase in new ABCS courses from year to year. ABCS courses are seen as a asset by undergraduate and graduate students, not only promoting the ideals of democratic education, but in their careers. While ABCS courses do not necessarily help “to obtain job skills,” they do equally well as non-ABCS courses in helping students “be competitive” in their careers, and better in developing research skills.

It is impossible to know from the available data whether ABCS changes students or if there is self-selection among them in their choice of courses and majors. ABCS and on-ABCS students are different in the kinds of social problems about which they are most concerned and these differences are likely to be reflected in the courses seen on their academic transcripts. There is likely to be an impact of academically based community service on all but the most intrinsically motivated students, but the effect is also likely to be small for any single course. The more probable effect on students of initiatives like the Kellogg Program is by helping to diffuse ABCS and its ideals throughout a university, by attracting a different kind of student to the institution, and as a result of exposing the non-involved students to an educational process which is committed to the ideals of ABCS without any compromise on intellectual and research rigor. To the extent that it has been shown to have an impact on the curriculum, the Kellogg Project may be judged as successful.

The Process

The administration of the Kellogg Program was logical and adequate. The Directors of the program were Dean of the College (the under-graduate arm of the School of Arts and Sciences) and the Director of the Center For Community Partnerships, who headed a Committee composed of the heads of the three program areas and a representative from the School of Arts and Sciences.

The CCP reported to the faculty through its Faculty Advisory Committee, which meets once each semester.
Proposals for new ABCS were sought each semester through an RFP published in The Almanac; and funding decisions made by the Kellogg Committee. Each year there was a one-day Kellogg Conference to which members of the university and participating schools were invited, held on campus and in University City High School. There was also a smaller meeting each year, less structured and largely student-run. The focus in both meetings was to report on the activities of various projects. Reports were usually presented by university students, and local school students frequently participated.

These conferences involved almost exclusively individuals who were part of the Kellogg Program and, while no formal records are available, attendance by others was uncommon. The format – one of student presentations – was selected consciously to involve them in the preparation and presentation of reports. Arguably, a more formal agenda with presentations that emphasized theory and method, might have drawn more non-Kellogg persons. However, the structure of the conferences was a conscious one, intended to maximize student involvement as an integral part of their experience at Penn.

A more formal presentation of ABCS and the Kellogg Program is being actively planned. In addition to the University of Pennsylvania, the Kellogg Foundation made a parallel grant to the University of Michigan. While the overall purpose of this grant was the same, differences between the two educational institutions in existing structures and initiatives meant different approaches to a common problem: the improvement of undergraduate education. For example a professionally done newsletter, aimed at the various communities that had an interest in the goals, could have helped, not just be making more persons aware of “the Kellogg Program,” but by making them aware of its goals and its accomplishments.

Respondents and interviewees, especially Penn faculty, also expressed ambiguity about the program’s effectiveness. To some, ABCS courses were an inappropriate way to change the social and economic setting of West Philadelphia; to others, families rather than schools were the best focus for ABCS activities; and to others, ABCS was not working because it was not yet embedded within the majors of departments. At least one respondent noted that ABCS at Penn had not carried out ongoing and systematic self-evaluation of its activities, especially with respect to the community, so that its efficacy had not been established by the Kellogg Foundation.

These comments represent the concerns of individuals who are committed to the principles of service learning and community engagement, but who are less optimistic about how it is being carried out at Penn. These are issues beyond the scope of this evaluation for they call for a deeper understanding of these initiatives by accelerating their effects and by providing a stimulus for new ones. The Program’s impacts can be seen as significant and sustainable in two areas:

1. the curriculum, by increasing the breadth and depth of academically based community service across the university;
2. university/community engagement, by increasing the breadth and depth of existing partnerships.
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Conclusion
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2. university/community engagement, by increasing the breadth and depth of existing partnerships.
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Abstract

Changes in achievement motivation were examined in a sample of early adolescents attending a school that was involved in a school-university partnership. Specifically, the school was carrying out reform efforts in order to become a community school. Longitudinal analyses of data indicated that changes in students' motivational orientations in this school often ran contrary to what is found in the general developmental literature. For example, whereas most early adolescents become more focused on performance and grades during the middle school years, students in this sample actually became less focused on performance and grades. Perceived school belonging increased over time. However, not all changes in motivation were atypical—for example, perceived mastery goals declined over time.
Many parents, teachers, and administrators have noticed that during early adolescence, academic motivation tends to decline. This shift in the motivational patterns of adolescents has become a great concern in the United States (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989). For many students, early adolescence is a critical life stage, in which identities are formed, and interests are pursued. However, for many students, negative shifts in academic motivation can have deleterious effects on students’ future aspirations and plans.

There is a large body of research that documents the decline in motivation during the middle grade years (e.g., Anderman & Maehr, 1994; Anderman & Midgley, 1997; Eccles & Midgley, 1989; Midgley, Anderman, & Hicks, 1995; Simmons & Blyth, 1987). Whereas numerous professionals in the field of education had assumed for many years that this decline in motivation was associated with the physiological changes associated with puberty, these and other recent research studies have indicated that these shifts in motivation are associated with changes in social contexts, rather than with the physiological changes associated with puberty. Specifically, many of the negative shifts in motivation have been linked to the transition from elementary school to middle school (Eccles et al., 1993a).

The present study examines longitudinal data from a school that was engaged in major reform practices. Specifically, the school, which could be characterized as a “traditional” middle school in many respects, made significant movement toward becoming a “learner-centered” school. The school transformed itself from a typical school in which students spent 7 hours per day (during the day), into a community center, that was open into the evenings and during the summer, in order to provide students with opportunities to engage in academic experiences to early adolescents and their families. These changes were brought about because research clearly has indicated the influences that nonacademic environments have on adolescents (Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2000). The changes made by this school were brought about through a collaboration with a local university. This school-university partnership was based on previous work that universities and public schools can effectively work together to bring about effective changes in education (e.g., Bogle & Harkavy, 1996).

It was hypothesized that the changes in school environment associated with this reform would lead to positive motivational outcomes for students. Indeed, it has been established that psychological variables are linked directly to the essential components of school reform (Tirozzi & Uro, 1997). When schools make meaningful changes, the results often are evident in psychological characteristics of the students. The present article does not review the specifics of the actual structural changes that occurred within the school. Rather, the article focuses on changes in student-level variables related specifically to academic motivation.

The Transition from Elementary School to Middle School

During early adolescence, students attend a variety of different types of schools, with various grade configurations. Nevertheless, one of the most common grade configurations is a 6th through 8th grade or a 7th through 9th grade configuration. Data from the base year of the United States Department of Education’s National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) indicated that 58.6% of the NELS sample attended schools with grade configurations of 6 - 8, 8 - 9, whereas 22.7% attended schools with grade configurations of either P, K, or 1-8 schools or P, K, or 1-2 schools. The remaining students attended schools with various other grade configurations (e.g., 6th through 12th grade) (National Center for Education Statistics, 1994). These data indicate that many students make a transition into middle school during the early adolescent years (e.g., at grades 6 or 7).

This is cause for concern, because research indicates that academic motivation often declines dramatically at the point of this educational transition (Anderman & Maehr, 1994). Two parallel lines of research conducted by motivation researchers have linked this decline in motivation to the academic environments associated with many middle schools. These lines of research have emanated from two distinct perspectives on academic motivation: expectancy X value theory, and goal orientation theory.

The expectancy X value perspective on the middle school transition. Eccles and Midgley (1983) argued that elementary school teachers and their colleagues conducted a series of important studies during the 1980s and early 1990s, using an expectancy X value framework. These studies examined changes in motivation during early adolescence. The studies were particularly important and influential because they all linked the observed negative shifts in motivation to the transition from elementary schools to middle schools. Eccles and Midgley argued that there is a “developmental mismatch” between the developmental needs of early adolescents, and the typical environments provided by most middle level (junior high) schools (Eccles & Midgley, 1989). Typical middle school learning environments are characterized by homogeneous ability-grouping practices, poor student-teacher relationships, few opportunities for students to make choices and feel autonomous, and an increased focus on grades, test scores, and ability differences (Anderman & Maehr, 1994; Blyth, Simmons, & Bush, 1978; Eccles et al., 1993a; Eccles & Midgley, 1989).

Nevertheless, developmental research clearly indicates that during early adolescence, students need to be able to express choices, autonomy, self-determination, and to have ample social interaction with peers and with caring adults (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; Eccles & Midgley, 1989; Simmons & Blyth, 1987). Consequently, the traditional environment provided by most middle schools is basically antithetical to the developmental needs of early adolescents.

Eccles’ expectancy X value model of motivation (Eccles, 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992) is a well-tested model of academic motivation. The “expectancy” component refers to students’ expectations of success or failure on academic tasks. The “value” component is actually broken down into four aspects of achievement values: attainment value (how important is the task?), intrinsic value (how interesting is the task?), utility value (how useful is the task?), and cost (what are the negative aspects of engaging in the task?). Research studies generally indicate that expectancies predict actual academic performance (e.g., grades), whereas values predict choices (e.g., enrollment in courses in the future) (Eccles, 1983; Meece, Wigfield, & Eccles, 1990; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992).

Eccles and Midgley (1989) demonstrated that differences in the classroom environment before and after the middle school transition that elementary school were related to changes in students’ expectancies and values in mathematics (e.g., Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989). For example, Midgley et al. (1989) found that students who moved from elementary school teachers who were perceived to be low in support to middle school teachers that were perceived to be high in support experienced an increase in intrinsic valuing of math. In contrast, students who moved from highly supportive elementary school teachers to middle school teachers who were lower in support experienced a decline in both the intrinsic valuing of math, the perceived usefulness of math, and the perceived importance of math. This is a matter of great concern, because other research (e.g., Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1988) indicates that middle school teachers, compared to elementary school teachers, trust students less, are more concerned with discipline and control, and are less efficacious.

The goal orientation theory perspective on the middle school transition. Goal orientation theory is a social-cognitive theory of academic motivation. Goal orientation theory suggests that students approach academic tasks with different types of goals. These goals represent students’ reasons for doing academic tasks. A mastery goal (also referred to as a learning goal or a task-orientation in the literature) is evident when a student’s goal in doing an academic task is truly learn, and “master” the task at hand. A performance goal (also referred to as an ability goal, a relative ability goal, or an ego-orientation) is evident when a student is primarily interested in demonstrating his or her ability. A performance-approach goal is the goal of appearing more competent than others, whereas a performance-avoid goal is the goal of avoiding appearing incompetent or “dumb” (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Middleton & Midgley, 1997).

There is general agreement that mastery goals are predictive of adaptive outcomes (e.g., Ames & Archer, 1988; Anderman & Maehr, 1994). However, there has been debate regarding the effects of performance goals. Part of this is because prior to the mid 1990s, researchers did not distinguish between performance-approach and avoid goals. Therefore, some studies indicated that performance goals were helpful, whereas others indicated that performance goals were harmful to the learning process. Some recent research (e.g., Elliot, Church, McGregor, & Gable, 1999) suggests that in some situations, performance-approach goals may be helpful to learning, whereas performance-avoid goals may be harmful to learning. However, other
research indicates that contexts that are perceived as emphasizing performance goals may result in other types of problematic outcomes, such as academic cheating (e.g., Anderman, Griesinger, & Westerfield, 1998), or a decline in achievement values over time (Anderman et al., in press).

Several studies have been conducted in recent years, examining the transition from elementary school to middle school, using a goal orientation theory perspective. In a cross-sectional study, Midgley, C., Midgley, M., & Hicks, R. (1995) found that middle school teachers and students perceived the overall school culture as being more performance oriented and less mastery oriented than did elementary school teachers and students. They also found that elementary school teachers reported using instructional techniques that emphasized mastery goals more than did middle school teachers.

In a longitudinal study, Anderman and Midgley (1997) found that when students were in elementary school, they endorsed mastery goals more, reported a greater emphasis on mastery goals during academic instruction, and felt more academically competent than one year later, when they were in middle school. In addition, they found that students reported perceiving a greater emphasis on performance goals after the middle school transition than before.

Using another longitudinal sample, Anderman and Anderman (1999) found that endorsement of mastery goals declined over the middle school transition, whereas endorsement of performance goals increased over the transition. One important finding from this study was that increases in performance goals across the transition were associated positively with perceiving an emphasis on ability and performance in middle school, whereas an increase in mastery goals across the transition was associated with perceiving an emphasis on ability and performance in middle school, whereas an increase in mastery goals across the transition was associated with perceiving an emphasis in both mastery and performance after the middle school transition. Results of this study also indicated that social variables play an important role in determining student motivation after the transition. Specifically, a high perceived sense of school belonging and the endorsement of responsibility goals were associated with an increase in mastery goals after the transition, whereas a low perceived sense of belonging and the endorsement of relationship and status (popularity) goals were associated with an increase in performance orientation after the transition.

Summarizing the Research on the Middle School Transition

In summary, the results of studies from both the expectancy X value perspective and from a goal orientation theory perspective converge on the unavoidable fact that motivation declines as students move into middle grades schools. After the middle school transition, student-teacher relationships generally deteriorate, there is an increased focus on ability and performance, and the academic tasks that students encounter often do not meet early adolescents’ developmental needs. In addition, other research has demonstrated that these negative shifts in psychological variables do not tend to occur in schools with well-organized and substantive personnel to make organizational and substantive changes in the learning environment, with the ultimate goal of helping early adolescents to become more invested in schooling and the learning process.

We examined five overall questions in this research, in order to see if the relations and changes observed in this school were similar to those observed for most early adolescents (e.g., Eccles & Midgley, 1989). The questions that were examined included the following:

1. Is perceived school belonging related to participation in community school activities?
2. Did general measures of motivation change between 1995 and 1997?
3. Did perceived school belonging change between 1995 and 1997?
4. Did motivation in the domain of science change between 1995 and 1997?
5. Did motivation to engage in risky behaviors change over time?

Method

In the following section, the methodology used in the evaluation of this community school is discussed. The evaluation occurred in multiple stages. The various samples and measures are discussed below.

Overall Summary of Methodology and Subjects

The evaluation occurred between 1995 and 1999. Various survey data were collected from students throughout this period. Specifically, longitudinal surveys were administered during the 1995-1997 time period. Additional cross-sectional surveys were administered in 1998 and 1999. Student record data (grades and attendance records) were collected between 1997 and 1999. Data on participation in community school activities were collected in 1995 and 1996.

Measures

Various measures were collected using surveys. All surveys were administered in regular classroom settings. Trained graduate students administered all surveys, with the classroom teacher present in the room at the time of survey administration. Most measures assessed student motivation in three domains: (a) general motivation, (b) motivation in science, and (c) antisocial-related motivations.

Several measures of personal goal orientations were administered. Measures of personal goal orientations are indicative of how much students report personally endorsing various goals. In the present studies, these included measures of students’ personal mastery goals, performance goals, and extrinsic goals. These measures have demonstrated excellent reliability and validity in numerous studies. For detailed information, see Midgley et al., 1995, and Midgley et al., 1998. We also asked students to complete measures of perceived school belonging (e.g., whether or not the student feels respected and well-treated in the school environment) (Anderman & Anderman, 1999; Goodenow, 1993).

Finally, several measures of motivation toward risky behaviors were included in the present study. These measures assessed students’ anger toward school, and students’ willingness to participate in antisocial activities in order to be “cool.” Both of these measures contained multiple items, and displayed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha 0.83 for anger, 0.95 for antisocial behaviors to be “cool”).

Results

Results are presented in terms of specific research questions that were asked throughout the evaluation.

Question #1: Is perceived school belonging related to participation in community school activities?

During the 1995 and 1996 school years, all students participating in the evaluation were asked to indicate their levels of participation in all community school activities. These included both activities that occurred during the school day, and activities that occurred during the afternoons and evenings. It was hypothesized that participation in these activities would be related to a greater sense of school belonging.

Students indicated (a) whether or not they participated in each activity, and (b) the number of times that they participated in each activity. In 1995, there was a weak positive correlation between participation and school belonging (r = .17), whereas in 1996, the correlation was a bit stronger (r = .27). The correlation between perceived belonging in 1995 and activity participation in 1996 was stronger (r = .32), suggesting that a stronger perceived sense of belonging may have led to greater participation in the future; however, strong causal conclusions can’t be drawn from these data.

Question #2: Did general measures of motivation change between 1995 and 1997?

Research has clearly indicated that as schools make changes in instructional practices, motivational variables often are affected in predictable ways (e.g., Ames, 1990; Anderman, Maehr, & Midgley, 1999). In the present research, we examine longitudinally changes in students’ endorsement of performance goals (doing their school work to demonstrate their ability and to be competitive) and mastery goals (doing their school work to truly master and learn the material). Much research suggests that in traditional middle school environments, performance goals in particular increase during the middle school years (Anderman & Midgley, 1997; Eccles et al., 1993a; Eccles & Midgley, 1989).

For performance goals, results indicated that students’ endorsement of performance goals remained stable (ranks 1995 and 1996, and decreased during 1997, F (1, 122) = 4.52, p < .05. These motivational shifts are displayed in figure.
In the present evaluation, endorsement of mastery goals changed in ways that are predictable for most adolescents. Specifically, there was an overall decline in mastery goals, F(1, 122) = 53.44, p < .001. Specifically, perceived mastery goals declined between 1995 and 1996, and remained at this level during 1997 (see table 1 for descriptive statistics).

**Question #3: Did perceived school belonging change between 1995 and 1997?**

A perceived sense of school belonging (connectedness) has been identified as an extremely important variable during adolescence (Resnick et al., 1997). Indeed, during the adolescent years, many youth become disengaged and disconnected with school, and feel that they have little in common with the values of their schools. Consequently, as the school in the present evaluation made changes toward becoming more of a community school, we were interested to see if students’ perceived sense of belonging changed.

Results indicated that students’ perceived sense of belonging did increase over time, F (1, 122) = 25.53, p < .001 (see table 1). Nevertheless, it is important to note that mean levels of mastery goals in science were high (above 3.0) at all times.

**Question #5: Did motivation to engage in risky behaviors change over time?**

For the final question, we assessed several measures of antisocial behavior. These measures were assessed for the present samples in 1996 and 1997. Pareid-sample t-tests were run to examine changes over time.

First, we assessed students’ self-reported feelings of anger (e.g., toward teachers). Results indicated a significant decline in school-related anger between 1996 and 1997, t(132) = 3.50, p < .001. One of the measures assessed students’ desire to participate in antisocial activities (e.g., smoking, fighting, etc.) to be “cool.” Although the data displayed a declining trend, results were not statistically significant, t(131) = 1.31, NS.

**Discussion**

School change is a complex, often slow process. Whereas researchers and policy-makers would like for schools to change rapidly and effectively, the truth of the matter is that effective change takes time. Thus some of the change (and lack of change) observed in student motivation in the present evaluation may become more salient as the school continues to engage in the reform process.

In the present research, we found that some of the variables that we measured exhibited relations that were contrary to what is found in the general adolescent motivation literature. These atypical patterns may be related to the reform efforts that were occurring at this school. However, it is important to note that not all variables changed in unexpected ways.

First, we examined the relation between perceived school belonging, and participation in community school activities. Results indicated a weak positive correlation during the first year of the evaluation, and a slightly stronger correlation during the second year. In addition, perceived belonging during the first year was correlated positively with activity participation during the second year.

Whereas causal inferences are not warranted from these data, the results do suggest that an important relation exists between activity participation and perceived school belonging. The important question that future research must address is the causality of this relation. Indeed, it may be that participation in activities leads to a greater sense of belonging; however, it may also be the case that a heightened sense of school belonging fosters participation in school activities. There probably is a somewhat reciprocal relation, where these variables constantly influence each other. Given recent research indicating that a perceived sense of school belonging serves as a buffer against many negative outcomes during adolescence (Resnick et al., 1997), it is important to continue to examine variables that are related to an increased sense of connectedness with the school.

Our second question addressed changes in general measures of student motivation. We assessed a number of different constructs, using a goal orientation theory perspective on achievement motivation (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Nicholls, Cobb, Wood, Yackel, & Palashnick, 1990). We found that students’ endorsement of performance goals (doing academic work in order to demonstrate one’s ability) remained stable during the first two years of the evaluation and declined between the second and third year. These findings are extremely encouraging, considering the fact that much research has documented an increase in performance goals for most students after the middle school transition (Anders and Midgley, 1997). Students’ endorsement of mastery goals (doing academic work in order to truly learn and master material) exhibited a decline between 1995 and 1996, and remained at this level during 1997. This is reflective of other research, which has demonstrated that early adolescents’ intrinsic motivation to learn often declines during the middle school years (Eccles & Midgley, 1989; for a review, see Anderman & Young, 1994). Nevertheless, it is somewhat encouraging to see that perceived mastery goals leveled-off during the third year of the evaluation, and did not continue to decline. Longitudinal studies that last longer than three years may provide additional insights into how such variables continue to change over time, as school implement reform efforts.

Our third question examined changes in perceived school belonging from 1995 through 1997. Results indicated that a perceived sense of belonging increased over time, particularly between 1995 and 1996. This is a very encouraging finding, because a heightened sense of school belonging can serve as a protective agent against many negative outcomes during adolescence, such as violence and suicidal ideation (Resnick et al., 1997).

Although longitudinal studies of school belonging are lacking in the literature, reviews of the literature in the field of achievement motivation strongly suggest that early adolescents become disinterested in school, and perceive an increasing lack of a connection with school, during the middle grade years (Anderman & Maehr, 1994; Eccles & Midgley, 1989). Therefore, the observed increase in perceived belonging is contrary to what would normally be expected. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the increase mainly occurred between 1995 and 1996. Again, additional research examining the trajectory after 1997 is warranted.

Our fourth question examined changes in motivation with the domain of science. Because research indicates that motivation varies by academic subject (Eccles et al., 1993b), we believed that it was very important to examine motivation within at least one specific academic domain.

Extrinsic motivation in science demonstrated an almost statistically significant decline, with the major decline occurring between 1996 and 1997. Perceived mastery goals decreased over time, although students in this school generally reported high levels of mastery goals at all three waves of data. The decline in intrinsic motivation in science mirrors the decline in generally mastery goals that was found in our examination of the first question.

Our final question examined changes in variables related to risky behaviors. In our sample, school-related anger declined between 1996 and 1997. Our measure of students’ endorsement of antisocial activities to “be cool” displayed a declining trend between 1995 and 1997; although this trend was not statistically significant.
General Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

It is important to note that the observed changes and relations cannot be linked directly to the changes that were made by the school. Indeed, it is possible that the observed changes were unrelated to the school’s partnership with the university and the movement toward becoming a community school.

Nevertheless, it is extremely difficult to link such shifts in policies and practices to student outcomes in any program of research. Even when researchers can have “control” schools to serve as comparisons, it is difficult if not impossible in educational research to have a pure control. This is because teachers often implement new practices and strategies throughout the school year, particularly as they hear of innovations that are being made by other schools.

Whereas the observed changes can’t be directly linked to changes that were implemented by the school, we are confident that these changes were at least somewhat related to the changes and relations observed in our data. Specifically, a number of the developmental shifts in motivation that we observed ran contrary to what the literature has found for most early adolescents (see Anderman, Austin, & Johnson, in press, for a review).

The types of activities and learning environments provided by middle schools have a dramatic impact on young adolescents’ experiences in schools and communities. The development of goal orientation. In A. Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds.), The development of achievement motivation. San Diego: Academic Press.


Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Longitudinal Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Performance Orientation</td>
<td>4.52** (1, 122)</td>
<td>3.08 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.10 (0.89)</td>
<td>2.86 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mastery Orientation</td>
<td>53.44** (1, 122)</td>
<td>3.76 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.24 (1.03)</td>
<td>3.16 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived School Belonging</td>
<td>52.48** (1, 122)</td>
<td>1.55 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.56 (0.82)</td>
<td>3.40 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation in Science</td>
<td>3.25 (1, 122)</td>
<td>2.91 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.92 (0.91)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Mastery Goals in Science</td>
<td>28.53** (1, 122)</td>
<td>3.79 (0.89)</td>
<td>3.47 (0.91)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>3.50** (1, 122)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.22 (1.18)</td>
<td>1.84 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial Behaviors to be “cool”</td>
<td>1.13 (1.11)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.63 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.69 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05  **p < 0.01  ***p < 0.001  +p < 0.17
Changing the direction of an institution of higher education is, as a former University of Wisconsin Regent once wrote, a lot like trying to move a battleship with your bare hands. It takes strategic leadership ... and a lot of people willing to help push.

This is the story of that push, the continuing tale of how the idea of community-university engagement has become an invigorating—and transforming—vision for an entire institution.
Time for a Change

In 1998 the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was ready to consider a change in course. The Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin System’s largest urban public university was ending a seven-year term to return to the classroom. Student enrollment was back to more than 50,000 students for the first time in the decade and faculty numbers were stabilizing after years of cutbacks. New student housing and ren- ovations to major buildings promised to highlight the university’s enviable location near the shores of Lake Michigan, just minutes from downtown.

As the university looked to the future it was clear it needed a compelling vision, one that would help shape and define its mission as an urban, research university as well as its unique role within the UW-System which also includes the internationally recognized flagship campus in Madison and twelve other four-year comprehensive universities. Despite its ranking among the Carnegie’ s doctoral/research universities and strong undergraduate and graduate programs, UWM wanted to do better in attracting minority students, outside dollars and innovative faculty. The Search and Screen Committee for the new chancellor, meetings with faculty, staff, alumni and students, determined that what the university needed was a visionary leader who could help UWM become a more responsive, innovative urban university.

