HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE

2014

The *Higher Education Exchange* is founded on a thought articulated by Thomas Jefferson in 1820:

> I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

In the tradition of Jefferson, the *Higher Education Exchange* agrees that a central goal of higher education is to help make democracy possible by preparing citizens for public life. The *Higher Education Exchange* is part of a movement to strengthen higher education's democratic mission and foster a more democratic culture throughout American society. Working in this tradition, the *Higher Education Exchange* publishes case studies, analyses, news, and ideas about efforts within higher education to develop more democratic societies.

HIGHER
EDUCATION
EXCHANGE

2014

CONTENTS

FOREWORD
By Deborah Witte

Do you like to start a book by glancing through the last few pages? I'm not one who does, but I hear there are such people. With this issue of the *Higher Education Exchange*, I urge you to do just that and begin with David Mathews' piece, "Who Are the Citizens We Serve? A View from the Wetlands of Democracy." In this piece, Mathews asks—much as I did in last year's issue—why higher education doesn't see the public. In that issue, we shared stories from folks who were trying to make higher education more aware of the public. We continue with more of those stories in this issue.

In our research we are finding that, not only does higher education *not* see the public; when the public, in turn, looks at higher education, it sees mostly malaise, inefficiencies, expense, and unfulfilled promises. And yet the authors in this volume tell of bright spots in higher education where experiments in working with and for the public are taking place. In different ways, these experiments reveal the public that is visible when seen through the lens of a citizen-centered democracy. If you've been a reader of this journal for very long, you know that at Kettering we embrace experiments. (Must have something to do with Charles F. Kettering, our founder!) And so, we share stories from these experimenters—some about service learning, others about professionalism, and still others about civic engagement. They are a testimony that the public does indeed exist and is worth engaging. The issue begins with a piece by Claire Snyder-Hall. She examines faculty "public happiness," a term coined by Kettering to describe the sense of flourishing that comes from engaging with others in work that has public relevance. She finds that when faculty undertake civic engagement work, they may be busy and overworked, but they feel they are more effective with students and better connected to colleagues and communities; they see themselves as energized and happy.

David Brown, coeditor of the *Higher Education Exchange*, shares an excerpt from his most recent book, *America's Culture of Professionalism: Past, Present, and Prospects*. In it, he chastises professionals in academe who encourage students to seek status and

create dependence rather than nurture the capacities of those they will serve. He strongly asserts, "Nothing could be more misleading than the proposition that the public world rightfully belongs to 'professionals.'" Professionalism, he suggests, often prevents faculty and administrators from seeing an active, engaged public.

In a piece entitled "Faculty, Citizens, and Expertise in Democracy," Ted Alter and his colleagues also struggle with the implications of professionalism. They attempt to illuminate what the public looks like from the perspective of faculty engaged in research with the community. Gathering preliminary data from a small pilot study, Alter, et al. suggest that it is in *practice* that the public becomes visible. And they urge all scholars to foster a more nuanced view of citizens, a view that puts both citizens and scholars in the role of learners.

Adam Weinberg, president of Denison University, shares his perspectives on the promises and perils of education in the 21st century in an interview with David Brown. The college's connection to community is important to Weinberg and he seeks to share this connection with students—and their parents. He wants the students to be prepared, after their four-year college experience, for "lives marked by personal, professional, and civic success."

Lorlene Hoyt provides a picture of the ever-changing service-learning movement around the world in "University Civic Engagement: A Global Perspective." While U.S. universities have embraced community service/service learning by students for several decades now, many other countries also have long histories of attention to social responsibility. Hoyt provides a concise explanation of the current state of service learning in Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Europe, Asia Pacific, and the Arab world.

In his piece entitled, "Beyond Service and Service Learning: Educating for Democracy in College," Rick Battistoni provides a framework for understanding why conventional approaches to community engagement and service learning have fallen short. He advocates for an "intentional" approach to service learning that engages students directly and explicitly in democratic politics through the curriculum. A side outcome to this intentionality, Battistoni suggests, involves solutions to the problems that most community engagement initiatives exhibit.

Blase Scarnati and Romand Coles share the latest initiatives at Northern Arizona University. Seeking to push the model for liberal education to include vocation and engaged democracy, they sketch a theoretical framework that is beginning to impact the culture, practices, and institutional space at their university. They suggest that more faculty are beginning to think of themselves as civic scholars and active agents of change within the broader community, and they sense the dawning of a new, powerful, and diverse movement to reclaim genuinely *public* forms of education.

Rounding out the volume, Marietjie Oelofsen reviews Peter Levine's newest book *We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For: The Promise of Civic Renewal in America*. She writes, "Levine's thoughtfulness about the complexity of issues that theorists of participatory and citizen-centered approaches to democratic governance face is a strength of this book. Levine is mindful of the obstacles encountered by citizens involved in the practice, or work, of civic engagement. The book is a powerful and concrete proposal for moving civic engagement from important, but modest, localized efforts to a forceful, cohesive national movement of civic renewal."

We hope you've found at least one or two articles in this issue that spur you toward experiments of your own. If so, we'd love to hear about them!

FACULTY HAPPINESS AND CIVIC AGENCY

By Claire Snyder-Hall

What motivates faculty to do civic engagement work, given that most institutions of higher education do not reward, and sometimes even penalize, such work? And does the work give faculty "public happiness"—the sense of flourishing that comes from engaging with others in work that has public relevance? To explore these questions, I interviewed a diverse group of 39 faculty members, asking them how they got involved in civic engagement work, what motivates them, how their institutions have responded, how the work has affected their lives, and whether they are "happy." (In the interviews, I use the term "civic engagement work" because it seemed to be a term that is both broad and broadly recognized. In this paper, I use it interchangeably with "public work.") While the sample size is small, these interviews provide a collection of stories that give rise to a number of common themes.

Faculty who do civic engagement work generally encounter a number of challenges. The publication treadmill, the rise of status-seeking behavior within academic culture, the introduction of private business management practices within higher education, and the loss of public purposes are a few trends that undercut public work. I was particularly interested in what motivates civic faculty, since I struggled for years to balance academic and public work, and ultimately ended up leaving academia after 20 years—a story I tell in the 2012 issue of this journal under the title "Tales from Anti-Civic U."

Faculty malaise is not unusual. Indeed, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* discusses that topic in "Why Are Associate Professors So Unhappy?" (Wilson 2012). The article reports that:

> New national data show that associate professors are some of the unhappiest people in academe. They are significantly less satisfied with their work than either assistant or full professors, according to the data, which were collected this year . . . by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education [COACHE], at Harvard University. Adjunct professors have also made their unhappiness with their work conditions well

known, but the Harvard survey focused on faculty members within the tenured and tenure-track ranks.

The *Chronicle* article made the case that associate professors are unhappy because they feel overwhelmed by their extremely heavy workloads, in particular the onerous amounts of committee work required after tenure that keeps them away from what they need to do to get promoted, which is publish.

If you look more closely at what those interviewed actually said, however, it becomes clear that it is not just frustration with too much committee work that bothers associate professors. To the contrary, many are disappointed that their work lacks public meaning and their campuses lack community. In short, they desire public happiness, which theorists from Aristotle to Thomas Jefferson to Hannah Arendt have argued arises from working with others on projects that have public relevance, such as participation in the practices of self-government.

O'Meara's Study of Faculty Civic Agency

My study builds on a study by Kerry Ann O'Meara, in which she interviewed 25 tenure-line faculty who do civic engagement work (O'Meara 2010). O'Meara discovered that all of her subjects "had early family, religious, community, and professional experiences before entering academia that they attributed to their current work" (O'Meara 2010, 6). Motivating factors mentioned include "family legacy;" religious beliefs; love of a particular community; gender, racial, and/or working class identities; and membership in Generation X or Y (O'Meara 2010, 9). In addition, "all the women in the study who were parents talked quite a bit about the world their children would inherit and mentioned that part of their identity as a central explanation for their sense of civic agency" (O'Meara 2010, 9).

O'Meara's interviews document that civic faculty often do public work to counteract the sense of isolation that can develop at universities, where each faculty member is an expert in a particular area and rarely has departmental colleagues in the same narrow field, and where they are not linked by a shared focus on public life. Many said they fulfill their need for connection with community work.

Interviews with Faculty Who Are Doing Civic Engagement Work

For my study, I interviewed 39 faculty who do civic engagement work of various kinds, including deliberative pedagogy, service learning, public scholarship, and community engagement. I recruited interviewees largely from the Kettering Foundation network, including 26 from foundation meetings on higher education, four from the Public Philosophy Network (PPN) conference in 2013, and eight from the American Democracy Project (ADP) annual meeting in 2013, plus one who was referred to me by a friend. I chose people who seemed to have an intriguing story or who were recommended to me.

The interviewees include a diverse group of academics who work at various types of institutions, come from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, and are at different points in their careers. They include faculty at 18 research universities, 10 comprehensive or regional universities, 10 liberal arts colleges, and three community colleges. (The total comes to more than 39 because two adjunct professors taught at more than one type of institution.) They hail from the Northeast, the South, the Midwest, the Mountain West, and the West Coast. (The "Mountain West" does not include Texas (South) or California (West Coast), and the Northeast includes the Mid-Atlantic Region.) And their backgrounds include the social sciences, the humanities, the arts, education, and the sciences. (Of the 20 social scientists, nine are in political science. Of the humanities professors, seven are in philosophy. For the purposes of this study, nursing and math were included as part of the sciences.) The group is comprised of full professors; associate professors; assistant professors; adjunct professors; instructors or lecturers; a visiting assistant professor; and a center director who also teaches.

In contrast to O'Meara's findings, in my study almost half of those interviewed came to civic engagement work on the job, rather than as an outgrowth of core values or the product of pre-professional

experiences or identities. More specifically, while 13 of my interviewees got involved in civic engagement because they saw it as connected to their long-standing commitments to "social justice," 18 faculty members—almost half—came to the work on the job. Three came to it through a need in their teaching, and five came to civic engagement after connecting with people affiliated with the Kettering Foundation. All the ADP faculty were recruited on the job, except for two, and two of them cited meeting Tom Ehrlich as a catalyst. Two were very active in electoral politics before discovering ADP.

A third group within my sample constitutes a hybrid; they came to civic engagement work not because of values instilled in childhood or opportunities presented on the job, but through experiences they had during their own educational process. Three people discovered civic engagement during high school, two in college, and four in graduate school. Three were hooked by volunteering, while others were taken by intellectual ideas introduced in the classroom or through reading.

"I'm Tired but I'm Happy": Faculty Workloads

The author of the *Chronicle* article depicts heavy workloads as the main cause of faculty unhappiness, so it is puzzling that civic professors voluntarily take on huge amounts of extra work that most likely falls under the category of "service," which generally does not count for much. I will never forget a conversation I had with a friend who teaches at a regional state university. I told her I was conducting a study of why faculty do civic engagement work. She replied, "I'll tell you why they do it: because some dean tells them they have to, and they are stuck with it." Her jaw dropped when I told her that faculty actually take the work on voluntarily.

My study found that both workloads and levels of happiness were extremely high across the board. Almost all those interviewed say they work almost all the time, and that remains true across rank. What is remarkable, however, is that despite their heavy workloads, *all those interviewed reported being happy in the public sense, and, remarkably, none of the eight associate professors interviewed said they were unhappy in either sense*, a marked contrast from those in the *Chronicle* article.

"All those interviewed reported being happy in the public sense."

My study did not find lower levels of happiness among female faculty who are married and have school-aged children in the house, which other studies have found. Cathy Ann Trower has found that "59 percent of married women with children were considering leaving academia" (Trower 2012, 63). The majority of the people I interviewed were women, and a little over a third were married (or the equivalent) with school-aged children at home. Three were tenure-line faculty at research universities, three were tenure-line faculty at regional universities, two were non-tenure-line faculty at research universities, and one was a tenure-line faculty member at a community college. All were happy in the public sense, and interestingly, concerns about their children's future were barely mentioned. While the small sample size precludes generalization, the finding suggests that civic engagement work might help make female faculty happier as well.

Benefits for Student Learning

Many common themes emerged from the interviews. First, faculty believe that civic engagement work provides huge benefits for students, so being civically engaged helps them do their jobs better. One man explains how experiential learning improved the quality of his teaching:

> This notion of public happiness [for me relates to my experience] that in the classroom, there's a fair amount of fear, a fear of being exposed as someone who doesn't know everything, who isn't perfectly wise and all knowing . . . [who by not having all the answers] was made to look the fool. . . . And I can remember experiencing that very early on in my life in classrooms, a sort of feeling, like, if you didn't know the answer, it was really bad. So you wanted to really avoid that. . . . I think on a subconscious level and through just the way our educational system is set up, there is that level or at least some level of fear in that space.

