



**Community-Campus
Partnerships for Health**
A POLICY AGENDA FOR HEALTH
IN THE 21ST CENTURY



TRACK 5

Building Partnerships: Stronger Communities and Stronger Universities

written by

Loomis Mayfield, Great Cities Institute, University of Illinois - Chicago

Prepared for Discussion at Community-Campus
Partnerships for Health's 4th Annual Conference
April 29th ~ May 2, 2000 Washington, DC

Please do not cite or reproduce without permission from:

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
3333 California Street, Suite 410
San Francisco, CA 94118

PH: 415-476-7081 FAX: 415-476-4113 E-MAIL: ccph@itsa.ucsf.edu
<http://futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph.html>

This preparation of this paper was made possible, in part, by support from
the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the Corporation for National Service

PREFACE

From Community-Campus Partnerships to Capitol Hill: A Policy Agenda for Health in the 21st Century April 29-May 2, 2000 ~ Washington, DC

Creating healthier communities and overcoming complex societal problems require collaborative solutions that bring communities and institutions together as equal partners and build upon the assets, strengths and capacities of each. Community-campus partnerships involve communities and higher educational institutions as partners, and may address such areas as health professions education (i.e. service-learning), health care delivery, research, community service, community-wide health improvement, and community/economic development. Founded in 1996, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health is a non-profit organization that fosters community-campus partnerships as a strategy for improving health professions education, civic responsibility and the overall health of communities. In just four years, we have grown to a network of over 700 communities and campuses that are collaborating to achieve these goals.

Community-Campus Partnerships for Health's 4th annual conference was designed to broaden and deepen participants' understanding of the policies, processes and structures that affect community-campus partnerships, civic responsibility, and the overall health of communities. The conference also aimed to enhance participants' ability to advance these policies, processes and structures.

This paper – one of nine commissioned for discussion at the conference – played an integral role in the conference design and outcomes and would not have been possible without the generous support of the Corporation for National Service and the WK Kellogg Foundation. On the conference registration form, participants chose a track that interested them the most in terms of contributing to the development of recommendations and possibly continuing to work on them after the conference. Participants were then sent a copy of the commissioned paper corresponding to their chosen track, to review prior to the conference. At the conference, participants were assigned to a policy action team (PAT). Led by the authors of that track's commissioned paper, each PAT met twice during the conference to formulate key findings and recommendations. These key findings and recommendations were presented at the conference's closing session and are reflected in the conference proceedings (a separate publication). These will be considered by CCPH's board of directors as part of its strategic planning and policy development process, and are expected to shape CCPH policies and programs in the coming years.

The complete set of nine commissioned papers is available on CCPH's website at <http://futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph.html>

1. Integrating student learning objectives with community service objectives through service-learning in health professions schools curricula – Kate Cauley
2. Working with our communities: moving from service to scholarship in the health professions – Cheryl Maurana, Marie Wolff, Barbra J. Beck and Deborah E. Simpson
3. Promoting collaborations that improve health – Roz Lasker
4. Public policies to promote community-based and interdisciplinary health professions education – Janet Coffman and Tim Henderson
5. Building communities: stronger communities and stronger universities – Loomis Mayfield
6. Community-based participatory research: engaging communities as partners in health research – Barbara Israel, Amy J. Schulz, Edith A. Parker, and Adam B. Becker
7. Racial and ethnic disparities in health status: framing an agenda for public health and community mobilization – Gerard Ferguson
8. Social change through student leadership and activism – David Grande and Sindhu Srinivas
9. Advocating for community-campus partnerships for health – Charles G. Huntington

The *engaged university* is a recent perspective of higher education for urban universities. University engagement supports research and teaching to address specific needs of metropolitan areas and the community; integrates the teaching, research, and service functions of the university in an interdisciplinary manner; and promotes partnerships with public agencies and the community for broad public affairs and civic interests. It engages its faculty, students, and staff with interests outside the university as it develops new ways to pursue its functions. This is done in an institutional and strategic way, and not just ad-hoc in individual courses, projects, or partnerships. This engaged role for universities is often juxtaposed against the traditional concept of the modern university as a fortress of pure research driven purely by the desire for knowledge and in the interests of autonomous faculty in their individual disciplines.

The engaged university concept is developing a literature with a wide range of cases studies from various locales. Work outlining principles for doing this work appear in a variety of venues: books, peer reviewed journals, and professional journals and magazines (e.g., Nyden, Figert, Shibley, Burrows, 1997; Feld, 1998; Edwards and Marullo 1999; Marullo and Edwards, 2000; White and Ramaley, 1997; Sandmann, Foster-Fishman, Lloyd, Rauhe, Rosaen, 2000; the journals Metropolitan Universities and Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research, particularly a forthcoming issue of the latter, ed. by David Cox and scheduled for spring, 2000; see www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html). A great deal of this literature focuses on technical issues of how to do this kind of work, and in the specific issues related to working with community groups.

Much of the analysis in this paper is toward issues internal to the academy and how to sustain these efforts within the university. If the university is interested in partnership, community partners can be found to form a fruitful relationship. If community partners want partnerships but the institution of the university is hostile to these endeavors, an equitable and collaborative relationship cannot exist. This paper also refers to support for these efforts that tends to focus on holistic views of economic and community development across a range of issues. This support comes from disciplines within the academy, especially sociology and urban planning, and

foundations and government agencies listed below and in the appendix (see “List of Resources”). Some aspects of the engaged university and university/community partnerships this paper discusses are:

- The historical background for aspects of the engaged university and university/community relationships.
- Unifying the effort – across campus and across institutions.
- Sustaining and institutionalizing the efforts.
- How to affect the reward systems for faculty to promote this work within the academy.
- Affecting university administration in its conduct of planning and bureaucratic decision-making affecting the community.

In addition, participants in a policy action team at the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health for its 4th Annual Conference (hereafter referred to as CCPH-PAT) participated in a two-day group exercise identifying key elements affecting their involvement in partnerships. The conclusions of this group are presented in the addendum.

Background

Much of the modern support for the engaged university dates from events and processes in recent decades. However, there are important precursors for this trend in North America, even predating the organization of universities for pure academic research. Some philosophical trends in education are discussed in Harkavy and Benson (1998) and Bender (1998). Higher education was often called on to play a particular role in public affairs and universities always had a relationship to the community, sometimes hostile and sometimes amicable. Often the links were through religion, particularly as many universities were originally founded by different faiths.

From colonial times, higher education was not oriented toward research but was, in a sense, community oriented, i.e., toward the religious community. The earliest universities were founded to produce educated ministers for the laity, as with the establishment of Harvard and Yale in the 17th century.

In the 19th century, a major orientation of higher education to public issues and concerns began with the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 and the establishment of land-grant colleges (see Cooper, 1999). The act provided for the donation of federal land to states for public universities to promote research and professional development in agricultural and industry. This public good of using government aid to promote education was promoted particularly from a partisan perspective, that of 19th century Republicans. Much of partisan identification and voting at this time was related to religious affiliation. Evangelical Yankee Protestants formed the core pietist group in the Republican Party, who wanted to use government to enforce their ideas of morality on society. The ritualists or, more accurately, the non-pietist groups who joined together against the pietists, organized in the Democratic Party with Catholics as their core group. They opposed the use of government to dictate action on social issues and generally opposed using government to make market and economic policy. This division affected policy concerns on specific issues in people's daily lives, such as immigration restriction, prohibition, and educational policies, as well as general outlooks about the role of government in society and in economic development. During the Civil War, with the Republicans dominant in the war congresses, they were able to pass federal aid to higher education as a reflection of their moral, religious perspective of the active role government should play in society (Benson, 1961; Shade, 1972; Kleppner, 1979).

Land-grant colleges were legally required to have public service missions in return for federal aid. Given the state of the economy, particularly in the rural areas where most of these colleges were placed, this led to the development of public service in the agricultural extension service in the early 20th century. This was an important public service and one that modern practitioners of campus-community partnerships can look back to for important lessons, particularly in that it became institutionalized through political support from its customer base. However, this relationship was (and is) a much different type than the modern one promoted by the engaged university. The land-grant college relationship to farmers and the agriculture industry, then as today, was very much on a "community as client" basis. Farmers and university experts did not meet on an equitable basis. Farmers identified specific problems they

encountered or expressed a need for certain improvements, and experts from the college solved the problem through scientific inquiry, the domain of academic research. The university retained the authority and the expertise. But one important lesson to learn from the organization of this service is how it became sustained through politics by delivering clear services to its clients. The political representatives of the rural community continue to provide it with consistent public and financial support.

As others have pointed out, this political base of support for agriculture extension was useful for instituting a major development, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). Selznick (1953) describes how the federal government was able to use the extension service and the American Farm Bureau to establish reliable channels for local input in the project. This affected the scope and practice of TVA plans, making the vision more conservative to take into account local power centers, but probably ensured it achieved its overall goal and was sustained politically (LeGates and Robinson, 1998).

In 1966, the federal government extended the land-grant concept and passed the National Sea Grant Program to encourage the analysis and use of marine resources through research, education, outreach and technology transfer (see www.nsgo.seagrant.org/index.html). Sea Grant is a partnership between government, academia, industry, scientists, and private citizens. The program is under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the Dept. of Commerce. There are 29 Sea Grant Colleges in the designated areas: the coasts, the Great Lakes states, Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Sea Grant designations can be shared across institutions and states, as in the Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant (see <http://ag.ansc.purdue.edu/il-in-sg>). Like the land-grant colleges, the orientation of Sea Grant is toward resource use in the economic sector.

The orientation of U.S. universities to academic research in terms of vision, support, and organizational structure began after the establishment of land-grant colleges. In 1876 John Hopkins was founded as the first modern research university in the U.S. Established colleges like Harvard and Yale and new schools like Stanford and the University of Chicago followed suit (Kerr, 1991, pp. 27-44). This early development of the research university and the professionalization of academic disciplines had connections to community concerns.

For major universities in cities, the settlement house movement is an early example of university/community connections influencing both the academic side and public or community orientation of academia (Mayfield, Hellwig, Banks, 1999). Chicago was the leading, but not the only, example of this with the best known settlement, Hull House, founded by Jane Addams and Ellen Gate Starr in 1889. Addams pioneered a new response to urban problems. The standard view from patrician families for the source of poverty was the bad personal moral conditions of the individual; the poor were to blame for their own misfortune. Addams rejected this view and became a part of the working class community on Chicago's West Side to work with the poor on a daily basis.

Settlement house staff were primarily upper and middle class women, often with college degrees, but with few places in society to use their education. Their immersion in the realities of working class life and their college education led many house workers -- particularly those in Hull House -- to analyze and investigate social conditions in the community and propose political reforms to alleviate the material conditions of the poor. Rather than insisting on moral change on an individual basis, Hull House helped improve social conditions by supporting policy changes, such as minimum wage legislation. It supported the development of community leadership in labor and political organizations, with residents representing their own communities (Cohen, 1990).

In addition to their links to the community, settlement houses were also connected to universities and academic life in Chicago.¹ This was sometimes reinforced by religious affiliations of private schools and the settlement houses. The Chicago Theological Seminary founded the first department of sociology in 1890 and Graham Taylor, a pastor, came to it as a Christian Sociology professor with a keen interest to work with Hull House. He went on to start the Chicago Commons settlement house in 1894 (Stockwell, 1996; Harkavy, 1996; Harkavy and Puckett, 1994). Addams, Starr, Taylor, and other people from the settlement houses developed a model of community-based research to inform public discourse on urban issues and affect university based analysis.

¹ Thanks in particular to Maureen Hellwig for her insights on the role of settlement houses in academia and the community.

In particular, the University of Chicago had important links to the settlement house movement, which affected the development of the discipline of sociology. As some of its faculty and students worked with the houses, they were influenced by the social surveys, maps, and analyses produced by settlement house staff and used some of the concepts and work to develop the emerging research of the Chicago School of Sociology. The education philosophy of John Dewey, also at the University of Chicago, supported this action orientation toward research and the community, in that his “new education” emphasized that the school should be connected to the outside community. He supported students shaping their education studies and the manner of reflection on its value, rather than derive it solely from the faculty (Harkavy and Benson, 1998).

However, as sociology developed into a social science, the academics, mostly male, disdained the social activism done by the settlement house workers in the field, who were mostly female. University academics assumed a pose of scientific objectivity. The creation of new knowledge, not reform or activism, was their vocation (Harkavy and Puckett, 1994).

The academics in the Chicago School seized on the settlement house philosophy of attention and immersion in community life and took it back to their discipline for their own purposes. They turned it into a one-way street of action, from the university to the community. The community was their laboratory, and the residents were test subjects. While the researcher could be *in* the community, they were not to be *of* the community. Neither reform nor service was necessarily the desired outcome of their work, only the creation of new knowledge.

As the major universities organized as modern research institutions, their role vis-à-vis the community was defined as either academic research or education. In education, it was not unlike the “community as client” role, which developed with cooperative extension at land-grant colleges, in this case the clients being community residents who (occasionally) met the entrance standards and had the tuition. Effects on public policy also came indirectly at best, through the education of the next generation of leaders and the general diffusion of academic analysis to public officials.

On the one hand, the early 20th century might have been a key moment of a path not taken in higher education. That is, if university researchers had incorporated the

community vision of the settlement house movement, higher education might be centered more around the public service role of higher education instead of predominantly oriented on academic research. However, this was probably not a viable alternative for the university. For academics to gain respect at that time, particularly in the nascent social sciences, they had to close themselves off from perceived bias, special interests, or political leanings. Higher education looked toward the German model of scientific objectivity, which was considered the best model for university research at that time. The professionalization of academic disciplines took this call for objectivity and pure research by an autonomous academic as the only serious way to achieve academic respectability.