UWM found that leader in Nancy L. Zimpher, who came on board in the summer of 1998 from the Ohio State University where she had been dean of the College of Education and Executive Dean of the Professional Colleges. While at Ohio State she had helped direct its Campus Collaborative, working with community groups to transform the university’s neighborhoods. No stranger to the power of community-campus part- nerships, Zimpher arrived in UWM in strong history of outreach and service and the potential for finding new purpose and mission in the principles of engagement. Shortly after her arrival, she challenged faculty, staff and students to imagine a future as a new kind of university, one inex- tricably linked to its community: “It’s not just us serving the city. It’s not just the city serving us,” she said in her first campus speech. “It is the notion of togetherness, building a city and university that are the heart of metropolitan Milwaukee. This is the essence of [what we will call] The Milwaukee Idea.”

An Old Idea Made New

Of course the idea of community engagement as an animating mission for the academy is not a new one. As Seth Low, president of Columbia from 1890 to 1901 said in his inaugural address, “...there is no such thing as the world of letters apart from the world of men.” This progressive tradition was the fertile soil in which Wisconsin’s university system was nurtured in the late nine- teenth century. It was at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, that the notion of “The Wisconsin Idea” was first expressed: “the bound- aries of the university are the boundaries of the state.” From its earliest years to today, The Wisconsin Idea has embodied the university’s mis- sion of research and outreach—as well as teaching—to provide information, policy and service to the state and community.

When the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was founded in 1956, it continued this philosophy, with the expressed purpose that it be “Milwaukee’s university,” a “powerful partner” with the city.5 UWM faculty and students have taken that charge seriously, engaging in literally hundreds of projects and partnerships with neighborhood schools, small business, downtown development agencies, community activists and social service agencies.

In 1996, for example, UW-Milwaukee received a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to form a Milwaukee Community Outreach Partnership Center (MCOPC) to pursue broad-scale neigh- borhood revitalization. Administered by UWM’s Center for Urban Initiatives and Research, MCOPC brought together an interdisciplinary team from across campus that included The School of Architecture and Urban Planning, the Centers for Economic Development and Urban Community Development, the Employment and Training Institute, and the Department of Sociology.

Since MCOPC was formed, UWM faculty and staff have joined with a community partnership of educators, parents, neighbors, community organ- izations and businesses, sustained six-service community centers at three area schools. MCOPC staff and students from the School of Architecture and Urban Planning worked with residents of a home for the chronically mentally ill to design suitable housing. UWM’s Employment and Training Institute conducted regular job opening surveys to assist technical training organizations in matching openings to workforce skills, and pro- duced school-to-work and career planning mate- rials for middle and high-school students. Non- profit leaders participated in a year-long seminar called Community Action Scholars and learned “the value and power of shared experience.” From community nursing to on-site tutoring, research for business start-ups to studies of welfare reform, UWM continues to demonstrate the effectiveness of “powerful partnerships” to enhance learning and strength community.

Integrating Engagement Into the Institutional Mission

But as the Kellogg Commission report on the future of state and land-grant universities notes, university engagement goes beyond conventional outreach and public service. Interdisciplinary coalitions and large numbers of community part- nerships are important, but are only a prelude to the next step: “integrating engagement into the institutional mission” and “infusing engagement into curriculum and teaching.” Such a vision for the “engaged institution” is, in the words of Chancellor Zimpher, “too ambitious to be the property of a single campus entity, like one depart- ment or one school.” Equally important, engage- ment at the institutional level must include the community from the very beginning in its design and implementation.

And so, The Milwaukee Idea was born. Over the course of the past three years, students, fac- ulty, staff, alumni and community members have met to create and implement “Big Ideas”—“new ways in which UWM can join hands with the peo- ple of metropolitan Milwaukee.” According to Zimpher, the Milwaukee Idea of community engagement will be “woven into the fabric of the university and into the way in which we do our work, adding color and luster to our strong tradi- tion of teaching excellence, research and scholar- ship, service and engagement.” If, as Ira Harkavy contends, “the radical reform of higher education is most likely to occur in the crucible of signifi- cant new ideas to create engagement,”7 UWM is testing that hypothesis where it counts: in the academy and on the street.

Step One: Imagine

How do you mobilize an entire university around community engagement? As Chancellor Zimpher has noted, it began with 100 people and one word: imagine. Imagine the shared future of Milwaukee and UWM. A “Committee of 100”—invited students, faculty, staff and community—met for the first time in October, 1998, and were tasked with fleshing out The Milwaukee Idea. What is it? What are the big ideas that will mobilize the university? How can community engagement improve student learning and research? Most important, what concrete action can be taken to make the ideas reality?

Over the course of only six months (a mere blink of an eye in traditional academic time!) the Committee of 100 (which soon grew to 200 as more people became involved) was organized into ten Affinity Groups to research and debate ways in which UWM could create bold new initiatives that would not only extend existing UWM strengths, but also encourage new partner- ships. Groups, led by self-selected convenors, met on campus and by e-mail, shared ideas over the Web and came together to brainstorm concepts with the committee as a whole.

Early on, the leadership team for The Milwaukee Idea evolved into two sections to be called “connectors:” a set of guiding principles that helped the Affinity Groups assess the valid- ity of their proposals. First and foremost, the ideas had to be “big”—they had to result in significant and fundamental change to the campus and the community. In addition, the connectors included a commitment to fostering diversity and multi- culturalism, nurturing new partnerships and collaborations, encouraging interdisciplinary relationships, enhancing student learning and campus culture, and supporting more open communication.

Communication has become a watchword for The Milwaukee Idea. Its success. As James Carr, a senior vice president at the Fannie Mae Foundation reminds us, university efforts to engage the community must often first overcome well-earned and long-held skepticism about the effectiveness of institutions of higher education.8 So Chancellor Zimpher took The Milwaukee Idea on the road. She spoke to community and campus groups, at luncheons and breakfast meetings, and to business and civic leaders about The Milwaukee Idea and UWM’s desired change. In addition, more than
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Moving to Action

At the end of six months, UWM’s Affinity Groups identified ten “First Ideas” that reflected the values of the connectors and offered visionary new directions for the future of the university. At the same time, a group of community foundations joined forces to begin their own “First Idea Planning Process,” and, working with UWM, developed an eleventh proposal for a Non-profit Management Education center. The Ideas also included major initiatives in education, the economy and the environment:

- a proposed alternative general education requirement celebrating the city’s multicultural assets and involving community members in the learning process;
- a consortium for economic opportunity, linking university expertise with the community’s small businesses and entrepreneurs;
- a global program for international education;
- new partnerships to study and implement programs addressing urban health issues;
- a “healthy choices” program targeting issues of substance use on campus and in the community; and
- an international center for freshwater research.

The ideas were announced by Zimpher at her inauguration as the sixth Chancellor of UWM and applauded by the mayor, county executive and governor. The more important announcement, however, was not the ideas (they’d been publicly discussed for months) but the next step. As Zimpher stated at the very first Milwaukee Idea plenary session, “ideas without action are meaningless.” The real challenge of change is implementation and so Zimpher assembled Action Teams of faculty, students, staff and community to create concrete action plans—complete with detailed budgets and staffing proposals—to implement the First Ideas. Eighteen months after the first Affinity group meeting, the first Idea was ready to launch.

Since that time, ten of the original eleven Ideas have been implemented and three more ideas have joined the ranks. All are making significant contributions to the life of the university and our region. The Consortium for Economic Opportunity is based in the city core and has partnered with neighborhood development groups and small businesses. A campus-wide survey on student drinking habits has been completed and a new course on Healthy Choices developed. The Milwaukee Partnership Academy, a collaboration with Milwaukee’s Public Schools, has brought the school board, administration, the union, business and higher education to the table to improve teacher training and retention. The Helen Bader Institute for Nonprofit Management has opened its doors and Cultures and Community, the curriculum component of The Milwaukee Idea, has sponsored faculty fellowships to create new courses that connect student learning to the urban community. More than thirty have already been offered.

Tacking Stock

It is, of course, too early to assess success of The Milwaukee Idea. By no means has engagement been embraced campus-wide, nor have the many and varied opportunities for enhanced student learning, community participation and faculty research been fully realized. There are, however, signs that the “battleship” is changing direction.

Early on in the Milwaukee Idea process, the leadership team identified “Eight Steps to Success”—measures to help assess accomplishments. They are:

1. Establish a sense of urgency
2. Create a guiding coalition
3. Empower people for broad-based action.
4. Develop vision and strategy
5. Communicate the change vision
6. Generate short-term wins
7. Consolidate gains and produce more change
8. Anchor changes in the culture

The sense of urgency for change at UWM was real. The “guiding coalition” included not only the Chancellor and Milwaukee Idea director, but the hundreds of people involved during the past three years. The secret to the success of The Milwaukee Idea, however, can be found in Step 3: “Empower people for broad-based action.” Chancellor Zimpher recalls the reactions she got as the process unfolded: “People would send me e-mails and say, ‘We know you have all these people working on ideas, but surely you have a plan, Nancy.’ I had to tell them, the plan is not mine. It belongs to UWM and to the people who create it and then make it happen.” Thanks to the work of hundreds of people, the university has new goals and specific strategies to reach them.

The process has brought together individuals from across campus and the community, creating new networks and relationships. Almost one hundred new faculty have been hired in the past year, with an additional seventy-five slated for 2002—many of them attracted to UWM because of the opportunities for engagement being offered. This has resulted in a cohort of enthusiastic students, faculty, staff and community people who are committed to implementing the ideas and to sharing the vision more broadly. As one participant said, “The most meaningful result of this process is that it was so open. It allowed anyone who wanted to join in. This enabled people from across disciplines to talk to each other—it hasn’t happened before!”

Thanks to The Milwaukee Idea, UWM has a new profile in the neighborhood and new ways to communicate with the community. According to Timothy Sheehy, the president of the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Chancellor Zimpher and The Milwaukee Idea “opened the door to the university as a resource.” The Milwaukee Idea office fields calls daily from organizations and individuals eager to explore potential partnerships and projects. A new Institute for Service Learning and a revived student volunteer center provide additional support.

The sixth step to success—“create short-term wins”—can be measured in the Milwaukee Idea banners that dot the campus, the 100-fold increase in public reaction back; to signal to the community, the media. The goal was three-fold: to make UWM accountable for results. “We’re moving without a net,” said Zimpher. “What we are doing is public and must produce action.”

So Far…

Chancellor Zimpher likes to tell the story of an encounter she had with a student, early in her tenure at UWM. The student was a beautiful fall day and as the Chancellor walked across the plaza to the Student Union, he stopped her, introduced himself and told her how pleased he was with everything she was doing. Then he paused … and added: “So far!”

The challenge for change never ends.
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The quaint old nursery rhyme begs us to ask some questions about our communities and their schools. What are the characteristics of a school system that would produce a student so reluctant to arrive in a timely fashion? What are the characteristics of a family that produces such a student? Is the child working late into the evening to help provide the basic family necessities and, therefore, unable to get out of bed early enough to arrive at school on time? Is it a single parent household, and is our scholar assuming the responsibility of getting other siblings off to school so the parent can go to work? Does a family illness require the student to be home in the morning? Is there a total lack of parental supervision? What are the characteristics of the community in which our scholar attends school? Is it a poor urban community whose school suffers from the same battle fatigue as many of the homes and families within its boundaries? Is it an affluent middle-class community where everyone is so busy pursuing the American dream that schools and children go unnoticed?

While these questions are neither exhaustive nor relevant to every situation, they do demonstrate the complexity of the world in which our ten o’clock scholar lives and grows. It can be argued that one of the most important issues facing our nation is the adequate education of our children. Lawson and Hooper-Briar suggest that only through collaboration among a variety of concerned partners can this issue and all of society’s complex problems be adequately or successfully addressed. Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett challenge our institutions of higher education by stating that collaboration with communities to solve
society’s most complex issues is the university’s civic responsibility. Harkavy suggests that the university should no longer be rewarded for the lofty rhetoric it produces; it should be rewarded for its ability to collaborate in solving America’s most serious problems, especially those of the city.

The Campus Collaborative at The Ohio State University is built upon a foundation very much in accord with the assertions of Lawson, Hooper-Briar, Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett. Simply stated, their admission is this: The university has a responsibility to support the community; it must learn from and build on community assets; it cannot support the community without supporting schools and families; and university support, if it is to be effective, must be collaborative.

This article highlights the work of the Campus Collaborative (Collaborative) especially as it relates to the communities (University District) that surround the campus of The Ohio State University (OSU), Columbus, Ohio. It begins with a brief look at the birth of the Collaborative and an overview of its activities. The remainder of the paper concentrates on three specific initiatives of the Collaborative especially regarding the ways in which initiatives impact the university schools and neighborhoods, the ways the Collaborative strives to facilitate campus efforts to respond to school and neighborhood needs, and lessons learned. These three initiatives are the University Neighborhood Faculty Seed Grant Program, the Community Outreach Partnership Center, and the University District Education Committee.

The Collaborative grew out of the work of two organizations: The Interprofessional Commission of Ohio (Commission) and Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment, Inc. (Campus Partners). The Commission is a cooperative group of university professors whose goal is to improve services through collaboration for the children, adults, and families of Ohio and our nation. Founded in 1973, the Commission serves as a bridge between the academic and professional communities by facilitating interprofessional dialogue and problem solving throughout the state and nation. The Commission provides interprofessional opportunities for persons in the helping professions, complex social, ethical, clinical, and public policy issues.

Housed at Ohio State, the Commission provides technical assistance in collaboration that includes interprofessional planning and evaluation; training and education for communities and agencies; community collaboration; and staff development. It offers interprofessional credit courses to graduate and professional students at OSU and three seminars which comprise the Interprofessional Consortium of Greater Columbus. Other activities of the Commission involve public policy analysis of emerging social issues that impact professional practice; continuing professional education conferences, workshops, and staff development programs; program development and research from an interprofessional perspective; and publications on interprofessional collaboration. For more information visit the Commission’s web site at http://www.osu.edu/inn.

In 1994, Dr. E. Gordon Gee, then president of OSU, and Columbus mayor, Greg Lashutka announced that the university and the city had entered into a joint commitment to work toward the improvement of specific neighborhoods bordering OSU’s Columbus campus. The commission’s impetus grew from a growing concern regarding the quality of life in these neighborhoods. A task force representing the Ohio State faculty, staff, and students; the City of Columbus; and community organizations was formed. Included in the task force’s recommendations was the suggested formation of a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization. This, Campus Partners was formed and charged with two priorities: “To develop a comprehensive neighborhood Revitalization Plan...accompanied by an Implementation Strategy; and to actively promote projects and programs that can have an immediate, positive impact on the neighborhoods” (p E-1). For more information on Campus Partners visit their web site at http://www.osu.edu/org/ospc/.

With extensive community input and the assistance of a team of consultants, Campus Partners published Interprofessional Neighborhood Revitalization Plan: Concept Document 8 Columbus City Council and the university’s Board of Trustees formally adopted the plan in mid-1997. The document contained six “Core Values” around which Campus Partners’ projects would be developed. Through the leadership of Nancy Zimpher, then Dean of the College of Education, the Commission was invited to take leadership in developing initiatives addressing the human services issues of the revitalization plan. The Campus Collaborative evolved from this invitation. The Collaborative is an interprofessional group that now has over 40 university offices and several community organizations, including resident and neighborhood collaborative, religious organizations, and government and human services agencies.

The Collaborative developed recommendations in five areas intended to foster the goal of creating a model for university/community relationships characterized by educational excellence. The recommendations centered on three of the six core values articulated in the University Neighborhoods Revitalization Plan: Concept Document 9.

Core Value: The university district shall be a model for university/community relationships. The Collaborative suggested two initiatives to implement its first recommendation:

Faculty participation:
1. Establish Community-Based Courses in partnership with existing neighborhood agencies, schools, and families to prepare students for human service and other professions.
2. Establish the University Neighborhoods Faculty Seed Grant Program to encourage teaching and learning by faculty and community partners in the university neighborhoods which will benefit the community, its families, and residents.

Core Value: The university district shall be culturally and socio-economically diverse. The Collaborative suggested three initiatives designed to implement the second recommendation:

Strengths, health and well-being in the university district:
1. Establish a Collaborative Neighborhood Healthy Community Initiative to provide residents and university faculty and students community-based integrated approach to education, employment, health, recreation, and human services.
2. Develop Housing for Student Mothers and Children: A Co-Housing Model to provide housing, child-care, parenting education, and other support to single-mothers while they pursue higher education and to prepare students and faculty to respond to this population.
3. Create a Dialogue Bridge (This evolved into a Community Outreach Partnership Center) to enhance and sustain partner-
6. Develop a Resident Manager’s program for off-campus housing.

Core Value: The university district shall be a neighborhood of choice. The Collaborative made its fifth recommendation relating to this core value: Strengthen the schools in the university neighborhood. This recommendation stresses the assertion that schools of choice foster neighborhoods of choice. The University District Education Committee (UDEC) was formed to implement the following five initiatives:

1. Create additional Professional Development School Sites and Placements to better prepare teachers and other school professionals to address the needs of urban students.

2. Provide Off-Campus Seminars for Teachers to benefit teachers in university area schools and university faculty and students in urban curriculum development and instructional strategies.

3. Develop a Partnership for Technology in Education to link the 13 university area schools and the university, to provide access to information systems for all residents and teachers, and to strengthen university faculty and students resources in the use of technology in urban areas.

4. In cooperation with the Columbus Public Schools’ 5-year Strategic Plan, support Family Focus Centers in developing and planning to strengthen families in the community and to prepare university faculty and students to work effectively with families.

5. Assist university area schools to become Centers for Community Learning, open evenings and weekends to offer life-long learning opportunities to all area residents and to equip university students and faculty to respond to individual life-long learning goals.

The recommended projects briefly described above are intended to enable the University District to become a teaching community that can serve as a model for other urban college and university communities, as well as an opportunity for teaching, learning, and inquiry by residents, professionals, and university faculty, students, and staff. The initiatives were developed through collaboration with the community and are currently in various stages of planning and implementation.

Space limitations do not permit a review of each initiative and its current status. The remainder of the paper offers a more in-depth look into three of them: the University Neighborhood Faculty Seed Grant Program, the Community Outreach Partnership Center, and the University District Education Committee. To learn more about the Collaborative and its other initiatives, visit our web site at http://www.osu.edu/campus-collab/.

University Neighborhood Faculty Seed Grant Program

Partners in the revitalization of the University District Neighborhoods developed six core values to guide their work. One of these core values for which the Collaborative offered recommendations said, “The university district shall be a model for university/community relationships.” A vital step in reaching this goal is the participation of university faculty. The idea of stimulating faculty participation through a seed grant program to encourage teaching and research in the neighborhoods follows naturally. Through funding from OSU’s Office of Academic Affairs, the University Neighborhood Faculty Seed Grant Program became a reality, and the first grants were awarded in 1996. Funding began with $50,000 annually and has risen to a yearly investment of $80,000. Since 1996, forty grants of $2,500-$32,000 have been awarded. Funded projects are interdisciplinary whenever possible, must include significant collaboration with community agencies, schools, organizations, and/or residents, and most include neighborhood-based credit teaching. Faculty members from all disciplines of the university are urged to apply via an RFP in the spring of each year. Projects from 12 of OSU’s 19 colleges have been funded to date. A list of the colleges and/or units involved and the various community partners offers a glimpse of the increase in faculty participation and potential impact upon the University District.

OSU Colleges/Units

College of the Arts
College of Dentistry
College of Education
College of Engineering
College Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences
College of Human Ecology
College of the Humanities
College of Law
College of Medicine
College of Nursing
College of Social Work
College of Veterinary Medicine
Office of Academic Affairs
University College

Community Partners

All 13 Columbus Public Schools Serving University District residents
BalletMet Columbus
The Columbus Symphony
The Family Center
Family Focus Center at Second Ave.
Elementary School
Godman Guild
Neighborhood Services, Inc.
Project OpenHand

The scope of the projects funded affirms the Collaborative’s dedication to its premise: The university has a responsibility to support the community; it must learn from and build on community assets; it cannot support the community without supporting schools and families; and university support, if it is to be effective, must be collaborative.

Grants Focusing on Community

A variety of seed grant projects focused on one or more aspects of the University District communities.

• A geriatric dentistry clinic operates a half-day session each week and provides a range of dental services for under-served, homebound, elderly patients.

• An assessment of animal-related contamination of public areas in the university neighborhoods has senior veterinary students assess certain disease risks to neighborhood residents that arise from domestic, stray, and wild animal contamination in the district.

• The service-learning cooperative has as its goal to develop an innovative, collaborative partnership between the College of Education and three community nonprofit organizations: Godman Guild, Neighborhood Services, and Project OpenHand.

• Community commitment introduces new students, faculty, and staff to thoughtful community service in the University District.

• A project called Developing Community/ University Partnerships: A Model for Exemplary Theory and Practice engaged faculty and students with a neighborhood agency in the assessment of community strengths and needs. The project built a stronger sense of community among the residents, provided data for the agency, taught students techniques involved in such data collection.

• A School of Natural Resources project provides students with practical experience in evaluating trees in the University District neighborhoods for structural stability and other associated hazards.

• Urban public health action and education for the university neighborhoods involves 10-12 senior veterinary students in identifying public health problems in the community and devising and implementing solutions to those problems.

• The use of the arts to engender a positive community spirit takes OSU Arts personnel into schools and other settings, and encourages residents to attend arts events on campus.

• Iuka Ravine: Resident and User Surveys conducted a study of the Iuka Ravine and prepared design and management proposals for the rehabilitation and long-term sustainability of this unique green space in the University District.

• A home ownership survey analyzed deed transfer data for the University District (1984-95) to provide a longitudinal look at property values in the area.

• A College of the Arts project is developing a portable graphic information display of community activities initiated by Campus Collaborative/Campus Partners including an interactive component for presenting videotaped material and feedback from community and other viewers.

Grants Focusing on Schools

A number of seed grants are directed at supporting the University District schools.

• Cultural diversity as practice: introducing somatic education facilitates community understanding and appreciation of cultural...
diversity through cross-cultural movement experiences for teachers and students at two University District schools.

- A College of Education project is developing an interactive website for the 13 public schools which serves the district and their neighborhoods that will service civic and educational purposes.
- The neighborhood literacy tutoring exchange brings together first-year OSU honors students and public school students from the neighborhoods in a literacy tutoring exchange.
- The Department of Spanish and Portuguese is building a community of Hispanics and Spanish speakers in the University District through mentoring, tutoring, internships, activities on and off campus, partnerships with public schools, and field research.
- Students at two University District schools are engaged in neighborhood studies and needs assessments as the foundation for service-learning.
- A project called Music and Dance created a unique partnership among OSU faculty and students, professional musicians in the Columbus Symphony and BalletMet Columbus, and three University District schools.
- University District public schools in context constructed a database profiling the area’s public schools and their neighborhoods as a tool to promote teaching, inquiry, and service.
- Honors at Indiana is a project matching students from the University Honors Program to work with 8th grade students at Indianapolis Middle School.
- The College of Law designed a Law in the Public Schools that used 36 law students to teach basic legal concepts to students in 10 of the University District schools.
- Two service-learning initiatives are funded. They will result in at least six new service-learning courses in the University District.

A team from the College of Education is currently conducting two major school studies.

- The contexts of learning study is a comprehensive analysis of the family, community, and school contexts affecting school improvement efforts across the University District.
  - The study of best practices across the country in three areas: university/school partnerships, successful school restructuring models, and effective coordinated services models. The studies will result in recommendations for the partnership between OSU and the schools in the University District.
  - For further information on these College of Education projects see www.coe.ohio-state.edu/obbl.

Grants Focusing on Families

A third group of funded initiatives emphasizes families.

- A project out of the School of Allied Medical Professions, Hands Across High, provides resident health screening and a referral network, collects health risk and demographic data; and develops credit courses for graduate and professional students.
- Strengthening Bridges that Link Schools, Families, and Communities developed an upper level undergraduate course and web site on developmental issues faced by adolescents and families in the transition from middle to high school.
- Neighborhood Learning Circles provide adult learning opportunities for University District residents on topics chosen by them. A unified physical activity program provided a weekly program at OSU (gymnasium, pool, and playing field) for persons 3-21 years of age with or without disabilities.
- A project from the School of Nursing analyzed the increased use of emergency food services in the University District and the characteristics of users of this service.
- The Senior Housing Outreach Program assisted older homeowners with referrals to appropriate service agencies and with volunteer student service projects.
- Determining the feasibility of providing a model of transitional housing for college students who are single mothers at risk for homelessness was a joint project with the College of Social Work and the School of Architecture.

- The Family/Community Literacy Partnership conducted home and community visits to learn about existing literacy events in three school communities and shared models for improving reading with children and their families.
- A grant to the College of Human Ecology provided software for students to study housing needs in the university neighborhoods.
- A group representing several OSU colleges and units is gathering to begin a study on the impact on low income housing in the neighborhoods brought on by the revitalization project.

As a result of the seed grant program, numerous faculty, staff, and students were, are, and will continue to be involved with the residents, families, schools, organizations, and agencies of the communities in the University District. Many of the projects seeded by the Collaborative are in second stages with funding from other sources. The impact on the University District is only beginning to be understood. However, the impact on the university is evidenced by the continuing interest in the seed grant program and in its increased funding. For further information on the seed grant program see http://www.osu.edu/campuscollab/seed.htm.