> I'm pretty good at having a good discussion, and it wasn't like I was some dictator, but on the edge of kind of trying to manage things to avoid some of that vulnerability. And I found sometime ago . . . I realized that that way of handling things in the classroom was not working for anyone. There was very little

space for the students to be directly involved. And it took a huge amount of effort and energy on my part to kind of manage that.

So I realized that on some level what I needed to do was just let go, kind of not try and manage the classroom as carefully as I had before. And to me, I relate that to a notion of developing a more public space, a freer space in the classroom for genuine discussion and deliberation and dialogue that is riskier, right, in order to know where that's going to end up.

Many faculty members emphasize how much satisfaction they get from the positive impact civic engagement work has on student learning. This man is especially worth quoting:

I was often frustrated in my discipline teaching because I wasn't reaching my students. As a PhD from a major research university in [the sciences]—how much opportunity do I have in a [typical] undergraduate classroom to make a difference? But when I started having those students do community-based projects, seeing the difference that can make, I just thought that my teaching became alive again with purpose. So, I'm more fulfilled that way.

It was very clear that civic engagement work allows faculty to establish a sense of connection with students that exceeds anything that can be measured by student learning outcomes.

"I Do Believe that Human Beings Are Social Creatures": Connecting with Others

As if in direct response to the *Chronicle* article, the faculty I interviewed recount that their work provides them with strong connections with students, other faculty, and/or the larger community. Some emphasize the value of seeing students blossom:

How satisfying could it be, though, to launch a student out into the world who you just know is going to make a difference? And she was really—you know, I just remember her as this very quiet, shy college freshman, and then by her senior year, she's this incredibly competent and capable 21-year-old, who is feeding people in Africa and gathering together people to talk about a very divisive [state] farm bill and hosting a series of conversations on everything on the history of farming in [our] County . . . how exciting to watch her now. So I think for me, I live very vicariously

"Faculty recount that their work provides them with strong connections with students, other faculty, and/or the larger community."

9

through my students, and so I don't know how you could be more deeply satisfied than to watch that sort of thing. . . . How could you not be satisfied, right? I just get chills thinking about it.

Other faculty agree that engaging together in civic work allows faculty to connect with students more deeply than they can in a traditional classroom setting: "That ability to get to know students so personally—and to me, civic engagement work allows me to do that. I mean every single one of these 30 kids that I just had in this class this semester—it was just amazing. It was just amazing."

In addition, civic engagement work in particular allows faculty to connect with others in a deeper way:

Well . . . I feel that a large part of the [deliberative] process, and one reason I like it so much, is because it engages people, not just intellects, but full people with lives and values and relationships. And I do believe that human beings are social creatures, and we are happiest when we are fully engaged on all of those levels.

Civic engagement adds something valuable to faculty work:

I'm thrilled to be doing this kind of work. And I—it would be depressing for me to go back to just teaching philosophy. I'm thrilled with this. This is like, what I want to do. This is my life—I can have these public conversations with people in [local towns] and live here and do this work. I'm just like, "What else?" I'm totally happy . . . I'm doing what I really love, and I think it's needed, and people appreciate it. So, I mean, it's really great. [While] I think I am dispositionally happy . . . I've had jobs that made me miserable. I've done things that I didn't love, but I love doing this. I mean, I think it's just a great opportunity, and I've been lucky that they've let me do it, because there's not really a model for it. I just started doing it, and it was supported.

Civic engagement work also makes faculty feel more connected to the local community, which could play an important role in faculty retention. That is to say, a lot of faculty yearn for community (Trower 2010), but the structure of the academic job market makes that prospect difficult. Applicants must move wherever the jobs are. If you want a tenure-line position, you generally cannot choose where you live. Civic engagement work could ameliorate the downside of that reality by providing a sense of rootedness in the local community.

Work that is Meaningful

In addition to achieving a stronger sense of community, civically engaged faculty find their work to be very meaningful, and that makes the increased workload worthwhile. "It's a lot of meetings. It's a lot of extra writing. But to me, it certainly has been satisfying. I would say it has increased the meaningfulness of the work I do, I think because I see it as having direct relevance . . . to our community and to the wider world."

Another woman stresses that faculty should organize their careers in accordance with core values:

> I think in general, faculty have to find the agency in themselves, that they can ask, "What are my core values here?" And what is the reason why I have this job and use that as a constant rubric for evaluating what committee assignments you're taking on, what classes you're starting to teach . . . And finding that alignment also just helps with the work-life balance.

> So I've been trying to be more smart about that, I'm really committed ethically to being a scholar that continues to be productive, as I move to full professor . . . but that work has to have a meaning to me in terms of being related to values and goals that I have for myself and for my students and things that I want them to understand in classes, and to teach in communities, where I feel like they're aligned with something of value. So it doesn't always work out that way, but it should most of the time, or else the whole happiness thing's not going to happen.

"It's What Feeds My Soul": Spiritual Dimensions of Civic Engagement Work

One of the most surprising things that came up during interviews is how many faculty use spiritual or quasi-religious terms to describe their work. For example:

> So, my motivation, I guess, originally came from the sort of feeling of—I won't try to get too touchy-feely with this, but there's sort of a spiritual dimension about that process of making and creating things with people and communities, and in a sense, performing by developing events and projects. So, that's how I originally came into it.

Another uses the quasi-religious language of being part of something larger than herself:

> But there's also this collegial element of being involved with something that is for the public good or feeling part of the public good . . . There's something about that, that feeling that you're part of something that's larger than you could possibly be. And I do think that that's the key to happiness.

Synthesis and Synergy

"Civic engagement work helps faculty members synthesize the disparate parts of their jobs."

Faculty clearly enjoy their civic engagement work and report that, despite heavy workloads, the work energizes them. "It's just very rewarding and satisfying in many ways, which makes up for a lot of the extra work that it takes to do this stuff," says one professor. "It makes me feel tremendously happy. It almost makes me feel alive. It's so invigorating," says another.

In addition, civic engagement work helps faculty members synthesize the disparate parts of their jobs, which increases productivity. One person commented that because of the work, "I actually feel surprisingly allowed to be fully who I am here. And we just had a meeting with a bunch of our community partners last week. Yeah. I felt like I wasn't actually having to kind of soft-pedal who I am."

"I Just Love It!"

In addition to all these specific benefits, faculty members told me again and again that they just love doing civic engagement work. Consider this account:

> [I feel] jazzed up [doing civic engagement work]. I mean, I just—you know, really I just get the goose bumps—you know, the chills—from head to toe, just thinking about how important it is. And not to say that from a place of ego—like "I am doing something so important"—but from a place of just caring so deeply about wanting to see community members empowered and, kind of, supported. Supported in a way to have the skills to be able to feel like, "Okay, we can deal with this. We can do this."

In light of all we know about the dysfunctions of academia, I find the energy, enthusiasm, and happiness reported by the faculty I interviewed extraordinary. Clearly, when professors undertake

civic engagement work, they may be busy and overworked, but they are effective with students and research; more connected to students, colleagues, and communities; and they feel energized and very, very happy.

REFERENCES

O'Meara, Kerry Ann. "Because I can . . .": A Final Report to the Kettering Foundation for the Collaborative Project: Exploring Faculty Civic Agency and What Supports It (2010). http://kettering.org/wp-content/uploads/OMeara-KFWP2012-01-FI-NAL.pdf (accessed August 29, 2014).

Trower, Cathy Ann. *Success on the Tenure Track: Five Keys to Faculty Job Satisfaction.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.

Wilson, Robin. "Why Are Associate Professors So Unhappy?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 3, 2012). http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Are-Associate-Professors/132071 (accessed August 29, 2014).

BLIND SPOTS IN ACADEME
By David W. Brown

The following is excerpted from America's Culture of Professionalism: Past, Present, and Prospects *(Palgrave Macmillan 2014), authored by* HEX *co-editor, David Brown. The excerpt is from Chapter 3, entitled "Self-Serving Professionals." It comes after Brown takes a critical look at the law, medical, and finance "industries," which too often ill-serve their clients or patients. Brown notes that academe has remained relatively unscathed while being "increasingly preoccupied with preparing students to make a living, with little consideration of how to live."*

Obviously, there are many traditions affirmed and explored in a university's curriculum, and many professors and administrators, personally and professionally, quarrel with the predominance of student ambitions to get a job and make a buck that any kind of credential supposedly offers. But in the desire to attract and retain as many students as possible, most of the recruitment literature and amenities of colleges and universities promote career development, not the moral kind. What the student wants has become the measure, not what the student may owe others. Moral development is pretty elementary but easily neglected when an institution's "competition" ignores it and the bottom line is institutional advancement, or sometimes survival. For those embedded in America's culture of professionalism, whatever moral sensibilities seem lacking have, strangely enough, been replaced by considering competence as a contemporary form of virtue. I have written elsewhere: "It is understandable why so many professionals treat competence as a virtue —the professional enterprise leaves so little room for anything else. Their gifts and talents, opinions and sentiments not subject to professional measure are largely ignored. . . . The problem, however, of treating competence as a virtue is that competence is really *not* a virtue at all. When we say that virtue is its own reward, we mean that any virtue, such as courage, honesty, or [doing] justice, properly understood and appreciated, is an end in itself. But professional competence, properly understood and appreciated, has only instrumental value; it is meant to serve as a means to other ends. If you

make competence a virtue, an end in itself, you have no grounds for finally determining the value of what you know or do, or for evaluating what others know or do."

When competence is combined with a credential, the temptation is to put aside the traditional notion of professional service as a "calling" and substitute "I hear $ calling.". . . The culture has allowed almost anyone with a credential to posture himself as a "professional" and exploit those embedded in such a culture who assume their interests will come before those who profess to serve them. In academe, peer oversight polices competence among colleagues sharing the same discipline, but professionals in practice do not necessarily experience such peer oversight, and clients often cannot judge competence. Most clients willingly yield to those whose esoteric knowledge is beyond their understanding or whose tacit knowledge is beyond their experience. Furthermore, the pretension of professionals seemingly knowing more than they actually do sometimes makes them resemble magicians. . . .

Nonetheless, the experience in academe conditions both would-be professionals and those who do not entertain such ambitions to accept a false premise that those in the know must look after those not qualified, with the have-nots ignoring their own unused capacities in favor of becoming dependent on those who are credentialed. As a consequence, those credentialed, who are seeking status and substantial income, too often create dependence rather than nurturing the capacities of those they ostensibly serve. . . .

Consider the example of "professional" politicians and "public servants." I once came across an advertisement of a graduate school of political management that headlined "Professional Politics Isn't For Amateurs." Nothing could be more blunt—acquire professional skills or else stay on the sidelines while those who know better do the social problem solving for you. Nothing, however, could be more misleading than the proposition that the public world rightfully belongs to "professionals." And academe often promotes just such skewed vision, but nothing could be more self-serving than to put "public service" on the shelf beyond the reach of the lay public. It comes back to how would-be professionals are educated by the example of professors yielding to colleagues on all matters not within their areas of specialization. It hardly encourages such

"Those credentialed, who are seeking status and substantial income, too often create dependence rather than nurturing the capacities of those they ostensibly serve."

students to develop the habit of looking for themselves in any field of knowledge, and as citizens they may very well forfeit the opportunities to be active participants across a wide spectrum of public issues. Young men and women need more than *training* to use an "analytic mind" within a specialized field. They deserve an *education* that helps them develop an "inquiring mind." Too many of them are currently schooled to assume that "problems" offered in a classroom have been perfected by instructors before being offered for "solution." But perfect problems and perfect answers are a serious distortion of what actually goes on in social problem solving whether in government or communities where they will live. To practice their skills in a classroom on problems that come ready-made and well defined with enormous amounts of data ill serves the preparation they need to be inquiring citizens who construct as best they can, with or without professional help, the kind of trial-and-error processes in which most civic learning is grounded. Similarly, as students they may fail to develop a "strategic mind" nourished by experiencing both inside and outside the classroom what it means to get out of themselves and into "the other person's shoes." They are handicapped not only by normal egocentricity but by the mistaken belief, fostered on many occasions by professors who insist on "objective" analysis of a problem situation without regard for how the problem appears subjectively to others. After such students have been outfitted with a host of problem-solving methodologies, they may neglect the simple approach of finding out what others know and want and, instead, just rely on this objective analysis or that methodology. Students may learn that right answers are enough to prevail on an exam, but they are not likely to be enough in the real world where many "answers" compete and conflict. [The excerpt

is followed by a story that offers a further way of understanding the ideas being explored.]

"A Bunch of Amateurs" (I)

Nathan Sax, the President of Pennacook University, looked out the window from his office in Bancroft Hall. There they were on a bright September morning, 75 students walking back and forth with signs saying, "Divest Now: Fossil-Fuels Make Climate-Fools," and chanting, "Facts, facts, Doctor Sax, sell the stock or get the axe."

Sax didn't like the chant, but he knew where it came from. *Campus Citizen*, the student newspaper, had written a scathing editorial denouncing the President "for studying the divestment question to death. Even in academia, dear Nathan, there is a limit to how long you can examine an issue." From his window, Sax could also see some younger faculty members talking with the milling students. Certain factions in the faculty were also "fed up" with Sax, according to the *Campus Citizen*.