A lesson from this historical experience for today's partnership model is that both sides need to express what they need out of the development of the engaged university and respect the needs of each other to form strong, successful projects. If not, one sided perceptions can prevail; e.g., the community feeling that results of joint activity only turn into publication lines for an academic concerned about tenure, or an academic fearing their involvement is pure volunteerism with no relation to their own professional or research interests. Given busy schedules, such a situation will only lead to failure as one side drops out. Acknowledging the differences can lead to a mutual acceptance of the needs and interests the other side must pursue in joint projects. At the turn of the century, there was probably no basis for compromise because of the academic views about how they should proceed to gain respect. Now, higher education is in a different position and compromise can be much more acceptable. (N.B.: The necessity of dealing with a reward structure for both the academic and community sides was addressed by CCPH-PAT as shown in the addendum).

The academic (and foundation and government side) needs to recognize that community members have expertise to provide in the topic areas. In practical terms, this can come down to dollars and cents. Just as other institutions, foundations, and agencies reward academic expertise with honorariums for participation, community partners need this as well. Academics usually (although not always) have access to travel money to attend national and regional conferences; community partners need access to these resources also, to fully participate in the issues related to this area.

Community groups need access to the budget in projects also, to pay for their administrative overhead. The community also needs to recognize that academics, while generally having a more stable economic situation than most staff in community groups, can also have this concern. As with some community staff, faculty members are often required to raise money for their salaries or career advancement, especially in the hard sciences and health fields.

As the modern system of universities and research developed, higher education expanded in enrollment and staff through the 19th and early 20th centuries. In 1870, the earliest year with solid data from the census, there were 563 total institutions with 5,553 faculty and an enrollment of 63,000. However, the percentage of 18 to 24 year olds in college over this period showed that it remained an elite system. In 1870, the student population reflected only 1.3% of the youth in that age range. Only by 1945 did enrollment reach ten percent of 18 to 24 year olds, as the system began to expand to a broader, mass base. The GI bill helped orient people to an expectation for higher education, providing the principle that would come true with the demographic event of the baby boom. By 1950, enrollment increased to over 2.4 million (14.3%) in 1,851 institutions with over 190,000 faculty; in 1970, there were over 2,500 institutions and 551,000 faculty with over 8 million (35.8%) enrolled; and by 1990, over 3,500 institutions with nearly one million faculty and an enrollment of 13.5 million (51.1%) (see Tables 1 and 2 on in Appendix, page 38; Snyder, 1993). The system has come a long way since Harvard had nine students in 1640.

Public funding for higher education increased somewhat for both private and public institutions, to support tuition payments, teaching, and research. In total revenue for higher education, the proportion from government funds jumped to nearly half of the revenue in the post-World War II period for all private and public schools, as noted in Table 3 in the Appendix (page 39). Government support as a proportion of all revenue has dropped in recent years since 1980. The proportion of revenue from student fees has remained relatively stable throughout the 20th century, accounting for about a quarter of revenue (Snyder, 1993).

Expansion of higher education in size and spending affected the way its role was perceived by those inside and outside the academy. In terms of funding, the expansion in higher education was seen as a necessary endeavor for the public interests of the nation, particularly as the Cold War heated up (e.g., Conant, 1956). The U.S. saw the Soviet Union make important headway in the space race and the nuclear race and began to pump more money into research, particularly math and the hard sciences. Higher education became another soldier for democracy and capitalism.

In terms of the increasing size of the university, larger enrollments meant larger proportions of students came from groups who previously had not participated in higher education. This demographic shift helped change the composition of the university from an elite upper class, almost uniformly white, to a more diverse university with a variety of interests. Members of white ethnic working class communities increased their college participation, as well as racial minorities. By the 1970's, approximately a quarter of African Americans and Latinos aged 18 to 21 were in college (American Almanac 1993-1994, 1993, Table 263, p. 169). University faculty and staff also changed in composition, although at much slower rates than the student population. The increase in higher education meant there were more diverse university personnel, from different experiences.

These compositional changes in student and faculty created a base supporting a different perspective of the university. It was increasingly seen as part of, not distinct from, society. Campuses became involved in civil rights, peace, feminist, and other movements. Students and faculty pushed for special studies programs and centers devoted to new perspectives, such as race, nationality, gender, and sexual identity. This would also produce a base for the concepts behind the engaged university.

The expansion in funds led to support for the academic research model across a range of universities. As universities grew, they needed more physical space for buildings and the housing of students, faculty, and staff. For universities in small towns or rural areas, this was often not much of a problem; wide expansions were available which were already clear of buildings. The urban university was in a different situation as it had to take space from its surrounding community to expand, creating the impression for the community that real estate, and the protection of real estate, was the

urban university's only interest in the community. And, with the changing composition of the university, this perspective was sometimes heard inside the academy as well. In 1968, for example, anti-war activists seized a building at Columbia University and included a demand to stop work on a university gym opposed by community residents (Miller, 1987, pp. 290-292).

The expansion of funding for research in higher education also reinforced traditional perceptions within colleges for the way to gain in reputation. The top universities received most of this research money; lower ranked schools saw the pursuit of these funds as the way to increase their status in the collegiate pecking order. As Kerr put it, "I have heard so many inauguration addresses... that such and such an institution was going to become the Harvard of Southeast state X, or the Berkeley of Southwest state Y..."(Kerr, 1994, p. 166). Or, he could have added for an urban university, "Harvard on Halsted Street" as University of Illinois at Chicago was touted in its early years.

However, this route to academic prestige had limited possibilities. Those universities that entered the post-World War II period with the best reputations in this regard were the ones who received much of the new largesse. This became even more apparent with the declines in public funding of the 1980's, when the top ranked universities continued to get the lion's share of the shrinking research pie. Lower level universities competed with their own rank for a dwindling pot of money, winning awards at the expense of another Harvard-wannabe rather than from the real McCoy, keeping pace in the collegiate pecking order but rarely gaining. One small measure of the futility of such an exercise for increasing institutional standing is the stability of rankings of universities over time. Comparing the top 15 universities in a ranking of 1906 with one done in 1982, Kerr points out that only 3 universities were dropped from this top category and replaced by other institutions between these two polls (Kerr, 1994, pp. 166-170).

The expansion in public funding for both private and public institutions also affected community and public perceptions of what universities owe to the community. People recognized it was their tax money going to higher education, and they increasingly wanted to see the return on it. This was reflected in some state legislators

demanding higher teaching loads for faculty, assuming that a teaching load of, for example, three courses meeting three times a week meant a professor worked only nine hours per week. Time-work studies disabused some of their notion that faculty did not put in hours exceeding the standard forty-hour work week when committee work, research, and class preparation are included. However, the notion that the public could and should demand some kind of results prevails.

This occurred with the University of Illinois at Urbana in 1987. The chair of the higher education state finance committee representing East St. Louis challenged the university to show its commitment to dealing with underserved communities, particularly his home district. The politician asked to see the commitment before considering the university's budget request, an implicit threat that certainly helped produce quick results. The university shifted \$100,000 of its funds to support outreach efforts in East St. Louis. This effort was reinvigorated in 1990 with the establishment of the East St. Louis Action Research Project (Reardon, 1998a, 1999).

The number of Ph.D. granting programs increased across the spectrum of colleges with the expansion of higher education in the post-World War II flush period. However, by the 1980's there were proportionally fewer academic positions for these degree holders. Two main factors played into this. One was the delay of the birth of the successive generation of students coming from the baby boom -- "the baby boom echo." Fewer 18 to 24 year olds meant a smaller base to pull students from, even though the rate of college education was increasing. And even as the "echo" surfaces later than expected, it still does not provide jobs for the Ph.D.'s higher education produced because of a second factor.

A corporate, administrative change within universities affects job prospects for degree holders in the current system. Although the retirement of the professors of the baby boom generation meant openings in academia, this did not mean new Ph.D.'s found the jobs or that those that work in the academy found the same kind of job as their predecessors. The decline in funds for higher education forced more university administrators to develop a corporate mentality concerned with the bottom line of university finances. To save money, full-time faculty positions are increasingly replaced with part-timers who work for lower salaries with less benefits and no chance for tenure.

As more Ph.D.'s realize they are unable to find the traditional academic job, more may recognize that there are other careers to pursue their vocation. If nothing else, these various factors play into the expressions of academic crises and calls for change in the function, structure, and role of higher education.

Ernest L. Boyer, for example, in his analysis of higher education, called for universities with different missions to forego following the same, academically driven research path to prominence. He suggested colleges could fulfill their distinct roles and revel in their unique contributions to the academy. He identified four categories of scholarly work, which take the academy beyond the traditional view of pure research: the scholarship of discover, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990; see also Rice, 1996; Bok, 1982; Tierney, 1998).

The engaged university, however, is more than simply renaming academic duties. Rather than assign different colleges to new, rigid roles, it can allow institutions with vision and flexibility to reinvigorate traditional duties in new ways to cut across teaching, research, and service. Two important trends supporting the engaged university show aspects of this: collaborative, community based research and service learning.

Community Based Research: Groups, Consortia, Collaborations

Community based research developed in recent decades among faculty interested in developing a new research model. This area is variously called "participatory action research" or "collaborative community research." Social science disciplines have primarily developed this perspective, particularly academics interested in economic and community development (Nyden, Figert, Shibley, Burrows, 1997; Nyden and Wiewel, 1992; Reardon, 1998b; Nyden and Wiewel, 1991, 1992; Policy Research Action Group, 1999; Stoecker, 1999; Whyte, 1991; Murphy, Scammell, Sclove, 1997).

The University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) has long given institutional support to collaborative research. In 1978, UIC's Center for Urban Economic Development (UICUED) was founded. Its mission emphasized the production of research, analysis, and technical assistance to community groups to help groups in planning and

development, in the mode of community based or participatory action research (Ansley & Gaventa, 1997). UICUED's faculty and staff reflected the increasing racial diversity of the university faculty in modern times, and the individuals brought their own strong connections to community groups to their work.

In 1993, UIC's then-chancellor, James Stukel, and his special assistant, Wim Wiewel, developed the Great Cities Initiative as the university's mission (see appendix for list of Selected Higher Education Mission Statements). Wiewel had been director of UICUED from 1983 to 1993. Great Cities expresses UIC's commitment to address urban issues through teaching, research and service partnerships. Stukel is now President of the entire University of Illinois system and has encouraged similar programs for the other two main campuses in the state system, called Partnership Illinois in Urbana and Capital Outreach in Springfield.

This mission incorporated all the existing university/community projects that was on-going at the university, particularly at the colleges of Education, Social Work, Architecture and the Arts, Urban Planning, and the health side of campus. But it is more than old wine in a new bottle. The Great Cities Institute at UIC was created to provide support to new programs (Wiewel and Broski, 1999; see also www.uic.edu/cuppa/greatcities). Programs include the Great Cities Seed Fund, set up to give financial support to pilot projects by UIC faculty. The Institute also selects an annual group of Great Cities Scholars from the faculty to give them a year off from teaching to pursue projects in tune with the engaged university, reimbursing the home department for this appointment. Both these programs are awarded on a competitive basis to support teaching or research projects. While the Institute is administratively under the College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs, it draws on faculty from across all the colleges in the university in the Seed Fund, the Scholars program, and in the individual projects developed and housed at the Institute.

The UIC Neighborhoods Initiative (UICNI) was started in 1994 and is housed at the Institute. UICNI is a more focused expression of UIC's metropolitan commitment. It is a comprehensive community development program based on a partnership model between UIC and core areas of the two nearby neighborhoods. It was developed in a year long planning project with staff talking with community groups and faculty in

different Chicago neighborhoods to see where it could do the most effective work. Both the Institute and UICNI have hard line state budget money committed to their programs.

There are various consortia of universities involved in collaborative, community based research as well. The Urban Universities Collaborative in Chicago includes 14 universities in the Chicago metropolitan area, linking university-based researchers and urban research centers together to exchange information. Institutional representatives include deans, center or institute directors, and faculty; university presidents and chancellors attend as appropriate. It sponsors a biennial conference on Chicago area research and public policy. The first conference in 1998 had an attendance of over 400 with about 175 panel participants (about 40% from community groups or the public sector outside higher education). About 10% of the participants came from outside the Chicago metropolitan area (Conference proceedings are available by calling Karen Ide at by calling Karen Ide at 312-915-8622 or checking www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag).

The Policy Research Action Group (PRAG) is a consortium of four Chicago universities begun in 1989. Loyola, UIC, DePaul, and Chicago State are institutional members, and about 15 community representatives sit on its main board, the Core Group (www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag). PRAG's major grants for projects came from the US Department of Education's Urban Community Service program, a federal program, which ended recently. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation funded PRAG with administrative costs since its inception. Funding from a variety of private foundations and public agencies also support various projects. It started a journal, PRAGmatics: A Journal of Community Based Research, in 1998 (Nyden, Figert, Shibley, Burrows, 1997; Mayfield, Hellwig, Banks, 1999; Policy Research Action Group, 1999).

Other cities also have consortia interested in collaborative research and the engaged university. Barbara Ferman was involved with PRAG in Chicago before she went to Temple University In Philadelphia. She joined with faculty from other area universities to develop the University-Community Collaborative of Philadelphia, supported by a grant from the William Penn Foundation. Research projects conducted under this grant were selected by a steering committee including university and community representatives. This built on an earlier collaborative effort of area

universities of the Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development working on the revitalization of neighborhoods, particularly through service learning initiatives.