Lessons Learned

1. Focusing the basic academic mission of the university in community-based teaching and inquiry is the most effective way to engage faculty in an on-going partnership with the community.
2. Seed grants promote this engagement and attract interest from across the university.
3. Sustainability of projects is critical and needs more attention because offering the community programs that are temporary does not build partnerships and may do more harm than good in terms of building trust.
4. Interdisciplinary approaches are essential for success in community partnership but still difficult to achieve given the departmental structure of the university.

Specific outcomes of individual seed grants are available on the Collaborative web site at http://www.osu.edu/campuscollab/.
Committee, comprised of partners from OSU, OSU Extension, and two community outreach centers, the Weinland Park Community Collaborative and the Godman Guild Association, hosted an open house for residents titled “Want a Good Job? Help Us Help You.” The results provided residents’ input on their own needs related to employment. Two major initiatives are designed to increase the abilities of residents of the University District to obtain and retain employment, and to increase the capacity of the neighborhood to support employability through job training. They are (1) work maturity and job search skills; and (2) competency-based building construction skills integrated with employability skills.

Work Maturity and Job Search Skills: Job Success Course

Curriculum for a Job Success training program was developed and is shared by a team of representatives from the Center on Education and Training for Employment at The Ohio State University, the Godman Guild Association, the OSU Cares Project, and the College of Education School-to-Work Campus Partners Project. Built around an employability skill framework, its objective is to equip unemployed adults in the neighborhood with the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities (SCANS Competencies*) to secure and successfully perform in temporary and permanent jobs. Specific topics in the 55-hour course are:

- personal attitudes crucial to successful job performance
- self-knowledge in identifying realistic job options
- time management and goal-setting
- personal short- and long-term goal-setting
- job application process
- resume building
- successful job interviewing techniques and role plays
- employer expectations
- teamwork and team behavior
- computer basics

Since March 1998, five Job Success Courses have been offered through the Godman Guild Association, serving more than 75 Weinland Park Neighborhood residents. Merging course content with targeted counseling and the outreach support of Godman Guild staff members has proven to be a winning combination. When participants complete the course and become employed, relationships with Godman Guild staff do not end. Ongoing support in the form of mentoring relationships that continue as long as needed is a critical element of successful employment experiences for Job Success graduates.

*SCANS is an acronym for Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, representatives from education, business, labor, and government who identified “workplace know-how”—five competencies, skills and personal qualities needed for solid job performance by entry-level workers.

Competency-based Building Construction Skills Integrated with Employability Skills:

Project Build

PROJECT BUILD was envisioned as an expanded, six-week, double-stranded Job Success course for neighborhood residents. Customized to the construction industry, it focused on highly integrated training in employability skills and technical construction skills in seven areas of the industry:

- landscaping
- plumbing
- electrical
- masonry
- carpentry
- roofing
- heavy highway and utility construction

The first PROJECT BUILD was held as a pilot program in the spring of 1999. Training was conducted at the Godman Guild Settlement House, in a number of local trade apprenticeship training facilities, and in local Habitat for Humanity homes. Experts from the construction industry taught job-specific skills in basic home and building maintenance, and heavy highway and utility construction. Two adult educators facilitated the application of employability skills to each area of the industry. Tools that were purchased have become part of a toolbox, which will be run like a lending library for neighborhood residents as needed.

Ten residents graduated from the pilot program, and nine are employed in the construction industry at this time (one woman delivered a baby after completing the course). The hands-on activities, networking opportunities with people from the industry who were in a position to hire course participants, ongoing mentoring from the Godman Guild staff, and bonding support from each other created an empowering growth experience for each participant. Additional funding has been awarded the Godman Guild Association for three more offerings of PROJECT BUILD. Continued collaboration of all the COPC partners – OSU, Weinland Park Community Collaborative, and Godman Guild – will enhance the impact of these courses. In addition, COPC will assist Godman Guild financially in phasing in a Job Developer position.

Due to the demand for qualified workers the next phase will add HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) and lengthen the program to eight weeks. Curriculum is being enhanced to reflect specific industry competencies, and will be certified by the Building Industry Association of Columbus as a competency-based curriculum. Phase II will include graduates of the pilot program in the planning stages, and it is hoped that their employers, in allowing them released time to work in some capacity with students during the second course, will become partners as well.

Entrepreneurship Training

The Weinland Park Business and Entrepreneurship Center (BEC) began with a program for acquiring competence in entrepreneur ship. The training was coordinated with accompanying services to assist neighborhood residents in small business with start-up and operation. The BEC is designed to support the birth, growth, and development of small businesses in the Weinland Park area.

A community garden was planted and micro entrepreneurial activities for youth and adults were held. The BEC Team held three major community service events which brought together community and university students.

The next phase of the entrepreneurship activities was to identify programs and organizational aspects of existing business incubators. Results of the research into business retention and expansion programs and business incubators have been used to develop a working plan for the center. This plan was developed through a BEC Advisory Committee made up of representatives from city government, the business community, the University Community Business Association, and...
The training each peer mentor was matched with community resources. Upon completion of methods of mentoring, and to increase familiarity to learn how to teach family life skills, to learn neighborhood. They participated in five weeks of training to learn about community resources door-to-door and at the same time encouraging and recruiting residents to become involved in community building activities. Other community empowering events have been held as part of a program called "Dare to Care about Weinland Park," including neighborhood meetings with police and government officials to discuss neighborhood concerns, neighborhood clean up and beautification projects, and several community festivals featuring arts and crafts, music, and food.

Family Housing Stability

The purpose of the family/housing stability outreach program is to increase family stability and to prevent eviction and homelessness. Among the barriers to stability are lack of family life skills, confidence in individual ability, and access to resources needed to acquire skills. The program builds on and complements existing programs at Godman Guild and the Weinland Park Community Collaborative, and focuses on development of skills that enable families to increase the probability of obtaining and maintaining a secure housing situation, and to reduce the chances of eviction or encroachment. Emphasis is placed on goal setting, planning and decision-making skills, within a train-the-trainer context of budgeting, tenant rights/responsibilities, consequences of non-payment of rent, community and consumer skills and access, home management and care, nutrition and meal planning and awareness of community resources.

Counselors from Godman Guild assisted the start-up of the first activity by recommending community residents for training as peer mentors for at-risk families in the Weinland Park neighborhood. They participated in five weeks of training to learn how to teach family life skills, to learn methods of mentoring, and to increase familiarity with community resources. Upon completion of the training each peer mentor was matched with a family.

A Block Leader program was initiated in support of the Eyes on Weinland Park community program. Information binders were created and distributed to all block leaders including topics such as telephone circles, block leader duties, and procedures to follow for various code violations within the neighborhood. Each topic had been identified by neighbors as problems, and the procedural steps for dealing with such problems equip the block leaders to inform their neighbors about appropriate actions to take.

Two community residents were hired as community liaisons to promote these programs with their neighbors and to keep the lines of communication continually open between residents and COPC. An Information Exchange was also conducted, involving residents and OSU students taking information about community resources door-to-door and at the same time encouraging and recruiting residents to become involved in community building activities. Other community empowering events have been held as part of a program called "Dare to Care about Weinland Park," including neighborhood meetings with police and government officials to discuss neighborhood concerns, neighborhood clean up and beautification projects, and several community festivals featuring arts and crafts, music, and food.

Lessons Learned

1. Community partnerships require long-term commitment to build and maintain. All partners bring a history of previous relationships that need to be understood and may need time for healing and/or rebuilding working relationships. Flexibility and a willingness to listen and learn from all parties are essential for this type of work.

2. Cultural diversity and expectations must be respected. University representatives in particular need to be sensitive to styles of management and organizational community group expectations, for practical results from projects, and scheduling meetings and events when community partners can participate.

3. Taking as much time as necessary to communicate effectively and achieve consensus from all partners before decisions are made is essential and time well spent. Without that process, conflicts and misunderstandings interfere and make successful programs impossible.

University District Education Committee

The University District Education Committee (UDEC) is a collaboration of educators, parents, and citizens. It grew from the Collaborative’s recommendation to “strengthen the schools in the University Neighborhood” so that the university district becomes a neighborhood of choice. This partnership has been working since 1996 to improve the education of children and youth in the six elementary schools, two middle schools and five high schools that serve families living in the neighborhoods around the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University. Formed under the auspices of the University District Organization and the Campus Collaborative, UDEC is composed of principals and teacher representatives from the above 13 schools of the University District, and of representatives of Columbus Public Schools, the Columbus Education Association, Ohio State, and the University District neighborhoods.

In December 1997 four key principles and goals for UDEC’s work emerged from the committee’s discussions, two public forums, and a series of neighborhood potluck dinner meetings:

- Educational excellence and success in student performance,
- Community-based involvement and collaboration,
- Linking community resources through the schools, and
- Learning for a lifetime.

UDEC has become known as the Learning Bridge—a place where the university, the community, and the schools can enjoy in-depth discussion of issues and share insights. It connects the schools of the University District with statewide sources of ideas and funding to develop programs suited to the needs of the students and teachers.

UDEC has focused its efforts on specific issues related to its goals, namely technology, English as a Second Language (ESL), and internships. All areas identified by the UDEC schools as important to improving the quality of education for their students. UDEC and the Campus Collaborative have been able to identify resources at OSU and in the larger community to fund a community computer center, to assist with assessment and tuition of ESL students, to recruit tutors from OSU students, faculty, and staff for literacy initiatives, and to attract funding for the two major initiatives described below. UDEC is currently exploring ways to publicize the programs of the UDEC schools to the community through the studies of the UDEC schools described above (in the section on Seed Grants). These studies will provide recommendations for the direction UDEC’s work will take in the next five years.

Building a School-to-Work System: Walking the Walk

Addressing the concern of “community involvement and collaboration,” Ohio school-to-work grant activities were carefully conceptualized for consistency with the Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment initiative, and within the OSU College of Education’s School-to-Work Program. Grant activities brought together a diverse partnership of representatives from Columbus Public Schools, OSU and the City, and the Small Business Excel Program.

- • Intern provider planning guide
- • Intern provider planning guide
- • SCANS teacher externship logbook
- • K-12 school-to-work thematic curriculum units

The following year, 1998-99, Continuing to Walk the Walk was funded to build upon the foundation by emphasizing work-based learning. The
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Finally, 160 sophomores were brought to cam-
pus to visit with OSU faculty and staff to learn

about specific academic requirements of profes-
sional careers in the arts and humanities. Students

toured campus departments, attended undergradu-
courses, met with OSU admissions and finan-
cial aid representatives, and interacted with faculty

and staff members. Elementary teachers utilized the free Campus

Area Bus Service to bring their students for career

exploration. The list below demonstrates the teachers’ enthusiasm for visiting campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites Visited</th>
<th>Career Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU Police Station</td>
<td>law enforcement, criminal justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Union</td>
<td>hospitality, food services, business administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing and Food Services</td>
<td>food services, maintenance, housekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>purchasing, customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern Newspaper</td>
<td>journalism, publishing, printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprographics/ Print Shop</td>
<td>computers, printing, customer service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of these activities, from September 30, 1998 through September 30, 1999:

• 645 K-12 students participated in career experiences on the OSU campus.

• 88 University District Columbus Public School teachers and administrators worked to provide K-12 students with OSU career experiences.

• 103 OSU faculty/staff members agreed to serve as STW career hosts to University District students and schools.

• 7 STW teaching units were created and printed. Each grade appropriate teaching unit is correlated with the Columbus Public Schools teaching objectives. Additionally, each unit integrates STW, contextual teaching and the ITAC (Instructional Technology & Academic Computing) principles.

• 38 teachers and school administrators attended a professional development STW workshop on the OSU campus. This workshop provided teachers and administrators with STW information, teaching resources, and opportunities to involve their students in future STW activities on campus.

Urban Schools Initiative

Under the leadership of the College of Education at Ohio State University, four urban school districts, Columbus, Mansfield, Southwestern, and Springfield, have joined as partners with the Ohio Department of Education and the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation in a five–year project to study and improve urban education. Here in Columbus, OSU and the Columbus Public Schools agreed to work with the elementary and middle schools serving the University District. With a grant from the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation, the OSU/Urban Schools Initiative aims to promote much-needed research and develop training programs to support the work of teachers and educators in Central Ohio schools.

Local Needs, Statewide Issues

The issues facing the thirteen schools serving the University District are similar to those of other urban schools across the state. Thus, the OSU/USI partnership is an opportunity for University District schools in Columbus to join in a statewide effort to reform urban education. OSU/USI in Central Ohio builds on earlier work of the Ohio Department of Education’s Urban Schools Initiative. Since 1996, ODE has met regularly with representatives of Ohio’s twenty-one urban school districts to study common issues such as literacy, mobility, and community collaboration.

These urban school districts face enormous challenges to improve student performance: large student populations, higher concentrations of minority and special needs students, and a history of past economic and social barriers. In 1997, the statewide Urban Schools Initiative, with funding from the Jennings Foundation, produced a vision statement, Through the Eyes of Children, calling for systemic change in Ohio’s urban schools. While each of the University District schools must create its own continuous improvement plan, to guide its work at the building level, the vision statement Through the Eyes of Children gives depth and broader context to what each school defines as its agenda for change.

Tackling the Issues

In December 1998, with direction from the statewide USI project and Jennings, the OSU/USI staff interviewed administrators and educators in the four districts to identify areas of greatest need. Priorities with the strongest response included: student mobility, proficiency tests, curriculum alignment, teacher turnover, and the role of families and mentors in student learning. In March, 1999, OSU faculty in Columbus and Mansfield were encouraged to join the OSU/USI collaborative and to identify action research projects on these and related issues. From the start, the public schools accepted responsibility for defining and developing projects in their districts. In August, 1999, they began making decisions about the selection of proposals from OSU faculty and about which schools within the four districts to include. Overall, there was little difficulty in reaching agreement about areas of greatest need or where to locate the research.

In the first half year, the OSU/USI responded to the critical need for literacy programs, both in the short-term and the long-term. For example, the first OSU/USI project, a workshop held in Columbus on May 22, 1999, was designed for teachers who were to work with third grade stu-
dents in summer school. The program focused on reading and writing activities to help students pre-
pare for the fourth grade proficiency test. A sec-
ond project, addressing long-term needs, focused on training literacy teams, through five sessions held during the 1999-2000 school year. Both these projects included teachers from schools inside the University District. With a nationally recognized faculty in language and early childhood instruc-
tion, OSU met the challenge of getting these proj-
ects up quickly and effectively.

Context for Change

Six months into the project, the OSU/USI staff has begun to focus more sharply on the schools within the University District. The greatest chal-
lenge so far springs from the size of the Columbus school system and The Ohio State University. Nevertheless, each has discovered how to make innovative changes in their usual way of doing busi-
ness. For example, the OSU College of Education delegated decision making on faculty proposals to a steering committee with members from each of the four urban school districts. The Columbus Public Schools, for its part, was willing to focus
resources from USB on the University area schools as a subset within the larger CPS system. Since many of the schools in the University District had some of the lowest test scores citywide, concentrating resources here made sense, and the lessons learned here will benefit other urban schools in Columbus and elsewhere.

As the OSU/USB project moves into its second year, the Learning Bridge of UDEC offers hope and vision for the work ahead, and a way to tackle tough issues together.

Lessons Learned

1. There are resources available internal to the university and external, e.g. the Jennings Fund, to support serious education reform initiatives.

2. Having existing, on-going partnerships in place between universities, schools, and communities facilitates the process of securing additional resources for extending those partnerships.

3. Research projects and other training programs undertaken by university/school partnerships work best when the urban school districts define their needs/interests and when they are fully involved in the decision making of the partnership.

Concluding Remarks

During its five-year history, the Campus Collaborative at The Ohio State University worked to support the core values of the Campus Partners’ mission. We will continue in the work toward building a model of university/community relationships so that the University District will be a culturally and socio-economically diverse neighborhood of choice. Progress made and lessons learned are continually analyzed and as a result program, plans, and initiatives are adjusted and revamped. Each step taken affirms the Collaborative foundational concept: The university has a responsibility to support the community and learn from and build on community assets; it cannot support the community without supporting schools and families; and university support, if it is to be effective, must be collaborative.

Notes
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As a new century dawns, a growing number of universities are revisiting the land grant ideal. This part of their planning takes them “back to the future.” All seek increasing community involvement, often through service learning initiatives. A few universities, notably ones supported by the Kellogg Foundation, are not merely going back to the future by revisiting the land grant ideal. They are pioneering new approaches to community engagement. Indeed, some call themselves “engaged universities.”

How does community involvement differ from engagement? Are engaged universities any different from those that are involved? Or, is engagement merely a new label for customary kinds of involvement? What kinds of involvement and engagement activities should universities prioritize? How might involvement pave the way for engagement? Questions like these highlight needs for a working vocabulary, one that identifies alternatives and facilitates strategic planning. This paper has been structured in response to these needs.

Community involvement and engagement are defined, and their differences are identified. Planning alternatives are defined briefly. Their relationships and differences are also identified. For example, some of these alternatives are associated with the arts and sciences disciplines. Others are associated with the professional schools and colleges. Some are associated with both. In other words, these alternatives are not mutually exclusive, and all analyses need to guard against dichotomous thinking. Planning alternatives should be viewed on a continuum, which has involvement at one end and engagement at the other. “An involvement alternative” may pave the way for community engagement, and vice versa.

Three limitations must be acknowledged at the outset. First, all strategic planning frameworks and working vocabularies are normative. That is, they are value-committed, not value-neutral or free. Value frameworks need to be made explicit and then assessed against the character, aspirations, and accountability structures of each university.

Second, planning frameworks and vocabularies are limited in two senses. It is impossible to envision every possibility for involvement and engagement. Moreover, there is growing diversity among universities in the programs they offer and the faculty they support. State and local contexts also weigh heavily in strategic planning, suggesting that some involvement and engagement alternatives will be more appropriate for some universities than for others. One size does not fit all.
The third caution: All planning frameworks and working vocabularies are selective. They emphasize some priorities, external constituencies, societal needs, and internal university constituencies more than others. This selectivity brings an obligation, an invitation, and an opportunity. Analysts are obliged to identify their preferences and priorities.

For example, in the ensuing analysis academic administrators and university faculty are the primary audience. Selected professional schools, colleges, and departments may not be prioritized—namely, the helping fields of education, social work, health, juvenile justice, the individual, child, and family services fields (e.g., family and consumer sciences, clinical psychology), and public administration and policy. This selectivity serves as an invitation for other planning frameworks and vocabularies. Presented with these alternatives, leaders have the opportunity to make informed choices and good decisions, which allow them to build on the strengths and aspirations of their university and respond to local contexts, priorities, and needs.

**Contrasting Involvement and Engagement**

Although involvement and engagement are related, they offer different alternatives. A clear distinction needs to be made, mindful that any such distinction reflects the values of the person offering it. Because this distinction frames the ensuing analysis, it needs to be introduced at the outset so that readers can evaluate it.

Involvement describes the voluntary, extramural activities of academic administrators, faculty, and students as individuals and groups. The degree and kind of involvement varies because the interests and commitments of individuals and groups also vary. In other words, involvement is optional. It entails adding new activities and programs, and involvement activities often occur at the margins. They are called special projects, and they may depend on grants and contracts. They may not be sustainable. Typically they lack “sticking power” and “staying power.”

To be sure, involvement activities may be innovative, as they last as long as individuals’ and groups’ interests and commitments are maintained. For example, special courses and community experiences are added, but little structural and cultural change occurs in departments, schools, and colleges. The university’s mission does not change. Nor does the dominant faculty career pattern change. It remains individualistic, perhaps altruistic or entrepreneurial, in a laissez-faire university environment.

In brief, the “real university” does not change (Lawson, 1999b). That is, there are no visible changes in its missions, fundamental structures, cultures, accountabilities, reward systems, roles, and responsibilities. Simply stated, community involvement activities and programs are things universities might do.

In contrast, community engagement is a social responsibility. It is something the university must do. Engagement is selective and strategic. It focuses on resource allocation and strategic planning. It reaffirms and strengthens the essential responsibilities of universities for knowledge-related work and the preparation of knowledge workers. Because universities have finite resources and limited capacities, their engagement priorities must be selected carefully and strategically. Engaged universities seek to advantage themselves at the same time that they respond to important needs and challenges.

For example, the needs of vulnerable children, families, and their neighborhood communities are an important engagement priority. They are vulnerable, in part, because they experience multiple, co-occurring needs associated with poverty and its close companions (e.g., geographic isolation, social marginalization, learned hopelessness), along with racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity. They are vulnerable for another reason—namely, local universities may not have made firm commitments to their improvement.

New century, engaged universities will form firm, sustainable partnerships with school communities to demonstrate change in them and to enhance school communities. Engaged universities are responsive to local leadership, and they know the limits of their influence, power, and authority. In other words, these demonstration sites are not universal; multiple university colonies because leaders in vulnerable communities and engaged universities alike know the limitations of colonialism. Enlightened self-interest on both sides propels the engagement agenda and engagement-related innovations. Suggesting that this discussion also should start with them. There are four involvement alternatives, and each may lead to engagement. These are: Service learning; outreach research and scholarship; interprofessional education and training programs; and, interdisciplinary research and scholarship.

**Service Learning**

Service learning is commonplace in public secondary schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities. The literature on service learning is growing (e.g., Astin, 1999; Harkavy & Benson, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1999). It provides a comprehensive rationale and documentation of the institutional and personal benefits that may accompany it.

Typically, service learning is described as a form of citizenship education. Its premise is that students learn while serving and serve while learning. Experience is both learning process and content, and students learn how to reflect on it to gain educational benefits. They reflect on its meaning, purpose, and value, considering how their identities and commitments may change as a result of their experience. In higher education, service learning typically is an undergraduate experience, and it is organized in two ways.

1. Undergraduate students elect a specialized service learning course and receive academic credit for their volunteer work. Typically students work with a special population (e.g., children and youth; the elderly; the mentally ill), or they work on a special project (e.g., addressing environmental problems, facilitating voter registration and participation, promoting historical preservation). Supervision may be provided by a faculty member, or it may be provided by a student affairs professional who is employed to develop and supervise service learning experiences. A seminar often accompanies the service learning experience. There is no final examination because the educational experience is self-justifying. Students must satisfy attendance and involvement requirements, and they usually are required to keep a personal journal. They record their impressions, experiences, learning, and development. They learn how to reflect on their experience, often in concert with other students. Limits tend to be imposed on the number of service learning credits students may apply toward graduation requirements.
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- They bring their knowledge and knowledge work to bear on important problems related with human well-being and social welfare. They will renew, reform, and transform themselves in concert with practice innovations in local school communities.
- In brief, engagement changes the missions of the university (Holland, 1999; National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1999), along with some of its organizational structures, faculty and student cultures, core programs, reward systems, roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities. Engaged universities are thus unique in some fundamental ways.
- However, engaged universities are not wholly transformed. They retain important traditions, especially ones associated with the arts, sciences, and humanities. For example, the “ivy tower” image, which depends on social distancing and academic freedom, should not be lost as engaged universities are created. Faculty and students must be free to inquire, criticize, and imagine apart from vocational requirements and practical necessity. Their freedom to choose, including the decision as to whether they wish to contribute to the engagement agenda, remains paramount. In fact, engaged universities will succeed to the extent that academic administrators, faculty, and students make firm, voluntary commitments to this part of the university’s strategic planning agenda. Only then will this agenda have sticking power and staying power. Only then will the university’s strategic planning agenda be an inclusive one. The tension between these two images—the engaged university and the university-as-ivy tower—is a healthy one. It animates dialogue and action planning around the need to strike an appropriate and effective balance.

Thus, engaged universities make strategic, selective changes in their priorities. They provide new opportunities and resources, structures and pathways for faculty and students. Said another way, they develop an infrastructure for engagement-related priorities, programs, organizational structures, and cultures (Walshok, 1999).

**Community Involvement Alternatives**

Some engaged universities have started with involvement activities, suggesting that this discussion also should start with them. There are four involvement alternatives, and each may lead to engagement. These are: Service learning; outreach research and scholarship; interdisciplinary research and scholarship; and, interprofessional education and training programs.
Community involvement and engagement. There is a "catch-all" descriptor for many different kinds of resource challenges grow, these twin issues gain economic resources for service learning? As growth and, in turn, to the allocation of limited resources? The first issue is, what is unique and appropriate of service learning in public secondary schools. The first issue derives from the increasing use of academic affairs, improving the quality and impact of service learning provides a timely and powerful way to integrate academic affairs and student learning. For example, students in a mathe- matics course may tutor children and youth. Students in a psychology course apply their knowledge to meet a personal, family, or com- munity need. In both cases, students acquire more understanding of the subject matter (math, psychology) through service. They also demonstrate enhanced experiences and job readiness competencies. Customary stu- dents complete a special paper or keep a jour- nal. An examination is not required, nor do exams for the course address the service learning experience.

Both ways to organize service learning are effective. They also can be combined. Ideally, service learning provides a timely and powerful way to integrate academic affairs and student affairs, improving the quality and impact of undergraduate education. On the other hand, serv- ice learning’s growth and success give rise to two issues and important need.

The first issue derives from the increasing use of service learning in public secondary schools. The first issue is, what is unique and appropriate about service learning in higher education? The second, related issue is, what are the limits to growth and, in turn, to the allocation of limited economic resources for service learning? As resource challenges grow, these twin issues gain importance and are an important need. Unfortunately, service learning has become a “catch-all” descriptor for many different kinds of community involvement and engagement. There is need for more precise descriptors for these other, important kinds of engagement and involve- ment. Together these descriptors comprise the foundation for an improved planning vocabulary. This vocabulary may guide decision-making, resource allocations, and evaluations of the ben- efits to the students, the university and society.