Sax turned away from the window. He knew that the divestment question would be the major item on the Board of Trustee's agenda when it met on campus for its next board meeting later in the week. The students were right, of course—Nathan Sax was slow to act. He had always believed that reasoned deliberation was the only appropriate style for a university president. There were so many people to talk to, so many meetings, so many committees. And besides, Sax was convinced that divestment was not the "climate change" issue that the students portrayed it to be. Colorful rhetoric, yes, but he was rarely moved by rhetoric. The University was too embedded in a history and a city with priorities that did not correspond to the opinions and demands of students who made their home at Pennacook for four years and then moved out, moved on.

Looking out the window again, Sax thought Paul Goodman was about right when he said, "The young are lively, beautiful and callous…and there is nothing to do but love them. If this is impossible, the next best thing is to resent them." This morning Nathan Sax resented them, especially after consulting again with Pennacook's investment adviser, Harry Frank, who Sax thought

was a first-rate professional, and whose advice he and the board normally followed. It was Frank who told Sax, "What do these kids know? The financial cost of Pennacook divesting itself of investments based on criteria other than expected performance would very likely be substantial. And it would not include the substantial transaction costs that Pennacook would incur by divesting part of its portfolio. I'm telling you, Nathan, you can't afford to listen to a bunch of amateurs."

The President reviewed in his mind the events of the last six months. A coalition of student groups, advocating divestment, Students for Divestment Now (SDN), launched a "spring offensive" protesting the failure of the university to sell all the stock it owned in fossil-fuel companies. SDN had prevailed upon the Student Senate to withdraw $50,000 of its funds, which was part of the University's investment pool, and instead put the money in a "Renewable Energy and Sustainability Fund."

As Sax stared out the window, Sonya Manka, the University's Vice President for Finance, stuck her head in the door and Sax waved her in. Manka had never been sympathetic to the SDN cause and, time and again, advised Sax to stick to the independent and objective advice of Harry Frank and other "professionals" on the trustee board. As far as Manka was concerned, "endowments and investments should never be used as political tools. Besides, fossil-fuel companies are dependable profit generators." Joining Sax at the window, Manka squinted. "Well, she said, "they're at it again and just in time for another trustees' meeting. I don't understand why they think divestment is a persuasive tactic with American companies. There are plenty of smart buyers of stock who are less interested in divestment than the few who sell. Divestment by Pennacook won't change a thing." Manka turned away from the window. "So many of the students are such hypocrites. They don't call for a ban on campus recruiting by those same companies. They are always badgering somebody else to do something."

Sax turned to Manka, "I'm not a lawyer, but our counsel advises me that as long as the trustees take no action that is contrary to public policy, they will be indemnified. Anyway, who is going to sue them?"

"Me," Sonya said emphatically and then laughed. "That is if our portfolio gets messed up by selling off some of our strongest equities. You know as well as I do that since the "Great Recession," a strong, recovering performance of our endowment remains absolutely critical to keeping this place afloat."

The President liked Manka despite her heated opinions. He badly needed her expertise in disciplining a budget which was constantly vulnerable to the annual competition for student enrollments, the unending demands of maintenance on buildings that were far beyond their useful life, faculty always seeking higher salaries, and the wage demands of Pennacook's unionized staff.

"You've heard it before from Harry Frank. 'Don't give in to a bunch of amateurs.'" Manka glanced again at the students outside and then promptly left.

Nathan Sax was soon off to consult with Francis Moody, the board chair, at Moody's office in the First State Bank downtown, but first he wanted to visit with the demonstrators outside. As he was leaving, his assistant Tim Delroy stopped him to report that SDN had requested the Pennacook alumni list for a mailing.

"What kind of mailing?" Sax asked.

"They didn't say. I have heard, however, that they want to discourage contributions to annual giving until the trustees act favorably on divestment. The SDN also wants the alumni to join them in getting the Board to enlarge its membership to include pro-divestment students, faculty and alums."

Sax groaned. "That would be an awful precedent. The trustees will never buy that, never."

"Do we give them the list?" Tim asked.

"I don't see how we can refuse them." Sax headed for the door. "Tim, I'm going out to see the students, then downtown for Francis Moody."

Delroy held the door for the President. "Do you really want to debate the SDN this early in the day?"

"Better outside now than having them sitting in my office when I get back." Sax walked out into the glare and blare of the September demonstration.

After years of teaching philosophy, Nathan Sax had developed the Socratic habit of playful, and sometimes not so playful, debate with whatever issue students confronted him. It often got him in trouble, however, when Pennacook students, soberly engaged in an important cause, became infuriated with his seeming detachment. Sax tried to adjust his style but old habits die hard. As Sax walked toward the students, the chanting stopped and several of them walked quickly over to see the President.

"Have you decided to move the trustee meeting off campus? We heard that…"

Sax cut them off. "I've heard no such thing. No, the trustees will meet where they always do, in the Curtis Room of Bancroft Hall."

The students now surrounded him. He looked at each student in the circle. He did not know many of them by name but he recognized some and nodded in a friendly way. They smiled and nodded back. A few remained sullen.

"Doctor Sax, we'd like to know what your recommendation will be to the trustees?" The others shook their heads in agreement.

"Who says I'm to make a recommendation? I didn't know the trustees needed my recommendation. They are quite able to act on their own, you know."

One woman, Jenny Stackhouse, whom Sax had met before on the issue, from the outer edge of the circle which had now grown three deep, raised her hand, then laughed at the gesture and moved to the President's side. "Doctor Sax, what we want is for you to care, for the trustees to care, for Pennacook to care about what's going on with climate change."

Sax turned to her. "What makes you think that we don't care? I'm surprised you think that we don't…"

Stackhouse persisted. "You don't care enough to make a sacrifice, if that's what divestment means to you."

Sax looked at the other students. "I'm sorry but I don't understand why my caring for Pennacook, trying to avoid unnecessary costs, trying to keep your tuition within reason…" Some students started to hiss. Sax went on. "What we care about can be a very complicated business. My job is to…"

"Your job is to lead," another student edged closer, "Your job, to follow your logic, is to make us care about this University, and you can't do that if you put dollars ahead of saving the planet."

"I hear you," Sax looked at the student. "Is our decision here at Pennacook meant to be effective or symbolic?"

"Both," many students said in unison. "Both, Doctor Sax."

Jenny Stackhouse resumed her argument. "It is the right thing to do." Her eyes glistened. "It shows that we care, that you care, Doctor Sax, that the trustees care."

Sax thought she was starting over again. He couldn't stop himself. "Caring, all right the subject is caring. Let me ask you if we were talking about companies which are important to this town or which provide jobs for people who live here, would you still say that we should divest?"

"The students looked at each other. They didn't understand Sax's question. "C'mon Doctor, that's a hypothetical, a red herring. What companies in this town will be hurt if Pennacook divests?"

"I don't know," and Sax really didn't know, but he had made the argument and now he felt compelled to continue. "But if they were, would you care if it meant people lost their jobs?"

"No," one student said emphatically. "When it is a matter of climate change, everyone has to pay their dues."

Sax thought he saw an opening. "Oh, I'm sure they're willing to pay their dues," he looked intently at the student, "they just don't want to pay yours." The students hissed again and started to drift away.

Sax started walking and a few students followed along to ask more questions about what would happen at the trustees' meeting. Sax could hear them chant again. "Facts, Facts, Doctor Sax…" He had said too much or not said enough. When he reached the campus gates, the students turned back and he stopped momentarily to make some notes. "Next time," he vowed, "I won't use any hypothetical."

FACULTY, CITIZENS, AND EXPERTISE IN DEMOCRACY

By Theodore R. Alter, Jeffrey C. Bridger, and Paloma Z. Frumento

Recently we have been working on a pilot project for the Kettering Foundation that examines the democratic and political mindsets of university faculty who are doing public scholarship. This is a form of scholarship that embodies Harry Boyte's concept of public work, which he defines as "sustained effort by a mix of people who solve public problems or create goods, material or cultural, of general benefit" (Boyte 2004). Public scholars contribute to this work by actively collaborating with citizens in ways that make both civic and disciplinary contributions. While there is an emerging literature that focuses on the practice of public scholarship, we know much less about the value commitments and vision of democracy that animates scholars who are committed to public work. Understanding these facets of public scholarship is central to fostering the participatory and active democracy that is required if we hope to affect the kind of cultural change needed in academia, the professions, and among the larger public. Without this knowledge, it will be difficult to develop policies and incentives that might encourage a broader cross section of academics to integrate scholarly work with civic purposes.

Through our inquiry, we are exploring a number of questions, many of which revolve around the concept of citizenship and the role of citizens. We are interested in the ways in which faculty members' stories about public work intersect, and the key differences in the way that they define and evaluate citizen roles and purpose. As part of this research, we invited eight faculty members at Penn State, representing a range of academic disciplines, from theater to engineering, to share their stories. We also spoke to four citizens with whom these faculty had engaged in work on issues of public importance. Interviews covered broad issues of motivation and career trajectory, and also zeroed in on a specific project or initiative. Toward the end of each interview, we asked each interviewee for his or her ideal definition of citizenship. We were surprised to find that these descriptions sometimes diverged

rather sharply from the way the faculty described how they actually worked with citizens.

In almost every interview, faculty described the ideal citizen as being very active and engaged. One faculty member summarized this view well when she said: "To me, active citizenship means that you have an obligation to learn what's going on in the world and to have a collective role that is beyond your self-interest." Or, as another interviewee put it, "Being a good citizen means that you choose a ring to step into. Citizenship is about contribution, not commentary." In contrast, when asked to describe the roles that citizens actually played in a specific public engagement process, some faculty members emphasized the importance of their role in telling people what they needed to do. For instance, when speaking about developing products that can help lift people out of poverty, one interviewee described his work as follows: "It's all about execution and getting the job done. So you're thinking about what my execution process for this looks like from day one." In this conception, faculty are experts and citizens need to learn from them and use this expertise to address public issues and problems.

This more narrow approach to citizen involvement is probably related to a university incentive structure—not unique to Penn State—that does not reward public work. In fact, some faculty spoke of having to meet higher standards of excellence in traditional metrics of evaluation—primarily publishing—in order to feel justified in pursuing the community outreach and engagement that they were most passionate about. As one faculty member put it, "Here's the secret to public scholarship: be the best researcher in your department. Get another NSF grant, don't stop there, publish another book, publish a series of articles . . . Just do more than anyone around you and then do whatever the hell you want with whatever is left of your time."

In order to do public work, given these structural constraints, faculty must be highly motivated to take action regarding the particular issues they address. This motivation is driven by, and drives, particular commitments or stances, and thus leads faculty members toward stronger leadership roles in creating knowledge and setting public agendas. In other words, the faculty who find ways to do public scholarship despite barriers seem to be those with the strongest emotional attachment to the issues on which

they are collaborating with citizens, and thus may find themselves pulled toward the roles of a disciplinary or context expert, even if, at the same time, they are facilitating democratic processes.

But as we analyzed the data in more detail, an interesting distinction began to emerge. Faculty who were primarily passionate about particular issues were more likely to be inconsistent when it came to defining citizenship and describing citizen roles in practice. On the other hand, faculty members who were the most passionate about the process of public discourse and inclusion were more likely to define the ideal citizen and the roles played by citizens in public work projects in consistent terms. And as we thought about this finding, it seemed that in some ways it parallels the distinction David Mathews makes between "problems *in* democracy" and "problems *of* democracy" (Mathews 2014). Problems *in* democracy are specific issues that confront the public. These are the obvious problems we see around us every day and that require attention. In our interviews, these ranged from forest management to creating marketable products for economic growth; and the faculty members who were most passionate about problems in democracy tended to be more likely to describe citizens and their roles in terms that reflect a preoccupation with specific *outcomes* rather than the *process* through which these are reached.

Problems *of* democracy are the often unseen problems that prevent us from effectively addressing the problems that are staring us in the face—what Mathews calls the "problems-behind-the-problems" (Mathews 2014, xvii). These are systemic problems with democracy itself. They include lack of public engagement, divisive approaches to problem solving, lack of information and sound public judgment, lack of collective efficacy, lack of coordination, the absence of shared learning, and mutual distrust between citizens and social institutions (Mathews 2014, 4-5). The problems *of* democracy uncovered in our interviews ranged from lack of personal and community agency in public education to a lack of community engagement and access to decision-making processes —for example, with respect to natural resource management. Faculty interested in these kinds of issues were more likely to describe citizenship in ways that reflect a more active and processual approach to democracy and problem solving.