Some university consortia and collaborations started with funding from a government program under the US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (see below). In Detroit, three universities – University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Wayne State University – joined to form the Detroit Community Outreach Partnership Center. Each university works with a different alliance of community groups in different areas of the city. Faculty-student teams work with community leaders on specific projects (Dewar and Isaac, 1998). In the San Francisco bay area, San Francisco State University, University of California-Berkeley, and Stanford joined in the Bay Area Community Outreach Partnership Center (LeGates and Robinson, 1998; Rubin, 1995). These two are interested in a range of economic and community development projects. Some collaborations can be focused more narrowly on specific topics, such as the Center for AIDS Prevention Studies at the University of California-San Francisco (Nyden, Figert, Shibley, Burrows, 1997, pp. 177-189). Other examples of community based research organizations are available from across the country (Sclove, Scammell, Holland, 1998).

Service Learning

Service learning programs bubbled up from various sources. Service oriented programs, derived from a base of community service programs for college students, were traditionally oriented toward serving the interests of the student and easing the way to the volunteer experience. This aspect gained a boost in the 1960's with programs like the Peace Corps, VISTA, the New York City Urban Corps, etc., achieving a level of institutionalization in colleges. The civil rights movement and student movements for empowerment fed into the field as well. Some of the early leaders in service work in the 1960's and 1970's refer to early concepts of community influence (particularly influenced by the work of Paulo Freire, 1970) and the use of organized, reflective review (Stanton, Giles, Cruz, 1999).

Practitioners come from various institutional and personal interests. A few are: interest in college student community service and volunteerism; connecting with

government programs promoting service; pedagogical needs of their discipline; concern over connecting civic participation and social responsibility with higher education; connecting up with university missions, especially those of religious colleges. In a 1994 survey, most programs in Campus Compact are located under student affairs or student activities, followed by campus ministries and academic affairs (Jacoby and Associates, 1996, pp. 18-19).

The field is developing a structure in a centralized way, establishing principles to define the area with a greater concern for civic responsibility and community concerns. Its principles include:

- Form of experiential learning, in a structured format designed to promote learning and development.
- Participants integrate service in learning/course work, with structured reflection, review, analysis.
- Service provided by student flows from course/learning objectives.
- Students provide meaningful service, addressing human and community needs, engaging the student in the needs of the community.
- The service meets a recognizable goal in active participation – is not “make work.”
- Community, faculty, students are involved in reciprocal and equitable relationship in designing the course, assignments, and project objectives, as in:
 - Students gain greater sense of belonging and responsibility – social responsibility and civic responsibility, skills.
 - Community experts gain respect for their experientially gained knowledge, increase their capacity to deal with community issues, and can identify their needs for projects.
 - Faculty gain better sense of value of integrating theory, research, pedagogy, service.
- University and the community gain stronger relationships, mutual trust and respect.

These attributes seek to combine the interests and concerns of faculty, students, and community in terms of addressing needs and interests, pedagogy, and civic responsibility (Jacoby & Associates, 1996; Weigert, 1998; see also Marullo and

Edwards, 2000). Paraphrasing an existing perspective on collaborative research, “This is research done *with* the community not *to* it,” this is education done *with* the community not *to* it (Mayfield, Hellwig, Banks, 1999, p. 869; see also Ward and Wolf-Wendel, 2000).

But to fulfill that perspective, integration of the principles are key. Without clear integration, the realization of service learning from various institutional bases or interests can ignore one or another side. Programs out of student activities offices or campus ministries may not be connected to curriculum learning or any structured review, analysis, or examination. Service learning promoted purely from the desire to increase volunteerism and services can ignore the pedagogical needs. These, and those programs oriented entirely to their discipline’s pedagogical needs or the concerns of simply raising civic awareness in students, can also operate with little input from the community in needs and interests. Examples of organizational attempts to promote the more integrated, comprehensive views of service learning include Campus Compact and Learn and Serve America.

Campus Compact attempts to connect service with students and the missions of different universities (www.compact.org). It emphasizes the need for training students in the values and skills of citizenship through public and community service. The presidents of three universities and the Education Commission of the States founded it in 1985. The Campus Compact network includes 23 state-based Campus Compacts and a National Center for Community Colleges, with 620 institutions represented (public, private, and community colleges). It supports service learning efforts and collaborative projects between the campus, community, and private sector with small grants and resources. It has actively worked to establish federal programs and legislation that support these endeavors, including the National and Community Service Act of 1990. In 1998, 62% of Campus Compact’s members had incorporated service learning in departments, 42% had service learning majors, and a third included it in their core curriculum (Campus Compact, 1999).

President George Bush signed the National and Community Service Act of 1990 that authorized grants to schools to support service-learning (Serve America, now known as Learn and Serve America) and demonstration grants for national service

programs. President Bill Clinton established the Corporation for National Service (CNS) in the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. CNS includes several volunteer programs, including Learn and Serve America, AmeriCorps (incorporating VISTA), and the National Senior Service Corps. They pursue volunteer work in the areas of education, public safety, the environment, and health and human needs. They work to strengthen communities by mobilizing community resources; and help develop an ethic of service and the leadership skills needed for active, productive citizenship (see www.cns.gov and learnandserve.org/resources).

A few universities require service from students to graduate, including Rutgers, Providence, and Portland State University (PSU). PSU in particular is recognized as a national leader as an engaged university, using its community-based learning program as the main way for broad involvement in community work. The university was established in 1946 and moved to downtown Portland in 1952. In 1991, PSU President Judith Ramaley (now president of the University of Vermont) defined the university's urban mission to focus teaching and research on community issues in a systematic way. This commitment built upon existing university-community partnerships and formed the basis of its orientation to service learning. At its College of Urban and Public Affairs, PSU has an Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies engaged in public affairs research involving non-profits and public officials and promotes university-community collaboration across the region (Reardon and Lohr, 1997; Driscoll, 1998; see also www.upa.pdx.edu/IMS).

Service learning is the most widespread way the university interacts with the community. PSU provides institutional support to faculty and course curriculum development; student training and orientation for courses; and community development. Much of PSU's service learning work is primarily located under its Center for Academic Excellence (CAE). It organizes orientation workshops for faculty in service learning, support for curriculum development, offers various assessment resources, and other faculty resources such as in their promotion and tenure portfolio. CAE supports three main types of courses for students: a Freshman Inquiry course to introduce students to service learning; a range of service learning courses across disciplines for students to take throughout their educational career; and a Senior

Capstone course that is required for graduation. CAE promotes teaching these on an interdisciplinary basis. Funding for CAE included a Learn and Serve America grant awarded in 1994. PSU also received a Community Outreach Partnership Center grant from the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development. Private foundations like Kellogg and Pew also support PSU in these efforts. (Davidson, Kerrigan, Agre-Kippenhan 1999; www.oaa.pdx.edu/cae).

A key contribution of service learning to the engaged university is it strategically matches some intrinsic duties of a university – i.e., teaching, curriculum development, student training – with its urban mission. This puts its work within an organic framework. In a well-run program, communities gain focused help on specific issues and their capacity is expanded.

A problem with service learning from the perspective of the community is that some specific needs and interests – possibly even key ones from the community perspective – may not be able to be addressed in a course framework. This is particularly true for the time frame of a college term that lasts only 10 to 16 weeks, limiting the scope and intensity of a problem solving exercise. Students placed in organizations also will have varying degrees of skills, interest, and commitment to the problem.

These issues are not insurmountable. The problem of the semester length could be countered if faculty or departments work with community groups to devise long-term projects that successive classes work on; or do their class projects in conjunction with larger research or service collaborations that are not tied to the class schedule. PSU has countered the issue of student work quality somewhat by devising their freshman and senior level classes as interdisciplinary team exercises. Completion of a class project is not dependent on the skills or interest of any single individual.

Economic and Community Development

One important benefit that many community based research endeavors and system wide service learning initiatives provide to the engaged university is that they cut across various disciplines and topical interests. A holistic view of community problems can integrate various issues and show links across them. Economic development is related to housing and health issues in a community, for example.

Taking a broad view of community development has some practical advantages for the development of the engaged university. In the community, a partnership with this view increases the opportunity for community partnerships by being able to respond to a variety of topics. It can operate with the specific strengths and interests of community organizations, rather than trying to force a predetermined issue as the key one. On campus, it can support a program with a cross-disciplinary base, which helps lessen the isolation of academics interested in this work and forms a base that can help bring about institutional change. It also provides an opportunity for funding by increasing the range of grant opportunities. It can work with faculty and CBO's interested in health issues with grants from foundations or public agencies in that area; and those interested in other issues from their relevant sector. It can increase the viability of work on separate topics by providing a framework to connect across issues and disciplines, strengthening proposals.

Some foundations and public agencies are supporting this broad base work from university partnership vehicles. Examples of private foundations include Kellogg, MacArthur, and Ford (e.g., Chaskin and Ogletree, 1993; Gittel, Bockmeyer, Lindsay, Newman, 1996; see also appendix, "List of Resources" and US HUD, 1996). In addition to some of the other programs supported by foundations cited in this paper, there is a project supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts in the area of the engaged university, the Urban Universities Portfolio Project: Assuring Quality for Multiple Publics. This is "a national initiative aimed at developing a new medium, the institutional portfolio, for communicating about the work and effectiveness of urban public higher education" (see www.imir.iupui.edu/portfolio). It is a three-year project funded by Pew and cosponsored by the American Association for Higher Education and Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI). The project brings together six urban public universities to enhance the understanding, capacity, and institutionalization of their urban missions (IUPUI; California State University – Sacramento; Georgia State University; University of Massachusetts – Boston; PSU; and UIC). Pew, Kellogg, and others have supported other types of educational roundtables and organizations for reorganizing higher education.

One key government agency supporting a broad view of community development for partnership centers is the US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Under former Secretary Henry Cisneros and current Secretary Andrew Cuomo, HUD developed a reasoned policy analysis supporting collaborative efforts between public agencies, universities, and communities to deal with community issues holistically (Cisneros, 1996). In 1992, Congress created the Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) program to “determine the feasibility of facilitating partnerships between institutions of higher education and communities to solve urban problems through research, outreach, and exchange of information.” In 1994, the Office of University Partnerships (OUP) was established to administer this and other HUD programs related to collaborative work between the university, the community, and government (US HUD, 1998, 1999; Rubin, Fleming, Innes 1998; LeGates and Robinson, 1998; see also www.oup.org).

The COPC program has the highest profile for OUP in promoting collaboration between the university, community, and public agencies. From 1994 through 1999, over \$44 million was awarded to 117 higher education institutions to support COPC projects. Institutions are eligible to receive one start-up grant for three years with a limit of \$400,000. On-going support is harder to come by, but OUP has been able to make some efforts. In 1997 the office had an “Institutionalization Grant” program for existing COPC’s to receive additional funds; 9 programs received \$100,000. In a related program, OUP awarded Joint Community Development (JCD) grants in 1995; these were for \$2.4 million dollars over five years, and five programs won awards lasting through 2000 (University Of California a Berkeley; Yale University; Clark University at Worcester, Ma.; Washington University at St. Louis; and UIC). The JCD program was discontinued after that.

Broader and longer on-going support is important to sustain and institutionalize programs. In 1999 OUP started a New Directions COPC program. Colleges that completed a COPC start-up grant (and/or the JCD grant) can apply for \$150,000 over two years to expand in new geographic or topical areas, and 6 of these grants were awarded (see www.oup.org/news/press.html). This is a good start, but more needs to be done.

The COPC program is flexible in defining communities and promotes outreach, partnership, institutionalization, and active engagement. It promotes a multi-faceted approach, expecting several urban problems to be addressed in proposals. Research is expected to be applied research, closely related to outreach and community needs. It further promotes outreach by funding a bigger part of that activity; it asks for a 50% match from the institution for research but only a 25% match for outreach. In addition, only 25% of total project costs can be attributed to research. In New Directions, the relative matches are raised to 60% and 35%, respectively.

These rules have developed through experience. The philosophy on the research requirements has a good basis for what OUP wants to support, to try to avoid simply funding traditional university research centers, and promote full partnership by the community. However, they can run counter to institutionalization interests within higher education by cutting against research work, a key function of universities and one that is necessary for faculty promotion and tenure. This prohibition can act to consign COPC programs to the weakest area of university administration (such as non-tenured staff) and help support the views of internal critics who do not consider the engaged university a worthy endeavor of academic research. There are ways around this. For example, faculty and community participants could be supported in pursuing research in this field without changing COPC requirements if there were systematic efforts to support research outside the COPC funding.

OUP has tried this to an extent, especially as the director of OUP is appointed for a two year term and has usually come from an academic appointment. National COPC conferences have occasionally taken the form of academic conferences with papers; papers from the 1998 conference in E. St. Louis were selected for an issue of Cityscape (forthcoming; see www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html). This is a peer-reviewed journal of research on housing and urban policy issues put out by the HUD Office of Policy Development and Research.

Unfortunately, supporting research in this manner, by forming academic patterns of conferences, has been at the expense of the community. HUD has rarely provided funds for community participation, and the conferences have usually focused on institutionalization issues internal to universities. Ironically, the conference that

promoted the most community participation, in organization, attendance, and in paper and panel presentations, is also the one that produced the papers for the COPC issue of Cityscape. In 1999, OUP supported efforts by COPC participants at the national conference to develop a system of regional conferences as a less expensive way for community participation.

New avenues to further support the research component of this work could be relations with other institutional entities supporting research, such as private foundations or other government agencies. For example, one research project funded by Fannie Mae was published in an issue of Cityscape (Nyden, Lukehart, Maly, Peterman, 1998; see www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html and www.fanniemaefoundation.org).