Outreach research and scholarship is an essential component in this improved working vocabulary.

Outreach Research and Scholarship

Outreach research and scholarship, like the idea of “outreach universities,” can be traced to the land grant ideal for American universities. These concepts are regaining popularity, thanks to the work of Richard Lerner and Lou Anna Simon (Lerner, 1995; Lerner & Simon, 1998).

Outreach research and scholarship is different from basic research and applied research. Both basic and applied research are conducted in con- trolled, safe environments provided by university laboratories, libraries, and offices. With outreach research and scholarship, scholars move from university environments to extramural environments. These extramural environments demonstrate high levels of individual, family, and societal need.

Two popular examples are the needs of “at risk” youth and the needs of vulnerable families manifesting multiple, co-occurring needs (e.g., Lawson, 1997; Lerner, 1995). In order for these needs to be met and addressed, collaboration needs to be solved, new knowledge and understanding are required. Outreach research and scholarship is designed to provide this new knowledge and understanding. University faculty and students locate themselves strategically to gain it. They then make genuine contributions to meeting today’s needs and solving problems.

Like the original vision for agriculture in the original land institutions, research, development, diffusion, and dissemination models help placements, place- ments where collaboration is being practiced.

For example, interdisciplinary programs often provide the liberal education base for both under- graduate and graduate programs. Upon closer inspection, however, the two kinds of programs are different, but complementary. Interdisciplinary programs typically involve bridge-building practices across the arts and sciences disciplines, while involve fields known as “the ologies” (e.g., Klein, 1996). Basic knowledge and understanding gained through boundary spanning and relationship- building is the goal.

By contrast, IPET programs are action-orien- teed. They are tailored specifically for people who want to make a living by working with people and their communities, striving to improve individual, family, organizational, and community well-being. The land grant ideal for American universities and their faculty and leaders in their surrounding communities. Unfortunately, it may be associated with “kiss and run scholarship,” i.e., once the individual researchers get their data and write their publications, local community leaders and practitioners may never see them, or hear from them again.

When individuals and groups volunteer, or are commissioned, outreach research and scholarship is a form of involvement. When outreach schol- arship is embedded in a firm community partner- ship agenda, it is a form of engagement. Initial involvement can lead to permanent engagement; indeed the two can co-exist. Involvement in some settings by faculty in one or more disciplines may be carried out by faculty engagement in other set- tings by faculty and students in other disciplines.

Interprofessional Education and Training

Interprofessional education and training pro- grams (IPET) are structured to prepare helping professionals (e.g., social workers, educators, nurses) to collaborate effectively. Collaboration may occur at several related levels: Among pro- fessionals (interprofessional collaboration); among professionals and families in need (fam- ily-centered, or family-led collaboration); and, among professionals and all residents of a local neighborhood community (community collabora- tion). IPET programs and courses are structured to facilitate one or more kinds of collaboration. Typically, these programs and courses involve clinical instructors and field placements, place- ments where collaboration is being practiced.

Expert practitioners may serve as faculty associ- ates. Where involvement is concerned, the rela- tionships between practitioners and faculty are voluntary.

Although a growing number of academic administrators, faculty, students, and practitioners suggest that IPET programs are essential and help define best practices, and as many as eighty col- leges and universities are involved in some form of IPET, the fact remains that these programs presently tend to operate at the margins. They are voluntary. They tend to be grant-dependent. They often are called projects. And, they do not change “real university.”

IPET programs are sometimes called inter- disciplinary programs. Upon closer inspection, however, the two kinds of programs are different, but complementary. Interdisciplinary programs typically involve bridge-building practices across the arts and sciences disciplines, while involve fields known as “the ologies” (e.g., Klein, 1996). Basic knowledge and understanding gained through boundary spanning and relationship- building is the goal.

For example, interdisciplinary programs often provide the liberal education base for both under- graduate and graduate programs. Upon closer inspection, however, the two kinds of programs are different, but complementary. Interdisciplinary programs typically involve bridge-building practices across the arts and sciences disciplines, while involve fields known as “the ologies” (e.g., Klein, 1996). Basic knowledge and understanding gained through boundary spanning and relationship- building is the goal.

By contrast, IPET programs are action-orien- teed. They are tailored specifically for people who want to make a living by working with people and their communities, striving to improve individual, family, organizational, and community well-being. The land grant ideal for American universities and their faculty and leaders in their surrounding communities. Unfortunately, it may be associated with “kiss and run scholarship,” i.e., once the individual researchers get their data and write their publications, local community leaders and practitioners may never see them, or hear from them again.

When individuals and groups volunteer, or are commissioned, outreach research and scholarship is a form of involvement. When outreach schol- arship is embedded in a firm community partner- ship agenda, it is a form of engagement. Initial involvement can lead to permanent engagement; indeed the two can co-exist. Involvement in some settings by faculty in one or more disciplines may be carried out by faculty engagement in other set- tings by faculty and students in other disciplines.
Are interprofessional education and training (IPET) programs developed in concert with permanent community practice demonstration sites? If so, are these university-community partnership initiatives viewed as central to the missions of the university? Is there a central organizing center or institute that mediates partnerships and helps mobilize and deploy faculty, practitioners in the field, and students? Are IPET programs special projects that depend on grants and contracts? Or, are they viewed as best practices, which need to be institutionalized? Are IPET programs offered to undergraduate students? To graduate students? Where undergraduate students are concerned, have connections been made with the liberal or general education program? What is the balance between conventional professional specialization and interprofessional competence in IPET programs? Are students prepared for entry level competence, leadership, or both? How will department chairs, deans and directors, and the Vice President account for faculty time in IPET programs? How are their duties in home departments covered? Who receives credit for the student credit hours that are generated? Why? Is this formula satisfactory to all relevant stakeholders? When interdisciplinary teams of faculty secure grants and contracts, how are the indirect costs distributed? Does faculty involvement in IPET programs and community partnerships “pay off” in retention, promotion, tenure, and merit salary reviews? If so, what accommodations were made in faculty evaluation systems? If not, what changes are needed? How, and by whom, are IPET programs evaluated? How are the findings fed back and forward in the planning process?

**From Involvement to Engagement**

It is one thing to claim that community engagement is a social responsibility. It is quite another to determine the parameters of social responsibility and their implications for engagement. The question is, How should planners weigh their social responsibilities and determine their engagement priorities? Planning dialogue focused on this question helps make the choices explicit. In turn, these choices embody different priorities, and they involve value conflicts.

Derek Bok, the former president of Harvard University, provided a useful frame of reference. He cautioned against rushing into engagement activities absent a well-conceived agenda and appropriate supports and mobilization activities. He raised three important assessment questions, and implications for practice can be derived from them (e.g., Lawson, 1997).

1. How important is the social need and how likely is it that the university will succeed in doing something about it?

   **Guideline:** Avoid undertaking tasks that other organizations can perform equally well. Accept responsibilities for work that requires the special features that set universities apart—its inquiry-minded faculty (often without practical experience) and its ambitious, idealist students.

2. Will the requested actions interfere with the freedom of individual professors and students, especially with their freedom to form their own beliefs and express their own opinions?

   **Guideline:** Ensure that every activity undertaken enhances the university’s teaching, research and scholarship, and service functions.

3. What new burdens (e.g., resources, time, loss of autonomy) will the desired initiative have on the institution as a whole?

   **Guideline:** Do not embark upon a new project—even those with large sums of outside funding—without first making certain that this project commands the enthusiasm and support of faculty members because, without widespread faculty involvement, support, and ownership, these initiatives are destined to fail. (Bok, 1982, pp. 77-79).

Bok’s three questions, accompanying criteria, and overall perspective provide an important frame for planning dialogue about engagement priorities. Identifiable values and priorities for the university are embedded in these questions and criteria. The same values and priorities are implicit in the discussion that follows.

**First and Second Generation University-Community Partnerships**

First and foremost, engagement is marked by two generations of permanent partnerships between the university helping fields such as education, health, and social work and school-community demonstration sites. This “generational metaphor” and accompanying language for...
partnerships were first developed by Katharine Brier-Lawson and Hal Lawson (Brier-Briar & Lawson, 1994; Lawson & Brier-Briar, 1996). They have used them to promote new kinds of collaboration in conjunction with permanent demonstration sites. These school-community demonstration sites integrate and promote knowledge development, education and training, practice innovations, and community development. They facilitate mutually-beneficial learning and development.

First generation partnerships are field-specific. For example, education departments, colleges and schools form partnerships with selected public schools (called professional development schools and partner schools). Or, schools, colleges, and departments of social work form partnerships with public sector child welfare agencies. Nursing units in universities form partnerships with selected hospitals or community health settings in which students learn to practice. These first generation partnerships are evident on virtually every university campus. Typically best practice sites or platforms are the ones selected for partnership. Often the challenge is framed as applying and evaluating existing knowledge, technologies, and skill. Outreach research and scholarship may also be harbored in these partnerships.

Second generation partnerships involve two interacting and related kinds of collaboration: (1) Collaboration among schools, health and social service agencies, neighborhoods, organizations, governments, and the private sector in local communities; and (2) Collaboration among the academic and helping disciplines in the university. Second generation partnerships are, in other words, interdisciplinary and interprofessional development sites. Collaboration in the university mirrors, responds to, and helps guide collaboration in communities; and vice versa. University leaders create supportive infrastructures for mutual learning, knowledge development, and improvement.

Needs for second generation partnerships are especially evident in high poverty communities. These communities and their residents manifest co-occurring needs and problems. Their social geography is somewhat unique, and a new, social geography of helping and support is needed (e.g., Curtis & Jones, 1998; Sampson & Morenoff, 1997). Figure 2 below presents a worst case scenario, unfortunately one that derives from studies of neighborhood communities in the nation’s cities. A superficial examination of this figure yields an obvious conclusion. No one profession or organization can address them alone, in isolation from others. For example, public schools cannot succeed absent stronger families, community agencies, helping professions, neighborhood organizations, and economic-occupational development structures. Schools depend on these organizations and structures, just as the others depend on schools. All depend on the university, just as the university’s interests and welfare hinge on their improvement.

In brief, engaged universities develop second generation partnerships because of enlightened self-interest. A rationale follows. First, universitites are involved in articulation projects with community colleges, public schools and pre-schools (e.g., P-16 access and opportunity initiatives). Universities have clear political mandates for these projects. For example, as understanding of the workforce requirements associated with the global economy grows, and as the social demography of the United States changes, other clear mandates have developed. Universities are expected to contribute to the development of (a) a (higher) educated workforce, and reflecting the changing demographic landscape, to recruit and educate a culturally-diverse workforce. This rationale accompanies the human capital argument, which justifies economic investment in education, health care, and family supports. A relaxed platform in this plan of mandates is growing awareness of the social, economic, and political costs associated with lack of higher education access and opportunity pathways for culturally diverse citizens challenged by poverty. In short, these articulations among public schools, community colleges, and universities to improve educational access and opportunity will not be wholly effective absent these second generation partnerships.

Having sketched the rationale, questions that implicate values, priorities, and resources enter the picture. Will university leaders care about these vulnerable school communities? Even if they care, will they mobilize engagement-related actions? Do they have faculty, students, and academic administrators who are committed to this work? Do the people face the challenges? What are the consequences of not becoming engaged in these vulnerable communities? Reminders of Bok’s (1982) perspective, these four questions are pivotal for leaders of universities that aspire to become engaged. It is essential that all university stakeholders recognize that the challenges in high poverty school communities, especially multi-cultural communities. Alike in some ways and similar in others, these communities nevertheless differ from predominantly Caucasian, well-to-do communities. For example, many of today’s P-16 articulation projects in these well-to-do communities require only school first generation partnerships between public schools and university education units. By contrast, in vulnerable communities, public schools cannot begin to meet the challenges of poverty alone.

Most first public schools in high poverty, vulnerable communities are in crisis because, absent concerted and coordinated efforts, they are forced to address children’s co-occurring needs alone. They also are in trouble because they continue to be viewed—and may view themselves—as stand-alone institutions concerned only with academic achievement. And, they are in trouble because university leaders have selected for their “best practice sites” professional development, or partner schools in high poverty, Caucasian communities (Lawson, 1996b).

Unfortunately, the net effect is that children, youth, and adults in these school communities are denied educational access pathways and opportunity structures. By not engaging in these school communities, universities add to their sense of social and economic isolation and marginalization. No one benefits, least of all children and youth (future university students and professors). Grand articulation plans designed to improve human capital, which are so important to public universities and to their constituencies, continue to fall short of their potential. Second, social, political, and economic costly hardships.

There is, then, a compelling rationale for engagement through second generation partnerships. They allow vulnerable schools to succeed. As the first cohort of schools succeed, leaders from others imitate them and draw their success formulas. As these schools-in-crisis are helped to succeed, improved higher education access and opportunities are provided for children, youth, and other vulnerable students. Diversity increases in the university’s student body. The educational experience of all students is enriched as a consequence.

In short, this engagement agenda promotes interdependent relationships. Engaged universities committed to equitable access, opportunity, and social justice depend on the development of success formulas in vulnerable school communities.
ties. At the same time, the aspirations, hopes, and dreams of people in these communities depend on university engagements. The university gains multiple benefits through the knowledge it gains by virtue of its engagement. Benefits multiply as success stories spread. Through education and training, research, and scholarship, and the placement of their graduates, engaged universities facilitate social contagion effects, whereby good news travels quickly to other sites through formal and informal communication channels.

In contrast to first generation partnerships, in these second generation sites the challenge is not just to apply existing knowledge, technologies, and skill. Existing knowledge is limited. Best practices need to be invented and evaluated, and university faculty and students are on site to learn alongside others who work there. To revisit Bok's (1982) perspective: Engagement is warranted because the priorities are significant and because university knowledge and workers are essential.

Engaged universities create supportive infrastructures for this kind of work involving second generation partnerships. For example, a special university center usually must be created to facilitate these second generation university-community partnerships, IPET programs, and interdisciplinary research and scholarship. The three most common names are: The Center for Collaboration for Children; the Center for School-Family-Community Partnerships; and, The Center for Prevention Research and Development (or simply, the Prevention Center).

Engaged universities may have both first and second generation partnerships. They may co-exist, just as specialized professional education programs co-exist with IPET programs. Both kinds of partnerships are by cemented by awareness of the university and school-community interdependency and self-interest. For example, consider what happens when university preparation programs are changed, and school-community practices remain the same. When university professors enter school-community practice settings their new knowledge, values, sensitivities, and skills will not be accommodated. In fact, experience in these settings may “wash out” the effects of university preparation. When school community practice settings change and university preparation programs do not, every new graduate recruited to work in these settings must be re-trained.

This interdependence compels engagement. Knowledge must be developed at the same time that education and training and practice proceed. Second generation partnerships thus are practice innovation centers.

Once this knowledge work is prioritized, other priorities emerge. For example, it becomes evident that both generations of partnerships involve issues regarding how faculty spend their time, the expected products, and the meaning of productivity, especially the extent to which participation in these learning partnerships will facilitate promotion, tenure, and retention candidacies for faculty. Both generations of partnerships thus necessitate changes in “real university.” They require a supportive infrastructure.

Second generation partnerships also implicate the missions, structures, and cultures of the university. They require firm resource commitments on the parts of the Chancellor or President, the Provost, other Vice-Presidents, Deans, and Department Chairs. Because the Presidents’, Provosts’ and other top leaders’ terms of service in the same university may be limited, strategic planning for engaged universities must be participatory, eliciting their research and scholarship, university constituency and ensuring that, when a president or provost retires or leaves, the engagement university ideal is sustainable. Academically-based community scholarship and its forerunner, academically-based community service, are key concepts in the working vocabulary for these engaged universities.

Academi- cally-based Community Service

Academically-based community service was developed by Lee Benson and Ira Harkavy (Benson & Harkavy, 1994) at the University of Pennsylvania. It builds on service learning, but it also extends it. It is premised in John Dewey’s ideas about powerful learning in, and through, experience; and about education for democracy. Academically-based community service may involve undergraduate as well as graduate students. The logic is as follows:

Professors move their courses and seminars into permanent community schools, which serve as demonstration sites and hubs of community development. Professors adapt their roles, the course content, and the teaching-learning process to local characteristics and needs. In other words, professors join students in serving while learning and leading while serving. Academically-based community service animates the idea of a community school because it may benefit a diverse group of community residents, especially children and youth in the school.

For example, a cultural anthropology class may be offered in a local community school. This course may address the diverse cultures in the local community, and it also may address needs for multi-cultural understanding. Students serve local residents as well as children in the school. Service style may be “tacked on” to the course experience or they may be embedded in it. Faculty learn and work alongside the students. Some faculty may complete research and scholarship in the local setting. Indeed, for some faculty, academically-based community service is a vehicle for faculty development. It invites faculty from every discipline, especially arts and sciences disciplines, to respond to local needs while, at the same time, enhancing student learning and development. It offers exciting opportunities for faculty to integrate teaching-learning and community service, perhaps encouraging new directions and opportunities for faculty and scholars from every discipline. For example, arts and sciences faculty may become interested in outreach research and scholarship as a result of their academically-based community service. "Professional Community Service"

Academically-based community scholarship was developed by Hal Lawson (1997; 1998). It builds on the rationale for academically-based community service. This rationale is enriched and applied to the social responsibilities and engagement activities of the professional schools and colleges. Like academically-based community service, it is offered to both undergraduates and graduate students, and it involves moving faculty, students, courses and seminars into community settings. Academically-based community service knowledge generated in, and through prac-
tice, and institutionalized, scientific and scholarly, professional knowledge. Academically-based community scholarship thus describes the relationship between local knowledge generation and integration, practice, and institutionalized, scientific and scholarly, professional knowledge. Said another way, academically-based community scholarship describes a key knowledge interface, including how it informs and guides the other. Figure 3 (next page) depicts this interface.11

1. It is concept that is developed fields and programs that prepare helping profession-
als (e.g., education, social work, nursing, family studies, clinical psychology). It is applicable to profession-specific education and training as well as to interprofessional education and training.

2. It is premised in both individual and social learning theories regarding how helping professionals best learn how to practice, especially through apprenticeships in prac-
tice settings and involving action learning and forms of action research. It accommodates the action research of individuals; collaborative action research and participatory action research involving teams; and within- and cross-site lesson learning for model development and policy change (e.g., Rose; 1993; Lawson; 19990).

3. It also is premised in a particular view of the relationship between knowledge and practice, including the relationship between university scientists and scholars and community practitioners and residents. In other words, it embodies and promotes an epistemology of practice. In this episte-

4. With academically-based community scholarship, learning and development are facilitated at the same time that knowledge is generated and used. Above all, local practice knowledge is weighed against institutionalized, scientific and scholarly, professional knowledge. Academically-based community scholarship thus describes the relationship between local knowledge generation and integration, practice, and institutionalized, scientific and scholarly, professional knowledge. Said another way, academically-based commu-

5. Academically-based community scholar-
ship also unites and integrates teaching-learning, research and scholarship, and professional community service. Faculty and students move into these community set-
tings. These settings provide learning and development in academic disciplines, research, and practice innovation development.
6. With academically-based community scholarship, publications are expected. Collaborative action research and participatory action research involving students, faculty, and practitioners are commonplace. Joint publications, involving varying combinations of authors, result. Experienced practitioners join university faculty as professional educators and as practice scholars. Knowledge for practice and professional education derives immediately from practice. It is both global and local, responding to local contexts and cultural diversity.

7. Academically-based community scholarship is a vehicle for both generations of partnerships. These partnerships demonstrate sites for the helping professions, the equivalent of the research and development parks scientific disciplines enjoy in their partner schools and colleges. Engagement that develops occupational and educational ladders for under-represented and culturally diverse populations. In doing so, this kind of engagement also improves access and opportunity to higher education for under-served and represented populations.

Furthermore, university faculty for the professional schools and colleges tend to be recruited from the ranks of practicing professionals. Engagement that develops occupational and educational ladders is, in this light, a long-term strategy for diversifying faculty in the professional schools and colleges.

Thus, academically-based community scholarship in second generation partnership sites enables the helping professions and, in turn, their engaged universities respond to local needs; improve research, scholarship, and professional education; help diversify the helping fields; assist vulnerable people by improving practices in local settings; and honor their social responsibilities. Engagement promotes their enlightened self-interest because of the new recruits it attracts and the tangible benefits it provides.

**Toward Engaged Universities**

Engaged universities honor their social responsibilities when they develop second generation partnership sites that incorporate the entire involvement and engagement continuum. Faculty, students, and staff unite teaching-learning, research-scholarship, and service in these sites. Their knowledge missions and activities are central and essential. The application of existing knowledge and skills is essential, but by itself insufficient. New knowledge, skills, and technologies are needed. Both theoretical and practical challenges are evident. For example, multi-level collaboration is required. School reform, youth development, family support, community economic and social development, articulations with higher education institutions, and other improvement initiatives must be synchronized and integrated. These second generation partnerships embody, develop, and evaluate complex change. Symbiotic relationships develop between these second generation partnership sites and universities. Site-based leadership is essential, and empowerment strategies are commonplace. Local leaders, vulnerable children and families, and their school communities are not in a supplicant role. Nor are these sites university colonies. Faculty and students perform academically-based community service and scholarship in these sites because they provide invaluable, incomparable, and unique opportunities for doing good work, promoting policy and practice innovations, and gaining knowledge and understanding about them.

To summarize: Engagement is reserved for universities that meet the following requirements:

- These universities have formal missions regarding engagement, their strategic plan provides implementation and evaluation pathways, and their publications for external constituencies and prospective faculty and students emphasize their engagement agendas.
- They have created formal organizational structures (e.g., new centers, institutes, departments, schools and colleges, programs) for the expressed purpose of engagement in communities.
- They have established permanent, sustainable community partnership demonstration sites.
and scholarship, engaged universities also respond to their interdependence with urgent political priorities. Funding category, yet another priority among others, treat the universities as just another competing interest. Politicians and policy analysts could respond to external mandates, political realities, ceding analysis, send a clear, important message to university are not resources taken away from some benefit because their engagement initiatives serve the specific benefits identified earlier, universities themselves at the same time they serve others. Beyond interest.

Forms of involvement to become engaged universities in other words, permanent partnerships with are serious about the engagement agenda, and find structures. If university presidents and provosts are serious about the engagement agenda, and find only resistance in conventional units, then one of their choices is to create alternative units, starting to transform their universities in the process.12

Universities aspiring to become engaged universities will promote and support second generation partnerships that harbor the entire involve-ment-engagement continuum: Academically-based community service and scholarship; interprofessional education and training; interdisciplinary education; interdisciplinary research; outreach research and scholarship; and, service. Many will start with involvement. With time, experience, and success, they then will use forms of involvement to become engaged universities. The planning continuum and working vocabulary provided here may help them achieve their aspirations, focusing on enlightened self-interest.

Clearly, engaged universities advantage them-selves at the same time they serve others. Beyond the specific benefits identified earlier, universities benefit because their engagement initiatives serve as important social marketing and development efforts. Engaged universities, as defined in the pre- ceding analysis, send a clear, important message to their diverse constituencies, a message that responds to external mandates, political realities, and their social and disciplinary quality, including their centrality in society, makes engagement an important evaluation property. In fact, its prestige-enhancing and -expanding prop-erties make engagement an important evaluation category. Engagement indices can be added to the evaluative criteria for assessing faculty, program, and disciplinary quality, including their centrality to the university’s engagement mission, goals, and aspirations.

Engaged universities are new century institu-tions, which respond to the growing complexity, shifting priorities and multiplying needs of their times. Because engagement helps restore the public trust, stimulate external controls of teaching loads, trigger other external account-ability requirements, and reduce public funding supports. Academically-based activities in second generation partnership sites help counteract the “profscam” image. Faculty and student activities portray different, more accurate, and flattening images of university faculty as researchers, schol-ars, and teachers as a result of their face-to-face interactions with students and community resi-dents. Faculty and student work is public and vis-ible; it is open to inspection and evaluation. Their expertise is viewed as a significant community asset, a public good.

This engagement also staves off ill-conceived plans that substitute technology for faculty. Their merits notwithstanding, distance learning, computer-assisted technologies, and “canned” courses and curriculum packages will not substitute for the integrated, complex, powerful learning and devel-opment experiences that accompany academically-based community service and scholarship.

Finally, engagement does not compete with traditional ideas and criteria for a prestigious university. It enriches and extends them. In other words, since prestige, like beauty, often lies in the eyes of the beholder, engagement activities that expand the number and kind of “belongers” and the criteria for “beauty” benefit the university. In fact, its prestige-enhancing and -expanding prop-erties make engagement an important evaluation category. Engagement indices can be added to the evaluative criteria for assessing faculty, program, and disciplinary quality, including their centrality to the university’s engagement mission, goals, and aspirations.
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Abstract

Building on the framework of a developing partnership between Virginia Commonwealth University and its adjacent neighbor, the Carver community, a group of university faculty have developed and implemented an interdisciplinary training experience for professional students in nursing, social work, and child clinical psychology. The Carver Health Project works to provide access to and support for a range of health services including screening and assessment, care coordination and follow-up to the children and families served by Carver School, a large inner-city elementary school. The project is designed to offer students and faculty the opportunity for interdisciplinary service provision and care coordination and training. Lessons from the first two years of the training experience are presented.
Children and families in many urban communities face considerable challenges accessing adequate health and social service resources. Fractured and unitary service delivery models require families to negotiate multiple systems and settings to access basic medical, dental, mental health, and other human service needs. Integrated service delivery models are being increasingly proposed as a remedy to this problem; however, current professional training models have not generally been revised, augmented or coordinated to provide medical and other human service students with training experiences to work effectively and efficiently in an integrated service setting. Training programs that do not address integrated service delivery models may continue to reinforce disciplinary boundaries and support professional isolation. Consequently, continuing these delivery models will present resource-limited families with considerable difficulty. Relatedly, faculty within human service fields may also have limited experience and knowledge in supporting professional students to work effectively across disciplinary boundaries.