Two of our interviews provide a helpful illustration of the distinction between problems *in* democracy and problems *of* democracy with respect to citizens and citizenship and appropriate faculty roles. One faculty member we spoke with is a soil scientist and water specialist who organized and managed a water-quality program at a large research university for 14 years before coming to work in the College of Agricultural Sciences at Penn State. Another faculty member spent several years as an attorney and mediator, focusing on water rights, water quality, and flooding, before coming to the Dickinson School of Law at Penn State. Though both individuals addressed a similar problem *in* democracy —water use and quality—the stories they tell demonstrate how different ways of interacting with citizens and different approaches to problems *in* democracy can lead to very different outcomes. Moreover, they show why it is so important to understand how problems *in* democracy are connected to problems *of* democracy, and how this intersection relates to the role of citizens and citizenship.

The soil and water scientist tells a story about an ongoing program that he became involved in early in his career that was designed to study nitrogen levels and water use efficiencies. Farmers who participated in the study did so by giving researchers access to their land, but because the farmers were not given information about the purpose of the research, they behaved in ways that compromised the quality of the data. As he explained: "We talked to one guy that was managing the irrigation operation, found that he was cutting back on the amount of water applied because he wanted to look good to us, because we measured water-use efficiencies. So that was a totally unintended consequence."

This interviewee went on to acknowledge the importance of things like motivation and behavior, but in the end, still described a fairly passive role for citizens in the context of projects he has worked on. Though he saw a role for citizens "to help establish the mechanisms whereby the identification of the problem will occur," or in naming and framing the problem, he identified few opportunities for citizens to contribute their knowledge to the research and the best practices developed from that research. His focus remained behavioral change for specific outcomes; in his view, it is still legitimate for experts to leverage citizen motivations and

behaviors in order to achieve these outcomes. Again, speaking about water quality, he said:

> So, if you have an interest group that is impacted by cultural practices and those are practices that create sediment runoff, that's a very typical problem in [agriculture]. The ones—educators—who are successful, they reframe the question. The question is reframed for the farmer: how much money are you losing? What are you going to hand over to your children? How does your property look to the neighbors as a result of sediment losses from your field? So it's not a water-quality problem to them, it is reframed as a production question or a heritage question.

In contrast, the attorney who worked on water issues spoke of helping people identify and rethink the fundamental values systems underpinning water use in general:

> And so, the issue in both of the basins I was working with was one-hundred years of one particular set of values, giving all the water for irrigation, none or very little for in-stream flow purposes, and some for municipal [uses]. But when you, as a society, start to revalue what you want water for . . . you end up needing to reconfigure all of this.

She describes her own motivations for doing this work not as being tied to achieving a specific set of water-related outcomes, but instead as helping to facilitate the broader democratic process of identifying and working with values:

> Where I found joy is helping people actually get past what they see as irreconcilable difference to find common understanding on the resources they're drawing from . . . I'm, I guess, in the position of not presupposing what an outcome should be, but really looking for what's a fair discussion on any solution for these things.

Instead of water-related outcomes, her focus is on building community capacity to address the complex natural resource (and other) issues that they face. Describing one successful long-term mediation project, she put the matter this way:

> If you think about deliberative democracy and people's engagement, it went from "I don't trust you and I can't talk to you" to watching the fabric of that community turn around so that they are able to deal with all sorts of questions far beyond flooding.

In other words, the problems *of* democracy she addresses—in this case, trust and representation—become the infrastructure underpinning solutions to problems *in* democracy. It is difficult to get to "the real substance," or the problems *in* democracy, without having this infrastructure in place.

Unfortunately, she notes, problems *of* democracy are not as easily described or analyzed according to traditional scientific standards of evidence. While she argues that "There is a lot of science in this process, you just need to tap into it," she also experiences a feeling of disconnect with some academics. Describing a conflict-management conference at which she presented, she said:

> A lot of the people were presenting really theoretical stuff. . . . Effectively, it was "We're doing experiments on two people negotiating against each other." And they're like, "Can you experiment with the work you do?" And I'm thinking, "No! The work I do is so messy." You know, it's multiple parties and multiple issues and it's layered.

This quote points to another unique feature of problems *of* democracy: many of them are what Rittel and Webber (1973) termed "wicked problems." They define "wicked problems" as being fundamentally different from "tame" problems, which have relatively straightforward, technical solutions, such as building stronger bridges. Instead, wicked problems are intractable, poorly structured, and tend to have only temporary or partial solutions. Examples include climate change, AIDS, and the siting of hazardous waste incinerators and other noxious facilities. For these wicked problems, there are no unambiguous criteria by which to judge their resolution. In fact, we often find it difficult to even define the problem in the first place because it typically involves complexly intertwined normative criteria, personal judgments, and empirical conditions or situations.

Expert scientific and technical knowledge alone cannot address wicked problems because they are not only scientific, but also social, economic, moral, ethical, and cultural in nature. Different individuals and groups define the same problem in very different terms, and this means that there will inevitably be conflicts over appropriate solutions to problems. In fact, they might not even agree on the same facts. Scientific and technical knowledge can play an important role in achieving specific outcomes, but because the public

is part of the problem, they must be also be an integral part of the solution. When dealing with wicked problems, the distinction between expert and facilitator is more important than it might be when addressing tame problems. Whereas experts can make suggestions and provide advice, conventional wisdom dictates that effective facilitators must be perceived as neutral, or at least as an honest broker. The attorney we spoke with described this as "being able to carry everybody's stories in your head" and wearing a "cloak of invisibility." She spoke of reconciling this position with her role as an academic expert: "One of my problems has been how do I switch out of being a practitioner [mediator], wearing this cloak of invisibility, to [being] an academic, where I need to be explaining things? . . . I'm not neutral, I work for Penn State."

One way of addressing the tension between expert and citizen has been to find ways of creating reciprocal relationships between the two. For instance, Fischer (2005) puts forth the concept of "citizen expert" and "expert citizen," arguing that each party brings a unique set of knowledge to the public realm, usually drawing on differing epistemological approaches, and that both scholar and citizen are working together to tackle problems that ultimately affect us all. However, our research complicates the expert-citizen dichotomy. There is no single best practice role for experts. The disciplinary knowledge of the water and soil scientist with whom we spoke is just as critical to democratic process as is the disciplinary and process knowledge of the attorney and mediator. In some instances, it might be appropriate for experts to draw upon disciplinary expertise to weigh in and provide recommendations on important issues, as did the water and soil scientist. In other instances, it might be more important to participate in a neutral manner, as the attorney often does. In still other instances, there may be a role for the expert to work as an equal partner with citizens, as described by Fischer—informing debate, soliciting knowledge, and co-creating new knowledge with citizens. All perspectives are necessary for the development of democratic habits and community capacity.

Moreover, in the few interviews we have conducted with citizens, we are finding that they (who, themselves, may be individuals with "expert knowledge") desire and identify the need for these different types of expertise when dealing with issues they care about. For example, two landowners who had worked closely with Extension

educators described experiences soliciting scientific and technical knowledge and advice in order to achieve specific instrumental objectives, such as attracting more deer to their property. Citizens also described opportunities in which they were able to share their own knowledge and skills, either as part of a series of information-gathering forums facilitated by faculty or as partners in the creation of new projects and initiatives. In our interviews, faculty expressed some feeling of pressure to take on these different expert roles and responsibilities at once, and struggled—as did the attorney—to navigate appropriate boundaries among them. Without creating new silos, it is important to recognize the tensions between these roles, and the different levels of citizen activeness (for both citizens and experts) possible within both.

Disciplinary or content specialists may be asked to provide expert recommendations, or to educate a particular public tasked with decision making. In these scenarios, it would be unreasonable to expect the type of bidirectional knowledge transfer advocated by Fischer (2005). In this context, citizens may well want to be largely passive recipients of expert knowledge. But even in this situation, there are techniques for improving the process of determining what knowledge is most relevant to a specific audience. For example, a professor of theater with whom we spoke described working with water scientists who were preparing for a set of public meetings. Her goal was to help them move away from top-down information transfer to introduce some degree of democratic practice. The scientists were working on a slide presentation based on what they thought their audience needed to know. The professor listened for a moment and said: "No slides; you get two hours of asking a kind of question to find out what they know. . . . Think of it different-ly, you're not dispensing the information you think they want to hear, you're dispensing information [after] you find out they want to know."

In her experience, even trying to get some experts to begin considering the process of communication can be a challenge for content specialists, particularly in hard sciences and engineering, who have had little or no training in interacting with members of the public. Another professor of engineering design we interviewed acknowledged this gap, noting "soft skills are the hard skills. . . .

You can learn the math and science and the engineering, but if you don't know how to work with people, if you can't communicate, you're not going to get as much done." In his work developing marketable products and business "ecosystems" across sub-Saharan Africa, he saw a focus on process—which, for him, entailed soliciting local knowledge and encouraging lateral knowledge sharing—as ultimately improving and strengthening the impact of his end products. This did not mean, however, that he created opportunities for equal partnerships between experts and citizens.

We don't have the space here to provide a detailed roadmap for building the skill set needed for scholars to more effectively engage the public on problems *in* and *of* democracy, nor for helping experts think more expansively about the role citizens should play in this process. And we realize that it is difficult for experts who are passionate and knowledgeable about an issue to step back and resist the urge to impose their solution. At the same time, the wicked problems we face require collective action. This realization means that all experts—even those who focus heavily on problems *in* democracy—need to become more reflexive and reflective in their work with citizens. A first step requires a sustained effort to foster a more nuanced view of citizens and citizenship among those scholars working in the public realm—one that does not place citizens in a passive role of information recipient. Even the simple act of asking people what they want to know is a move in the right direction. This would place both citizens and experts in the role of learner, which, as our theater professor pointed out, is what will help both parties better address problems that neither side can fix alone.

REFERENCES

Boyte, Harry C. *Everyday Politics: Reconnecting Citizens and Public Life*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Fischer, Frank. *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Mathews, David. *The Ecology of Democracy: Finding Ways to Have a Stronger Hand in Shaping Our Future*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press, 2014.

Rittel, Horst W.J., and Melvin M. Webber. "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning." *Policy Sciences* 4 (1973): 155-169.

A VISION FOR THE LIBERAL ARTS

An Interview with Adam Weinberg

David Brown, coeditor of the Higher Education Exchange*, spoke with Adam Weinberg, recently installed president of Denison University. Brown was interested in learning more about the implications of Weinberg's vision for the liberal arts at Denison, and in America's public life.*

Brown: You would use "a residential campus as a design studio for students to practice liberal arts skills." Aren't most traditional liberal arts colleges these days seriously challenged by and preoccupied with other priorities?

Weinberg: We can't cede this ground. If the residential part of what we do is not central to the educational process, then it is hard to justify the expense. In challenging times, organizations need to be keenly aware of their assets, and they need to leverage them fully. In my view, one of the strengths of traditional liberal arts colleges is the residential experience and the ways it enhances the breadth and depth of the learning.

In my view, the residential part is central to the learning process and needs to be treated as a co-curriculum. A college campus should be a design studio that gives students space to practice their liberal arts skills, thereby deepening mastery in the same way a musician or athlete deepens their craft by practicing their skills. For example, in the classroom, students are acquiring the classic liberal arts skill of connecting disparate thoughts to formulate new ideas. Campus life gives them experiential opportunities to practice, sharpen, and deepen the skill. Second, residential education gives us space to help students develop liberal arts skills that they may not be getting through the curriculum.

Brown: In your experience at Colgate you confronted the "professional service model" of staff being the problem solvers for students, which made students little more than "customers or guests." Can that change when so many parents who are paying the freight prefer such a model?

Weinberg: I spend a lot of time talking to parents, and I believe we underestimate them. There is a public narrative, which is promulgated mostly by the media and politicians, in which parents only narrowly care about education as it relates to jobs. That is not true. Of course, parents want their children to be employed when they graduate, but they view the college experience much more broadly. They want their children to have a fantastic four-year experience filled with personal growth that prepares them for lives marked by personal, professional, and civic success.

Hence, parents want us to help their children explore careers in ways that will lead them to be responsible and productive human beings who contribute to society. They also understand the importance of mentorship and how transformative it can be to spend four years on a college campus with faculty and staff who are role modeling that kind of life. But we have to be much more proactive in helping parents understand a liberal arts college. In other words, we need to give them a roadmap for how to help their children maximize their college experience. We only have ourselves to blame if we don't give them a roadmap and then don't like the path they create!

Brown: Please say more about how residence halls can be critical in developing students' capacities for active citizenship.

Weinberg: Residential halls are great laboratories for experiments in American democracy. Students arrive on college campuses all over the country and move into residential halls. Each hall has lots of students who bring an array of ethnic, racial, class, sexual orientation, political, and religious backgrounds. They also bring a range of different emotional, AOD (alcohol and other drug), and other issues. For many students, this will be the first time they have shared a room with another person, much less bumped up against so much "difference." We need to capture the educational moments and see beyond residential halls as merely a functional place for housing students.