Other government agencies at different levels also support aspects of the engaged university. The city of New Orleans joined with HUD, residents of public housing, and Tulane and Xavier universities in a holistic approach to revitalize an underserved community (Kreutziger, Ager, Harrell, Wright, 1999). As mentioned before, political pressure from a state legislator instigated early efforts from the University of Illinois at Urbana to develop a community assistance program in East St. Louis (Reardon 1998a, 1999). A project in Chicago by UICNI helps residents in two underserved neighborhoods gain skills to open child day care businesses in their homes, the West Side Consortium Training Institute for Family Child Care Home Providers. This Institute was formed in a partnership between the university; a community group, the West Side Consortium; Malcolm X, a community college; and Chicago's Department of Human Services. The city agreed to fund the personnel costs, providing a stable base to seek other funds (see www.uic.edu/depts/paff/opa/releases/1999/childcareinst_release.html). Programs sponsored by HUD's OUP supported all three of these examples.

Institutional and Administrative Change for the Engaged University

Even though the field is developing a base of academic researchers and administrative supporters, the concept of collaboration has not yet developed a strong enough reputation to affect university policies or academic disciplines across the board. Traditional sectors of the university continue to look internally in developing their

policies, research, and methods in both university administration and academic research orientation.

In academic research, the dominant faction still uses the traditional academic model of autonomous faculty conducting pure research. Such researchers develop their questions and methods in response to other academics rather than including the community in the basic formation of their discipline. These researchers are not convinced that pursuing more inclusive community collaboration will benefit their efforts, any more than most university administrators are.

One way to gain support is to have a track record of getting outside money into the university for these efforts. Various private foundations can support aspects of research, as well as government. Besides HUD, federal government agencies that provide some support to different aspect of university/community partnership projects include the Dept. of Education, the Environmental Protection Agency's (especially the Environmental Justice programs), the Dept. of Justice, the Dept. of Commerce (particularly the National Technology Infrastructure Assistance program), and the National Science Foundation (NSF), among others. Money talks as far as university administrators are concerned, but some money talks louder, such as those grants awarded through a peer review process with academics such as NSF. These count for more prestige within higher education. While some have provisions for community input, they are the most oriented toward research.

To counter internal university issues on the role of collaborative partnerships in shaping the academy, university/community partnerships will need to become much more established and accepted by different sectors of the academy. This can be done partly by meeting the criticisms head on. Academic practitioners will have to show the utility of their practices by producing scholarship that, like any other academic research, withstands the rigorous criticisms of their disciplines. This means publishing in peer reviewed journals and books. Two problems with this route are:

- Even with publication, pure research devotees can dismiss it as applied work or irrelevant to the "important" work derived from questions internal to their disciplines. (This has occurred to faculty who have been in personal communication with the author).

- The length of time to gain a large enough body of work, and enough adherents, to affect the focus of any particular academic disciplines. Just as likely is that the field could move in the opposite direction. Some disciplines with strong applied principles, such as physical education (kinesiology), are working toward having a stronger hard science research basis at the expense of the production of teachers, for example, not to mention a lack of support for principles in the engaged university (for an example of a program in kinesiology which operates in teaching, research, and service aspects of the engaged university see Hellison and Cutforth, 1997; Cutforth and Puckett, 1999).

Other traditional ways to affect research and teaching interests of academic disciplines include promotion in conferences or symposiums. This also helps cut down on the isolation different participants may feel on their individual campuses and in their disciplines. Several state, regional, and national conferences organized on this basis have now been in operation for several years from various disciplines, such as those with the fields of urban planning, social work, education, or sociology. One broad based academic group with panels and roundtables on partnerships is the Urban Affairs Association, cutting across many disciplines (see www.udel.edu/uaa). The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) is one administrative conference supporting the discussion.

New organizations are inevitable, and not just those associated with grant awarding agencies like the COPC conferences. One new organization in particular is the Great Cities Universities (GCU). This is a formal organization of 21 colleges and was originally formed out of the Urban 13. The Urban 13 is an informal association of chancellors, presidents, and research officers of urban universities, which has met periodically during the NASULGC annual conferences.

GCU takes its name from UIC's Great Cities Initiative. One of its objectives is to duplicate the success in sustainability of land-grant extension programs for the urban setting. It pursues support for research in areas of importance to urban areas, including educational reform, housing and community development, economic development, transportation, criminal justice and health care. It is legally incorporated and able to lobby on behalf of its members, and apply for grants. The president of the University of New Orleans, Gregory O'Brien, chairs GCU (for more info, call 504-280-6201).

Administrative leadership for the engaged university has been key at some places, as the above examples of PSU and UIC indicate. The actual bureaucratic

practice of university administration is another factor affecting partnerships. Administrators and boards of trustees often make corporate-style, strategic decisions for their institutions. The administrators narrowly focus on the immediate interests of their institutions. While these decisions are usually made with little input from the community, they often have an eye toward broader political concerns. Including the concerns of the outside community might, at worst, hurt the university in pursuing what it internally decides are its best goals, and at a minimum cause delays in fulfilling those strategic plans. Administrative personnel pursuing strategic policies of the university mainly look to the administrative hierarchy and university policy to pursue the strategic issues of the institution. Decisions affecting the community can range from expansion, with the university-as-real-estate-developer, to hiring and purchasing practices affecting employment possibilities for residents (Hirsch, 1983; Mayfield, Hellwig, Banks, 1999; Mayfield and Lucas, forthcoming). Even as university-community partnership vehicles may have little influence over these decisions, the administrative actions can greatly impact the way partnerships are viewed by the community.

Administration of individual campuses can become more inclusive of the collaborative model if administrators are shown, through research or practice, that including outside groups can help make a better policy or help fulfill a strategic goal. The likelihood of this is problematic, however, given that in any decision adversely affecting the community, plans would have to be modified at the expense of specific university interests. Another way to promote collaboration in university administration is for faculty interested in collaboration to infiltrate administrative positions through career advancement and pursue their duties in a collaborative manner. At the worst, this can cause friction with administrative personnel used to working in the traditional, corporate mode and undercut the position of those desiring collaboration. At best, this is a long-term process to affect change within the administration, and dependent on the style and interests of the top leadership.

One important institutional step in affecting both academic departments and administration at a university is to establish a center to promote this work, such as PSU's CAE or UIC's Great Cities Institute. Ideally, it will work across disciplines to garner the most widespread support, and it will have hard money support to

institutionalize it within the hierarchy. Too often, centers which are created to promote this work, either from initial COPC or Learn and Serve grants, are forced to continue to scramble for soft money after their start-up grants are gone.

University centers that promote aspects of the engaged university should also have as broad a mission as possible. Those that are entirely internal to a department or college will have limited opportunity to find allies from outside their administrative focus. UIC's Great Cities Institute has operated to find supporters across the university through two of its programs, the Great Cities Seed Fund and the Great Cities Scholars competitions. The fund awards monetary support up to \$7,500 per project and Great Cities Scholars appointments give faculty a year off from teaching to develop new courses, research, or service projects. Both are awarded to people from disciplines across the university.

Another manner of affecting administration is by promoting a broader effort in fulfilling or amending a university's stated mission, as UIC and PSU did (see Appendix, "Selected Higher Education Mission Statements"). In spite of the bureaucratic, corporate manner of much university decision making, universities are not corporations. Individual universities have a base, history, or mission that can lead to philosophical support for collaborative methods. For example, nearly all universities pay lip service, on paper, to three attributes for faculty tenure and promotion – research, teaching, and *service*. Most do not weigh service very heavily in decisions, though.

A few engaged universities have increased the value of service for faculty advancement. PSU incorporated new guidelines, for example, and recognize Boyer's categories of "scholarship of teaching" and "scholarship of outreach." While some have included evidence of these categories in their portfolios and gained promotion or tenure, it is not consistent. PSU decisions are made at the departmental level without a university wide committee, with some resistance according to department (Davidson, Kerrigan, Agre-Kippenhan 1999).

The UIC Great Cities Institute combined various components to support the engaged university, including looking at promotion and tenure guidelines. Through the Seed Fund and Scholars competition, it has identified a wide group of scholars across campus who support this work and can be called on to participate in new projects.

Several of the Scholars and Great Cities Institute Fellows joined in an ad hoc committee and wrote the “White Paper on the Scholarship of Application: Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service in the Research University” (1999). It used the new focus of the university’s mission on the Great Cities Initiative to support changes in promotion and tenure. The report was delivered to the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Research, the Dean of the Graduate College, and the Dean’s Council and used to spark a campus-wide debate on the issue. If the ruling bodies of the university accept changes in the guidelines, UIC has a central university committee on promotion and tenure to help institute them.

Innovative ways for garnering support for this endeavor also need to be developed. One way is in recognition awards highlighting successful programs. One example sponsored by HUD in 1999 is the “Best Practices” award. Local HUD offices submitted entries and different categories were selected for recognition, the top category being the “100 Best Practices” in the nation for assistance to better serve families and communities (out of over 3300 nominations; see www.hud.gov:80/bpawards, and www.uic.edu/depts/paff/opa/releases/hud_release.html). Other recognition awards can apply to individual projects; for example, in Chicago the Sara Lee Foundation gives an annual Chicago Spirit Award. In 1999, the foundation awarded it to the Resurrection Project for a family needs assessment program, Esperanza Familiar, which was developed in a university/community partnership relationship with UICNI and the UIC’s Jane Addams College of Social Work (Kordesh, forthcoming).

This brief discussion of issues related to the engaged university indicate how far it has come and how far it still has to go. As new as it seems to its supporters, it is important to remember its historical antecedents for the lessons we can learn in shaping its future. Long-term professional trends fed into different components, such as community based research and service learning, which are internal to higher education. A focus on holistic community development can offer important benefits. Both its academic and administrative roles in higher education need attention in order to institutionalize itself. These are as important as other aspects of this work, such as

the technical questions of doing this work and issues related to public forces or the community.

ADDENDUM

This paper was commissioned by the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) for its 4th Annual Conference (April 29-May 2, 2000) in Arlington, VA, with grants from the WK Kellogg Foundation and the Corporation for National Service. Conference proceedings and full text of commissioned papers for this conference are available at <http://futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph.html>.

CCPH distributed commissioned papers to conference participants in advance, and authors ran policy action team meetings (CCPH-PAT) to facilitate discussion on policy issues. The CCPH-PAT related to this paper was comprised of about 30 individuals, roughly evenly divided between practitioners who primarily identified themselves as coming from a community group and those coming from a university. Douglas M. Simmons of the University of Texas at Houston, a CCPH board member, took notes.

The group discussed and identified various policy recommendations for supporting university-community partnerships. CCPH asked the group to identify two or three policy recommendations for it to pursue as an organization. These are also general recommendations to funders and practitioners in pursuing this work. This CCPH-PAT identified three broad areas for attention.

1.) Recommendation for changes in funding policies.

Private and public funding agencies should reconceptualize their funding strategies to support partnerships and support the process of collaboration as well as the specific projects that are a result of university/community partnerships. The facilitation and maintenance of relationships in partnership centers or boards requires sustained support to succeed. Examples are the on-going support for PRAG from the MacArthur foundation, the support from Kellogg for activities with the University of Pennsylvania projects, and the state money support for the Great Cities Institute and UICNI at UIC.

Specific suggestions include use grant making criteria that make the community an equal partner in partnerships, for example, insisting on community participation in

the budget process and directing funds to community organizations (whether or not the university acts as the fiscal agent for any grant).

The group also suggested funders consider support to publicize efforts for PR and to present information on the models that are developed. One example suggested was the dissemination grants that the Corporation for National Service offers for funded service learning projects.

2.) Support training initiatives to identify best practices, models, and needs of partnerships.

This included suggestions to create (or identify existing examples) a how-to guide or handbook that includes models, best practices, and principles for pursuing this work. It should include identification of assets and strengths from different partners, with attention to the issues raised under funding, such as identifying new sources of support for projects. One example was to use the expertise of community leaders in gaining support from local government agencies or corporations. One example of local government support was the West Side Consortium Training Institute for Family Child Care Home Providers referred to above.

In addition, organizations like CCPH should support systems of identifying best practices for this type of work, and facilitate discussions on various models. Organizations should also form a mentor program for new participants in these efforts. One example is the HUD Office of University Partnerships efforts to match new COPC grantees with preexisting ones for help.

3.) Identify and support a reward structure for both community and academic participants.

The issue of rewarding this work on both the community and academic side was addressed. For academics, institutions should recognize the service function of faculty and staff in promotion and tenure issues. CCPH and other organizations should work with other professional organizations and licensing boards on this issue.

For community partners, various suggestions were made, such as the academic side treating community participants as full partners with access and input on important issues like the budget, as mentioned above. Stipends, travel money, and other benefits

should be available for community participants. Universities should investigate allowing community participants to have some kind of adjunct faculty position.

The suggestion was also made to develop a community fellowship position for both community and academic participants. This could be based on service-learning or other projects in this field. One example was the program of visiting fellowships among medical doctors and health professionals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Almanac 1993-1994 (1993). Austin: Reference Press.

Ansley, F. & Gaventa, J. (1997). "Researching *for* Democracy and Democratizing Research." Change, Jan./Feb., 46-53.

Bender, T. (1998). "Scholarship, Local Life, and the Necessity Of Worldliness", in H. van der Wusten (ed.) The Urban University and its Identity, (pp. 17-28). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Benson, L. (1961) The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bok, D. (1982). Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Campus Compact (1999). "Campus Compact: A Season of Service 1998-1999." Meeting guide, Campus Compact, Providence, RI.