While health and human service provision is moving toward the models of consultation. If health and human service communities face considerable challenges accessing adequate health and social service resources. Fractured and unitary service delivery models require families to negotiate multiple systems and settings to access basic medical, dental, mental health, and other human service needs. Integrated service delivery models are being increasingly proposed as a remedy to this problem; however, current professional training models have not generally been revised, augmented or coordinated to provide medical and other human service students with training experiences to work effectively and efficiently in an integrated service setting. Training programs that do not address integrated service delivery models may continue to reinforce disciplinary boundaries and support professional isolation. Consequently, continuing these delivery models will present resource-limited families with considerable difficulty. Relatedly, faculty within human service fields may also have limited experience and knowledge in supporting professional students to work effectively across disciplinary boundaries.

The current paper presents the example of a professional interdisciplinary training experience involving the Schools of Nursing, Social Work and Dentistry and the Doctoral Training Program in Child Clinical Psychology at Virginia Commonwealth University. The Carver Health Project is an interdisciplinary training in which teams of faculty and students work to improve the health and well-being of an urban community which neighbors VCU, the Carver community. This interdisciplinary training experience developed out of a broader university-community collaboration between the Carver Community and Virginia Commonwealth University. We will begin by setting the context of the project by providing some background on the Carver-VCU Partnership, including a description of the Carver community and the Carver Health Project. In addition, we will share lessons we have learned from this experience.

**Background**

During the summer of 1996, Ms. Barbara Abernathy, President of the Carver Area Civic Improvement League (CACIL), and Dr. Eugene Trani, President of Virginia Commonwealth University, pledged to create a partnership between the Carver community and the university that would pursue the goal of creating a safe and nurturing community for every resident. This goal works, and studies in the area. Dr. Trani stated that, “it is critical that we build partnerships, not fences, between the University and our neighbors.” Rather than viewing the shared physical boundary between VCU and Carver as a dividing line between an academic community and an inner-city neighborhood, they agreed that a collaboration could be established that would have far reaching positive outcomes for the neighborhood, the University and the City of Richmond. For VCU, the partnership would provide opportunities for faculty and students to become involved in the real challenges of urban communities and to apply their professional skills to the creation of solutions. For the Carver Community and Carver Elementary School, the partnership would provide new resources to address problems and concerns, and in so doing, create a stimulating learning environment for all participants. Many students, parents, staff and neighbors of the City of Richmond, the partnership represented a new model of collaboration committed to improving the quality of life for a segment of the City. One of the first steps in this partnership was the establishment of a Carver-VCU Partnership Steering Committee. Dr. Grace Harris, then Provost, identified VCU representatives, which included faculty and staff from the Schools of Education, Social Work, Business, Nursing, Pharmacy, the Departments of Urban Studies and Planning, Psychology, Student Affairs and the VCU Police. CACIL identified community residents who represent the racial and economic diversity of the community. The Carver community includes the principal, a teacher, and guidance counselor of Carver Elementary School and representatives from the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority (RRHA), the Department of Social Services, and the Department of Community Development. This group worked together in sponsoring a series of community forums and meetings in which issues of community concern were raised, discussed, clarified and prioritized. These discussions shaped the focus of the partnership activities. The Steering Committee continues to be a vital force in directing the partnership and its agenda.

**Carver Community**

The Carver Community is home to approximately 1,350 residents. Based on 1990 census data, the area’s residents are almost exclusively minority—94% black, 5% white, and 1% other. The median household income is $18,438 and 18% of families fall below the poverty level. The unemployment rate is 12.4%, approximately twice that of the City of Richmond. Single mothers head 48% of families with children.

The community is served by the largest elementary school in the City of Richmond and at the initiation of the partnership, the school served close to 1,000 students in pre-kindergarten through fifth grades. The original building was constructed in 1887 and is over 100 years old. The 1995 test scores from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills indicate that 4th grade students from Carver Elementary School fall below the average recommended score by more than 50% below the national average. Of 31 Richmond Public Schools, Carver students ranked 30th in vocabulary and reading comprehension, 29th in language and social studies, and 26th in math. This performance is in line with the 1998 State of Virginia Standards of Learning examinations reveal that the students of Carver fall below the average recommended score in most subjects and below the average scores for schools in Richmond in all subjects.

Ninety-seven percent of all Carver students qualify for free or reduced lunch. The 1990 census reports that the average level of education among adults living in the Carver community is 9th grade. Fifty-three percent of persons over the age of 25 do not have a high school education, and only 6% have earned a bachelor’s degree or higher. Carver Elementary School also serves children from Gilpin Court, the largest public housing community in the City of Richmond. The Gilpin Court community houses 2,326 residents, 1,331 of whom are school age children. The median household income in this area is $13,000. Ninety-four percent of the households in Gilpin are headed by single women.

**Partnership Mission and Focus**

During the first year of the Carver-VCU Partnership, the Steering Committee developed the mission to, “... create a shared urban community with a commitment to improving the community’s quality of life including its health, community development, youth development, safety, and community school; and with a commitment to extending the experience of the community into the classroom and the university.” In September, 1997, the partnership received a $400,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to develop a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC). With support from the grant, the partnership focused on two sets of activities. The first, Networking and Program Development, and Community Training, and Assessment and Evaluation, addressed building the core structure of the partnership. The second set targeted the specific priorities, challenges and concerns expressed by Carver community residents. This include a focus on (1) Community Safety, (2) Community and Economic Development, (3) Youth, (4) Community School, and (5) Health Promotion and Services Integration. The fifth area, Health Promotion and Services Integration, was based on a desire for improved access to and effective utilization of mental health, physical health and social services for Carver residents and the children and families served by Carver Elementary School. Each of these five focus areas was assigned to a committee with shared leadership between a Carver community resident and a VCU faculty or staff member. The Health Promotion and Services Integration Committee worked on a series of activities focused on achieving goals of improving community access to health and social service resources. As part of this effort, JoAnne Henry, Associate Professor from the School of Nursing, took a leave to pursue funding to provide integrated health services at Carver School through an interdisciplinary training model, the Carver Health Project.

**Carver Health Project**

In 1998, VCU received a $200,000 grant from the Jesse Belle Dunford Foundation to support the provision of health, psychological, and social work services for children and families of Carver Elementary School and to educate professional students in an interdisciplinary practice site.
through the Carver Health Project. As suggested above, many Carver Elementary School children and families have limited access to resources. The majority of Carver Elementary School students are from single parent families, and have parents who are unemployed or underemployed. The financial difficulties and mobility of many members of the community cause unstable living arrangements. Eighty-five percent of parents have less than a high school education. These circumstances create considerable challenges for parents in providing resources and experiences that support and prepare their children for learning. Many Carver children have access to Medicaid, but those who do not have health insurance have even more limited access to health care.

School administrators report that families often use the school as their first resource for health care. Children frequently arrive at school and seek out the school nurse for an evaluation of dog bites, burn wounds, sprains, as well as illness. Families see the school as an important resource for health. The Carver Health Project was designed to enhance the health services available to these children and to expand the health promotion and partnerships with Carver as well. The Project brings together a multi-disciplinary faculty and students to learn together in the school setting.

Project Goal and Objectives

The Carver Health Project goals are based on the belief that accessible and efficiently coordinated health care, as well as relevant educational and counseling services, will positively impact children’s overall health and school functioning. These support services are provided to “at-risk” children and their families through the Carver Health Project. The long-term goal is to improve the lifelong health of Carver children. Health is defined broadly including physical and mental health, as well as the community supports needed to sustain health. The project involves the Schools of Nursing, Social Work and Dentistry and the Department of Psychology at VCU who provide services in the Carver Community. Linkages are provided to community health care providers who live and work within the Carver community and to VCU’s medical school, the Medical College of Virginia (MCV), for services that are not provided in the community. These services include medicine, pharmacy and dentistry.

The project has three primary objectives. The first is to, “Provide health screening and assessment for the people of the Carver Community.” Screening and assessment activities of the first year included the initiation of health screenings for the children of Carver School. To begin this process, the Carver Health Project Coordinator met with teachers and parents to explain the program and answered questions about the types of screening that would be available at the school. In coordination with the school nurse and school staff, children were screened for health risks and taught strategies for promoting health. Project staff, VCU students and other participants conducted health screenings, provided treatment, and made referrals as needed for the children.

In 1998-99, there were 930 students enrolled at Carver School. The Richmond Public School policy requires screening of all new students and those in grades 1, 3, and 5. Working with the school nurse, 293 children were screened by VCU nursing student and faculty teams. Fifty percent of the children screened were referred for further visual and dental services.

An additional focus that developed during Year One of the project was to provide physical exams for new students who do not have primary care physicians. At the start of the school year, 45 physical exams were completed and an additional 27 exams were completed since then. Because the physicals are required by law before students can register for school, these physical exams assured that students were enrolled in a timely manner and that they did not have to wait to begin school. The VCU Dental Van provided services at Carver School one day per week. The dental team, composed of dental faculty and students, has been able to meet the dental health needs of approximately one third of the children who were identified as needing dental care. All children who needed dental care received information about dental services in the community. A list of dentists who accept Medicaid was sent home with the children.

A number of children had needed dental cleaning and fluorides were treated at the van. Children who had major dental problems were referred to the clinic at VCU, however, some parents did not return the signed permission forms and their children were not able to be treated. All children who had needed dental care received referrals.

Screening and assessment objectives for 1998-99 also involved the assessment of adult health needs and adult interest in health activities. A needs assessment was conducted at neighborhood meetings and at a community health fair to determine the needs of the adults in the community. Teachers at Carver Elementary School were the first group assessed. They indicated that they wanted a program on stress management, diet and exercise. In this first group, many individuals were found to have high blood pressure and many were overweight. In the Fall of the first year, a six-week program was offered on Wednesday afternoons to address these health concerns. The program was advertised in the Carver Newsletter. Fifteen teachers and one community member participated. Each session included an exercise session offered by the Richmond Public Health Department. The educational portion varied each week and covered topics such as nutrition, exercise, stress management, recognizing early warning signs and managing their health.

The second major objective of the Health Project was to, “Provide health education and counseling to students and school staff.” The project staff, school personnel and VCU students. The third focal objective of the project is to, “Provide health education and counseling to students, parents, mentors, school personnel, and adults within the Carver Community.” A major focus of this project was to provide opportunities for prevention and disease prevention services that involve project staff, school personnel and VCU students. Social work and psychology staff, faculty, and
students provided outreach and educational services. Each program involved has integrated the Carver interdisciplinary experience into their professional training programs. A brief description of this integrated program follows.

The Structure of the Interdisciplinary Team
Faculty and students from the Schools of Nursing, Social Work, Dentistry and the Department of Psychology participate in the Carver Health Project. Project faculty meet with the school principal on a regular basis and all projects are discussed in the planning phase and approved before implementation.

A key role in the linkage of Project faculty and the program to the school is that of the coordinator. This faculty member joined the project at the end of the first year and has worked to develop trust and rapport with the key faculty and administrators in Carver School and at VCU. The coordinator is the consistent presence in Carver School. She is the person who hears about ideas and problems, who works most consistently with VCU students in the school and who is the bridge to the community.

The role of the health coordinator is to serve as the primary link between the elementary school and the university. The coordinator has an obligation to both the school and the university. The obligation to the school involves providing direct services, i.e., health screening, physical exams and referrals for utilization of services in the community. The coordinator brings an understanding of health resources to the school. From this vantage point, the coordinator can assist students and teachers to utilize existing health services. The coordinator is in a unique position to determine the utility of the university student’s projects for the elementary school.

The obligation of the university and its faculty within this project revolves around supervision of university students and providing linkages for student expression of university students. Each program involves coordinating students experiences within the parameters set forth by the elementary school while encouraging the university students to grow in their respective disciplines and in their ability to work effectively with other professions. Students participating in the Carver Health Project receive supervision organized within the traditional structure and parameters of their specific professional training programs and as well as in coordinated interdisciplinary team meetings.

Faculty Perspectives
The same faculty from each of the VCU schools and departments participating in the Carver Health Partnership have been involved with the project since its inception. This continuity has allowed faculty to develop rapport and a level of trust within the school. The positive outcomes of the Carver Health Project have resulted in large part due to a generally high level of acceptance of the project by school administration and staff. The stability of the school administrators and VCU faculty provided the base of understanding that is needed to move beyond multidisciplinary work. The biggest barrier to the interdisciplinary model has been the limited amount of time that faculty and students from across the disciplines have in the school at the same time.

The goal of our interdisciplinary model has been for all project members to work and see the perspective of the others, to accept the different professional norms and to adapt to the school environment. Each individual views professional experiences from the vantage point of their discipline as well as from their personal experiences. In a multidisciplinary approach, each member brings perspectives to the team that are unique and contribute a different perspective and we believe that any individual can utilize and gain from the knowledge of other approaches. Our experience of the results of these efforts suggest that the project is achieving the goal of interdisciplinary work. This has required continued attention and work by the faculty and school personnel since it is so much easier to work side by side instead of together.

Student Experiences
The schools of Nursing and Social Work and the Doctoral Program in Child Clinical Psychology have organized experiences at Carver School as a structured part of their professional training programs. Nursing students participate in the Carver Health Project through several nursing courses at VCU. For example, in the basic undergraduate nursing of children course, students and faculty provide basic health screening for Carver School children. In the undergraduate Community Health course, students conduct community assessments and offer health education programs for children through a service learning project. Graduate nurse practitioner students provide physical exams and work with teachers and parents of children with health problems. During the course of the first year, fifteen nursing students had clinical experiences at Carver. Some experiences are short-term, such as health screenings, for example. Others extend throughout the semester. Students with extended experiences develop rapport with the children and Carver School staff. They participate in community development activities and strengthen the parent support in the PTA.

The third learning experience that social work students have, has to do with designing and implementing group interventions. During Year Two of the project, the social work students designed and implemented a parenting-skills group during the fall term for families of Carver students. The other project, during the spring term was a girls’ group designed to enhance and support self-image and self-esteem. During Year Two, in coordination with graduate students in child clinical psychology, a brief survey of Carver School faculty needs was conducted. The results of this survey were then used to create a professional development in-service that was presented to the faculty at their annual retreat. The second group activity that was implemented during Year Two was another girls’ group.

Similar to social work students, first year graduate students in clinical psychology developed a project mentoring group formed to identify and support children identified as needing support, but relatively low levels of intervention. These relationships last for a year and are designed to allow graduate students to develop normative relationships with children and families and to be familiar with the school environment. Second year psychology students work with the school psychologist to provide educational testing for students. Carver elementary school administration obtained permission from Richmond Public Schools for VCU’s Center for Psychological Services and Development (the departmental training clinic) to provide free on-site individual and family therapy by third year child clinical psychology graduate students. This increases the availability of individual and family therapy for Carver students. Services are provided free at Carver School.

VCU students from these three professional training programs meet together both formally and informally to discuss their learning experiences. During the first year of the project, the student-faculty team met once each semester to evaluate learning experiences. The team met monthly with the Carver Principal to assure that programs and student experiences are coordinated with other school activities. VCU students are
developing the community-based skills that are essential for practitioners in the changing health care system and the faculty are learning to work together to share student supervision. This year the seminars are more formal and faculty are continuing to refine these learning experiences.

Student Perspectives on Learning

Feedback from students has been consistent across the disciplines. They are surprised at the complexity and severity of problems that the children and their families have. They are frustrated that efforts to reach parents often have limited success. They evaluate their learning as positive and they gain a new appreciation for the complexities of the lives of low income families and for the richness in community informal support systems that families form for mutual aid.

Students describe the challenge of learning to negotiate the school environment and professional relationships with school personnel and each other. Many among the university students and in the environment, which in part of the school and community context and alternate between the cultural and social systems. During the Contact phase, groups become salient and result in pressure for one group or another to change or accommodate. During the Crisis Phase, this conflict comes to a head and during the Adaptation phase, the interaction between groups is stabilized into one of several potential outcomes. These outcomes include Assimilation, where one group relinquishes its culture and assumes the dominant group’s culture and identity. A second outcome involves Integration, where a subordinate group maintains their identity, but also incorporates the culture and identity of the dominant group into their own. Separation and Segregation outcomes result when group members do not interact with the majority culture, through self-imposed separation or externally forced segregation. Individuals may also be marginalized and unable to identify or utilize either culture. Several of these options are suggested including cultural alternation, where individuals develop the ability to code switch, and move effectively and efficiently from one cultural contact to another.

The complexity of coordinating student and faculty time at Carver School has been a considerable challenge. Student clinical/field work experiences and requirements vary in length and time. Students were often not able to work together for project development since they were in the school on different days and had to be in their other VCU classes for their respective programs during other times of the week. Student-faculty seminars were one way that cross-disciplinary learning has been implemented. The project coordinator, a nursing faculty member, has been the link for students at Carver School. This individual supports the integration of student learning experiences by coordinating schedules, facilitating student collaboration on projects, and developing strategies to provide cooperative learning experiences. Effective integrated training is an area that project faculty want to improve as the project moves into its third year.

The Carver Health Project serves as a model of interdisciplinary community-based education to meet the learning needs of VCU students and the needs of Carver residents. We have modified experiences throughout the program to assure that the VCU student objectives align with the community’s needs through their experiences in Carver School. One example is the parenting group. This service was initially offered at Carver School in late morning and few parents attended. Faculty, students and Carver staff discussed this problem and decided that although the school had identified this as a parent need, that parents did not agree. During the year, a community assessment was conducted and a parent education program was developed which the community that is offered at night. Students have developed a new project as they work with the Parent-Teacher Organization.

Overall, the multidisciplinary approach involves extensive interprofessional collaboration across various other methods of working in the community. While this can be a boost for the elementary school by providing access to a new set of resources, it can also prove to be a difficult process as the students must learn to function outside of familiar methods. The role of the coordinator is to support the universities students through this learning experience while ensuring that the needs of the elementary students are identified. A multidisciplinary model has been suggested including cultural alternation, where individuals develop the ability to code switch, and move effectively and efficiently from one cultural contact to another.

Moving from Multidisciplinary to Interdisciplinary Training in Community Context: Lessons Learned

The goal to provide an interdisciplinary training experience in the school setting has resulted in the necessity to negotiate boundaries of multiple “cultures.” This analogy would suggest our analysis include the culture of a public elementary school, the culture of the local urban community that the school serves, the culture of the university, and the cultures of each professional discipline (i.e., dentistry, medicine, psychology, and social work) working in the school setting. Each system has its own unique set of values, goals, belief systems, organized social structures and practices. When these different cultures come into contact, their coexistence can range from interactions characterized by cooperation and collaboration to interactions which are overly hostile and destructive. Several models of inter-cultural contact have been proposed which can inform our analysis. Berry and associates (Berry, 1980; Berry & Kim, 1988) propose a model focusing on acculturation, the process by which intergroup contact resolves through a sequence of five phases. In the Precontact phase, projects identified learning objectives across groups, each group has its own independently functioning culture and social systems. During the Contact phase, groups begin to interact with one another. This is followed by the Conflict phase, in which differences between groups become salient and result in pressure for one group or another to change or accommodate. During the Crisis Phase, this conflict comes to a head and during the Adaptation phase, the interaction between groups is stabilized into one of several potential outcomes.

These outcomes include Assimilation, where one group relinquishes its culture and assumes the dominant group’s culture and identity. A second outcome involves Integration, where a subordinate group maintains their identity, but also incorporates the culture and identity of the dominant group into their own. Separation and Segregation outcomes result when group members do not interact with the majority culture, through self-imposed separation or externally forced segregation. Individuals may also be marginalized and unable to identify or utilize either culture. Several of these options are suggested including cultural alternation, where individuals develop the ability to code switch, and move effectively and efficiently from one cultural contact to another.
culture and context. For example, Carver Elementary School continues to negotiate its relations-
ships with the local Carver community and works on its perception to be seen as belonging to
the community or as a resource to the community. Parents, who are the clients for our trainees, may
or may not find it easy to negotiate the cultural context of this educational setting. When con-
ducting training in the school context, university students and faculty may variously be seen as
agents of Carver School, of their particular disci-
plines, or of the university (which has its own
unique relationship with the community). Faculty
and students are required to resolve these identi-
ties when working in the community context.

Summary and Conclusions

The Carver Health Project has provided an
important opportunity to offer a range of health
and human services to children and adults in the
Carver community, and is continuing to develop
and implement an integrated service delivery and
training model. Practical issues such as schedul-
ing and coordination have proved to be the largest
obstacle, while the role of a faculty coordinator
who facilitates a supportive and inclusive envi-
ronment has been an important contribution to the
success of the experience. The program has pro-
vided an important and accessible health and
social service resource to the school and commu-
nity, and has provided training opportunities to a
wide range of students in the health and human
service fields.

These efforts take place within the context of the
broader Carver-VCU Partnership that supports a
range of related Carver school-based projects. For
example, in 1998, VCU received an Eisenhower
Professional Development grant for $55,000 to
provide training to Carver Elementary School
teachers in the innovative practices of teaching
experimental design during the 1999 Spring and
Summer. VCU has also provided tutors to address
the reading needs of first and second graders
through the VCU America Reads program. The
VCU AmeriCorps Program, provides full and part-
time members who assist with tutoring, after-school programs, the Parent Resource Center, and Carver Promise. In addition, VCU students in service-
learning courses serve as volunteers to assist with various projects, including tutoring.

Preliminary indicators at Carver School reveal
significant improvements in academic improve-
ment and attendance, due in part to the large num-
ber of tutors and specialized support from VCU.
In addition, VCU supplied the Parent Resource
Center at Carver School with a computer lab using
surplus computers that were upgraded with funds
from the HUD grant. The grant also paid for the
installation of Internet connections. The school
contributed the computer tables. The lab is avail-
able to all parents of Carver School students and
residents of the Carver community for computer
classes and open hours for self-tutorials, Internet
access, and use for resume writing. The Health
Promotion and Services Integration Committee
also sponsors an annual health fair that provides
a range of screenings (e.g., mammograms, blood
pressure, hearing, prostate) and provides oppor-
tunities for the dissemination of health & social
service information from over 35 vendors.

While we do not have explicit data that tell us
whether community residents and Carver Elementary School families are accessing health
services more easily, feedback from our annual
Town Meeting suggests increases in the percep-
tion that, “It is easy to get good health services in
the Carver Community.” Among respondents,
agreement with this opinion increased from 23% in 1998 to 67% in 1999.

University-community collaborations that pro-
vide training opportunities for students in health and
human service disciplines may be useful resources
for communities lacking access to services. In turn,
young professional may have valuable training experiences through their work in urban communi-
ties. Training programs may also benefit from
increased opportunities to train, socialize, and pro-
duce professionals who are effective in interdisci-
plinary settings. Change in training programs and
community settings where this training may take
place forms out of the conflict or tension that arises
when traditional methods of coping and function-
ning no longer work. In addressing the challenge to
provide relevant and effective training experiences
to support the ability of health care professionals
to work in interdisciplinary settings, traditional
methods of training will be called upon to change,
and faculty and services settings will be asked to
work together. However, when such groups are
formed, with people that have different backgrounds and philosophies, conflict and change are inevitable.

The dual goals of service to the elementary school and promoting professional student’s learning must
be kept focal throughout this process. The core
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of these professors was told, “I certainly didn’t
expect anyone from your field to be involved in
this stuff.”

Although the community programs run by
the university students and professors began in
Chicago, one of America’s largest cities, it is no
longer a secret that many of our youth—perhaps
the majority—need more help than our institutions
give them (Benson & Harkavy, 1997). Underserved
neighborhoods and communities are everywhere.
That’s why the six professors’ work takes place in
a variety of locations, including Greeley, Colorado;
Grand Forks, North Dakota; Greensboro, North
Carolina; Los Angeles; Chicago; and Denver.
Thus, the ideas being shared in this article have rel-
relevance for professors and students in all colleges
and universities, not just those in major urban areas.

In the following sections, we detail the variety
of experiences, courses, and programs physical
educators in higher education can use to develop a
community focus within the college, school,
department, or division. We draw on our experi-
ences as professors as well as the experiences of
our students who have integrated serving under-
erved youth into their professional lives. We pres-
ent several options that professors might consider
as they consider how best to integrate experience
in community programs into university course work
and degree programs. We conclude with some
thoughts that may guide professors and students as
they strive to develop a community focus within
larger physical education/kinesiology contexts.

Establishing a University Commitment
towards Underserved Communities

In spite of periodic calls for reform and
change, kinesiology and physical education pro-
grams have remained largely isolated from their
surrounding communities (Lawson, 1997). Grant-
ted, teacher education programs place pre-
service teachers in local schools to fulfill student
teaching requirements, but in most cases, the
attention of student teachers, university supervi-
sors, and cooperating teachers is focused on chil-
dren and youth who fit within the normal range
of ability and attitude. This is hardly surprising
when one considers that university course work
is usually geared to this population as well as coach-
ing the future performers or else students with clearly
defined “special needs.” With few exceptions,
little regard is given to understanding the lives of
young children and youth who live in underserved
communities, and even less attention is devoted to
considering how their needs can be met through
physical activity programs.