This generation will inherit communities struggling under the weight of large social and political institutions that are not up to the task of the modern era. They will inherit communities grappling with complex global issues that manifest themselves as local problems, including a lack of jobs, water shortages, and

racial/ethnic/religious divisions. To meet their civic responsibilities, our students will need the capacity to thrive in diverse environments, embrace change as a daily reality, think outside boxes and across categories; and they must possess a mix of personal attributes, including humility, confidence, persistence, empathy, and communication and conflict-negotiation skills. Residential halls are great places for some of this learning to occur.

To do this, we need to make a few shifts. First, we need to better support our residential hall staff, understanding that they are educators on the front lines of the educational process. Second, we need to move away from training staff and student leaders by using professionalized frameworks that encourage them to think of themselves as "experts solving problems." Instead, we should train staff and students to think and act more like community organizers by using models of public work. And third, we need to "de-layer" residential halls of so many rules. I believe we should seek to replace rules with expectations. In many ways, this is moving toward a model that respects, values, and pushes for student self-governance wherever possible. This would lead to some messiness and, often, to some conflict. We would see these as positive learning opportunities, not messy moments to be avoided.

Brown: And how are "homestays" a way to develop such capacities?

Weinberg: Every student should have the opportunity to live with a family in a community that is vastly different from her or his own. Homestays get us outside our comfort zones in ways that help us to see the texture of family and community. They allow us to see that so many of the key concepts we use to understand the world are socially constructed and, hence, can be reconstructed in new and different ways. Homestays help us to develop humility. ("Others do this differently than I do.") Homestays help us to develop confidence. ("I can adapt to change and learn to love the differences that challenge my comfort zone.") Homestays help us to develop resiliency. ("I made it through something that was scary and overwhelming at first.") In sum, homestays help us develop creativity to live alongside people who are different. They move us from spending too much of our lives avoiding challenge to instead embracing the thrill and fun of vulnerability.

Brown: Another challenge on the forefront for you is "entrepreneurship and design thinking as a liberal art." Could you help me understand their importance?

Weinberg: I just spent eight years helping to lead World Learning, an organization that works with 10,000 young people from more than 150 countries who are on the frontlines of addressing critical global issues. I came away from this experience convinced that the future will be shaped by people who can think and act entrepreneurially, and continuously engage in design thinking.

I mean this in a few different ways: First, entrepreneurship is a mindset. Students learn to see issues not as problems, but as an endless series of opportunities to work with others to engage in creative thinking that leverages existing assets to create things of lasting social value.

Second, entrepreneurship is a set of skills, habits, and values. Entrepreneurship is most interesting when understood not as a business concept but as design thinking—the interweaving of habits, values and skills of creativity, innovation, problem solving, and risk taking. More and more, entrepreneurship is focused on the arts and natural sciences, with a lot of energy directed to environmental and social justice issues. For example, some liberal arts colleges like Denison are exploring social entrepreneurship and/or innovation with social impacts. These programs are focusing on instilling in students the capacity and interest in innovation, creativity, persistence, teamwork, and drawing connections between disparate ideas, concepts, problems, opportunities, places, and people to solve problems.

Third, entrepreneurship is a way to widen the circle. I have become convinced that entrepreneurship resonates with this generation. It is language they find compelling, and it pulls in a wide spectrum of students on our campuses—especially more men, who can be an underrepresented cohort in campus-involvement programs at college campuses.

Fourth, entrepreneurship is where the world is going. Most of the interesting work being done around critical global issues is

taking place at the intersection of markets and social needs. This is emerging terrain of immense importance.

In the liberal arts, we too often get hung up on this question: "Is entrepreneurship business?" I want to change the question. Entrepreneurship is neither for-profit nor nonprofit; it is about creating value. I want to instill within students the skills, values, and habits needed to start new ventures and to transform outdated institutions through entrepreneurial ways of being that create things of lasting value within and across communities.

Brown: Given your experience in helping to lead World Learning, what does "getting the 'global' right in U.S. higher education" mean?

Weinberg: Global education is imperative for the future of students. In fact, I think you would be hard pressed to find any college in the U.S. that does not claim a globalized curriculum as a goal in its strategic plan. But this is an area where the practice is undercutting the vision.

I worry about the following kinds of things. Fewer than five percent of all U.S. college students have a study-abroad experience. And more worrisome, those going abroad are often going to the wrong places and on very culturally and academically thin programs. The fact that we have virtually no U.S. students studying in China is a serious problem. What does it mean that fewer than two percent of U.S. students studying abroad are choosing to go to India? A large part of the future, I think, will be shaped by relations that either happen or do not happen between the United States, China, India, Russia, Brazil, and other major powers. Very few U.S. students are going to those countries or learning about them during their college careers. Instead, the vast majority of American students are studying abroad in Western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand —all wonderful places, but they are areas where cross-cultural understanding of the west is pretty strong. It is more difficult to have a life-changing cultural learning experience in central London than it is in southwestern Tanzania.

In many ways, the same is true in reverse. The number of international students studying in the United States has also grown, from virtually none in 1950 to more than 800,000 last year. But a recent study showed that 38 percent of international students went

back to their home countries having made no real friends in the United States. For Chinese students, which is the largest group in the U.S. and one that I would argue is one of the most important to build relationships with, that figure is even higher. I fear that U.S. colleges and universities send international students back to their home countries with a lesser view of the United States—of who we are and what we stand for.

We need new models for internationalization of higher education that infuse international perspectives, experiences, and content throughout the curriculum. We have to get people into places that are going to be vitally important on the global landscape, and we have to make sure our programs are culturally and intellectually deep. We want students to be culturally challenged so that they are able to form global competency. We also have to enable more students to participate. With 95 percent of U.S. college students never studying abroad, we are unlikely to transform higher education, much less the world. And we have to make sure that our returning students are well integrated so that they are able to help internationalize our campuses. It is part of our ethical principles as an institution of higher education to be good citizens of the world.

To do this, we have to facilitate new relationships between the world's faculty, here and abroad. Many of the efforts around internationalization have been administrator-to-administrator, setting up branch campuses, or creating MOUs between universities. Or they have been focused solely on students, helping to match them to study-abroad programs. I would advocate a radical shift towards connecting faculty and empowering them to imagine new ways of internationalizing our campuses. Denison has recently joined a new initiative of 25 liberal arts colleges, located in 13 countries. The goal is to help faculty develop relationships, and then find ways to link courses, students, and research—finding ways to infuse "the global" throughout everything we do. Our focus is on finding a multiplicity of ways for our faculty across institutions to develop deep and enduring relationships, and then providing support to pilot ideas. As an example, last semester a Denison faculty member linked his class with one in Slovakia. Students practiced conversational skills. They did joint projects. The classes did some online sessions. Through this, the faculty members developed a relationship. Now, the Denison faculty

"'Public work' is what happens when people come together . . . to create things of lasting social value."

36

member wants to bring their Slovakian colleague to Denison for a week to lecture in classes and to deepen the relationship. I could see this leading to trading students for a semester, undertaking joint research projects, and doing a variety of other activities that globalize the work of our faculty and students.

Brown: And you call for "rethinking Campus/Community partnership to expand beyond service to include political and economic activity."

Weinberg: For me, "public work" is what happens when people come together within communities and work with others —often with people they don't know, or know but don't like—to create things of lasting social value. It's the magic of locally rooted democratic action. Colleges need to do more than send students out into the community to do service. And we need to do more than just work with established nonprofits, governmental agencies, and other existing formal entities. These are great activities as part of much broader and deeper patterns of action. We need to create long-term partnerships with formal and informal groupings of people in order to be a constant participant in attempts to do public work. This means freeing our staff to be civic participants —even if this means they take time during the workday to devote to civic pursuits. It means encouraging faculty to think about public scholarship as important, valued, and rewarded forms of intellectual work. It means working with locally rooted neighborhood groups or emerging coalitions, which might make us a little nervous because they are unpredictable.

Brown: What is Denison doing to better connect faculty and students with the town of Granville where the college resides?

Weinberg: Clearly, it starts on campus. We need to find more ways for our faculty and staff to feel support and encouragement to exert citizenship through their work at the university. There is a range of ways that administrators send out signals and construct incentive structures that place obstacles in the ways of our faculty and staff members who want to be citizen-scholars. Do we count public scholarship for promotion and tenure of faculty? Do we free staff to attend civic meetings that take place during the workday? How do we treat staff when they take public stands that might not benefit the college? This requires addressing difficult and deep issues. It takes a willingness to talk openly about incentive

structures within our institutions that have mostly pushed faculty and staff to be less engaged with local communities than they ought to be.

But it goes well beyond role modeling on campus. Our students need mentors within the local community. Colleges shape the availability of these role models through the range of decisions we make every day about how to operate. For example, in our local community of Granville, Ohio, we have lots of people trying to expand citizenship through work. They are starting local businesses and stores with an ecological bent; working to develop organic farms; engaging in social entrepreneurship; and/or working as independent professionals who have more time to serve on local boards. If the college supports their work, they will become local mentors and role models for our students.

As a new president, I am operating in ways that will open up more space for effective role models to thrive in our local community. For example, in my initial conversations with civic organizations, I am talking openly about the need to protect the civic fabric of our community by more consciously supporting members of our community who are blending work and citizenship. As part of this work, we are taking initial steps to partner with social entrepreneurs on economic development that creates opportunities for citizenship and work to collide. We are trying to support locally rooted businesses.

These ordinary decisions allow us to role model in ways that open up space for our faculty and staff to act in a similar way. It also creates room for more local community members to be the kinds of coaches and mentors our students need. And it allows us to broaden the range of community projects we are focused on. There are some hidden initiatives to redevelop an old downtown about five miles from campus. It is being led by a loose coalition of entrepreneurs, community activists, main street business owners, and local government folks. The goal is to start with empowering people, not fixing buildings. It is risky for lots of reasons. Where it will go is unpredictable. It may not work. It may become politically contentious at some point. We freed our faculty to work on it and told them not to worry about the risk.

Brown: You find "conflict" to be an educative tool. How is that promoted in the work of a liberal arts college?

Weinberg: On most college campuses, there is some sort of controversy each year. When those emerge, we often have teams of administrators, staff, and faculty who step in to try and resolve the issue. We do this because the goal seems to be to make the campus calm. I take an opposite view. I see these moments of conflict as crucial to the educational process. They are moments when we can help students learn to work across difference with others to do public work. The liberal arts are about learning to think broadly, deeply, creatively, and boldly. A liberal-arts education should prepare individuals to work effectively in diverse teams to identify and solve problems in ways that create value and move organizations, communities, and institutions forward.

If anything, colleges should work hard to put the controversial issues on the table and endeavor to keep them there, where people have to interact around them. We should then encourage students to engage. As students engage, faculty and staff should coach and mentor students on how to do it in ways that lead to public work and social outcomes. This is hard work. It takes commitment and time. Often it will mean ignoring negative media spin and other very real pressures to resolve the conflict. Organizations need a clear goal. For me, the goal of a liberal arts college is to educate students by helping them develop the ability to think broadly, deeply, creatively, and boldly, and to connect effortlessly with a variety of people, allowing them to develop and put into action ideas that can positively anchor their lives while strengthening the world around them.

Brown: Tell me more about all the attention on careers and what this means for civic work.

Weinberg: Students are graduating into a competitive world and they are often doing so with debt. Jobs matter, and students crave jobs that matter.

We need to focus on preparing students for the professions broadly, including work in nonprofits, education, and socially responsible businesses, and for becoming social entrepreneurs. We also need to prepare students to work as professionals who act with others, not *on* others. We have an opportunity to produce a generation of doctors, lawyers, financial investors, and others who approach their jobs as citizen professionals, who are keenly aware of and interested in doing their jobs in ways that have a positive social impact. Harry Boyte has a wonderful new book out on this topic!

"I see these moments of conflict as crucial to the educational process."

The boundaries and categories, for this generation, are blurring in exciting ways. The rise of social-impact investing and social entrepreneurship are two examples of what could be deeply exciting transformations of the professions. To make this shift requires some complex shifts. We need to shift how professionals see themselves in relation to others and as citizens. We need to train students to be professionals who do not compartmentalize their roles as citizens into "professional workers by day and citizens by night." Second, when professionals act in the community, do they act *for* the community, or are they partners who act *with* the community?

This requires rethinking the career-development process. Starting with orientation, we need to create a more conscious connection between the curriculum and career development by framing large questions about human history and students' places in it. The first-year experience should be filled with classes that explore the classic liberal-arts issues. We then need to build on those classes during the sophomore and junior years to get students to draw connections between liberal arts frameworks and skills and real conversations about careers, jobs, and professions. In other words, we need more thoughtful and intentional ways to connect classes to create an arc that helps students develop clear views about how civic lives are led through the professions, not as an addendum to a professional life.