Chaskin, R.J. & Ogletree, R. (1993). The Ford Foundation's Neighborhood and Family Initiative, Building Collaboration: An Interim Report. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center, University of Chicago.

Cisneros, H.G. (1996) The University and Urban Challenge. Washington, DC: US Dept. of HUD.

Cohen, L. (1990). Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conant, J.B. (1956) The Citadel of Learning. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cooper, D.D. (1999). "Academic Professionalism and the Betrayal of the Land-Grant Tradition." American Behavioral Scientist 42, 776-785.

Cutforth, N.J. & Puckett, K.M. (1999). "An Investigation into the Organization, Challenges, and Impact of an Urban Apprentice Teacher Program." Urban Review, 31, 153-172.

Davidson, S.L.; Kerrigan, S.; & Agre-Kippenhan, S. (1999). "Assessing University-Community Outreach." Metropolitan Universities 10, 63-72.

- Dewar, M.E. & Isaac, C.B. (1998). "Learning from Difference: The Potentially Transforming Experience of Community/University Collaboration." Journal of Planning Education and Research 17
- Driscoll, A. (1998). "Comprehensive Design of Community Service: New Undertakings, Options, and Vitality in Student Learning at Portland State University." In E. Zlotkowski (ed.) Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education (pp. 150-168). Bolton, MA : Anker Pub. Co.
- Edwards, B. & Marullo, S. (Eds.) (1999). "Universities in Troubled Times – Institutional Responses." American Behavioral Scientist 42.
- Feld, M.M. (Ed.) (1998). "Community Outreach Partnership Centers: Forging New Relationships Between University and Community." Journal of Planning Education and Research 17.
- Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gittell, M., Bockmeyer, J., Lindsay, R., Newman, K. (1996). "The Urban Empowerment Zones: Community Organizations and Community Capacity Building." Report to the MacArthur Foundation and the CUNY Collaborative Research Program, NY.
- Gray, M.J.; Ondaatje, E.H.; Zakaras, L. (1999). "Combining Service and Learning in Higher Education: Summary Report." Washington, DC: RAND (available at <http://www.cns.gov/learn/research/slhe.pdf>).
- Harkavy, I. (1996) "Service Learning as a Vehicle for Revitalization of Education Institutions and Urban Communities." Paper presented to American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Toronto (available at <http://www.oup.org/pubs/copcpubs.html>).
- Harkavy, I. & Benson, L. (1998) "De-Platonizing and Democratizing Education as the Basis of Service Learning." New Directions for Teaching and Learning 73, 11-20.
- Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J.L. (1994). "Lessons from Hull House for the Contemporary Urban University" Social Science Review 17, 299-321.
- Hellison, D.R. & Cutforth, N.J. (1997). "Extended Day Programs for Urban Children and Youth: From Theory to Practice." In H. Walberg, O. Reyes, & R. Weissberg (eds.). Urban Children and Youth: Interdisciplinary Perspective on Policies and Programs. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Hirsch, A.R. (1983). Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacoby, B. & Associates (1996) Service-Learning in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kerr, C. (1991). The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980. Albany: State University of New York.

----- (1994). Troubled Times for Higher Education: The 1990s and Beyond. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kleppner, P. (1979). The Third Electoral System, 1853-1892: Parties, Voters, and Political Cultures. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Kordesh, R.S. (forthcoming) "Esperanza Familiar: A University-Community Partnership in the Settlement House Tradition." Cityscape (see www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html).

Kreutziger, S.S.; Ager, R.; Harrell, E.B.; Wright, J. (1999). "The Campus Affiliates Program: Universities Respond to Troubled Times." American Behavioral Scientist 42, 827-839.

Marullo, S. & Edwards, B. (Eds.) (2000). "Service-Learning Pedagogy as Universities' Response to Troubled Times." American Behavioral Scientist 43.

Mayfield, L.; Hellwig, M.; Banks, B. (1999). "The Chicago Response to Urban Problems: Building University-Community Collaborations." American Behavioral Scientist 42, 863-875.

Mayfield, L. & Lucas, Jr., E.P. (forthcoming) "Mutual Awareness, Mutual Respect: The Community and the University Interact." Cityscape. (see www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html).

Miller, J. (1987). "Democracy is in the Streets": From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Murphy, D.; Scammell, M.; Sclove, R.E., eds. (1997) Doing Community-Based Research: A Reader. Amherst, MA: The Loka Institute (see www.loka.org).

Nyden, P.; Figert, A.; Shibley, M.; Burrows, D. (1997). Building Community: Social Science in Action. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Nyden, P.; Lukehart, J.; Maly, M.T.; Peterman, W. (eds.) (1998) "Neighborhood Racial and Ethnic Diversity in U.S. Cities" Cityscape 4 (see www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html).

Nyden, P. & Wiewel, W. (1992). "Collaborative Research: Harnessing the Tensions between Research and Practitioner." American Sociologist. 23, 43-55.

Policy Research Action Group (1999) PRAGmatics: A Journal of Community Based Research. 2. (Journal produced by the Policy Research Action Group, prag@luc.edu, www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag.html, or 312-915-8628).

Reardon, K. (1998a) "Enhancing the Capacity of Community-Based Organizations in East St. Louis." Journal of Planning Education and Research 17, 323-333.

----- (1998b) "Participatory Action Research as Service Learning." New Directions for Teaching and Learning 73, 57-64.

----- (1999) "A Sustainable Community/University Partnership." Liberal Education Summer, 20-25.

Reardon, M.F. & Lohr, J. (1997). "The Urban Research University in American Higher Education: Portland State University as a Model." Journal of Higher Education (Special Issue)

Rice, R.E. (1996). "Making a Place for the New American Scholar." Working Paper for New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rubin, V. (1995). "Evolution of Campus/Community Partnerships." Metropolitan Universities 5, 27-36.

Rubin, V.; Fleming, J.J.; Innes, J. (1998) "Evaluating Community Outreach Partnerships Centers as Complex Systems: In Search of the 'COPC Effect'" Metropolitan Universities, 8, 1-12 (also at www.oup.org/pubs/copcpubs.html)

Sanmann, L.R.; Foster-Fishman, P.G.; Lloyd, J.; Rauhe, W.; Rosaen, C. (2000). "Managing Critical Tensions: How to Strengthen the Scholarship of Outreach." Change. Jan./Feb., 45-52.

Sclove, R.E.; Scammell, M.; Holland, B. (1998) Community-Based Research in the United States: An Introductory Reconnaissance, Including Twelve Organizational Case Studies and Comparison with the Dutch Science Shops and with the Mainstream American Research System. Amherst, MA: The Loka Institute (see www.loka.org).

Selznick, P. (1953). TVA and the Grassroots. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shade, W.G. (1972). Banks or No Banks: The Money Issue in Western Politics, 1832-1865 Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Stanton, T.K.; Giles, Jr., D.E.; Cruz, N.I. (1999). Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on its Origins, Practice, and Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Stockwell, C.E. (1996). "Graham Taylor Urban Pioneer" CTS Register 86,1-23.

Stoecker, R. (1999). "Are Academics Irrelevant? Roles for Scholars in Participatory Research." American Behavioral Scientist 42, 840-854.

Tierney, W.G., ed. (1998). The Responsive University: Restructuring for High Performance. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

US HUD (US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development) (1996). Foundation Resource Guide: A Compilation of Major Foundations That Sponsor Activities Relevant to Community Outreach Partnership Centers. Washington, DC: Office of University Partnerships (see www.oup.org).

----- (1998) Colleges and Communities: Partners in Urban Revitalization, A Report on the Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program. Washington, DC: Office of Policy Development and Research (see www.oup.org).

----- (1999) University-Community Partnerships: Current Practices, Volume III. Washington, DC: Office of University Partnerships (see www.oup.org).

Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2000). "Community-Centered Service Learning: Moving from *Doing For* to *Doing With*." American Behavioral Scientist 43, 767-780.

Weigert, K.M. (1998). "Academic Service Learning: Its Meaning and Relevance" New Directions for Teaching and Learning 73, 3-10.

White, C. R.; Ramaley, J.A. (1997) "Institutional Transformation as Scholarly Activity: The Experience of Portland State University." Journal of Higher Education (Special Issue).

"White Paper on the Scholarship of Application: Evaluating and Rewarding Public Service in the Research University" (1999). Great Cities Institute, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago.

Whyte, W.F., ed. (1991). Participatory Action Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wiewel, W. & Broski, D.. (1999). "The Great Cities Institute: Dilemmas of Implementing the Urban Land Grant Mission." Metropolitan Universities. 10, 29-38.

APPENDIX

Including:

- Tables**
- List of Resources**
- Selected Higher Education Mission Statements**

TABLES

Table 1: Total Number of Institutions, Faculty, Students in Higher Education, 1899-1990 (Selected Years)

<u>Period</u>	<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Instructional Staff</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>
1899-1900	977	15,809	237,592
1909-1910	951	36,480	355,430
1919-1920	1,041	48,615	597,880
1929-1930	1,409	82,386	1,100,737
1939-1940	1,708	110,885	1,494,203
1949-1950	1,851	190,353	2,444,900
1959-1960	2,004	281,506	3,639,847
1969-1970	2,525	551,000	8,004,660
1979-1980	3,152	N.A.	11,569,899
1989-1990	3,535	987,518	13,538,560

Source: Snyder, 1993, Table 23, p. 75.
 (N.B.: At time of fall enrollment for years)
 N.A. – Not available

Table 2: Percent of 18-24 Year Old Population Enrolled in Higher Education (Selected Years)

<u>Period</u>	<u>% Enrollment</u>
1899-1900	2.3
1919-1920	4.7
1929-1930	7.2
1939-1940	9.1
1945-1946	10.0
Fall, 1950	14.3
Fall, 1961	23.6
Fall, 1970	35.8
Fall, 1980	40.2
Fall, 1990	51.1

Source: Snyder, 1993, Table 24, pp. 76-77.

**Table 3: Source of Government Funds for Higher Education Institutions
(Selected Years)**

<u>Period</u>	<u>Federal (in thousands)</u>	<u>State (in thousands)</u>	<u>Local (in thousands)</u>	<u>All Gov't Funds,% of Total Revenue</u>
1919-1920	12,783	61,690	*	37.2
1939-1940	38,860	151,222	24,392	29.9
1949-1950	524,319	491,958	61,378	45.3
1959-1960	1,036,988	1,374,476	151,715	44.3
1969-1970	3,146,869	5,787,910	774,803	45.1
1979-1980	7,771,726	18,378,299	1,587,552	47.3
1989-1990	14,016,432	38,349,239	3,639,902	40.1

Source: Snyder, 1993, Table 33, p. 89.

(N.B.: Direct government aid to students was not included in the totals until after 1975)

* *Included with state total*

LIST OF RESOURCES **(Selected Web Sites)**

Government

- Department of Housing and Urban Development - www.hud.gov
Mission: A decent, safe, and sanitary home and suitable living environment for every American
Fighting for fair housing, Increasing affordable housing & home ownership, Reducing homelessness, Promoting jobs and economic opportunity, Empowering people and communities, Restoring the public trust
 - HUD Office of University Partnerships (OUP) was established to administer collaborative work between the university, the community, and government – see www.oup.org.
 - www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html
Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research strives to share HUD-funded and other research on housing and urban policy issues with scholars, government officials, and others involved in setting policy and determining the direction of future research.
 - www.hud.gov:80/bpawards
A HUD Best Practice is defined as a program or project, management tool, and/or technique that fulfills at least two of the following characteristics: generates a significant positive impact on those it is intended to serve or manage; is replicable in other areas of the country, region, or local jurisdiction; demonstrates the effective use of partnerships among government agencies, non-profit organizations, or private businesses; displays creativity in addressing a problem, and demonstrates effective leveraging of resources.
(<http://www.hud.gov:80/bestpractices/learn.html>)
- Department of Commerce – www.doc.gov
Mission Statement: The Department of Commerce promotes job creation, economic growth, sustainable development and improved living standards for all Americans by working in partnership with business, universities, communities and workers to: (1) Build for the future and promote U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace by strengthening and safeguarding the nation's economic infrastructure, (2) Keep America competitive with cutting-edge science and technology and an unrivaled information base, (3) Provide effective management and stewardship of the nation's resources and assets to ensure sustainable economic opportunities.
- National Technology Infrastructure Assistance Program - <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/otiahome/tiiap/general/general.html>
The Technology Opportunities Program (TOP), formerly known as the Telecommunications and Information Infrastructure Assistance Program, is a highly-competitive, merit-based grant program that brings the benefits of an advanced national information infrastructure to communities throughout the United States. TOP grants play an important role in realizing the vision of an

information society by demonstrating practical applications of new telecommunications and information technologies to serve the public interest.

- Department of Education – www.ed.gov
Our mission, as a Department, is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence for all Americans.
- Department of Justice – www.usdoj.gov
Our mission at the United States Department of Justice is to enforce the law and defend the interests of the U.S. according to the law, provide Federal leadership in preventing and controlling crime, seek just punishment for those guilty of unlawful behavior, administer and enforce the Nation's immigration laws fairly and effectively and ensure fair and impartial administration of justice for all Americans.
- Environmental Protection Agency – www.epa.gov
EPA's mission is to protect human health and to safeguard the natural environment—air, water, and land—upon which life depends.
 - Environmental Justice Programs - <http://www.epa.gov/reg50air/ej/factsht.htm>
Environmental Justice Initiative serves as a focal point for ensuring that communities comprised predominately of minority or low income populations receive protection under environmental laws.
 - National Science Foundation (NSF) – www.nsf.gov
The National Science Foundation is an independent U.S. government agency responsible for promoting science and engineering through programs that invest over \$3.3 billion per year in almost 20,000 research and education projects in science and engineering. Their mission is to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; and to secure the national defense.
 - National Sea Grant Organization - www.nsgo.seagrant.org/index.html
Our oceans, lakes and bays offer boundless potential for food, for minerals, for medicines. At the same time they also provide the setting for very special places, places which help define who we are, places we revere as well as use. To make the most of their promise while providing for their protection, the National Sea Grant Program encourages the wise stewardship of our marine resources through research, education, outreach and technology transfer. Sea Grant is a partnership between the nation's universities and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) that began in 1966, when the U.S. Congress passed the National Sea Grant College Program Act.
 - Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant - <http://ag.ansc.purdue.edu/il-in-sg>
Mission: To foster the creation and stewardship of an enhanced and sustainable environment and economy along southern Lake Michigan and in the Great Lakes region through research, education, and outreach.