A Brief History: How a “Lone Ranger”
Community-Oriented Professor was joined by
Kindred Souls

Until the late 1980s, Don Hellison was per-
haps the only university professor in the United
States who regularly taught physical activity pro-
grams to kids in underserved communities. After
having been a “lone ranger” at Portland State
University for almost 20 years, in 1987 he joined
the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC)
attracted by the then Kinesiology Dean, Chuck
Kristufek’s promise to support his efforts in
teaching urban kids. It wasn’t long before a small
group of faculty members and graduate students
joined him and taught their own programs. Under
Don’s direction, this group was instrumental in
creating a School of Kinesiology commitment to
providing physical activity programs for under-
served youth in the urban communities that sur-
round the UIC campus. While students have grad-
uated and faculty have moved on in their
professional lives, the group is still in place, and
in 1999 there are nine programs being run in
Chicago schools and social agencies.

Today, Don’s efforts have branched out into
other locations around the US. Two of Don’s for-
mer students—James Kallusky at Los Angeles
State University and Nick Cutforth at the University
of Denver—have used their knowledge and experi-
ence gained from a close working relationship with
him to develop a community focus in their univer-
sities and implement their own physical activity
programs. Two others—Tom Martinez at the
University of North Carolina at Greensboro and
Missy Parker (formerly at the University of North
Dakota) now at the University of Northern
Colorado—used their sabbatical leave to come to
Chicago to observe and assist in the UIC programs
run by Don and his students and on returning to
their universities applied this new knowledge to
develop community programs of their own. The
other professor—Jim Stiehl from the University of
Northern Colorado—has known Don for many
years and has always maintained close contact with
him by sharing ideas and writing. At the same time
Jim has taught underserved kids in outdoor pro-
grams, taking along university students with him.
Thus each professor’s journey toward a focus
on university-community collaboration differs in
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Introduction

This article describes the work of six university professors who are doing important collaborative
work with social agencies and educational institutions in their surrounding communities to impact
the social, emotional, and educational growth of underserved children and youth. In these universities,
professors and students are working together to provide a rich array of physical activity programs for und-
erserved youth1.

This work takes place at different times (schooldays, evenings, and weekends during the school year,
as well as summer vacations), in different venues (including elementary, middle, and high schools, alter-
native schools, detention centers, universities, and boys and girls clubs), and involves different ages (from
third graders all the way through to high school seniors). Much of this work has been going on for sev-
eral years at the same site, while other program sites are new and may not be there forever. However,
these programs share several things in common: they capitalize on the popularity of physical activity among
most underserved kids; they are taught or directed by people who are concerned about the plight of under-
served youth and who are committed to developing programs that work; and last but certainly not least,
Don Hellison’s (1995) responsibility model is at the heart of each program’s framework and focus.

The responsibility model occupies a central place in this work because it provides a common set of
values, goals, and instructional strategies for all youth programs conducted in these university commu-
nities. Furthermore, the model extends far beyond physical activity instruction by focusing on the teach-
ing of life skills and values and their subsequent transfer from the physical activity setting to the class-
room, community, and home. Four life skills/values—respect for others’ rights and feelings, effort,
goal-setting, and helping and leadership—are learned and practiced as part of the physical activity les-
sion. Eventually, the fifth goal, outside the gym, is introduced and increasingly emphasized, along with
activities such as cross-age teaching and one-on-one sessions to show kids how to apply these skills in
community settings.

One of the reasons that this work is significant is because most faculty and students in departments
of physical education (or kinesiology) in the United States have not been players in the university-com-
munity collaboration movement (Siedentop, 1998). At a recent HUD-sponsored COPC conference, one
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Visitations to Existing Programs

These are opportunities to visit and observe an existing program taught by a professor, university student, community youth worker, or public school teacher. They could be voluntary or provide credit for students who show interest and promise. The student’s role could be as an observer or, if sufficiently motivated or confident, he or she could assist the teacher by working with individual kids or small groups. While these visits need not be connected with course work, they could be one option for a course assignment (for example, Curriculum Issues in Physical Education or Psycho-Social Aspects of Physical Education and Sport) in which case they could be followed up by a written paper or class presentation.

Independent Study

An independent study involves a student and a professor having regular one-to-one exchanges on a project tailor-made to the students’ needs and interests—for example, Effective Programming for Underserved Youth (Cutforth). The pair meets on a weekly, biweekly, or monthly basis to discuss readings or an issue or idea about underserved youth and effective programming. Often, the result of more personal relationship enables the professor to be in a better position to make course readings, discussions, and perhaps visits to existing youth development programs meaningful. Sometimes, as a result of the course, the student may be motivated to become further involved with the professor’s visit to existing programs or developing and teaching a program in the community. The drawback is that the professor has to budget time to meet with the student, read and respond to the student’s journals or papers, and prepare for the next meeting, and often has to discuss readings or an issue or idea about underserved youth and effective programming. Often, the result of more personal relationship enables the professor to be in a better position to make course readings, discussions, and perhaps visits to existing youth development programs meaningful. Sometimes, as a result of the course, the student may be motivated to become further involved with the professor’s visit to existing programs or developing and teaching a program in the community. The drawback is that the professor has to budget time to meet with the student, read and respond to the student’s journals or papers, and prepare for the next meeting, and often has to discuss readings or an issue or idea about underserved youth and effective programming. Often, the result of more personal relationship enables the professor to be in a better position to make course readings, discussions, and perhaps visits to existing youth development programs meaningful.

Optional (or Mandatory) Service Learning Experiences in Current Courses

Service learning experiences involve students in community placements in which they assume service roles within the community. Such experiences offer a valuable opportunity to discuss readings and issues related to their academic interests.

• Visitations to existing programs
• Independent study
• Optional (or mandatory) service learning experiences in current courses
• Graduation requirements
• Special programs
• Faculty and student collaboration on research and scholarship
The purpose of these programs is to prepare students for teaching in underserved communities and to foster a deep understanding of the unique challenges and opportunities that come with working in these settings. The professors have found that students gain valuable insights and skills through their involvement in these programs, which often lead to greater confidence in their teaching practices and a deeper commitment to their students.

These special programs require faculty to work and think in a different way. Often the traditional professor-student relationship is replaced by a team approach in which team members spend many hours in discussions deciding what specific topics should receive focus and how best to study them. Each person should feel able to express his or her opinions, and decisions are often made by consensus, rather than directives from the professor.

Faculty and Student Collaboration on Research and Scholarship

Each of the above options may include professors and students engaging in varying amounts of teaching in community programs, consulting with community agencies, presenting papers and conducting workshops at local, national, and international conferences, and undertaking research. Numerous applied research opportunities are available for students and faculty interested in making a contribution to the academic community and to the advancement of the youth development model. Such opportunities illustrate how the mission to transfer research on teaching, and service can be combined rather than being seen as separate entities (Cutforth, 1997).

Some Closing Thoughts About Developing a University-Community Focus

Collaborating with social agencies and educational institutions in local communities takes a considerable amount of time, support, and intellectual energy, and is often more messy than working on research projects teaching. Problems and challenges occur regularly and all the professors have experienced struggles and victories in gaining support at the departmental, college, university, and community levels. Underserved communities are everywhere and most are desperate for additional help and services. While such neediness can be an asset (there is no shortage of settings in which to focus our energies!), there is also the danger that we will be asked to take on more of a challenge than we can handle. For example, on several occasions we have been asked to take 30 kids in our after school programs. In response we make it clear that large numbers will take our freedom in terms of responsibility goals of the program to classroom management and behavioral strategies (for additional thoughts on this issue, see Hellison & Cutforth, 1997).
which is usually reciprocated. Such practices embody the view of looking beyond labels such as “inexperienced,” “beginning teacher,” “graduate student,” or “member of a research team” and replacing them with appropriate recognition for contributions to various projects, whether they are teaching in community programs, writing research reports, making presentations, or submitting manuscripts for publications.

It has been our experience that neither centralization nor decentralization works in efforts to reach out to the community. What is required is a different two-way relationship of pressure, support, and continuous negotiation, amounting to simultaneous top-down and bottom-up influence. Each of us—whether as individuals or as institutions—has learned to manage this paradox.

The most important ingredients for successful university-community collaboration are the commitment, preparation, and persistence of the faculty and students involved. Every person can be a change agent but must forego the hope of discovering a set of easy-to-follow steps. Likewise, a commitment to university-community collaboration by itself is not good enough. A commitment needs an engine, and that engine comprises individual, skilled people pushing for changes around them, intersecting with other like-minded individuals and groups necessary to the formation of the critical mass necessary to bring about continuous improvements. Indeed, this is the spirit in which the partnership involving the professors was formed.

Physical education/kinesiology programs in higher education are well-positioned to direct more of their energies to their local communities, and to develop leaders in the youth development field—informing the professors was formed. Connecting School Physical Education to the Community Through Service Learning, Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Erickson, J., & Anderson, J. (Eds.) (1997). Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service learning in teacher education. Washington DC: American Association of Higher Education.
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Panelists:
Perspectives
Plenary Session on University-Assisted
zations. Partnerships have played an important role in
collaborations. Three years into the twelve-year goals, the
school and extended time programs both in the
colleges. Penn has played a leading role in
collaborations come together with faith organi-
ments. Three years into the twelve-year goals, the
School District of Philadelphia is ahead of sched-
Partnerships have played an important role in
success.

Plenary Session on University-Assisted
zations for Educating Citizens for Democracy: K-H
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Nevin Brown
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Democracy is a Discussion Handbook

Commentator:
Ira Harkavy
Associate Vice President
Director
Center for Community Partnerships
University of Pennsylvania

The opening panel chronicled the many devel-
ments in service learning, community schools, and
democratic education while laying out a num-
mer of critical issues and questions that currently
front schools, institutions of higher education, and
democratic societies in their efforts to educate
for democracy.

Nevin Brown began the panel by noting that
one of the issues facing post-secondary learning is
determining who is accountable for student learn-
ing and what kind of student learning should be
encouraged by those responsible for learning. We
must ask what it is we expect from post-secondary
education and what are we trying to produce in the
learning that our students engage in. Learning for
citizenship and engagement in democracy needs to
join the current focus on the academic. The move-
ment for service learning and education for democ-
ocracy is not just occurring in the United States, but
shaping discussions about higher education and k-
12 schools worldwide. The International
Partnership for Service Learning is pushing post-
secondary institutions to think about their role in
creating citizens in emerging democracies in coun-
tries such as Jamaica, Liberia, Uganda, India, and
Philippines. The implications of our discussion move far beyond our own borders.

Barry Checkoway asked the university should have a strategy for involving community
and community schools in democratic education and if so, what should it be. Civic education is essential
to a democratic society, but too many Americans
have reduced their engagement in public affairs.
While they may have increased involvement in
community service, engagement in public affairs has
decreased. Studies have documented that the
trend in traditional forms of political participa-
tion is especially prevalent among younger age
groups. While new forms of engagement are
emerging for an increasingly diverse society that
traditional political scientists do not necessarily
consider. Many of the key questions are still about peo-
ple’s interests in public issues, respect for differ-
ces, and ability to argue beliefs.

Universities are civic institutions whose orig-
inal mission had a strong public purpose and are
currently strategically situated to do something
about the problem of civic involvement.
Universities are not just places that educate and
conduct research, but they have immense
resources (such as libraries and technology) that
could be relevant for the community. Whether they
view themselves in this role or not, universities are
part of the community fabric because of their role as
consumers and employers. John Dewey demon-
strated this democratic spirit when he established
the Michigan Schoolmasters, an organization for
professors at the University of Michigan and local
school teachers that met monthly to discuss what
they had in common and how it was related to edu-
cation for democracy. However, universities have
 drifted away from this ideal. Community groups
find it hard to access universities as institutions,
faculty vary in their commitment to this idea, and
few top administrators have made educating for
democracy a top goal.

Three elements need to be considered when
examining the role of higher education in relation
to its community and schools. (1) How can uni-
versities engage faculty in and prepare for active participation in a diverse demo-
cratic society? Today’s students are among most
politically disengaged in history. Interest in polit-
ic participation is at a low level with incoming
freshman and declines while in the university,
making this both a societal and institutional
issue. Possible solutions that the university could
implement are research projects, service learning
courses, and co-curricular activities. Yet, even
when universities have these things, strong student
commitment to public participation is still a prob-
lem, leading one to believe that education is not
enough. (2) How can universities engage faculty in
teaching the education and teaching which involves and
improves communities? Dewey models a number of
avenues through which professors can involve
themselves in local community; opportunities
whichever and conducting research in and with
the community, providing technical support and
consultation in areas of expertise, and connecting
with teachers in schools. Yet faculty view themselves
as teachers or researchers, but generally do not
perceive themselves as public participants.
Furthermore, there is little in the training of pro-
fessors and teachers to prepare them for civic edu-
cation. (3) How can the universities form com-
munity partnerships for civic renewal? The prom-
ise of partnerships is not often matched by their
performance. Many partnerships show lack of
trust, inequitable power and control, differences in
cultural perspective, and conflicts over funding
and fiduciary agents. Partnerships in this arena are
most likely to be genuine if the community, and
not the university, is the fiduciary. While we have
exceptional partnerships, they are not typical and
need to become more numerous if we wish to
address the issues raised above.

David Lisman articulated that the service
learning movement is headed toward a new
dimension that connects service learning to
democracy and civic development. Community
schools are increasingly viewed conceptually as a
vehicle for helping students to achieve participa-
tion in a diverse democratic society. The promo-
tion of civic democracy as the underlying foun-
dation for service learning is a strong development
that builds on three previous models of service
learning. Using Service learning/Service learning
to promote a basis for an ethic of service lacks
institutional imbeddedness. While service learn-
ing serves as a model for experiential learning,
experiential learning can have other outcomes
besides civic development. Service learning as a
vehicle for promoting social conscious and justice is
not a sufficient rationale for people who are
concerned with the problems of public institu-
tions. The civic approach wraps in these objec-
tives, while giving it a foundation.

Public schools are one of the great commu-
nity locations for working to achieve this civic democracy. They have the stability and infra-
structure that other community institutions often
lack. Yet higher-eds face many challenges when
working with schools as well as other community
groups. Universities may be high minded when
wanting to return to a community role that
community partners set the agenda. In public schools,
established state and federal standards currently
play a large role in determining the agenda. When
principals are pressured to achieve standards they
will want after-school homework clubs or other
activities designed around raising test scores, even
though the university might entertain larger goals and
aspirations for community schools. As we move forward with the community school con-
cept, higher eds must be careful to use schools as
a laboratory for their own interests. Yet, while
focusing on both the needs of the university and
the schools, we must be careful to have an inclusive community school program and not just meet the academic needs of youth through after-school programs. Community schools must exist to serve adults in the community and operate during the evening. Community schools should also utilize service learning to promote civic development among youth and engage communities in sustainable democratic work. We are often focused on the civic development of college students and public scholarship of faculty, but we also need to bear in mind the civic needs of youth in schools. If we believe that service learning contributes to academic learning we ought to incorporate those activities into the community school model.

Terry Pickeral offered two frameworks for the conference participants to consider. The first framework examines three different levels of work: (1) practice, (2) policy, and (3) capacity and infrastructure. A struggle exists for the prevalence of high-quality practice which comes at the cost of individual and institutional, and community levels. One cannot expect transformation at K-12 level without being concerned with transformation within higher education and vice-versa. How do we move our schools from risk-taking American school to one that is accommodating to good citizens? Time and place also has to change because students must venture outside the schoolhouse doors. Enrichment activities that currently occur after-school must be employed in school. Service learning has capacity to get to academic, civic, social/personal responsibility outcomes while moving students from personal interest to communal interests.

The service learning movement should not be about reformation, but instead transformation at individual, institutional, and community levels. We must consider how to develop education for democracy and ask what is education for democracy? While Dewey understood what democratic education might look like, he never developed a strategy for implementing it. William Harper, former president of the University of Chicago, said that education is the basis of democracy and that higher education is the primary shaper of the American schooling system because it trains the teachers, educates the leaders, and dominates the pedagogy of American schooling. Universities are prophets of democracy, but only if they are working with local schools. How do we engage in a successful implementation revolution that sees the implementation of education for democracy as the goal of that revolution?

University-Community-School Partnerships as Strategies for Community and Economic Development

Convenor: Lucy Kerman
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University of Rhode Island

Michael Morand
Assistant Vice President
Office of New Haven & State Affairs
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Lucy Kerman began the session by outlining a number of efforts the University of Pennsylvania has undertaken to promote the corporate involvement of the University in the West Philadelphia community. Penn’s strategic effort of corporate involvement, entitled the West Philadelphia Initiatives, is an organized, comprehensive effort that understands neighborhoods are like people; need professional employment to meet its needs. Thus, the West Philadelphia Initiatives comprise five main areas of effort.

(1) Education—a commitment to good schools and public schools, especially the schools in close proximity to the University. In addition to the numerous academic efforts with local schools, Penn has recently joined with the Philadelphia School District and the Teacher’s Union in creating a new University-assisted public school. The school will draw students from the local community and serve as both a professional development hub as well as a community center.

(2) Clean and safe streets—a realization that any community needs to be both clean and safe. Penn has joined with the city of Philadelphia in creating a special service district that keeps the streets clean and places security ambassadors around the neighborhood. Additional initiatives have helped light and green the neighborhood.

(3) Retail development—building retail corridors around the University. Penn has recently completed a new retail complex that includes a book store, restaurant, and a number of upscale shops. In addition to upscale retail, Penn is establishing other corridors with mixed retail. All of these initiatives are aimed at building retail in areas of West...
Philadelphia that the University helped to transform a number of years ago during its expansion. (4) Housing—believing that homeowners help make communities stronger. Penn has begun an enhanced mortgage program which gives $15,000 (or $21,000 over 7 years) to help build home own- ership among Penn faculty and staff. The University is also involved in re-claiming abandoned homes, by buying, re-furbishing, and then selling those homes back to community. There is also an emphasis on multi-family properties, which deals with the management of absence landlords and student overcrowding.

(5) Strong Economic Development—a strategic use of the University’s economic policies. Penn is focused on how you purchase and build. Last year $50 million was contracted to businesses in Penn’s neighborhood. In addition to job development and small business mentoring, a very strong percentage of construction projects go to minor- ity business. The University has restructured so that they are focused on helping community businesses.

Marcia Marker Feld, Professor at University of Rhode Island and the first director of HUD’s Office of University Partnerships, spoke on the history of university-school-community partners- ships, the initial assumptions the grounded that work, and current activity in the field. Since the early 1970s there has been a growing movement to pair higher education systems with public school institutions. Although initially designed so that higher education institutions could provide a helping hand for public schools, the movement has developed on a broader equity basis that has brought about equal partnerships. These relationships encourage dialogue between university faculty and secondary schools, stress quality education restructuring, and encourage recruitment of low-income students to higher education.

In the mid-1980s, led by the efforts of Iris Harkavy at the University of Pennsylvania, these partner- ships saw the addition of a strong community service component to both in secondary and higher education. The next major development occurred in 1994, when Housing and Urban Development decided that government could not transform communities alone, but needed commu- nity planning groups to create change. HUD saw higher education institutions as the anchor institutions of many neighborhoods that could bring community building resources and articulate constituencies to solve inner-city problems. For this reason they established the Office of University Partnerships to act as catalyst and bro- ker for facilitating partnerships between higher education institutions and local communities.

Six initial assumptions grounded this work: 1) partnerships create a level playing field; 2) part- nerships bring resources and technical assistance to each partner and focus on solving urban prob- lems; 3) partnerships influence curriculum, com- munication, and behavior to move to their high- est level; 4) partnerships mediate the development of a community-based common vision and agenda as well as agreed upon implementation strategies; 5) partnerships foster building capacity and shar- ing among all individuals; and 6) partnerships empower all participants, from both the university and community, in the decision process of how to create a sustainable quality community environment. Experience has taught a simple equation for success in community building: CEE=RT (Communication, Enabling (or capacity building), and Empowerment = Respect and Trust).

The perspective from the eyes of the commun- ity and a community development corporation was outlined by Dori Jones-Dorn, executive director of United South Broadway Corporation (USBC). She discussed neighbor- hood and resident capacity building and empha- sized the need for local neighborhoods to be the driving force behind community revitalization. South Broadway, a neighborhood in Albuquerque, NM, has had to deal with the many problems com- mon to urban neighborhoods. For many years the community’s economic development was driven by and dependent on outside forces, which meant that such development was neither long term nor sustainable. During this outside intervention, an enlightened and engaged neighborhood developed that healthy neighborhood had come up with the initiative to initiate their own community planning activities. This has led to recent successes in building up the community’s voice and its ability to act and achieve independent of outside forces. Neighborhood residents and mobilizing them to act on behalf of the community’s interest, the USBC and the neighborhood have achieved a number of victories. These victories include bringing about changes in the local economic climate, creating a strategic plan, retooling and reducing crime and public nuisances, eliminating drug dealing, taking back the streets, and bringing about housing and commercial revitalization. This success has been achieved with little money, but much citizen participation (which led South Broad to receive the national neighbor- hood award in 1994). USBC has served as a link to the outside world and an organic vehicle for community action; one whose role constantly changes to be open to community identified neighborhood needs.

South Broadway has also attempted to insti- tutionalize their many successes to ensure their long-term success. This activity has seen South Broadway partner with many organizations, from local and federal government to higher education institutions. In partnership with HUD, they looked at how the built environment of the community influenced drug trafficking in the area. Public art initiatives and regular community clean-up days were established to encourage people to take pride in their community. South Broadway has also developed a relationship with both the University of New Mexico College of Education and their School of Architecture and Planning. When USBC undertook a project to identify vacant lots for housing in the neighborhood, they worked with the School of Architecture to hold design meetings with the community. This community came up with resident-derived design guidelines. In South Broadway’s partnerships there is a definite sense of equality, with residents actively participating in the work and determining the nature of the part- nership. Communities must bring a people/vol- unteer investment to the table for successful part- nerships and that takes grass roots organizing. If projects are not resident driven, what happens when programs decline or are taken away? Partners can help move communities to next level of activity, but they can not be relied on to sus- tain the activity forever. Thus, a model of resident- driven community development and self-help is needed. One that will lead them to become active in their schools. Healthy neighborhoods can only happen when people feel safe, have decent housing, and when a neighborhood has found its voice and is able to take the terms of engagement with potential partners.

Michael Morand discussed the intersection of the university’s roles in economic development and public education. One of the fundamental issues facing the local economic climate is the lack of high-quality, creative, and competitive fresh faculty and medical students who work with teachers and students in advanced college-level science classes. The University had to make their material better because they have to know it well enough to teach it to high school students. The bio-tech certification that high school students receives creates direct connections to economic opportunities because high school students have a certain level of skills.

In this manner, universities serve as the bridge between k-12 schools and the private business sec- tor because both institutions partner with univer- sities. This partnership has been facilitated by a formal agreement that signifies a commitment to work together by entering into open-ended rela- tionships based on trust. The University has been careful not to overpromise, but has delivered on modest promises including a shuttle between the medical school and high school, library access, and access to high school athletic facilities to stu- dents at Yale. This activity did not start with a strategic research program, but as a university developed trust which then led to development of programs. This has resulted in two hundred youth spending over eight hundred hours of studying in Yale programs and a chance to experience of youth to seize new economic opportunities.

Loomis Mayfield described the Great Cities program at the University of Illinois-Chicago (UIC). This program is an expression of UIC’s commitment to dealing with urban commu- nity level, thus fulfilling the land-grant status of university (albeit in an urban instead of agri- cultural environment). Community groups
function as equal partners in the Great Cities program and help to determine the agenda by laying out issues of importance to the community. Great Cities attempts to effect how faculty do research and teaching at the university by encouraging them to be driven by community interests instead of being discipline driven. The Neighborhood Initiative Program (UCNIC) is focused expression of this model in two neighborhoods around the university. This project-based initiative develops programs along a range of issues (health, education, public safety, economic development, etc.) according to interests of community and faculty/students. Both the community and university must have an interest in the issue in order to have a successful project. Two examples of projects:

Great Cities—Great Careers. This project began with HUD money in 1994, and was originally designed to help students understand their career options and equip them to pursue those careers. When pressure came down on schools concerning test scores the schools became less concerned with programs not directly related to test results. Since this program fell into that category, a re-evaluation led to a new project that related to faculty interests and one that test scores matter to achieve goals. Tenacity, consistency and flexibility allowed the project to develop and mature.

West-Side Consortium Home-Care Training Institute. This project grew out of research the West-Side Consortium (WSUP) regarding job aspirations and barriers for people in public housing developments. Research found that the biggest obstacle was lack of adequate daycare for low-income people, while the other job interest was also in day care. Initially, the project’s attempt to begin a day-care center flourished because it was hard to get a private development established and the policy focus of public agencies changed from supporting on-site to a troubled neighborhood in central Buffalo. The strategy focused on transforming commercial strips around which communities are built because these strips are often dilapidated and crumbling. The community chose to focus on strips for three reasons: (1) strips are the window through which people view everyday life and culture in a community; (2) strip development is central to bolstering the quality of life in a neighborhood; and (3) such a project could potentially become a community commons. The capacity could be developed to attack other complex and difficult problems because a range of individuals will buy-in to transforming the strip. The first stage of implementing this project was creating an environment that would get groups to concentrate on making visible changes.

Because kids do it themselves, it becomes sacred. This new project was integrally related to English faculty interests and organically intertwined with the curriculum of the high school. Professors performed a survey analysis of the school to understand what careers students were interested in and what information they had to pursue those careers. This new project was integrally related to English classes and helped teachers evaluate the skills and motivations of their students. Faculty received research and publishing experience for tenure while students realized that test scores matter to achieve goals. Tenacity, consistency and flexibility allowed the project to develop and mature.