We also need a fresh look at the ways we on-board students into their first jobs and ultimately into a profession. We need to connect them with alumni who can speak about jobs and about the wide range of ways people blend professions and public work. We need to move past the current categories that lead us to bring in alumni who work in the nonprofit sector to speak to the civically oriented students, and then bring in alumni who work in the private sector to talk to students who have more material goals. Why not blend the two? Why not expose students to alumni who are working throughout the professions to build meaningful lives where public work is infused throughout their work lives? We need to give people permission and space to make the hidden visible to our students as part of a larger process of linking jobs to citizenship and public work.

At Denison, we are at the very middle of a robust and vibrant conversation about how to move in this direction. We are reexamining the first year to make sure we are effectively getting students

to ask big questions as a way to unearth and upend assumptions, freeing their minds to explore and imagine. We are taking a hard look at the sophomore year to find places that get students to make better decisions about academic majors, because this is another place where students start to form decisions about jobs that bifurcate work and citizenship. We are asking how we can use the time between semesters to expose students to alumni and parents through internships, externships, and profession-specific training. And we are examining new language and forms of mentorship that help students understand the arc of career, helping students to better understand that the first few years out of college are a time to take some risk and explore.

Brown: Thank you, Adam, and we wish you well.

UNIVERSITY CIVIC ENGAGEMENT: A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

By Lorlene Hoyt

University civic engagement is a strategy for addressing pervasive challenges to civic life, such as poverty, illiteracy, disease, and natural disaster. It is a collaborative form of learning-by-doing that reflects, and is shaped by, its environment—the history, climate, culture, politics, and economy of where the work happens. The most common approaches include service learning, volunteerism, extension, applied research, participatory action research, and engaged scholarship.

A credit-bearing, curricular activity designed for students to provide services to local communities for the purpose of developing civic-minded graduates (Bringle and Hatcher 1995), service learning is an approach to university civic engagement that is practiced in all regions and many countries of the world. It sprung up in North America in the 1980s and Latin America in the mid-1990s, and it migrated to Sub-Saharan Africa in the early 2000s. Service learning exists, but is not as widespread, in Asian Pacific states, Europe, and the Arab region. It thrives in public and private universities and colleges, large and small. It flourishes in both urban and rural settings and has permeated all fields of study. For these reasons, service learning represents the middle pillar of higher education's three universal core missions—research, teaching, and service—and provides a sturdy framework for understanding university civic engagement.

History and Evolution of University Civic Engagement

University civic engagement is a growing global movement. From North America to Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia Pacific, Europe, and the Arab Region, universities and colleges have integrated engagement activities into one or more of their three core missions. (For the purposes of this paper, each region is defined by and includes the member states according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or UNESCO.) While there is significant variation across and within different regions of the globe, the larger story is one of common vision

42

(Hoyt and Hollister 2014). Characterized by both a diversity of approach and universality of strategic direction, university civic engagement is evolving differently in each region of the world. The varied ways in which universities approach learning by doing with their local communities, as well as the societal values that influence such collaborations, are shown below.

Region	Research	Teaching (Co-curricular)	Service (Extracurricular)	Societal Values
North America	Community-Based Research, Action Research, Engaged Research	Experiential Learning, Service Learning	Extension, Volunteerism, Community Service	Democratization of Knowledge, Good Citizenship
Latin America	Community-Based Research, Participatory Action Research, Socially Committed Research	Solidarity Service Learning	Extension, Field Work	Social Responsibility, Social Commitment, Solidarity
Sub-Saharan Africa	Participatory Research, Applied Research	Adult And Life-long Learning, Service Learning, Community-Based Field Training	Community Service, Field Attachment, Community Outreach	Social Responsibility, Good citizenship
Asia Pacific	Community-Based Participatory Research	Adult Education, Service Learning, Science Shops	Extension, Volunteerism	Social Responsibility, Brotherhood of Man
Europe	Participatory Research	Service Learning, Science Shops	Extension	Societal Engagement, Social Cohesion
Arab Region	Applied Research	Field Observations, Community Service Projects	Volunteerism, Charitable Services, Philanthropy	Social Solidarity, Charity

North America

North American scholars argue that approaches to university civic engagement are grounded in the philosophical work of John Dewey, who believed in "learning by doing" and citizen engagement (Axelroth, Hodges, and Dubb 2012). Understood as a public good, institutions of higher education in North America have long worked in partnership with nearby communities. In 1862, the U.S. Congress

passed the Morrill Act, establishing a system of public universities in each state. These land-grant institutions received cooperative experiment station and extension funding to solve problems with farmers and conduct public research. Jane Addams' Hull House at the University of Illinois at Chicago is another vivid early example and the standard-bearer for the settlement-house movement that expanded from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. By the 1960s, activist academics began weaving their own community work into their teaching activities; in 1967, the term "service learning" was coined to describe faculty and student involvement on the Tennessee Valley Authority project (Axelroth, Hodges, and Dubb 2012). A 2007 survey by Campus Compact, a coalition of university and college presidents committed to civic purposes in higher education, shows that 12 percent of U.S. faculty were or had been involved in teaching a service-learning course (Bringle, Hatcher, and Jones 2011). At "engaged" institutions, such as Michigan State University, service learning has grown dramatically from 4,000 students in 2002 to 19,000 students in 2012 (Fitzgerald 2014). Beyond service and teaching, there are numerous university civic engagement efforts embedded in research missions. Community-based research and action research entered the scene in the middle of the twentieth century. Such approaches challenge traditional social science by emphasizing the relationship between knowledge and action. Sometimes institutionalized in the form of university and college centers, an epistemology of technical rationality dominates many university and college cultures, and some faculty consider these methodologies inferior (Hoyt 2010; Hoyt 2013). (Examples include the Action Research Center at the University of Cincinnati, the Research Center for Leadership in Action at New York University, and the Center for Community Action as well as the Haas Center for Public Service at Stanford, which encourages and supports community-based research.)

Latin America

Many institutions of higher education throughout Latin America have a long and strong tradition of engagement with the community. In 1905, the Universidad Nacional de La Plata created the region's first extension project, signaling the start of the university reform movement and its emphasis on service, or the third mission (Tapia 2014). The movement also gave rise to the notion of obligatory social service, which was first adopted in Mexico's Constitution of 1917. By 1945, the mandate required 300 hours of student social service as a requirement for graduation. Other Latin American countries, such as Costa Rica, El Salvador, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama, followed suit (De Gortari 2005). The movement was reinvigorated in the 1960s by Paulo Freire, who questioned the "banking" concept and the broader societal values of social commitment and solidarity that are central to many university and college missions today. (Paulo Reglus Neves Freire was a Brazilian educator and philosopher who is best known for his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, which frames education as a political act. Freire challenged the "banking" concept of education in which the student was perceived by the teacher as an empty account in need of deposits or filling.)

Solidarity service learning is a leading approach, practiced by public and private universities and colleges as well as K-12 schools in Argentina, Costa Rica, Chile, Venezuela, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Bolivia (Tapia and Mallea 2003). For example, Pontifical Catholic University Chile has operated PuentesUC (BridgesUC), a partnership with 14 municipalities in the Santiago metropolitan area, for more than a decade. Faculty and students work hand-in-hand with municipal leaders to address issues of health, environment, and community development (Hoyt and Hollister 2014). In the engineering faculty of the Universidad de Salta (Argentina), students design, build, and install solar energy devices in isolated communities in the mountains of the province as part of the renewable energy course. The third mission, too, is well represented, with university faculty and staff throughout Latin America actively connecting their research to social challenges. Community-based

"Faculty and students work hand-in-hand with municipal leaders to address issues of health, environment, and community development."

45

and participatory action research appeared in the 1960s and 1970s, with variations such as engaged research and socially committed research promulgating in more recent decades (Tapia 2014; Garrocho 2011; Naidorf et al. 2007; Orozco 2010).

Sub-Saharan Africa

The British Advisory Committee on Education in the colonies prompted the establishment of several universities in Sub-Saharan Africa, including Fort Hare in South Africa (1916) and Makerere in Uganda (1922). The extracurricular British tradition of community outreach was adopted in the mid-1940s, a decade or less before several African countries gained independence. In the 1960s and 1970s, leaders, such as the former president of the Republic of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, advocated educational reform aimed at contributing to societal transformation (Hatcher and Erasmus 2008). These reforms—coupled with the UNESCO conference at Tananarive on higher education, as well as social and economic transformation resulting from the founding of the Association of African Universities—arguably created the foundation for Sub-Saharan Africa's contemporary approaches to university civic engagement (Walters and Openjuru 2014; Preece et al. 2012). In the late-1970s and early-1980s, adult education theorists introduced participatory research at a regional workshop held in Mzumbe, Tanzania. Universities (such as University of the Western Cape) defined their missions in relation to the anti-apartheid struggle. In the 1990s, after the end of apartheid, South African universities integrated engagement into their missions, and a wide array of community service and service learning opportunities were underway in other parts of Sub-Saharan Africa. At Ashesi University College in Ghana, students began implementing the institution's mission of "concern for others" by participating with their professors in a series of substantial, long-term projects with people in the local community. At Makerere University, "field attachment" (or service learning) became mandatory. Community service became a criterion for staff promotion at the University of Botswana (Preece 2011).

Today, university civic engagement continues to evolve into novel approaches in South Africa, where best practices are shared through the South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum (Watson et al.).

Asia Pacific

Residential universities existed in the Asia Pacific region as far back as the fourth century BC in the eastern region of India, where thousands of Nalanda students studied several different specializations (Tandon 2008). Many countries in this region had their own academic institutions (such as Confucius academies in China and Madrasahs in India), but colonial powers began altering them in the 19th century (Ma and Tandon 2014). Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, Chinese, Indian, and Korean governments promoted the idea of "social practice," "societal engagement," and "social responsibility" among their students, respectively. Extension and adult education appeared first, followed by volunteerism and community-based participatory research, which took hold and spread throughout the region in the 1970s and 1980s. Service learning emerged in the early 1990s, trailed by the idea of engagement (Ma and Tandon 2014). While the curricular integration of university civic engagement is popular in many Asian-Pacific countries, others have a "marked preference for volunteer services as opposed to service learning" (Watson et al. 2011, 209). For example, at the Notre Dame of Marbel University located in Koronadal City (Philippines) some faculty actively "oppose service learning because they believe in the higher value of voluntary action" (Watson et al. 2011; 132, 209). Service learning has been institutionalized in Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, and India, as evidenced by the establishment university and college centers. (Some examples include the Service-Learning Center at International Christian University, Japan; the Service-Learning Center at Fu Jen Catholic University in Taiwan; the Center for Professional Ethics and Service-Learning at Assumption University in Thailand; and the Center for Outreach and Service-Learning Program at Lady Doak College in India.)

In Australia, emphasis on university community engagement has increased significantly in the past decade. This is perhaps best exemplified by the formation of the Australian University Community Engagement Alliance (now known as Engagement Australia) in 2003 whose goal is "leading, developing and promoting an integrated approach to university-community engagement within and between the higher education, private, public and community-based sectors" (Engagement Australia 2013). During the same time period, the Australian government increased attention to the social responsibility of higher education, including the establishment of university audits that examine community engagement. In Malaysia, China, and beyond, the concept of "village adoption" is growing in popularity. For example, the International Medical University in Malaysia initiated the Kampung Angkat (village adoption) Project in 2007. Each of its three campuses engage with nearby rural villages, allowing students to practice their clinical skills and villagers to receive treatment and medicine.

Europe

Since their medieval origins, universities have had both private and public purposes. In 1898, the University of Oviedo in Asturias, Spain, implemented the practice of extension to address atrocious urban living conditions. For several decades, these efforts spread and developed in other universities, including the Universities of Salamanca, Zaragoza, and Santander (Benneworth and Osborne 2014). Contemporary university civic engagement in Europe started in the 1960s as Western European universities embraced grass-roots activism and community work, taking such approaches as continuing education. Today, service learning exists in Europe, but is less prominent than in the United States. Luephana University in Germany and the National University of Ireland in Galway have embedded volunteerism and service into their curricula (Reinmuth, Sass, and Lauble 2007). Science shops are the dominant approach to university civic engagement throughout Europe, and include service learning as well as elements of research and knowledge exchange (Benneworth and Osborne

2014). Established in the Netherlands in the 1970s, science shops aim to strengthen public involvement in research by involving civil society groups in the production of specialist knowledge. This approach is well aligned with broader European values of societal engagement and social cohesion, and reinforces the United Kingdom's new national policy framework, which focuses on "creating more socially responsible citizens" (Birdwell et al. 2013). With respect to the research mission, Spain is a leader, as it is home to the Instituto Paulo Freire, a national community-university research network that supports a number of Spanish Universities (Hall 2011). Beyond science shops, participatory and community-based research activities are not common in Europe.