Private Foundations

- Annie E. Casey Foundation - <http://www.aecf.org>

The Foundation's Board of Trustees explores opportunities to expand the Foundation's work on behalf of disadvantaged children. The Trustees committed the Foundation to an ambitious mission: to help build better futures for millions of disadvantaged children who are at risk of poor educational, economic, social, and health outcomes.

- Fannie Mae Foundation - <http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org/>

The Fannie Mae Foundation creates affordable homeownership and housing opportunities through innovative partnerships and initiatives that transform and revitalize communities across America. The Foundation's sole source of support is Fannie Mae. The Foundation is headquartered in Washington, DC and has regional offices in Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Pasadena, and Philadelphia.

- Ford Foundation - <http://www.fordfound.org/>

The Ford Foundation is a resource for innovative people and institutions worldwide. Our goals are to:

- Strengthen democratic values
- Reduce poverty and injustice
- Promote international cooperation
- Advance human achievement

This has been our purpose for almost half a century.

A fundamental challenge facing every society is to create political, economic and social systems that promote peace, human welfare and the sustainability of the environment on which life depends. We believe that the best way to meet this challenge is to encourage initiatives by those living and working closest to where problems are located; to promote collaboration among the nonprofit, government and business sectors, and to assure participation by men and women from diverse communities and at all levels of society. In our experience, such activities help build common understanding, enhance excellence, enable people to improve their lives and reinforce their commitment to society.

The Ford Foundation is one source of support for these activities. We work mainly by making grants or loans that build knowledge and strengthen organizations and networks. Since our financial resources are modest in comparison to societal needs, we focus on a limited number of problem areas and program strategies within our broad goals.

Founded in 1936, the Foundation operated as a local philanthropy in the state of Michigan until 1950, when it expanded to become a national and international foundation. Since inception it has been an independent, nonprofit, nongovernmental organization. It has provided more than \$9.3 billion in grants and loans. These funds derive from an investment portfolio that began with gifts and bequests of Ford Motor Company stock by Henry and Edsel Ford. The Foundation no longer owns Ford Motor Company stock and its diversified portfolio is managed to provide a perpetual source of support for the Foundation's programs and operations.

The Trustees of the Foundation set policy and delegate authority to the president and senior staff for the Foundation's grant making and operations. Program officers in New York, and in offices in Africa and the Middle East, Asia, Latin America and Russia, explore opportunities to pursue the Foundation's goals, formulate strategies and recommend proposals for funding.

- Kellogg Foundation - <http://wkkf.org/>

“To help people help themselves through the practical application of knowledge and resources to improve their quality of life”

Links within homepage:

- ❑ Community Voices
- ❑ ENLACE (Engaging Latino Communities of Education)
- ❑ Families for Kids
- ❑ Middle Start
- ❑ Managing Information with Rural America

Links Under Programming Interests:

- ❑ Health
- ❑ Philanthropy and Volunteerism
- ❑ Youth and Education
- ❑ Cross-Cutting Themes
- ❑ Leadership
- ❑ Information Systems
- ❑ Capitalizing on Diversity
- ❑ Social & Economic Community Dev.
- ❑ Devolution

- The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation - <http://www.macfdn.org/>

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation is a private, independent grant making institution dedicated to helping groups and individuals foster lasting improvement in the human condition. The Foundation seeks the development of healthy individuals and effective communities; peace within and among nations; responsible choices about human reproduction; and a global ecosystem capable of supporting healthy human societies. The Foundation pursues this mission by supporting research, policy development, dissemination, education and training, and practice.

- The Pew Charitable Trust - <http://www.pewtrusts.com>

The Pew Charitable Trusts, a Philadelphia-based foundation with approximately \$4.9 billion in assets, invested over \$250 million in 206 nonprofit organizations in 1999.

- The Rockefeller Foundation - <http://www.rockfound.org>

A knowledge-based, global foundation with a commitment to enrich and sustain the lives and livelihoods of poor and excluded people throughout the world.

Academic and Planning Organizations

- American Association for Higher Education - <http://www.aahe.org/service/srv-lrn.htm>
The AAHE Service Learning Project consists of a two-part initiative dedicated to the integration of service-learning across the disciplines.
- NASULGC – National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges - www.nasulgc.nche.edu
- APA - American Planning Association – www.planning.org/conferen/future.html
For more info contact phjertquist@planning.org and 312-786-6705
- Urban Affairs Association – www.uwm.edu/Org/acsp/events/2000call.html, www.udel.edu/uaa The Urban Affairs Association is the international professional organization for urban scholars, researchers, and public service providers.
- Assoc. of European Schools of Planning (AESOP) - www.nhh.no/geo/aesop/index.html
- Assoc. of Collegiate Schools of Planning www.uwm.edu/Org/acsp/conferences.html
- Campus Compact – www.compact.org/news/calendar-main.html
Coalition supporting service learning

University/Community Consortia, Partnerships

- American Association of Community Colleges - <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/initiatives/projects.htm>
Community Initiatives encouraging community involvement:
ALX (America's Learning eXchange)
Americans Discuss Social Security
America's Promise, etc.
- Community Information Exchange - <http://www.cominfoxech.org/>
The Community Information Exchange provides information that strengthens the capacity of individuals, community-based organizations and their partners to revitalize their communities.
- Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) - <http://futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph.html>
Community-Campus Partnerships for Health is a nonprofit organization founded in 1996 to foster health-promoting partnerships between communities and educational institutions.
- The Invisible College - <http://www.selu.edu/Academics/ArtsScience/IC/>
The Invisible College is a national organization dedicated to service-learning. We are university faculty and staff, community partners, and students working toward a common goal $\frac{3}{4}$ increasing the practice of service-learning across the United States.
- Western Region Campus Compact Consortium - <http://www.ac.wvu.edu/~wrccc/>
A four state coalition of ninety-two college and university Presidents and Chancellors that seeks to increase campus-wide participation in community and public service and to integrate service-learning as a valued component of higher education.
- Loka Institute - <http://www.loka.org/>
A non-profit research and advocacy organization concerned with the social, political, and environmental repercussions of science and technology. Loka works to make science and technology more responsive to social and environmental concerns by expanding opportunities for grassroots, public-interest group, everyday citizen, and worker involvement in vital facets of science and technology decision making.
- National Society for Experiential Education - <http://www.nsee.org/>
NSEE is a membership association and national resource center that promotes experienced-based approaches to teaching and learning. For over 25 years, NSEE has developed best practices for effectively integrating experience into educational programs.
- Oxfam America - <http://www.oxfamamerica.org>

Dedicated to creating lasting solutions to hunger, poverty and social injustice through long-term partnerships with poor communities around the world.

- The Urban Universities Portfolio Project - <http://www.imir.iupui.edu/porfolio/introduction.htm>
The Urban Universities Portfolio Project: Assuring Quality for Multiple Publics is a national initiative aimed at developing a new medium, the institutional portfolio, for communicating about the work and effectiveness of urban public higher education.
- Characteristics and Principles of University-Community Partnerships: A Delphi Study - <http://www.canr.msu.edu/aee/research/sandmann.htm>
A three-tiered Delphi survey used to examine principles of engagement for university-community partnerships.
- Medical Care & Community Partnerships - <http://medworld.biomed.hawaii.edu/CommunityPartnerships.html>
Ongoing partnership with several community health centers throughout the State to develop and maintain a dynamic, community-based and integrated system of medical care, education and research.
 - Policy Research Action Group (PRAG) - <http://www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag/>
Loyola University Chicago, University of Illinois at Chicago, DePaul University, and Chicago State University) and more than 20 community organizations. PRAG consists of Chicago-based academics and community activists who have been building a collaborative research network to better link research and grassroots activism. PRAG is coordinated by the Loyola University Center for Urban Research and Learning which serves as PRAG's fiscal agent. At a time when universities are increasingly under fire for not contributing to the community and not doing research directly relevant to the broader community outside college walls, PRAG works to strengthen ties between researchers and community organizations. PRAG matches researchers with community organizations (CBO's); develops research "apprenticeships" within community-based organizations; encourages undergraduate and graduate students to consider career options in community-based research; funds grassroots policy research projects identified and developed by community organizations; and disseminates research results to policy makers and community activists. The group has received a small start-up grant from the Joyce Foundation and strong support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education.

University Programs (see also under Service Learning section)

- University of Illinois at Chicago Neighborhood Initiative (UICNI) –
<http://www.uic.edu/cuppa/gci/>
The UIC Neighborhoods Initiative is a partnership between the University of Illinois at Chicago and organizations in neighborhoods adjacent to the university. The purpose of the UIC Neighborhoods Initiative is to strengthen the qualities of life in the neighborhoods for the benefit of current residents, businesses, the university, and the other institutions. The Great Cities Institute is the home of UICNI. (Recent news about UICNI is available at:
www.uic.edu/depts/paff/opa/releases/childcareinst_release.html
www.uic.edu/depts/paff/opa/releases/hud_release.html)

- University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work -
<http://www.edu/~gti/exchange/colman.html>
Summary of the importance of University/Community Partnerships, link to Generations Together and the Office of Child Development, two well designed partnerships (<http://www.pitt.edu/~gti/>).

- University of Pennsylvania, Center for Community Partnerships -
<http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/>
Improve the internal coordination and collaboration of all University-wide community service programs. Create new and effective partnerships between the University and the community. Encourage new and creative initiatives linking Penn and the community. Strengthen a national network of institutions of higher education committed to engagement with their local communities.

- Portland State University - www.oaa.pdx.edu/cae
Portland State University's Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) was established to promote and support academic excellence in Teaching & Learning Excellence, Community-University Partnerships, and University Assessment by enhancing faculty scholarship, improving student outcomes, and contributing to the Portland Metropolitan community.

- University of South Florida - <http://www.coedu.usf.edu/fcpc/benefits.htm>
An establishment of on-going relationships between the university and communities within its service delivery area, providing a unique opportunity to address urban problems systematically.

- Harvard University, Civic Engagement in America -
<http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguaro/>
This multi-year dialogue focuses on how we can increasingly build bonds of civic trust among Americans and their communities.

- Service Learning – Colorado - <http://csf.colorado.edu/sl/>
"Service-learning means a method under which students learn and develop through thoughtfully-organized service that: is conducted in and meets the needs of a Community and is coordinated with an institution of higher education, and with the community; helps foster civic responsibility; is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students enrolled; and includes structured time for students to reflect on the service experience."

- Ohio University Service Learning - www.ohiou.edu/commserv/servlern/
 - more information coming;
 - participation not required for students or faculty;
 - 41 courses incorporate service learning;
 - full-time coordinator report for activities of S&L grant;
 - service learning projects are available outside of courses but participating students need faculty partners;
 - mini-grants available to support faculty

- University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire Center for Service Learning - www.uwec.edu/Admin/SL/
 - all baccalaureate degree candidates are required to complete 30 hours of approved service learning activity;
 - UWEC program modeled after University of Utah's service learning program.
 - students may fulfill requirement by way of for-credit courses (90 courses with service learning components have been approved
 - college curriculum committees have approval authority) or non-credit options where students design project or respond to
 - project submitted by agencies in need of volunteers;
 - students work with a designated project supervisor in agency and with faculty/staff mentor in non-credit option or course
 - instructor in for-credit option;
 - students must complete a reflection project to fulfill requirement (projects range from papers, to journals, to oral presentations)
 - and faculty/staff mentor or course instructor must sign-off for successful completion of requirement;
 - agencies submit proposal for volunteer and are approved by center director;
 - \$500 grants are available to students, organizations, faculty/staff to support service learning
 - activities;
 - Center for Service Learning operates under UWEC Academic Affairs.

Service Learning

Links to various university and college service learning programs can be found at: <http://csf.colorado.edu/sl/academic.html>

Guide To: College and University Service-Learning Programs

Including Links to Online Course Lists and Syllabi

Linked to 301 programs, 74 on-line course lists and 24 on-line syllabi as of February 19, 2000.

- Best Buddies - <http://www.bestbuddies.org/>
Best Buddies High Schools pairs students with mental retardation in one to one friendships with high school students to help provide socialization opportunities and job coaching.
- Corporation for National Service - <http://www.nationalservice.org/learn/index.html>
Includes information on service-learning, programs, leader schools, employment, fellowships and internships.
- Do Something - <http://www.dosomething.org/connections/>
Helping connect young people with service opportunities in their communities.
- Berkeley - <http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/research/familycommunity.html>
Outreach to American Indian communities of the Southwest, helping them fulfill their roles and responsibilities.
- Campus Compact - <http://www.compact.org/>
A coalition of college and university presidents committed to helping students develop the values and skills of citizenship through participation in public and community service. It is the only national higher education organization whose primary purpose is to support campus-based public and community service.
- CAEL - <http://www.cael.org/index2html>
CAEL is a national organization dedicated to expanding lifelong learning opportunities for adults. Through collaboration with educational institutions, industry, government, and labor, CAEL promotes learning as a tool to empower people and organizations.
- Points of Light Foundation - <http://www.pointsoflight.org/>
To engage more people more effectively in volunteer service to help solve serious social problems.