In both projects, it is important to note some common elements that serve as general rules for university-community collaborative partnerships. These projects require tenacity, consistent efforts on the issue, and flexibility. Furthermore, the end results need to match up with interests of all the parties involved (public agencies, community, and faculty). Henry Taylor finished the panel presentations by describing activities that represent efforts to bring neighborhood economic development to the forefront of the process of transforming neighborhoods. There is a need to develop a long-term strategy for how we bring the schools into the process of neighborhood community economic development. A true community school will be a force in the process of transforming neighborhoods by engaging the neighborhood in a variety of activities which will re-enforce efforts to change communities.

The Center for Urban Studies (CUR) at the Buffalo University is a freestanding research and policy unit located in the Department of Planning. The University allows faculty members to be released from part of the course load during a semester to engage in center activity while also providing summer funding for faculty. CUR also houses a non-profit community-economic development corporation that is membership-based and linked directly to the community. Neighborhood economic development is a significant vehicle for community capacity building. A neighborhood intervention strategy that would center around neighborhood economic development was recently formulated by residents and city council members in a troubled neighborhood in central Buffalo. The strategy focused on transforming commercial strips around which communities are built because these strips are often dilapidated and crumbling. The community chose to focus on strips for three reasons: (1) strips are the window through which people view everyday life and culture in a community; (2) strip development is central to bolstering the quality of life in a neighborhood; and (3) such a project could potentially become a community commons. The capacity could be developed to attack other complex and difficult problems because a range of individuals will buy-in to transforming the strip.
that are respectful of many voices. As teachers, we want to know if our service learning efforts are reaping real benefits pedagogically and in terms of learning outcomes, and if students at all levels are learning better. As policy makers we want to demonstrate that our work matters and makes a difference. As stewards and fundraisers, we want to demonstrate that our projects have achieved real measurable outcomes.

Questions raised by evaluation and assessment are many—what are its goals and purposes? How do we set up research and assessment so that it captures what we want to learn without getting in the way of the program? How do we overcome fear and ignorance concerning matters of evaluation and assessment so that we see it as an instrument of confirmation and improvement?

How do we agree upon research goals and results we need? What about methodologies and implementation of assessment tools (both qualitative and quantitative)? How do we know more about what we know? How can we learn about our experience in the most useful and complimentary ways?

Ian Beckman described the model of assessment of DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest study. WEPIC has been part of a larger DeWitt study, which has invested 14 million into study—finance study. The three-tiered evaluation first WEPIC—Universities and public schools—educational graduate students supplementing the DeWitt study, which closely examines those sites to determine what the children in the DeWitt study, a base-line survey are learning better. As policy makers we want to know about planning, participation and implementation. Sites that were not identified to be in intensive group will receive an organizational survey to be documented (tier 3 sites). Tier 2 sites consist of nine cities identified as very intensive in terms of implementation planning and in terms of what they are doing. This will be part of the planning and participation study and six of those nine will be involved in a more extensive participation study examining characteristics of student participants, types of activities, etc. Six sites will also be part of the experience survey. Jean Grossman elaborated on the study being conducted by DeWitt. She began by noting the daunting nature of an evaluation that covers sixty schools in twenty cities. Much effort has been put in to determining what are the important lessons and information to glean and how to best go about gleanling them. It takes many sub-questions to answer the crucial “How do you prove if this thing works?” question. Among the most crucial are: “How do after-school and community-school initiatives get off the ground?”, “How does a community come together and determine the collaborators to put a program in the schools?”, “What are the lessons that can be learned?”. The model is always beautiful, but we are evaluating what is on the ground, not what is in the model. When looking at the implementation of what is on the ground we need to ask who is involved, what types of activities are in place, and how do we learn to measure the quality of activities in place (particularly the youth development qualities). While the content of a program is somewhat important, that is only one dimension of what determines the outcomes (i.e. different outcomes may come out of similar activities depending on the structure and quality of the activity). Understanding what the dimensions of the program are and how they can be measured is crucial (different goals). Sites are able to come those issues have the strongest collaborative structure with both school and community taking part in the governance of these after-school activities. Unless school, particularly the principal, is on board and welcoming of collaboration, it will be difficult to attain a collaborative partnership. Even when a program is up and running, tensions with teachers arise, making the principal’s support crucial. Does it matter if good leadership opportunities). There are also many lessons that we can learn from asking questions about the activity of a program. Does it matter if good kids or bad kids are attending? How often do they attend? Is the program geared toward many kids with less intensive activity or fewer kids with more intensive activity? Does intensive participation produce different outcomes at school? How much do children in the DeWitt study, a base-line survey was utilized with a follow-up survey in a year. Issues that are being examined over time include: use of children, peer, adult, and family relationships; youth’s sense of hope for future, belonging, and self-efficacy; engagement, behavior, and attitudes towards school. All those elements are then correlated with type, quality, quantity, and cost of the activity. Are higher quality activities more costly? Is training critical for high quality? Does spending more money produce better outcomes? When is one method of raising money more successful than other methods for an organization?

After visiting the 2nd level sites for a year, the organizational survey allows evaluators to determine how common the experiences of the nine sites are everywhere else. What causes one site to have different visions? While the type of model impacts participant’s vision, the historical context is also important in determining key visions for the school. When do you get more of a consensus on the vision and when does it seem more dispersed? Community involvement might play a crucial role in determining this. For some sights, the community runs initiatives and there is collaboration of community and school groups with management oversight. In other sights, less formal community input involvement exists. Even when site-level governance is strong factor, it is a difficult factor to put into place because input is easier, yet governance is much more difficult. The biggest implementation challenges found at this point primarily deal with issues of trust and control. There are tensions at the school district level about getting school district support and school-level tensions about space and liability issues. Who does school allow community (or property?) These challenges are based on fundamental differences in mission, procedural differences (makes communication difficult), and organizations styles (do you go to top or bottom of chain to solve problems)? These issues have the strongest collaborative structure with both school and community taking part in the governance of these after-school activities. Unless school, particularly the principal, is on board and welcoming of collaboration, it will be difficult to attain a collaborative partnership. Even when a program is up and running, tensions with teachers arise, making the principal’s support crucial. Does it matter if good kids or bad kids are attending? How often do they attend? Is the program geared toward many kids with less intensive activity or fewer kids with more intensive activity? Does intensive participation produce different outcomes at school? How much do children in the DeWitt study, a base-line survey was utilized with a follow-up survey in a year. Issues that are being examined over time include: use of children, peer, adult, and family relationships; youth’s sense of hope for future, belonging, and self-efficacy; engagement, behavior, and attitudes towards school. All those elements are then correlated with type, quality, quantity, and cost of the activity. Are higher quality activities more costly? Is training critical for high quality? Does spending more money produce better outcomes? When is one method of raising money more successful than other methods for an organization?

After visiting the 2nd level sites for a year, the organizational survey allows evaluators to determine how common the experiences of the nine sites are everywhere else. What causes one site to have different visions? While the type of model impacts participant’s vision, the historical context is also important in determining key visions for the school. When do you get more of a consensus on the vision and when does it seem more dispersed? Community involvement might play a crucial role in determining this. For some sights, the community runs initiatives and there is collaboration of community and school groups with management oversight. In other sights, less formal community input involvement exists. Even when site-level governance is strong factor, it is a difficult factor to put into place because input is easier, yet governance is much more difficult. The biggest implementation challenges found at this point primarily deal with issues of trust and control. There are tensions at the school district level about getting school district support and school-level tensions about space and liability issues. Who does school allow community (or property?) These challenges are based on fundamental differences in mission, procedural differences (makes communication difficult), and organizations styles (do you go to top or bottom of chain to solve problems)? These issues have the strongest collaborative structure with both school and community taking part in the governance of these after-school activities. Unless school, particularly the principal, is on board and welcoming of collaboration, it will be difficult to attain a collaborative partnership. Even when a program is up and running, tensions with teachers arise, making the principal’s support crucial. Does it matter if good kids or bad kids are attending? How often do they attend? Is the program geared toward many kids with less intensive activity or fewer kids with more intensive activity? Does intensive participation produce different outcomes at school? How much do children in the DeWitt study, a base-line survey was utilized with a follow-up survey in a year. Issues that are being examined over time include: use of children, peer, adult, and family relationships; youth’s sense of hope for future, belonging, and self-efficacy; engagement, behavior, and attitudes towards school. All those elements are then correlated with type, quality, quantity, and cost of the activity. Are higher quality activities more costly? Is training critical for high quality? Does spending more money produce better outcomes? When is one method of raising money more successful than other methods for an organization?
extrinsic goal orientation, which is good since psychology shows extrinsic orientation to be the weakest motivator. There was also a decline in effort avoidance. A decline was seen in anti-social community needs. Evaluation needs to be built into the program of a university so that it is taken into the K-12 curriculum and linking it to the university and their impact on curricular structure of university; and (4) impact on central administration—how has it enriched and expanded education. Students develop of a concept of evaluation and monitoring as they learn and help to sensitize community schools to the evaluation process so that they can take an active part in that process.

For future evaluations, it is very important to try and have a comparison/control school, but this raises the issue of how do you find a comparable school. Classroom level differences (different teachers doing different things) also need to be taken into account. Multi-level effects would help tease out individual differences from classroom level differences. Other lessons learned include combining qualitative and quantitative measurements and using collected data collaboratively with teachers and administrators at the school level.

Francis Johnston concluded the panel presentations by commenting on the ongoing evaluation of a Kellogg-funded grant linking intellectual resources at the University of Pennsylvania with community needs that ideally need to be built within the program of a university so that it becomes a part of academically based community service (service intrinsically linked to the academic and research missions of a university). The Kellogg project demonstrates how universities can serve communities while advancing their research mission and improving undergraduate education. The grant supported three different projects in the fields of nutrition and health, lead and environment, and culture and community studies. Non-academically based community service (ABCS) courses along with expanded courses and course projects also resulted from Kellogg funding, helping the University to develop over eighty ABCS courses. These courses cut across departments and undergraduate schools. Finally, Kellogg provided support for undergraduate and graduate students to serve as research assistants, provide infrastructure support, and write ongoing doctoral dissertations and undergraduate theses.

How do we improve the quality of work that we do in local community schools? When confronted with this question, Johnston set up a course on evaluation of programs: “Monitoring and Evaluation of Social Programs.” It is crucial that the university draw on its only and most unique resource—students. Students can learn the process of evaluation as part of their own courses of study. Students develop of a concept of evaluation and monitoring as they learn and help to sensitize community schools to the evaluation process so that they can take an active part in that process. There are four central areas of evaluation: (1) establishment of program, process of implementing the program, impact of program on the school and school community; (2) impact on university students—how has it enriched and expanded education and developed their own sense of moral and civic awareness; (3) integration of activities within the university and their impact on curricular structure of university; and (4) impact on central administration—how has it shaped their view of the mission of the university?

Evaluation should be brought within what we are doing on a daily basis. In the class, group projects, in-class presentations, and evaluation write-ups based on the four-fold model have all been utilized. Students then were able to present their findings at a recent Kellogg conference. One group of students evaluated the impact of ABCS courses on undergraduate students. Two samples of students were taken—one group that did not take ABCS courses, and one that did. What types of students were drawn to ABCS courses? Students who did not take ABCS courses have a greater concern for social problems that impact them directly; race relations, crime and violence, drug use, etc. Students enrolled in one or more ABCS courses were more concerned about homelessness, poverty, teenage pregnancy, universal health care, income disparity, quality of public education, and health care. How do students view their academic careers? While all were concerned about getting good grades, ABCS students proved to be more concerned with volunteering and slightly less concerned with socializing. What is the impact of these courses? ABCS courses increase students’ abilities in being community leaders, acting morally, developing research skills and a philosophy of life, and concern for community and volunteerism. Non-ABCS students claimed to be concerned with attaining job skills, being competitive, practicing learning and working with groups they are not familiar with, although there was only a slight increase in actual community service rendered and school community; (2) impact on university and preparing for life.

The process of project evaluation ought to be a part of ongoing university curricula and not separate from it. Evaluation is part of the total process in both university and community schools. While external evaluations are also needed, evaluation is too important to be left to just the evaluators.

Concurrent Session 1: Service learning workshop: Introducing service learning into the K-12 curriculum and linking it to out-of-school time

Convenor:
Karl Nass
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Edison Freire
Learn and Serve Master Teacher
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Urban Nutrition Initiative

Cynthia Belliveau described the many service-learning developments occurring in Pennsylvania, while raising general issues of concern for service learning. Service learning organizations are taking a conscious look at how service learning can be developed in a state as big and diverse as Pennsylvania. A service-learning program needs to be both a good teaching methodology and a community-changing tool. Service learning is too often a quick adventure into the community and then a retreat back to school. Communities are often changed during that adventure but there is no mechanism to look at the systemic change in communities or individuals that results from service learning. Character education, traditionally kept separate from service learning, is now becoming increasingly linked with service learning efforts. How can character education be developed within the context of service learning, thereby making the experience more valuable? Students should not just learn about responsibility, but practice it through service learning. A youth leadership model where youth are trained as facilitators to help their peers with service learning is one example of how service learning and character education can effectively merge together.

Service learning must also follow a needs and assets based mode, which leads us to consider how can we do a whole lot with very little money. Communities many resources to offer the schools, but often have trouble establishing a relationship with the school because they do not know how. Youth-driven service learning centers are a new development in service learning. They are helping to address that problem. The centers serve as hubs within schools for service learning and are operated by students. The model empowers youth by allowing them to organize and produce service learning projects and directs community organizations interested in partnering with the schools to the youth-driven service learning center. This model has been tested in Gratz High School in Philadelphia and has been extremely successful. Students are leaders and administrators of the center and the organization has addressed issues of sustainability, teacher involvement, and multi-

Danny Gerber
Graduate Student
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Urban Nutrition Initiative
disciplinary project planning. The community uses classrooms to meet with students about community issues, needs, and assets. The service learning that results is grounded in authentic needs determined by community. The community then evaluates the effectiveness of service learning projects. Students from Temple University taught the high school students to run focus groups to help determine needs in areas around the schools. What started out as student newsletter for service learning has evolved into community newsletter.

Ten other similar centers in Pennsylvania have developed following the successful Gratz model. Tamara Dubowitz and Danny Gerber, both graduate students in Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, detailed their work with the Urban Nutrition Initiative (UNI), a program which has received funding from Kellogg, Ford, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Centers for Disease Control. UNI is a school-based child-centered community health project, which is linked to an academically based community service course in the Anthropology department. The course employs participatory-action research with experiential learning as the pedagogy of choice. The course has evolved as undergraduates create the new knowledge that the course generates. Volunteers for the UNI program come from both the Anthropology course and also from the WEPIC volunteer organization. The major components of the project include school-based produce stands, school-based gardens, and an interdisciplinary curriculum that teaches about nutrition, health, business, social studies, science, math, and language arts. At the high school level there is also a business aspect where students grow vegetables that are sold to local restaurants.

UNI primarily works with three schools. UNI volunteers help students at Drew Elementary to plant and harvest the school produce stand four days per week. Students also cultivate a vegetable garden and are exposed to an interdisciplinary curriculum where the lesson plans incorporate the arts. At Middle School also runs a produce stand, and the students are engaged with designing school gardens, classroom gardening, and the interdisciplinary curriculum. University City High School focuses on micro-business units (sdu) are also offered in service learning. Middle school teachers are invited to audit classes as part of their professional development needs. Teachers at the school have established an after-school club that is an eyesore has potential to be used for successful programs, such as the computer recycling program, turning a detriment into an asset. Non-profits are notorious for having technology so the project has become a resource, providing non-profit organizations with needs assessments, hardware, and technical support.

University involvement is needed in partnerships where service learning experience involves a collaborative process in which all participants are learners and teachers, receivers and providers. University-school relationships are a two-way street. How can high school students' expertise be utilized with university strengths? For example, if university students have established an after-school mentoring program, then high school students in the technology program could provide technical support for the after-school mentoring program. This type of activity and partnership engages students, at the university and secondary levels, to solve their own problems and develop models that can be emulated. Programs must be embedded in the community to outlast individual personalities. Universities will be connected with the outside community to the extent that students take their acquired skills back to their communities, whether that community be in West Philadelphia or Vietnam. One example of a university-school-community project that allowed for service learning opportunities at multiple levels was a partnership formed between the University City New School and a school in Quito, Ecuador. Students from Penn partnered with students from the technology program to establish computer labs at both of these schools. Everyone who was involved in creating this program offered something to the program and this brought together a local partnership to prepare students to partner globally. By identifying common needs and skills we were able to bridge differences and bring different partners together. This in turn led to personal transformation regarding education and the use of technology.

Concurrent Session 3: Implications of University-Assisted Community Schools for Teacher Education

Convener: Josephine Robles
Coordinator Cluster Resource Boards
University of Pennsylvania

Panelists:
Claudette Williams Professor of Educational Leadership Clark Atlanta University

Nick Cutforth Professor of Education University of Denver
Kenneth Tobin Professor of Educational Leadership Director of Teacher Education Graduate School of Education University of Pennsylvania

Claudette Williams offered that the term university-assisted community schools is ill suited for what it defines because the schools assist universities as well. Community-based professional development models are more of what the panel is considering. Clark Atlanta University works with a school in urban Atlanta with this type of model. The partnership between the university and school has implications on policy. Policies must be put down very clearly so that the partnership’s mission is well known. For example, how does the work get done very quickly, documentation is very important to ensure continuity at the school and school system levels. Conceptual frameworks are also impacted. Before entering into a partnership both the school and university should consider define their institutional mission and consider how a partnership will help them achieve that mission. Clark Atlanta came up with a new vision and mission that relates to the partnership with local schools. Conceptual frameworks also evolve at the school level. Teacher education should not be limited to pre-service teachers, but also certified teachers and faculty at the university level. Professional development is also impacted by school-university partnerships. Joint training between university students and schoolteachers leads to an infusion of service learning. Middle school teachers are invited to audit classes as part of their professional development needs. Assessment and evaluation must also be considered. The community schools necessitates different assessment and evaluation methods in order to sustain community school efforts. When Atlanta’s new superintendent established goals centered on the primary academic areas and emphasized the necessity of meeting those goals, teachers became hesitant to teach outside of that established framework. While the principal at Clark Atlanta’s partner school has been
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supportive of the community school and encouraged teachers to participate in it, there is still a need for community schools to be a part of the assessment process. If community school efforts do not become part of evaluation, teachers will be hesitant to do it. Similarly, because we are changing the way we teach, it should be evident in the way we do assessment at the university. Teacher education is not just about what is going on in the college classroom, but also in the local schools. Students at Clark Atlanta are assessed on the basis of their recommendations/evaluations of various school programs. This incorporates service learning into curriculum and increases the amount that they learn from the class.

Nick Cutforth described the work that the University of Denver is doing to prepare education students to meet the challenges of urban education. The University of Denver has a non-traditional teacher education program, with the average student age falling in the late twenties. The program is designed for working adults and lasts nine months with classes meeting on Wednesday nights and all day Saturday. As part of the program, students are required to spend one day a week in the schools doing observation or the fall semester and then complete a thirteen-week student-teacher assignment in the spring.

In recent years, an urban education element has been built into the curriculum of the education program. All students must do at least one student-teaching assignment in an urban school. Yet, the program needed to infuse the type of experience that urban teachers need to address the special issues of culture and diversity, poverty, racial injustice, etc. In response to this need, the University of Denver began a voluntary program called SALUTE (Service And Learning in Urban Teacher Education) that focuses on urban issues. The university invites all teacher education students to be a part of the voluntary education program. SALUTE spends two hours every week working with elementary students and then an hour seminar following the experience. Student teachers train the 5th graders to help the 2nd graders with their schoolwork. Then the 2nd graders leave and the student teachers engage the 5th graders in service learning projects. Student teachers work in groups of four and are in charge of 15-20 5th graders who are in charge of 10-12 2nd graders. Student teachers get to create their own learning environment with urban students, which is very beneficial experience for the aspiring teachers. The school-community seminar is also important because it provides the reflection piece that service learning needs. The primary focus of the seminars is to get them to think critically about their teaching, values, and biases. Exposure to the community is also an important part of program. Students do community walks and visits before the teaching starts to expose them to the urban environment.

Kenneth Tobin raised four points for consideration based on the teacher education graduate program at the University of Pennsylvania. (1) The teacher education program is very intentionally an urban program because urban schools are good places to learn to teach. If students want to teach in urban schools, they really need to learn in urban schools. If students want to teach elsewhere, urban schools are excellent venues to be prepared for other environments. (2) The Graduate School of Education has transformative goals. The School does not place student teachers in schools just to learn to teach, but to help transform the schools. The teacher education program needs to work closely with the school community to co-develop goals and to facilitate the learning of youngsters. By facilitating learning and working with teachers, student teachers will learn to teach. (3) Education is facilitated by co-teaching (learning at the elbows). The best way to learn to teach is not to read about methods and pedagogy, but to experience it. Students spend half days in the schools during the first semester of the program and full days during the second semester. A team of about eight student teachers is normally assigned to a small learning community of six. Teachers of student teachers allow classes to be divided and student teachers gain hands-on teaching experience. In the science education program, student teachers were teaching high school students chromatography. The issue of standards never arose because the problem solving and activity was closely involved with scientific investigation and learning. If teachers are confident that their teaching methods are solid, then they will be meeting the established standards. (4) Guided by a belief in teaching from a social-constructivist point of view, the teacher education program thinks about learning in communities. Students plan lessons and activities with other students and with cooperating teachers. K-12 students are brought in and asked about effective teaching styles, making these students teacher-educators with respect to graduate students. Undergraduates and graduate students work with teachers and prospective teachers to help open up the resources at the university for the high school students. Student teachers teach physics and mathematics in the university departments. This affords more ways for both K-12 students and student teachers to learn.

After the panelists concluded their presentations, the audience and panelists engaged in a time of extended discussion. One of the central questions raised in the dialogue was the issue of standards in schools and the apparent tension between standards and service learning. Education programs must meet the challenge of preparing student teachers for the classroom while equipping them to help youth learn the standards-based curriculum. How can we accomplish that and prepare our teachers to facilitate civic development for young people? Education students must know that what they will be capable of doing is largely shaped by the context of the school. But, within that context they should be proactive with respect to opportunities for civic development. On the policy level, we need policymakers to realize that national standards do not work and schools need community-oriented curriculum. Such a curriculum would lead to a natural marriage between curriculum and civic development. Still, most successful service learning initiatives naturally connect to existing standards. If you focus on the child and the child’s development, then you will meet the standards, although not always in traditional ways.
Sir David began with his reflections on the changing role of higher education in civil society from a global perspective and then turned to his views of British higher education. One of the greatest strengths of the university system is the ability to periodically re-invent itself as well as managing the balance between continuity and change. Each phase of reinvention has carried forward previous elements within a changed context. There are various examples of this. Patterns of participation in higher education have changed and as well as their goals in educating their students. The late medieval university produced rhetoricians and mathematicians. The early modern university served to create theologians and natural scientists. The nineteenth century university created civil servants and the modern university has created large numbers of professionals from engineers to teachers and health workers.

The technological environment has also changed. The march of modern science and that of the university have been in lock step. Both have experienced rapid expansions with no clear end in sight. Both have also struggled to maintain what they regard as appropriate levels of resource for the job in hand. Shifts throughout the economy and the public life in general have both formulated and absorbed by the university. Social expectations have changed as well. Universities have been refuges for the poor and devout, finishing schools for the elite, and engine rooms of technology and democracy.

With greater investments into universities in Europe, came greater expectations in policy related returns. This may partly explain why universities have been able to delay and resist change. Universities have to some extent wanted to be apart from the world of social, economic and technical life and to maintain a critical and disinterested standpoint. With the “Dearing Compact” of 1997 in the UK, higher education has retained its independence, while getting increased financial security, but in return, there is clearer accountability and greater responsiveness to a wide range of stakeholders.

There are epistemological as well as policy currents at work here. For some critics, the advances in the modern society have prevented the humanist vision of the university as the engine rooms of technology and democracy. The United States and Japan are examples of the market driven model and Germany is an example of the other system.

Australia and in Asia the growth is 412%. Empirically, there can be no doubt that there is a convergence of mass systems of higher education away from elite systems. In Trow’s Taxonomy, elite systems enroll up to 15% of the age group. Mass systems enroll between 15 - 40% and universal systems enroll more than 40% of the age group. The problem with these numbers is that it ignores the life long learning factor in that even initial higher education is no longer the initial province of the uniformly prepared young. For example, in Britain, there are a majority of students over the age of 21 have had some experience in school when they start. Secondly, the taxonomy concentrates entirely on the process rather than on output. What are all these students doing?

Looking at graduation rates in 1998, Sir David pointed out that internationally there are several mass systems, a majority in the developed world are close to or over the mass threshold and very few which can be safely regarded as elite. The rates also question the relative efficiency of different national systems. The UK system produces the same amount of graduates into the population as the US, but on very different age participation rates. In the UK, over a third of young people participate, but in the US it is roughly 50%.

There are certain characteristics in higher education that seem to be generic if not universal. The major one is pressure for expansion on economic, as well as personal and cultural reasons. There are certain features, which are almost unstoppable characteristics of expansion. The first one is the challenge of the distinctiveness of higher education as an intellectual or epistemological enterprise. The second is the concern of the maintenance of standards. This is a special dilemma when education shifts from elite to mass (quantity versus quality). The third feature is an increase in “instrumentality.” Students make more vocational choices in a mass system and sponsors want to see more economic return.