Arab Region

In the 22 countries included in the Arab Region, extracurricular civic engagement programs are more common than approaches that are embedded in teaching and research activities. The Arab cultural values of social solidarity and charity have been adopted, and the public regards universities and colleges as the lead institutions in building a robust citizenry (Ibrahim 2014). Though governments in this region do not encourage the development of civil society, institutions of higher education provide charitable services (such as food, clothing, and medical supplies), deploy volunteers, and create forums for public debate. Though short-term student service projects led by university faculty and staff dominate the region's approach to university civic engagement, a small number of universities have institutionalized a commitment to serving the community in the form of centers. (In 2003, Taiz University in Yemen created a Center for Environmental Studies and Community Services. Qatar University in Doha launched a Center of Volunteerism and Civic Responsibility in September of 2012.) In Morocco, Al Akhawayn University's Azrou Center for Community Development provides instruction to community

leaders in tandem with the university's 60-hour community service requirement for students. The Azrou Center is the exception, not the rule, as the issue of compulsory service is being debated in a handful of countries. While rare, some universities and colleges offer service-learning courses and others have core missions that point to the aspiration of infusing civic engagement throughout the institution. (Zarqa Private University and Al al-Bayt University in Jordan, the American University in Beirut, and the University of Balamand in Tripoli, Lebanon, offer service learning courses.) An especially impressive example of this is Al-Quds University in Jerusalem, which has a 120-hour service requirement for graduation, a clinic-based legal education program in its Law School, and applied research projects to "inform public decision-making on policy issues and conflicts such as water supply and quality" (Watson 2011, 83-89).

Conclusion

To address such challenges of civic life as poverty, illiteracy, disease, and natural disaster, universities in some regions of the globe began collaborating with local communities more than a hundred years ago. In other regions, university civic engagement is a strategy that emerged in the middle of the twentieth century. Today, universities and communities around the globe are engaging with one another by way of service learning, volunteerism, extension, applied research, participatory action research, engaged scholarship, and other approaches. University civic engagement has grown dramatically in some regions (such as North America and Sub-Saharan Africa), as evidenced by the wide range of approaches that have been adopted over time. In other regions (such as Europe and the Arab Region), the strategy is growing steadily, yet substantial resistance to some approaches remains. Nonetheless, the university civic engagement movement is global. It is driven and shaped by societal values, such as good citizenship, social responsibility, and social solidarity. Though characterized by a diversity of approaches, the universities and communities participating in the movement share a common vision: collective action and learning to improve civic life.

REFERENCES

Axelroth Hodges, Rita Dubb, and Steve Dubb. *The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at the Crossroads*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2012.

Benneworth, Paul, and Michael Osborne. "Knowledge, Engagement, and Higher Education in Europe." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Birdwell, Jonathan, et al. "Active Citizenship, Education and Service Learning," *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* (2013). Sage Journals: http://esj.sagepub.com/ (accessed June 25, 2014).

Bringle, Robert, and Julie Hatcher. "A Service Learning Curriculum for Faculty." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2, no. 1 (1995): 112-122. http://quod. lib.umich.edu/m/mjcsl/3239521.0002.111/1/--service-learning-curriculum-for-faculty?rgn=full+text;view=image;q1=A+Service+Learning+Curriculum+for+Faculty (accessed August 20, 2014).

Bringle, Robert, et al. *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research.* Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2011.

De Gortari Pedroza, Ana. *El Servicio Social Mexicano: Diseño y Construcción de Modelos*. En: Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia y Tecnología. UPE. Programa Nacional Educación Solidaria, 2005. Aprendizaje y servicio solidario en la Educación Superior y en los sistemas educativos latinoamericanos. Actas del 7mo. Seminario Internacional "Aprendizaje y Servicio Solidario." República Argentina.

Engagement Australia. http://www.engagementaustralia.org.au/home.html (accessed May 26, 2013).

Fitzgerald, Hiram. "Knowledge, Education and Higher Education in Canada and the United States of America." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Garrocho Rangel, Carolos, and Gustava A. Segura Lazcano. *La Pertinencia Social y la Investigación Científica en la Universidad Pública Mexicana* (2011). http://ergosum. uaemex.mx/pdfs/pdf_vol_19_1/5_gustavo_segura.pdf (accessed September 22, 2014).

Hall, Budd. "Towards A Knowledge Democracy Movement: Contemporary Trends in Community-University Research Partnerships." *Rhizome Freirean* 9 (2011). http:// www.rizoma-freireano.org/index.php/towards-a-knowledge-democracy-movement-contemporary-trends-in-community-university-research-partnerships--budd-l-hall (accessed August 20, 2014).

Hatcher, Julie A., and Mabel A. Erasmus. "Service-Learning in the United States and South Africa: A Comparative Analysis Informed by John Dewey and Julius Nyerere." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Fall 2008): 49-61.

Hoyt, Lorlene. "A City-Campus Engagement Theory From, and For, Practice." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 17, no.1 (2010): 75-88.

Hoyt, Lorlene, ed. *Transforming Cities and Minds Through the Scholarship of Engagement: Economy, Equity and Environment*. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 2013.

Hoyt, Lorlene, and Robert Hollister. "Moving Beyond the Ivory Tower: The Expanding Global Movement of Engaged Universities." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Hoyt, Lorlene, and Robert Hollister. "Strategies for Advancing Global Trends in University Civic Engagement." *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 6, no. 1 (2014): 1691-1710.

Ibrahim, Barbara. "The Role of Higher Education in Societal Transformation in Arab States." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Ma, Carol Hok Ka, and Rajesh Tandon. "Knowledge, Engagement, and Higher Education in Asia Pacific." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Naidorf, Judith, et al. *Las Tensiones y Complejidades de la Noción de Pertinencia*. Ponencia presentada en: V Encuentro Nacional y II Latinoamericano "La universidad como objeto de investigación". 30, 31 de Agosto y 1 de Septiembre de 2007, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, UNICEN, Tandil. (2007)

Orozco Silva, Luis Enrique. "Calidad Académica y Relevancia Social de la Educación Superior en América Latina." RIES, *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior* 1, núm. 1 (2010), http://ries.universia.net/index.php/ries/article/viewFile/22/calidadpdf (accessed August 27, 2014).

Preece, Julia. "Higher Education and Community Service: Developing the National University of Lesotho's Third Mission." *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education* 17, no.1 (2011): 81–97.

Preece, Julia, et al. "Community Engagement within African Contexts: A Comparative Analysis." In *Community Engagement in African Universities: Perspective, Prospects and Challenges*, edited by Julia Preece, et al. London: NIACE , 2012. http://supportservices.ufs.ac.za/dl/Userfiles/Documents/00004/2532_eng.pdf (accessed August 27, 2014).

Reinmuth, Sandra I., et al. "Die Idee des Service Learning." In *Studierende Übernehmen Verantwortung - Service Learning an Deutschen Universitäten*, edited by A. M. Baltes, et al. Weinheim: Beltz (2007): 13-28.

Tandon, Rajesh. "Civil Engagement in Higher Education and its Role in Human and Social Development." In *Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI) - Higher Education in the World 3, New Challenges and Emerging Roles for Human and Social Development*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Nieves Tapia, María, and Marta Mallea. "Service Learning in Argentina." In *Service Enquiry: Service in the 21st Century*, edited by Helene Perold, et al. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute and Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa (2003): 203-215. http://www.icicp.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Service-in-the-21st-Century.pdf (accessed August 27, 2014).

Tapia, Maria Nieves. "The Engaged University in Latin America and the Caribbean." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Walters, Shirley, and George Openjuru. "University-Community Engagement in Africa." In *Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility*, edited by Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Watson, David, et al. *The Engaged University: International Perspectives on Civic Engagement*. New York and London: Routledge, 2011. (out of print: available in ebook from http://books.google.com/books?id=hGurAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false).

BEYOND SERVICE AND SERVICE LEARNING: EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY IN COLLEGE

By Richard M. Battistoni

For the past two decades, higher education leaders, particularly college presidents, have advocated solving the "democracy crisis"—low political understanding and participation rates among younger people —by increasing civic engagement and service-learning programs on campuses (Campus Compact 1999, 3-4). But for those who held out hope that service learning and community engagement could make a significant impact on democratic political engagement, there has been more disappointment than success. Why have conventional approaches to service learning and community engagement fallen short politically? I find three major problems with the majority of these initiatives.

The Problem of Purpose: Insufficient Attention to Civic Goals

In the effort to grow and spread the field, colleges and universities have encouraged "scattershot" initiatives—single-course, single-semester experiences across the curriculum—allowing the departments sponsoring such experiences or courses to set their own outcomes. Some promoters of community engagement simply assume democratic political engagement will occur for students as a "secondary effect" of a program, without much intentional setting or evaluation of democratic political outcomes for students. Moreover, if those coordinating community-engagement programs or teaching service-learning courses do not see themselves as civic educators, this poses a barrier to achieving democratic political outcomes.

Even those programs or courses that profess to have democratic-citizenship outcomes as their end take a "thin" view of democracy and citizenship. Critics like Harry Boyte contend that service learning routinely "neglects to teach about root causes and power relationships, fails to stress productive impact, ignores politics, and downplays the strengths and talents of those being served"

(Boyte 2004, 12). David Mathews adds that "service programs, although filled with political implications that bright students are likely to recognize, tend to be kept carefully distanced from political education." It is, therefore, "difficult to say what effect, if any, these service programs have on civic education" (Mathews 1996, 265-285). More recently, Eric Hartman argued that there is a difference between "educating for democracy and encouraging civic engagement" (2013, 58); to do the former, higher education needs to return to explicitly fostering democratic values (see also Saltmarsh and Hartley 2011, 14-24).

Until recently, efforts to define learning outcomes related to democratic political engagement have been incomplete, somewhat amorphous, and undefined. For example, the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Elective Classification is one such national effort to advance "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities" in order, among other things, to "prepare engaged citizens" and "strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility" (Carnegie Foundation 2013). A glance at the 16-page Documentation Framework for campuses seeking to apply for the classification, however, suggests a limited understanding of democratic citizenship and a "check-the-box" approach to community engagement. Moreover, while service-learning courses are referenced in the application, and campuses are expected to "provide specific examples of . . . learning outcomes for students," nowhere are democratic, political, or civic-learning outcomes mentioned.

The Problem of Time: Insufficient Commitment to Civic Development

One consequence of the "scattershot" approach to service learning and community engagement is that most college programs simply do not take the time necessary to develop their students' civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Wallace 2000). Following John Dewey, who argued that for an experience to have an effect on educational growth, it "must cover a considerable time span and be capable of fostering development over time" (Giles and Eyler 1994, 80), research clearly shows that the duration and

intensity of a course or program is necessary to produce impact (see Billig 2009). This is particularly true of democratic political outcomes, where skills and relationships take time to develop. While in the United States you can become a legal citizen by birth, you don't become an *effective* citizen by birth, or by voting once, or by taking one civics course in high school, or by having a "one-and-done" college experience, even if it's a well-constructed and supported community-based learning experience. And this is especially true if the "civic intervention" is not directly connected to your core identities; that is, you see your civic identity—as a participant in public life—as part of your personal, professional, and other identities.

The Problem of Accountability: Insufficient Attention to Evaluating Outcomes

The final concern regarding service learning has to do with how the field typically measures its effectiveness. Campuses either "count" things—the number of civic engagement courses or faculty, the number of students involved, the number of hours served—or do simple and often meaningless "pre-post" surveys from the beginning of an intervention to the end (at most one semester). These measures do little to determine whether an impact occurs, let alone how and why democratic civic outcomes are occurring. These accountability standards even fail to use the standard announced by Campus Compact presidents, who argued that:

We will know we are successful by the robust debate on our campuses, and by the civic behaviors of our students. We will know it by the civic engagement of our faculty. We will know it when our community partnerships improve the quality of community life and the quality of the education we provide (Campus Compact 1999, 4).

The Potential Promise of Service Learning

For all of these reasons, many higher educators interested in advancing democratic political-engagement aims have long given up on service learning. This, I believe, is a mistake; there is compelling evidence that community-based learning, done intentionally and well, still offers a fruitful approach to engaging students directly and explicitly in democratic politics. As Peter Levine argues, "the best examples" of service learning offer much to recommend themselves to democratic civic educators:

> [They] are true collaborations among students, professors, and community members; they have a political dimension (that is, they organize people to tackle fundamental problems collectively); they combine deliberation with concrete action; and they are connected to "teaching and learning, research, and the dissemination of knowledge [goals] that drive the university" (Levine 2008, 21).

There are several reasons for continuing to advance service learning as a means to the end of educating for democracy. Let me begin with more theoretical, epistemological, and pedagogical justifications for continuing to hold out hope for service learning as a democratic political education strategy in higher education. First, service-learning pedagogy has the effect of breaking down the hierarchical and "expert-driven" epistemology so prevalent within the academy. Service learning evinces what Derek Barker calls a more "democratic epistemology" (Barker 2011), flipping the "expert-knower" roles in radically democratic ways. It also works to "redistribute power," not only between campus and community, but also between faculty and students (Mitchell 2008). Further, service-learning practice over the past forty years comes out of a pragmatist theoretical foundation, which also has deep connections to participatory democracy (Barber 1984, 1992; Giles and Eyler 1994).