- Project America - <http://www.project.org/index2.html>
Believes in the power of the individual to make an impact on his or her community. America inspires and teaches people to take positive steps in their communities, and creates partnerships between volunteers and organizations that need them.
- <http://www.doe.state.in.us/srv/ln/elements.html>

Key elements of service learning.

- PUBLIC ALLIES - www.publicallies.org - Chicago
 - program is AmeriCor sponsored (funding comes from grants, direct mail solicitation, and Public Allies);
 - 30 allies (18-30 years old) are recruited and accepted into the program from local high schools and universities yearly;
 - allies work 40 to 50 hours per week including four days at their partner organization (volunteer site) and one day at Public Allies (for review, assessment, meetings, evaluation);
 - allies are also required to form teams and set-up a sustainable neighborhood project before completion of Public Allies program;
 - partner organizations are required to pay \$10,000 of allies' \$14,750 yearly stipend (allies receive \$5,000 after one year of service in Public Allies);
 - partner organizations are recruited by word of mouth and are matched by Public Allies with the appropriate volunteer (50 to 60 partners are approved for matching but are not guaranteed a match every year).
- National Youth Leadership Council <http://www.nylc.org/>
A Pioneer in Service-Learning
Founded in 1983 as a Minnesota-based non-profit 501 (C) (3) organization.

The National Youth Leadership Council's mission is to engage young people in their communities and schools through innovation in learning, service, leadership, and public policy. As one of America's most prominent advocates of service-learning and youth service, the NYLC is at the forefront of efforts to reform education and guide youth-oriented public policy. It accomplishes its mission through several related strategies:

- Developing innovative model programs in schools across America
 - Creating curricula and training programs for educators and youth
 - Advocating educational reform and progressive youth policy
 - Conducting on-going research in youth issues
 - Maintaining extensive networks in support of these measures.
- Leadership for the Common Good
11th Annual National Service-Learning Conference, March 15-18, 2000
Providence, Rhode Island

SELECTED HIGHER EDUCATION MISSION STATEMENTS (Universities, Centers, Consortia)

University of Illinois at Chicago

www.uic.edu:80/depts/paff/uicnews/uic_archives/Archive/1998/19981007123011.html;

See also

www.uic.edu:80/depts/paff/uicnews/uic_archives/Archive/1995/19950810181135.html

and www.uic.edu/index.html/about_mission.html

The UIC Agenda

As we move toward becoming the nation's leading urban land-grant university, UIC must:

- Seek and achieve membership in the Association of American Universities as evidence of our academic standing.
- Reaffirm our commitment to undergraduate education and to the improvement of our undergraduate student body while maintaining the cultural diversity it reflects.
- Expand our instructional outreach to the region and the state.
- Use South Campus development as the catalyst for building a vibrant UIC community.
- Position the Health Sciences Center for leadership in the emerging competitive health care environment.
- Strengthen the Great Cities Program, UIC's metropolitan commitment.

David C. Broski , Chancellor, 1998

Great Cities Institute

<http://www.uic.edu/cuppa/gci/>; see also

<http://www.uic.edu/cuppa/greatcities/greatgci.htm>

Great Cities Institute's (GCI) mission is one of "civic engagement." By creating, disseminating and applying interdisciplinary knowledge about urban affairs, the Institute works to improve the quality of life in metropolitan Chicago and other national and international urban areas. A cornerstone of the University of Illinois at Chicago's Great Cities Initiative, the Institute serves as the University's focal point for new initiatives in interdisciplinary, applied urban research. GCI's Affiliate Centers are the University of Illinois at Chicago Center for Urban Economic Development (CUED), and the Nathalie P. Voorhees Neighborhood Center.

Portland State University

http://www.oirp.pdx.edu/portweb/published_pages/prototype/threads/urban_important.htm

The mission statement of Portland State University shows PSU's commitment to providing access to educational opportunities that make the most of its urban setting.

Portland State University Mission

The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to the metropolitan area. The University will actively promote development of a network of educational institutions that will serve the community and will conduct research and community service to support a high quality environment and reflect issues important to the metropolitan region.

August 30, 1991

President Judith Ramaley

San Francisco State University

<http://www.sfsu.edu/~pubaff/sfsufact/sftoday.htm>

Stated by Board of Governors in 1980

San Francisco State University's mission is:

- To create and maintain an environment for learning that promotes respect for and appreciation of scholarship, freedom, human diversity, and the cultural mosaic of the City of San Francisco and the Bay Area
- To promote excellence in instruction and intellectual accomplishment
- To provide broadly accessible higher education for residents of the region and state, as well as the nation and world

The mission was decided by committee approximately 10 or 15 years ago, the president at that time was either Paul Romberg or Chia-Wei Woo.

Bay Area Community Outreach Partnership Center

<http://www-iurd.ced.berkeley.edu/bacopc/>

The Bay Area Community Outreach Partnership Center (BACOPC) provides technical support to innovative urban development and housing initiatives. The Bay Area Community Outreach Partnership Center (BACOPC), created in 1994, is a consortium of the University of California at Berkeley, San Francisco State University, and Stanford University. Under this program, faculty and students provide technical assistance and community service to scores of governmental and nonprofit organizations. BACOPC's applied research program has helped guide the housing and economic development plans for San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley and East Palo Alto.

Rutgers University

<http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~oirap/OIRAP/fact9798/facthtml/mission.html>

Mission and Goals

As the sole comprehensive public research university in the New Jersey system of higher education and the state's land-grant institution, Rutgers University has the mission of instruction, research, and service. Among the principles the university recognizes in carrying out this three-fold mission are the following:

Rutgers has the prime responsibility in the state to conduct fundamental and applied research, to train scholars, researchers, and professionals, and to make knowledge available to students, scholars, and the general public.

Rutgers should maintain its traditional strength in arts and sciences, while at the same time developing such new professional and career-oriented programs as are warranted by public interest, social need, and employment opportunities.

Rutgers will continually seek to make its educational programs accessible to an appropriately broad student body.

Rutgers is committed to extending its resources and knowledge to a variety of publics, and bringing special expertise and competence to bear on the solution of public problems.

Consistent with this mission, the Board of Governors in 1980, following a review of the university's achievements and capabilities as well as New Jersey's needs, adopted a statement of goals that set the bold aspiration of enhancing Rutgers' national and international standing and establishing the university as a major center of higher education.

By pursuing these goals the university made major strides towards the attainment of a new level of national distinction. These goals shall continue to guide the development of the university as Rutgers achieves even greater eminence and contributes even more fully to New Jersey's well being in the tradition of this nation's great land-grant universities. As the goals state, Rutgers will:

Continue development of the University as a national and international resource by:

- improvements in the quality of its instruction, research and public service;
- Increased emphasis on the contributions of its scholars; and increased emphasis on an atmosphere that stimulates learning, encourages creativity, rewards service, and contributes to the personal and professional growth of all the members of the Rutgers community.

Increase the number of areas of graduate education, research, and scholarship of national and international renown.

Improve the already high quality of the undergraduate experience in the liberal arts, seeking both to preserve the diversity of its programs and to develop students who will provide future leadership for the state, the nation and the world.

Develop and improve programs to serve society's needs for broadly educated, humane, competent professionals.

Serve the needs of the State of New Jersey by:

- conducting research on such basic issues of public policy as energy, transportation, urban affairs, agriculture, human services, coastal and marine science and similar areas, especially those of emerging importance;
 - fostering programs in the arts, music, and theater to enhance the cultural environment;
 - conducting research and retraining programs to improve education in the schools;
 - working with state and local government officials to help improve the quality of citizens' lives;
 - working with business, industry and labor to provide a resource for their research and development needs and for the future education of their personnel;
and
 - working to strengthen and improve the institutional capability and performance of state governmental bodies.
-

DePaul

<http://www.depaul.edu/mission.html>

The Mission of DePaul University (November 1991)

As a university, DePaul pursues the preservation, enrichment and transmission of knowledge and culture across a broad scope of academic disciplines. It treasures its deep roots in the wisdom nourished in Catholic universities from medieval times. The principal distinguishing marks of the university are its Catholic, Vincentian and urban character.

Central Purposes

DePaul is dedicated to teaching, research, and public service. However, in pursuing its own distinctive purposes, among these three fundamental responsibilities this university places highest priority on programs of instruction and learning. All curricula emphasize skills and attitudes that educate students to be lifelong, independent learners. DePaul provides sufficient diversity in curricular offerings, personal advisement, student services, and extracurricular activities to serve students who vary in age, ability, experience and career interests. Full-time and part-time students are accorded equivalent service and are held to the same academic standards.

Research is supported both for its intrinsic merit and for the practical benefits it offers to faculty, students and society. Broadly conceived, research at the university entails not only the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge but also the creation and interpretation of artistic works, application of expertise to enduring societal issues, and development of methodologies that improve inquiry, teaching and professional practice.

In meeting its public service responsibility, the university encourages faculty, staff and students to apply specialized expertise in ways that contribute to the social, economic, cultural, and ethical quality of life in the metropolitan area and beyond. When appropriate, DePaul develops service partnerships with other institutions and agencies.

Egan Urban Center at DePaul University

<http://www.depaul.edu/~egan/>

Mission Statement

The Msgr. John J. Egan Urban Center (EUC) represents DePaul University's tangible and enduring commitment to search, develop, deliver and transfer innovative, educationally-related programs and services that have a significant social impact and give concrete expression to the university's Vincentian mission.

To that end, the mission of the Egan Urban Center is to extend the opportunities for DePaul in collaboration with its metropolitan community to address critical urban problems, alleviate poverty, and promote social justice through teaching, service and scholarship.

Loyola

<http://www.luc.edu/info/mission.html> Revised: November 20, 1998?

Loyola's Mission

Loyola University Chicago is a Jesuit Catholic university dedicated to knowledge in the service of humanity. It is a comprehensive, independent, urban institution of higher education and health care. The university endeavors to develop in the lives of students, faculty, and staff, the spirit of searching for truth and living for others which characterized Ignatius of Loyola.

This university exists to preserve, extend, and transmit knowledge and to deepen understanding of the human person, the universe and God. Loyola values freedom of inquiry, the pursuit of truth, and care for others, especially the young, the poor, and the sick. The university strives to develop in its community a capacity for critical and ethical judgment and a commitment to action in the service of faith and justice. To perform its educational mission, Loyola stresses excellence in the complementary endeavors of teaching and research.

The Jesuit character of the university derives from the presence of Jesuits and others whose work is inspired by the conviction that learning is a way of seeking and finding God. Loyola, while believing in the Christ and His Church, welcomes students, faculty, and staff from many religious and cultural backgrounds, confident that they will find the university environment congenial, rewarding, and enriching.

Respect for the human person characterizes Jesuit education, which encourages students to develop all dimensions of themselves - intellectual, emotional, physical, creative, moral, and spiritual. To accomplish this end, all undergraduate schools offer a common core curriculum of liberal arts and sciences.

Loyola's graduate and professional schools express the university's values through research, rigorous training, and clinical practice. In addition to developing professional expertise, Loyola emphasizes ethical behavior and recognition of the dignity of each individual. As an employer, Loyola practices these same values.

The Loyola University Medical Center addresses a wide range of education and health needs. Its teaching and research facilities, faculty, and staff expand scientific knowledge, promote health-related research, and train the health care professionals of the future, while its hospital and out-patient center provide services to metropolitan Chicago.

An urban institution, Loyola benefits from Chicago's exceptional cultural, economic, and human resources. In turn, the university affirms its long-standing commitment to urban life - and works to solve its problems - in Chicago, the nation, and the world.

Aware of its international role in a world unified by communications technology, and conscious of its emerging national status, Loyola transmits its own cultural and intellectual heritage while preparing students to understand and to serve the needs and aspirations of the world community.

Loyola University Chicago encourages all members to strive for excellence, to search for truth, to live for others, and to develop in their lives a spirit of freedom. This is its tradition.

This is its character.

Center for Urban Research and Learning of Loyola University Chicago

<http://www.luc.edu/depts/curl/>

Through its deep commitment to the city and the rich diversity of urban life, the Center for Urban Research and Learning of Loyola University Chicago (CURL or the Center) is dedicated to the development of innovative and practical approaches to community change that bring about perceptible improvement in the quality of life of the people of Chicago's city and suburban communities.

To accomplish this mission, the Center promotes cooperation between university researchers, both faculty and students, and community-based organizations, citywide organizations, social service agencies, health care providers, and government. By fostering collaborative relationships with organizations outside the university, the Center recognizes the importance of working with communities and organizations in seeking new solutions to pressing urban issues.

The Center is grounded in a model of collaborative research and teaching in service to the community. This new model of teaching and learning stresses knowledge exchange between the university and community that builds capacity while drawing on the strengths of both the community and university. In working closely with communities outside the university, the Center recognizes the knowledge and experience of individuals and organizations in non-academic settings. Strong emphasis is placed on the equal partnership between the university and community in the formation of research issues, development of methodologies, analysis of data, and writing of results. The research leads to action and policy change at the university, community, and government levels.