Such educational inflation can lead to paradoxical outcomes. A simple additive model such as increase in “instrumentality.” Students make more vocational choices in a mass system and sponsors want to see more economic return.

There is debate institutional status, both stratification and the acceptable limits of diversity in a higher education system. Larger systems always raise questions of relative institutional esteem. Purely market systems quickly produce bad rankings and a rigid ranking order. Other systems rely more on the state to fix and maintain strata of institutions. Usually there is a policing the dividing of academic and higher education. The United States and Japan are examples of the market driven model and Germany is an example of the other system.

Finally, there is controversy about increasing costs of a larger system and how they should be met. This usually focuses on the identification of who the real beneficiaries of higher education are and how much they should pay. That issue is usually cast in the marketization or privatization of higher education. There are three counter instances to the market model. Only in the most extreme instances are there that students can become consumers and purchase awards and qualifications. Secondly, there are systems that are entirely independent of public investment. Finally, market failure is reluctantly tolerated. Most of the generic features have played out between WWII and the 1980s. In that period, USA participation rates went up from 11% of 16 - 24 age bracket, to 40%. Expansion of the UK system has been much more recent. The UK went through its own transition from elite to mass at about twice the rate of the US. In contrast to the US, there is the central role of the national government and of public policy. One result shows that educational policy in the UK is deeply political and on a partisan basis. Secondly, it is important to show that higher education institutions are not warmly referenced in the public press in the UK. There has been much moral panic, even in the British tabloid.

If you want a more socially valuable system, you have to allow it to expand. Sir David shows a chart showing how UK student numbers have expanded in that past thirty years from 300,000 to 1,800,000 students. Along with that chart is another showing students by mode of study and level of courses from 1979 to 1999. In the chart, the highest increase occurred in part-time postgraduate student. The next chart shows women as a percentage of total home full-time students. The next chart demonstrates the
Sir David demonstrated the impact of the student funding issues at his own institution. The acceptance of loans is almost universal, almost 80%, starting from 40%. Students are now working for money during their studies, almost 50% working at 15 or more hours a week. Lifestyle choices do of course affect these financial choices. Cars, cell phones, computers all affect students’ “need” for money.

Another pressure for convergence is the government’s concern on policy returns for higher education. The catch phrase is “something for something.” If the government puts in more money, they want to see their social agenda being achieved. There is a very strong emphasis on wider participation and the drive for social inclusion.

Pursuing the social agenda is the development on the inside; these include action on admissions and non-student support and choices on teaching, research, and service priorities. The second is outside development; for example, developments in schooling and on community capability. There are apparent risks in this second option. For example, the partnerships with the community often force universities into junior or secondary positions, losing the ability to define what universities may find hard.

Secondly, there will always be voices inside the university stressing ambiguities about the bottom line, of lower class peoples getting into higher education. There is much research in this area trying to solve this problem. Partly as a result, there are good initiatives looking at engagements with schools and communities, trying to make higher education a realistic goal. The higher education institutions, eager as they may be to engage in these projects, need to do some owning up. The first is the danger of using these kinds of schemes as a way to recruit students from the lower three classes, and ethnicity, the new universities are shouldering the greatest load in terms of social change.

Expansion in the UK has come at the price of relative under-funding. The next chart Sir David shows is a decreasing rate of public funding per student for higher education. Between the 1960s and 1990s, higher education was a free good in the middle class. The Dearing Report, completed in 1997, looked at the educational needs for the next twenty years. The report is huge with hundreds of pages. It asked for support for expansion, support for research, greater use of communications and information technology, graduates to contribute approximately 25% of the price of their courses on an income contingent basis, and stronger regional role for higher education.

The Dearing Report provoked extensive discussion, looking out of the reduction of the amount of money per student. The government took a highly controversial step over fees. They recommended charging fees on a flat rate basis, but maintaining living support for those in need established the flat rate fees, but took the stand on means tests.

Those in need. The government established the flat over fees. They recommended charging fees on a reduction of the amount of money per student. Approximately about 25% of the price of their

graphs show very high unemployment levels in lower class and ethnic minorities. Even for university graduates, many face discrimination in the workplace.

Universities can no longer isolate themselves from what goes around them. Sir David concluded that the University of Brighton needs to contribute graduates who will work locally as well as contribute to the performance of the maintained schools in the area. This is not just about access to higher education, but supporting the teachers, health workers as well as the entrepreneurs who hold the city’s future in their hands. This work is central mission to the University of Brighton as it is to University of Pennsylvania, promoting a vision advanced by Sir David’s professor at Penn, Lee Benson, over a quarter of a century ago—Tocquevillian notion of community empowerment through democratic, collaborative action.

Information technology in this framework is a tool; an instrument in reconstructing the environment. There are at least four issues that need to be considered beyond the digital divide. The first is the design and construction of a system of information technology that will serve these ends. How will we create infrastructures in communities so that everyone has the tools to make the most of this? How will we have a system of fast and clear communication? The second is issues of culture. How do you build and construct the type of culture that makes individuals aware of the power of this technology? How do you make them excited to learn about this? The third issue is the question of finance. Where will the money come from to build this information technology system? Priorities have to begin to change. The last issue is the role of university-assisted schools. How do we turn these schools into hubs around that information system? How do we show that technology is not just for the people in the schools, but in the community?

Mr. Taylor goes on to define commodification. This is the access to buy anything. Everything is based on a dollar value. Access is the ability to buy something that exists within the digital divide, the ability based upon the market economy as currently conceived. Commodification goes against the idea that technology should be given to everyone, especially those without access to it. Lee Benson began by referencing Ira Harkavy and his paper, titled “Democratic Virtuous University Versus Entrepreneurial Virtual Universities: Education for Virtue Versus
Education for Profit—Saving the Soul of the University, What is to Be Done? The basic argument of the paper is not simply radically reinventing American universities, but radically reinventing the entire schooling system. Universities are the strategic agencies to do so. The basic argument is that universities should be democratic virtuous schools whose primary functions are to develop democratic virtuous citizens who then will go on to create democratic virtuous societies. The argument made is that the university is the key entity to bring this. Contrasting Marxism, which held that the economy is the subsystem of society, Dr. Benson stated that he believes it is the schools in today’s society that is the strategic subsystem. Battles over the university is where the battle for good society takes place.

The primary purpose of the university should be education, not research. The mission statements of universities say that education is their focus, but this is not quite true. The research emphasis has become obsessional. The paper does not, however, say research is unimportant, quite the opposite. But Dr. Benson believes that the primary mission is education. The argument is that if we did this in education, there will be better research. Dr. Benson noted that professors should be mentors to students on how to do inquiry, problem solving, and research. The argument is that if universities are centered on that principle, every course in every university would be rooted in some real world problem solving. There would be most impact if the courses would be designed to solve strategic real world problems. All higher education should be solving the problems of education their greatest priority. If democratic universities could solve the problems of their local schools, a revolution could occur.

The next panelist to speak is Gabriele Mazzia. The core question here is whether or not this partnership is a good model for practice for higher education. The second question is whether or not it offers lessons in democratization for the future of the university. Mr. Mazzia believes that the answer to the first question is yes. In Europe, there has been a small project on universities for sites of citizenship which extends to a bigger school based project on democratic citizenship. The argument is that European universities have less resources for this kind of action. US universities are the envy of the world. However, European secondary schools receive more money than American secondary schools. European universities are now thinking more about the education they offer. They are seeking partnerships with businesses and local government to secure their futures.

The more difficult general question is democratization. Americans somehow believe that Europe acts as a single entity and when it does not Americans conclude that it is fragmented. Europe is a project without a master plan. There are many issues to address when looking at Europe. The first is cultural diversity. There are many languages and dialects. There are ranges of conditions from first world to third world standards. There are political stabilities and instabilities. The common goal though is the shared future. Second, there is a divide in Europe. The greatest divide is in Western and Eastern Europe. Another divide is the Protestants North and the Catholic South. The last divide is the Southeast Europe with all the violence in Bosnia and Kosovo. The third issue is war. It has been 137 years since the last war on American soil. Most of Europe has experience reoccurring trauma. The last issue is government. Almost all European countries have a history of strong governments. China has moved more from governments than they do in the US, including a minimal standard of education and health. The good side is Europeans have a macro framework for equal opportunity. The bad side is a cultural dependency on authoritarian style of education and government.

The stage is different in Europe and America, but both universities are being challenged as are K-12 schools. The reason is plain, they have become institutionalized. There is a common malaise in many countries. The bad reason is to train the young in docility and ideology. The good reason is now teaching is centered on learners, active competencies, and greater flexibility. Mazzia quoted Dewey in saying that “education has to be a collectivist enterprise.” You may get facts from lectures, but you learn critical learning from problem solving. What we know is of no use without action. Studies and universities still survive and adapt, but they need to show their role in democratic education. The strongest argument will be examples. Although the democratic work that happens in Philadelphia may not be perfect for Naples, it is the model of the right kind of political view of action.

Sir David Watson focused on the historical view of the success the university as an institution has had in reinventing itself to meet new needs. That reinvention is focused on three elements. The two obvious elements are continuity and change, allowing itself to maintain the factors that make it successful, while being able to change those that do not. The third element is restoration. One of the agendas is to restore that social element within the mission of the university.

On schools, Sir David noted that they are critical, and often deciding the factors in social advancement. For example, in Africa you improve health fastest by giving women primary education. On information technology, it is very important to note it is a technology, an applied science. Universities are scared all over the world. If higher education is not globally entrepreneurial, the for-profit sector will dominate. Sir David ended by warning that people should not get overwhelmed by the future of this. The way to go forward is to understand where you are and to find out what is really going on.

The last speaker was R. Eugene Rice. Rice suggested that in order to change universities, you have to change the reward system.

There are great changes in higher education not just administrative. The problem is war. The first change noted by Rice is the changing of the guard among faculty. Higher education grew dramatically during the 1960s. Many White male faculty were recruited. Today they are ready to move on. For the first time in years, universities are hiring junior faculty. More females and minorities are being hired, a silent revolution. They are not tenured track, full time faculty and adjunct faculty are growing in numbers.

The second change is the pedagogical revolution, started by three developments. The first is information technology and how it relates to the learning process. The second is experience-based learning (or service-based learning). Collaborative learning in the community is the third development.

The third change is the most disturbing. Universities and universities goods competitive struggle takes place for advantage. Students, administrators and faculty are all competing. Higher education is seen now as a private benefit, not a public good. There is a serious disconnection between higher education and the people in society. This seems to be two forms of social rationality. The first is procedural rationality, questions on having to do with how. The second is substantive rationality, question on having to do with why. Our society is getting caught up with the procedural and technical issues of process. We are narrowing our understanding in technology. Here is where commodification occurs. The moral obligation of the teacher is to ask inconvenient questions. If teacher do not have this, there is no education. You have training. The for-profit companies and the corporate universities can do this kind of training.

The fourth change is between the collegiate culture and managerial culture. The collegiate culture is faculty-oriented, peer-reviewed, with an emphasis on the community of scholars and merit. Then in comes managerial culture comes from the corporate sector. They focus on the bottom line, efficiency, productivity, output, etc. They talk about customer orientation, that is the student. The managerial culture is driven by market economy. The collegiate culture is about the academic economy.

Commodification is a problem in higher education, but there is also a culture where status is big. In terms of the relationship between the university and the public schools, this status discrepancy probably has a lot more to do with lack of appreciation for and neglect of K-12. Although the economy is the entity on the public schools have deteriorated and fallen apart. The universities have not focused on this problem. This is a serious problem of the university.

Ralph Waldo Emerson asked the question, “what does it mean to be a scholar in a dynamic changing democracy?” There is a tradition there that has developed that is uniquely American. Freedom began to change in meaning, not just freedom from tyranny, but freedom to learn and grow as people, institutions and society. There has been a neglect of schools and multicultural democracy. They are tied and go together. Equality also has changed, not to mean equal, but to also celebrate and confront difference. There has to be a broader vision of the scholar.
are more and more not just a multicultural society, but we have greater acknowledgement of standing and claiming a multiple ancestries and cultural experiences by more and more individuals. A second trend is the numerical growth that challenges the traditional definitions and understandings of minorities and majorities. The public school is suppose to be the place of access to family and communities and that is the place where the changing diversity confronts people are in the schools everyday. This is the place of great possibility and potential for helping young people and citizens to deal with the issues of diversity. Finally, she states the question, what are the broader impacts that are engaging in these types of partnerships? What will be the products of the work as well? What are the positive impacts for the students, schools, family and communities?

Mr. Covington noted that he has been at Winburn Middle School since 1984 and became the principal in 1990 at the time the state passed the Kentucky Educational Reform Act (KERA). KERA been continuously studied and examined and many people are following its results. Most teachers doubted it, expecting it to not last past the first two years, as the act has caused many changes, mainly changing decision making from the top to the bottom. In the changing of the decision making, it required the schools to be partners with the community. If there was to be any type of success, working with the community was necessary.

Dr. Pires-Hester introduced the three principals as school-based practitioners and generators of emerging theories. Their schools have been participating in the WEPIp Replication Project for at least three years, working to develop elements of Penn’s higher-education assisted community school model. The first principal is from the Winburn Middle School in Lexington who works with the University of Kentucky (UK). His name is Virgil Covington. His school has been engaged in this work the longest, since 1994, when three sites were funded through Penn by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund (Fund). The other two principals began their partnerships in 1998 with renewed Fund support and assistance from the Corporation for National Service-Learn and Serve America (CNS). The second speaker is Nolan Graham, principal of Patterson Kennedy Elementary School. His partner is the University of Dayton. The final panelist is Terence Johnson, the principal of North Middle School in Aurora, Colorado, who works in partnership with the Community College of Aurora.
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distribute the money so that all the children are receiving resources. The school has developed a cyber café with wireless Internet. The school is being completely renovated so that every computer will go wireless. So often public education, without the support of higher education, continues the same old curriculum every year. UD has brought curricular innovation, such as project on lead-based paint exposure and risk reduction. Lead poisoning has taken place in many of the students. The UD went in with surveys and presentations to the parents on lead. Many of the parents did not even know of the effects.

Terence Johnson noted that North Middle School has developed two key partners: the Community College of Aurora and the city of Aurora. North Middle School is very close to Denver, in “original” Aurora, the lowest income section of Aurora and one that is experiencing extremely high rates of demographic change. They are approximately 45% African American, 32% Caucasian, and 17% Latino five years ago. Today they are 50% Latino and 40% African American. There was also a mismatch between the school and the teachers. There is a large prostitution and drug problem near the school. Approximately 75% of the students are eligible for free lunch. They are considered a lower achieving school. They needed to connect their children to the school and the teachers. There is a large problem with the community. Attendance was poor, roughly about 87%.

When Mr. Johnson first came to North Middle School he spent his time in the alleys learning where the fights would take place. There was a fight just about everyday.

The mission had to be created. The focus was on academic achievement. The goals are often focused on how they are doing on standardized tests. They needed to connect their children to the schools and the parents to the schools. One of the ways they did that was to invite people back into the buildings. During this time they went through a four and a half million dollar renovation. Through the partnership with the city of Aurora, a grant was submitted to plant trees, have a picnic area, and other things. They have been quite productive. The challenges to democracy raise serious questions. One of them is what is at least one institutional base that can renew and rebuild democracy in the US? There have been such institutional bases in history. For example, the organized labor movement helped to build democracy. However, we know organized labor today has gone down to nine percent of the workforce.

When you look at an institutional base, one possibility is the university. With its resources, intellectual capacity, civic mission, and financial wealth and its partnership with the community could make a huge contribution to democracy and civic engagement. While there have been a lot of negative trends, such as commodification, the time is possibly right to renew the mission of higher education. In recent years there has been some favorable trends to promote this. There are many university issues on the trend, how can our higher education institution best bring about academic renewal in our communities? If universities are to meet the historical challenges facing them at this time, various elements must be present. First, civic engagement responsibility must become central to the mission of higher education. Next, internally, universities need to further develop and use pedagogy that better integrates theory and research that focuses on democratic problem solving and meeting real world challenges. Finally, the whole effort needs to focus on locality and community in recognition that democracy and civic engagement begins at home. In order for the society to focus on democracy, the community must first begin to be civically engaged. The Coalition is also focused on policy and working on a state framework. Many of the principals feel overwhelmed by all these renewals. The Coalition is trying to make their jobs a lot easier.

Ted Howard convened the panel by noting that while democracy has recently triumphed, as the 21st Century begins, democracy faces some daunting challenges both in the US and throughout the world. In the US, citizens are apathetic and mistrust their government. The differences in income and wealth have been quite destructive. The challenges to democracy raise serious questions. One of them is what is at least one institutional base that can renew and rebuild democracy in the US? There have been such institutional bases in history. For example, the organized labor movement helped to build democracy. However, we know organized labor today has gone down to nine percent of the workforce.

When you look at an institutional base, one possibility is the university. With its resources, intellectual capacity, civic mission, and financial wealth and its partnership with the community could make a huge contribution to democracy and civic engagement. While there have been a lot of negative trends, such as commodification, the time is possibly right to renew the mission of higher education. In recent years there has been some favorable trends to promote this. There are many university issues on the trend, how can our higher education institution best bring about academic renewal in our communities? If universities are to meet the historical challenges facing them at this time, various elements must be present. First, civic engagement responsibility must become central to the mission of higher education. Next, internally, universities need to further develop and use pedagogy that better integrates theory and research that focuses on democratic problem solving and meeting real world challenges. Finally, the whole effort needs to focus on locality and community in recognition that democracy and civic engagement begins at home. In order for the society to focus on democracy, the community must first begin to be civically engaged.

Panelist Marty Blank observed that if universities have gone around the school. Because of the success in school, that has to be the focus. Meritocracy is the place where all this happens. This is where the university, community, parents, youth organizations, and faith based institutions all come together. Breaking down the walls between disciplines, institutions and sectors. The support of public education is what he does. The question that needs to be addressed is what is the connection between the work that is done in the university and the partners they are working with? Education reform people state this is clutter; academic achievement should be the number one priority. So it is very important to gather everyone and build a strategic community school. People need to come with their distinct perspective.

What is then the most important outcome in the schools? Success in school is the answer. If you can get kids through schools successfully, they do well in life. Everything somehow has to be connected. Higher education has a bit of problem. Who else is working with the local schools? How can we bring about those sectors together? Academic achievement is not the only important thing to measure, but it is an important goal. If work is to be done in school, that has to be the focus.

Mr. Blank next addressed the kind of work the Coalition for Community Schools is doing. The Coalition is trying to get more principals and superintendents on this vision of civic engagement and community schools. They are trying to figure out a way for principals to get prepared, that their successors have some idea about community. There is not enough skill to build community inside and outside of the school. For years people have gone around the school. Because of this alternative programs are developed. But the school just remains there separated and isolated. The Coalition is also focused on policy and working on a state framework. Many of the principals feel overwhelmed by all these renewals. The Coalition is trying to make their jobs a lot easier.

Nevin Brown began by reminding us about what happened twenty-one years ago when he headed the Department of Human Affairs. This department was focused on how to make urban public universities try to figure out how to be better citizens in the community. If people are really serious in getting higher education engagement in civic engagement, then the community schools is the place where all this happens. This is where the university, community, parents, youth organizations, and faith based institutions all come together. Breaking down the walls between disciplines, institutions and sectors. The question that needs to be addressed is what is the connection between the work that is done in the
The first part of the talk focused on what the successful. Many institutions are not transparent. Students know what they need to have to be very public about its expectations and what it does. 

The second area that needs work is preparation of students in college to be successful. One of the key to that is looking hard and seeing what students need to do on the high school level, what students need to do to be admitted to the institutions, and more importantly, what they need to do to be placed in college bearing courses. Many times students may be admitted to college, but find when they take placement exams, they are not prepared adequately. Far too many low income and minority students find that this ends their higher education experience. Third, colleges need to think about their own undergraduate programs. In many cases, it is not clear to students what they really want to do, to learn, and to take away from the completion of college. There is not talk about qualities of learning. In this area, part of the problem is the lack of modeling of good teaching practices. There is also the lack of focus on two year colleges. For many low income and minority students, that is where they first experience higher education. Finally, there needs to be a serious consideration being educational institutions. Many urban universities employ a large number of local citizens as nurses, aides, janitors, groundskeepers, etc who we never think of as having teaching practices. There is a need for two years of two year colleges. For many low income and minority students, that is where they first experience higher education. Finally, there needs to be a serious consideration being educational institutions.

Mr. Brown concluded by describing the educational environment of Alverno College. A small all women's college. He noted that Alverno College has done its best to make sure all the students are learners and civic minded citizens. At Alverno, faculty work as teachers, even when they are not teaching a specific course. The students in the classroom are going to be future teachers of America. How often do we encourage the best students in the departments that K-12 teaching is a high goal to have? Rather is it more likely that you take the best students and help them into graduate schools. The promotion of teachers must be more widespread, not just isolated in the college of education.

The Corporation of National Service and the second part on her observations on undergraduates and service engagement. The Corporation of National Service is a small federal agency created in 1994. There are three essential programs. The most popular is the AmeriCorps program, which puts individuals in direct service for an extended period of time in their local community. They also operate the National Senior Service Corp Program which brings Americans 55 or older into service in their communities. Lastly they have the Learn and Serve program that provides service learning in K-12 and higher education. In all three branches, perhaps 80% of programs are involved in education. The service-learning resource availability is widespread. Under Learn and Serve America, 43 million dollars has been made available annually for the last seven years. Three-fourths of the money goes to K-12 related programs. The goal of these programs is to get students into service that is embedded into their academic curriculum. Service-learning also promotes civic responsibility as well as academic learning. The ways in which it promotes civic responsibility depends on how well the service-learning is done. The quality of the service, the length of time, and how that service is analyzed, discussed, and contextualized is what engenders civic responsibility. The higher education programs get a quarter of the funds. They fund 57 direct grants. Those 57 direct grants are nearly evenly divided between grants to consortia and individual institutes of higher education. How does that matter? Through the consortia they are able reach 250 colleges a year to do service-learning and to make sure those courses are integrated into the community. Service-learning focuses on the community. Service-learning also focuses on making the personal political, to find the motivation for service and civic engagement. Personal politics creates personal responsibility. It carries with it a commitment to join others to get things done. Individual action can lead to collective action and this collective action makes a difference. Collective action has to deal with diversity and many of the barriers have to be broken down. Civic engagement teaches how to live in a multi-cultural world. In short, Ms. Cohen concluded, we need to engage young people in civic engagements that are high quality and meaningful which will lead to democratic action.

The third panelist speaker was Amy Cohen. The first part of the talk focused on what the Corporation of National Service and the second part on her observations on undergraduates and service engagement. The Corporation of National Service is a small federal agency created in 1994. There are three essential programs. The most popular is the AmeriCorps program, which puts individuals in direct service for an extended period of time in their local community. They also operate the National Senior Service Corp Program which brings Americans 55 or older into service in their communities. Lastly they have the Learn and Serve program that provides service learning in K-12 and higher education. In all three branches, perhaps 80% of programs are involved in education. The service-learning resource availability is widespread. Under Learn and Serve America, 43 million dollars has been made available annually for the last seven years. Three-fourths of the money goes to K-12 related programs. The goal of these programs is to get students into service that is embedded into their academic curriculum. Service-learning also promotes civic responsibility as well as academic learning. The ways in which it promotes civic responsibility depends on how well the service-learning is done. The quality of the service, the length of time, and how that service is analyzed, discussed, and contextualized is what engenders civic responsibility. The higher education programs get a quarter of the funds. They fund 57 direct grants. Those 57 direct grants are nearly evenly divided between grants to consortia and individual institutes of higher education. How does that matter? Through the consortia they are able reach 250 colleges a year to do service-learning and to make sure those courses are integrated into the community. Service-learning focuses on the community. Service-learning also focuses on making the personal political, to find the motivation for service and civic engagement. Personal politics creates personal responsibility. It carries with it a commitment to join others to get things done. Individual action can lead to collective action and this collective action makes a difference. Collective action has to deal with diversity and many of the barriers have to be broken down. Civic engagement teaches how to live in a multi-cultural world. In short, Ms. Cohen concluded, we need to engage young people in civic engagements that are high quality and meaningful which will lead to democratic action.

The final panelist speaker was David Ray who addressed issues of diversity and service learning. The United Negro College Fund is a consortium of historically Black and private colleges and universities. Most are their students are first or second generation college students. They come from communities that are often marginalized, dealing with critical socio-economic problems. Historically Black schools tend to embrace the idea of service. The idea of service-learning did not usually resonate because these colleges were already used to the idea of service. Clearly there was a language barrier. Many of the institutions felt this was the last movement of the society. Many did not want to participate because they feared being dictated by the outside. Service-learning at a historically Black school does not embrace the idea of charity. They speak in terms of change; how one engages young people, staff, and faculty in service. How do we educate young people so that they are civically active.

What does civic mean then? Does it mean to vote? To be politically active? The whole idea of civic engagement can be foreign to these historically Black institutions because voting and being politically active were not even allowed until recently. Service-learning provides constructive dialogue. There can be a provision of opportunities for civic engagement. How do you recognize that this way of learning needs to be viewed differently by different people? These are students that have a stake in the community. They will go to college and come back to their communities to help. There are always assumptions about the nature of the civic engagement. Mr. Ray noted that there is no level playing field when it comes to civic engagement. There are many people who do not see the value of being an engaged citizen. The programs Mr. Ray is involved in are trying to show its value. The idea of what Blacks think of civic may be different than the idea of the majority: civic engagement is not that you have the privilege to be engaged, you have the right and responsibility to be engaged and educators have the responsibility to find ways in which everyone can participate.