Georgia State University

<http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwreg/98UGCAT.htm#statement>

Statement of Mission

As the only urban research university in Georgia, Georgia State University offers educational opportunities for traditional and nontraditional students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels by blending the best of theoretical and applied inquiry, scholarly and professional pursuits, and scientific and artistic expression. As an urban research university with strong disciplinary-based departments and a wide array of problem-oriented interdisciplinary programs, the goal of the university is to develop, transmit, and utilize knowledge in order to provide access to quality education for diverse groups of students, to educate leaders for the state of Georgia and the nation, and to prepare citizens for life-long learning in a global society.

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

<http://www.jaguars.iupui.edu/plan/mismay.html>

The mission of IUPUI is to:

- Raise educational achievement and intellectual aspirations in Indianapolis, the state and beyond through leadership and access.
- Develop and apply knowledge to ever-changing issues of health and economic and social well-being through teaching, research, and service.
- Enhance the public and private lives of students by offering the state's most comprehensive range of effective academic programs, from the liberal arts and sciences to a wide array of professional programs.
- Serve as a model for collaboration and multi-disciplinary work through partnerships with Indiana University and Purdue University and the community, drawing upon the distinctive strengths of the academic health sciences and the resources of the capital city and state.
- Build understanding and respect in academic and human relationships through cultural diversity.

University of Massachusetts Boston

http://www.umb.edu/about_umb/mission.html

The mission and goals of the campus derive from and reflect the six components of the Vision Statement of the University system as expressed in T91-107:

- **Access:** The University of Massachusetts offers liberal arts and professional programs on the graduate and undergraduate levels, with doctoral programs addressing issues of particular importance to urban environments and people. Our curricula, the way we teach, and our financial and academic support services address the needs both of traditional and nontraditional students, who come to the University from varied social, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds, who may have a variety of previous educational experiences, and who characteristically combine University education with work and family responsibilities.

- **Excellence:** The University of Massachusetts Boston addresses the intellectual and professional needs of individual students through classes and other educational experiences that encourage dialogue with faculty who are active scholars, performers, and/or practitioners. Our programs reflect contemporary thinking about the disciplines and professions, while honoring the disciplines' and professions' historical contexts. Students benefit from rigorous, specially tailored approaches to fostering gains in abilities and understanding. We seek to distinguish ourselves in four areas of inquiry: the physical environment; critical social and public policy issues; leadership in health, education, and human services; and high technology manpower needs.

- **Public Service:** Extending the land grant tradition, the University of Massachusetts Boston forges linkages between research and service, and is forming partnerships with communities, the private sector, government, other colleges and universities, and other sectors of public education. These linkages bring the intellectual, technical, and human resources of the university community to bear on the economic and social needs of metropolitan regions -- for example, through public policy analysis and applied problem solving in areas such as environmental quality, city planning, tax policy, the schools, and economic development, especially in ethnic and minority communities.

- **Innovation:** The University of Massachusetts Boston pursues research and offers programs serving current and emerging needs of urban populations, institutions, and environments, for example, in gerontology, public policy, and environmental sciences. Programs incorporate new knowledge developed through research, new methods yielded by emerging technologies, and insights and opportunities afforded by interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary and other collaborative enterprises.

- **Economic Development:** The University of Massachusetts Boston works cooperatively with metropolitan businesses, major public and private sector employers, representatives of state and local governments, neighborhoods and communities to develop programs to link Massachusetts with economic communities around the world. We offer professional education in areas critical to regional employers, assist state executives in policy analysis and development, and work to strengthen small businesses and local governments through the application of knowledge and expertise and by providing an effectively educated workforce. We conduct research on critical economic issues, e.g., the environment, especially but not solely harbor and coastal aspects thereof; social, public, and fiscal policy. And we offer programs to enhance Massachusetts' participation in the global economic community.

- **Quality of Life:** The University of Massachusetts Boston sponsors and supports cultural diversity by helping ethnic and international communities to articulate and celebrate their cultural values and identities, and by recognizing the contributions and achievements of members of these communities. We educate artists, performing artists, writers, archivists, teachers, environmentalists and others whose lifelong contributions will enrich the culture and environment of the urban populace. By the

nature of our enterprise and through our normal activity, we contribute to the rich and diverse cultural life of a major American city.

Copyright 1997, University of Massachusetts Boston. All rights reserved.

The University of Alabama at Birmingham

<http://main.uab.edu/>

OUR MISSION

As an urban research university and academic health center, the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) is committed to the discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge as a fundamental path to success and to the enhancement of people throughout the world. In so doing, the University has an enduring commitment to teaching, research and scholarship, creativity, and service to the community. We embrace an unyielding belief in the virtue of diversity as well as the fair and equitable treatment of students, faculty, staff and those we serve. UAB's success in fulfilling this mission is demonstrated by the accomplishments of the University community.

The University of Memphis

<http://www.people.memphis.edu/~acadafflib/mission.html>

The University of Memphis is a member of the State University and Community College System of Tennessee and is governed by the Tennessee Board of Regents. As an urban university, The University of Memphis provides a stimulating academic environment for its students, including an innovative undergraduate education and excellence in selected research areas and graduate programs. The academic environment extends beyond the campus boundaries to encompass the entire community.

Education is enhanced through exposure to diversity in the composition of the student body, faculty, staff and administrators, including women, minorities, individuals with disabilities, and various age groups and religions. The University has responded to the challenging responsibility of being located in a culturally diverse region by developing a unique blend of teaching, research, and service that contributes to the growth of the Mid-South region.

Teaching brings the benefits of scholarship and research to students and through them to the people of the area. The University of Memphis asserts that excellence in teaching traditional and non-traditional students is its central responsibility. A comprehensive undergraduate education, grounded in the arts and sciences, develops intellectual, cultural, and ethical qualities in its students. The innovative General Education Program challenges students to develop the analytical and critical skills necessary for life-long learning. The University of Memphis offers master's and doctoral degrees in selected graduate programs as well as degrees in the major professional areas. Through learning begun at The University of Memphis, graduates compete in the global intellectual community in which they live.

As a research university, The University of Memphis develops, integrates, disseminates, and applies knowledge. Faculty maintain on-going programs of basic and applied research or creative activities appropriate to their disciplines. The University's urban environment provides a rich opportunity for research and creative scholarship, and for the use of that scholarship in the intellectual and cultural development of the region. The University's commitment to fostering a research and creative environment harmonizes with the other aspects of its mission.

The University of Memphis fulfills its outreach mission through its contributions to professional organizations and to the needs of the community. The University promotes intellectual, cultural, and community development of the region through, for example, its artistic programs, lecture series, technical assistance, continuing education, and intercollegiate athletic programs.

The University of Memphis, through its research, teaching, and outreach roles, responds to individual needs, such as the support of health care and preventive health services. The University addresses broader issues as well, for instance, K-12 education, economic development, environmental initiatives, international programs, computing, and telecommunications.

California State University – Sacramento

<http://www.imir.iupui.edu/portfolio/CSUS/CSUSprofile.htm>

University Mission:

The mission of California State University, Sacramento - a regional comprehensive public university - is to preserve, communicate, and advance knowledge; cultivate wisdom; encourage creativity; promote the value of humankind; and improve the quality of life for its graduates and the people of the region. The education of students is the central mission of the University. Therefore, the University faculty's primary responsibilities are teaching and the creation of an active learning environment for students.

The University is committed to the principle that responsible and knowledgeable persons freely exercising reason in the pursuit of individual and community interests play a significant and beneficial role in addressing society's problems and enriching life. Education liberates individuals from ignorance, intolerance, and dogmatism, freeing them for critical and reflective thought, and for wise and effective action. CSUS is committed to helping students develop a sense of self-confidence and self-worth, respect for diverse cultures, awareness of important social and moral issues, and concern for others. The University strives to provide students with opportunities for active participation in academic and extracurricular activities which will contribute to their ability to function productively in a rapidly changing society.

We reaffirm the value of and need for education of the whole person in the tradition of a liberal undergraduate education. Building on the fundamental knowledge and skills acquired through a general education program, the University offers traditional liberal

arts disciplines and professional studies which emphasize three curricular values - acquisition of knowledge, the development of critical thought processes, and the synthesis of knowledge-hallmarks of an educated person. The University further enhances the intellectual life of the campus through its graduate and post-baccalaureate program offerings and research centers. Masters, post-baccalaureate certificates, and joint doctoral programs advance students' educational achievements and prepare them for professional and leadership positions throughout the region and society. As a regional resource the University is committed to providing educational opportunities that contribute to the cultural and economic development of the region. The University strives to advance the public good through collaboration with government, social and cultural agencies, and businesses and industries within the region.

The University's mission is guided by fundamental values which reflect its identity as a public, regional, comprehensive, metropolitan university. Thus, California State University, Sacramento seeks to offer individuals the opportunity to realize their highest aspirations and become involved citizens for the good of the individual and society.

University of Pennsylvania

Judith Rodin, President; Stanley Chodorow, Provost
<http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v42/n13/agenda.html/>

Agenda for Excellence: A Strategic Plan for the University of Pennsylvania

Mission of the University

Almanac Tuesday, November 21, 1995 Volume 42 Number 13

The University of Pennsylvania's roots are in Philadelphia, the birthplace of American democracy. But Penn's reach spans the globe.

Faithful to the vision of the University's founder, Benjamin Franklin, Penn's faculty generate knowledge that is unconstrained by traditional disciplinary boundaries and spans the continuum from fundamental to applied. Through this new knowledge, the University enhances its teaching of both theory and practice, as well as the linkages between them.

Penn excels in instruction and research in the arts and sciences and in a wide range of professional disciplines. Penn produces future leaders through excellent programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels.

Penn inspires, demands, and thrives on excellence, and will measure itself against the best in every field of endeavor in which it participates.

Penn is proudly entrepreneurial, dynamically forging new connections and inspiring learning through problem-solving, discovery-oriented approaches.

Penn research and teaching encourage lifelong learning relevant to a changing, global society.

Penn is a major urban university that is committed to strength and vitality in each of its communities. In this connection, Penn will:

Encourage, sustain, and reward its faculty; nurture, inspire, and challenge its students; and support and value its staff;

Strengthen and appreciate the diversity of its communities;

Support free expression, reasoned discourse, and diversity in ideas;

Pursue positive connections to the city, state, and region and a mission of service to its neighbors in West Philadelphia;

Develop and support its connections to alumni and friends; and

Foster the growth of humane values.

Center for Community Partnerships

<http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/index.html>

The Center is based on three core propositions:

1. Penn's future and the future of West Philadelphia/Philadelphia are intertwined.
2. Penn can make a significant contribution to improving the quality of life in West Philadelphia/Philadelphia.
3. Penn can enhance its overall mission of advancing and transmitting knowledge by helping to improve the quality of life in West Philadelphia/Philadelphia.

The Center was founded in 1992 to achieve the following objectives:

- Improve the internal coordination and collaboration of all University-wide community service programs
- create new and effective partnerships between the University and the community
- encourage new and creative initiatives linking Penn and the community
- strengthen a national network of institutions of higher education committed to engagement with their local communities

The Center's Director reports to both Penn's Vice President for Government, Community, and Public Affairs and the Provost (the University's chief academic officer). Through the Center, the University currently engages in three types of activities:

- Academically-Based Community Service
- Direct Traditional Service
- Community and Economic Development

The Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development

<http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/PHENND.html>

The Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development (PHENND) is a consortium of colleges and universities in the greater Philadelphia area. Its mission is to build the capacity of its member institutions to develop sustained, democratic, and mutually-beneficial community-based service-learning partnerships. The consortium actively seeks to revitalize local communities and schools and foster civic responsibility among the region's colleges and universities.

Policy Research Action Group (PRAG) in Chicago

<http://www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag/INFO/>

Loyola University Chicago , University of Illinois at Chicago , Depaul University , and Chicago State University) and more than 20 community organizations. PRAG consists of Chicago-based academics and community activists who have been building a collaborative research network to better link research and grassroots activism. PRAG is coordinated by the Loyola University Center for Urban Research and Learning which serves as PRAG's fiscal agent. At a time when universities are increasingly under fire for not contributing to the community and not doing research directly relevant to the broader community outside college walls, PRAG works to strengthen ties between researchers and community organizations. PRAG matches researchers with community organizations (CBOs); develops research "apprenticeships" within community-based organizations; encourages undergraduate and graduate students to consider career options in community-based research; funds grassroots policy research projects identified and developed by community organizations; and disseminates research results to policy makers and community activists. The group has received a small start-up grant from the Joyce Foundation and strong support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education.

The Community Research Network of the Loka Institute at Amherst

<http://www.loka.org/>

The Community Research Network (CRN) is a trans-national network of research and grassroots organizations conducting community-based research for social change.

The mission of the CRN is to create a system through which grassroots, worker, and public-interest organizations and local governments can -- by establishing the agenda and controlling the results of research -- find solutions to social and environmental problems and participate more effectively in public policy.

AUTHOR:

Loomis Mayfield
College of Urban Planning & Public Affairs
University of Illinois, Chicago
412 S. Peoria St. (M/C 348)
Chicago, IL 60607-7064

Office: 312-355-3231 or 312-996-8700
Fax: 312-413-8095
E-mail: loomis@uic.edu
Web Page: <http://www.uic.edu/~loomis>

Loomis Mayfield is an independent scholar in Chicago. He was formerly the coordinator of the UIC Neighborhoods Initiative at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Previously, he was Research Coordinator at the Policy Research Action Group, a consortium of universities and community groups in the Chicago area. His research interests include the political, social, and historical analysis of the city within its metropolitan and regional context; and the historical and comparative analysis of university/community relationships. His publications include articles in *American Behavioral Scientist*, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, and *Journal of Urban History*. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Pittsburgh.

* The author would like to thank Sarena Seifer and Piper Krauel for comments on this analysis; and Heather Persky and Kimberly Courtney for their assistance.