Second, to the extent that high quality, or "critical," service learning (see Mitchell 2008) places a primary emphasis on authentic relationships, both in the classroom and in the community, it shares with current democratic political education efforts a resistance to "institutional politics" in favor of "informal, everyday democracy." A growing number of service-learning practitioners have come to

an understanding that we must begin with what David Mathews calls a "wetlands" approach to our work:

> Citizens are defined by what they do with other citizens rather than with the state. Their relationships are pragmatic or work-related rather than based on patronage or party loyalty. The names people give to problems in the political wetlands reflect the things they hold dear . . . The knowledge needed to decide what to do about the problems citizens face is created in the cauldron of collective decision making. It is formed by the inter-action of people with other people. (Mathews 2011, x).

Or, to use Mark Wilson's metaphor, what both quality service learning and democratic political education seek is that people be "part of" their communities, rather than merely "partnering with" them in a service-oriented placement or project (Wilson 2012). The language we find around "reciprocity" and "co-creation," prevalent in both community engagement and democratic citizenship pedagogies, suggests that a union between the two is possible—and desirable (Longo 2013).

Additionally, to the extent service learning has advanced an understanding of "shared governance," with strong emphasis on student and community "voice," it has something to offer those interested in advancing the democratic purposes of higher education. The democratic concern about student voice can be traced back to *College Students Talk Politics*, a 1993 report published by Kettering. In the preface, David Mathews complains about the complicit role higher education has played in depressing student political engagement: "Sometimes [students] learn what politics is in class. Most of the time they learn politics from the way it is practiced on campus" (Creighton and Harwood 1993). And service-learning researchers have long documented the positive impact that "student voice" can have on student-learning outcomes, including civic ones, as campuses begin to involve "students as colleagues" (Billig, Root, and Jesse 2005; Battistoni and Longo 2011; Longo, Drury, and Battistoni 2006; Zlotkowski, Longo, and Williams 2006).

A final reason for "educational democrats" to invest hope, time, and energy in the potential of service learning lies in the commitment to critical reflective practice. With its roots in John

Dewey, the field has always maintained a focus on the importance of "reflective thinking" to service learning (and democratic civic) outcomes (Giles and Eyler 1994; Youniss, et al. 1997). The Carnegie-supported Political Engagement Project, many of whose programs and courses were community-based, found strong connections between "learning through structured reflection," personal meaning and political efficacy, and what the project termed "politically engaged identity," which "involves seeing or identifying oneself as a person who cares about politics and has an overarching commitment to political participation" (Colby, et al. 2007, 17).

Democratic Community Engagement in Practice

For the past three years, I have been part of a study of three programs that embody this reasoning behind sticking with community engagement—done well and with a particular civic emphasis—as an effective strategy for democratic political engagement. The three programs studied are: the Public Service Scholars Program at Stanford University; the Citizen Scholars Program at the University of Massachusetts; and the Public and Community Service Studies major at Providence College. These three programs take a "sustained, developmental approach" to community engagement curricula, in order to:

> support civic identity and leadership development by creating opportunities over time for students to work on issues and concerns in increasingly complex roles; to invest deeply in an issue, agency, or relationship that creates connection and a sense of belonging; and to create community both on and off campus that builds the critical awareness and skills necessary to take action and mobilize others in meaningful and constructive ways (Mitchell, Visconti, Keene, and Battistoni 2011, 116).

In addition to developing authentic, longer-term relationships, and thus addressing "the problem of time," all three programs demonstrate a "commitment to a practice-based and democratic pedagogy within a community of learners," and to students and community members as "equal colleagues and coeducators" (Mitchell, Visconti, Keene, and Battistoni 2011, 129). All three are grounded in and informed by fundamental democratic political values (such as diversity, social justice, active citizenship), and

have specific, articulated program outcomes involving democratic civic skill development that are assessed over time, thus addressing "the problem of purpose."

Finally, these civic engagement programs have been subjected to a rigorous, mixed-methods research study of almost 400 program graduates to determine what, if any, outcomes have been achieved. To give an example, preliminary analysis of quantitative and qualitative data from this study demonstrates a strong relationship between deep, critical reflection in the program and the subsequent development of civic identity and commitments to civic action after the graduates leave college (Mitchell, et al. 2014).

Advancing Democratic Political Education through Community Engagement

This three-program study not only gives hope that service learning can advance students' democratic political education, but also points the way out of the three problems most community-engagement initiatives exhibit. Conversations begun at Kettering are generating ideas about how best to advance democratic civic education through and beyond service learning, which include the following steps:

1. Address the problem of purpose by developing agreed-upon democratic citizenship-education outcomes for community engagement, and connect courses and programs to these standards, with concrete assessment indicators and measures.

Much work has already been done to begin to identify student civic learning outcomes in higher education. Over a decade of research, practice, and articulation has taken place (see Howard 2001; Battistoni 2002, 2013; Kirlin 2003; Koliba 2004; Saltmarsh 2004, 2005; Colby, et al. 2007), attempting to define the standards by which the civic education work of higher education could be judged and measured. This has culminated in three important initiatives:

- construction of "Civic and Global Learning" objectives as one of the "five basic areas of learning" in the Lumina Foundation's Degree Qualification Profile tool (Lumina Foundation 2014);

"Analysis demonstrates a strong relationship between deep, critical reflection in the program and the subsequent development of civic identity."

- development of a "Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric" as part of the VALUE rubrics project of the AACU (Rhodes 2010); and
- articulation of "A Framework for Twenty-First Century Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement" (Framework) as part of The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement's *A Crucible Moment* (AACU 2012, p. 4).

Both the Degree Qualification Profile tool and the VALUE Rubric define civic learning developmentally, with attention to students attaining civic outcomes at "progressively more sophisticated levels" (Rhodes 2010). And the "Framework" lays out in some specificity the concrete knowledge, skills, values, and characteristics of collective action necessary for citizens to have.

More needs to be done, however, in solidifying an "agreed-upon list" of student-learning outcomes, connecting these outcomes to concrete indicators and measures, and then connecting these outcomes to college programs and curricula. The Degree Qualification Profile understanding of civic learning is fairly thin,

"rely[ing] principally on the types of cognitive activities [such as *describing*, *examining*, *elucidating*, *justifying*] within the direct purview of institutions of higher education" (Lumina 2014, 25). The Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric, while including important elements like *diversity of communities and cultures*, *civic identity and commitment*, *civic communication*, and *civic action and reflection*, avoids direct reference to *democratic politics* or *power*, in what comes across as a fairly general articulation of standards for evaluation. The "Framework" list is more specific, but quite long, making the task of meeting the democratic learning goals fairly daunting. Even so, it doesn't capture essential civic dispositions or motivations, like *civic agency* (Boyte 2008), *political efficacy* (Colby, et al. 2007), *critical reflection* or *reflective practice* (Mitchell, et al. 2011, Battistoni 2013), or *civic vocation* (Roholt, Hildreth, and Baizerman 2009, 131).

In reflecting upon the different lists of civic-learning outcomes that have been developed, and my own experience as a civic educator, I would argue for a final list that includes fewer, rather than more, items: prioritizing a handful of civic education goals, beginning with *voice* and *critical reflection*. As argued above, the value of equal voice is central to any understanding of democracy, and connects quite nicely to other productive scholarly work —in and outside the community-engagement field—documenting the importance of narrative/story, deliberation, and relationship-building between campuses and communities. Critical reflection, as mentioned above, is a fundamental civic capacity, one shared by experiential and democratic educators.

Developing standards out of such a short list, with indicators and measures that could be used by colleges and universities, is another important matter, as is getting service-learning and community-engagement programs to agree to abide by them. After all, most service-learning programs fail to meet the criteria for "quality," determined through extensive research and practice by the field itself, let alone that which would come from a body of democratic political educators.

2. Address the problem of time by studying and encouraging sustained, developmental initiatives that exist in higher education.

If we take seriously the critique of short-term engagement strategies and the advocacy of "wetlands" approaches that ask students to be "part of" community efforts over time, we need to examine the handful of multi-term educational programs connected to overtly democratic political learning outcomes. Kettering has been working with and learning from the *Living Democracy* program, a multi-semester program at Auburn University. In addition, a number of examples of multi-semester, curriculum-based community engagement programs leading to academic certificates, minors, and majors have been documented by Dan Butin, and are worth exploring further (see Butin and Seider 2012). The Bonner Scholars Program (BSP), initially a co-curricular, four-year undergraduate community-engagement initiative with increasingly sophisticated civic education curricular elements, is another sustained, multi-institutional effort worth examining.

"The value of equal voice is central to any understanding of democracy."

3. To address the problem of accountability, study the actual outcomes of exemplary initiatives aimed at engaging students in democratic politics, not only on students as they exit courses or programs but after they leave college and are out in the political world, as well as on the communities they aim to improve.

The Carnegie Foundation's Political Engagement Project (PEP) attempted to evaluate political engagement outcomes on a very small scale and over a short time frame, with a pre-post-test research design, but even with these limitations, the findings that emerged from the PEP study raised important issues for democratic educators (Colby, et al. 2007). The Bonner Scholars Program offers a better example, as it has been the subject of longitudinal research on those who have graduated from the program. Longitudinal and community-impact studies take extra time and resources, but they are ultimately more effective indicators of long-range impact, and are more consistent with the values we profess.

Related to this, more needs to be done to engage with the field and disseminate research on best practices and outcomes. One of the problems in the field of service learning and community engagement has been that important concepts and research do not find their way to other practitioners and researchers. For some time, research has revealed crucial insights about how to connect service learning to civic learning outcomes, and what constitutes "best practice" in the field in order to achieve certain outcomes for students (and communities). And yet these have seemingly been unable to inform practice or subsequent research.

With all of the many challenges to advancing service learning and community engagement as a democratic political strategy in higher education, there remains great promise in this approach. We need to engage in a conversation about how to involve students as citizens beyond service learning, without abandoning its potential promise.

REFERENCES

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU). *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*. Washington, DC: AACU, 2012.

Barber, Benjamin. *Strong Democracy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1984.

Barber, Benjamin. *An Aristocracy of Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America*. New York: Ballantine, 1992.

Barker, Derek. "Eleven Sticking Points: Priorities for the Future of Civic Engagement in Higher Education." In *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*, edited by John Saltmarsh and Matt Hartley, 7-9. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011.

Battistoni, Richard. "Civic Learning Through Service Learning." In *Research on Service Learning: Students and Faculty* 2A. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2013.

Battistoni, Richard. *Civic Engagement Across the Curriculum: A Resource Book for Faculty in All Disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2002.

Battistoni, Richard and Nicholas Longo. "Putting Students at the Center of Civic Engagement." In *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*, edited by John Saltmarsh and Matt Hartley, 199-216. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011.

Billig, Shirley H. "Does Quality Really Matter?" In *Creating Our Identities in Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, edited by Barbara E. Moely, et al.,131-157. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009.

Billig, Shirley H., et al. *The Impact of Participation in Service-Learning on High School Students' Civic Engagement* (CIRCLE Working Paper 33). College Park, MD: University of Maryland, Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2005.

Boyte, Harry. "Against the Current: Developing the Civic Agency of Students." *Change* 40, no. 3, (2008): 8-15.

Boyte, Harry. *Everyday Politics: Reconnecting Citizens and Public Life. Philadelphia*, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Boyte, Harry. "Community Service and Civic Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* (June, 1991): 765-767.

Butin, Dan, and Scott Seider, eds. *The Engaged Campus: Certificates, Minors, and Majors as the New Community Engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Campus Compact. *Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 1999.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "Community Engagement Elective Classification." 2013. http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php (accessed August 18, 2014).

Colby, Anne, et al. *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Responsible Political Engagement*. Stanford, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2007.

Creighton, John, and Richard Harwood. *College Students Talk Politics*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation, 1993.

Giles, Dwight, and Janet Eyler. "The Theoretical Roots of Service-Learning in John Dewey: Toward a Theory of Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1, no. 1, (Fall 1994): 77-85.

Hartman, Eric. "No Values, No Democracy: The Essential Partisanship of a Civic Engagement Movement." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 19, no. 2, (2013): 58-71.

Howard, Jeffrey. *Service-Learning Course Design Workbook*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2001.

Kirlin, Mary. *The Role of Civic Skills in Fostering Civic Engagement* (CIRCLE Working Paper 6). Medford, MA: Tufts University, Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (2003). http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP06Kirlin.pdf (accessed August 18, 2014).

Koliba, Christopher. "Is Service-Learning Contributing to the Downsizing of Democracy? Learning Our Way Out." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 10, no. 2 (2004): 57-68.

Levine, Peter. "The Engaged University: A Tale of Two Generations." In *Agent of Democracy: Higher Education and the HEX Journey*, edited by David W. Brown and Deborah Witte, 11-28. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press, 2008.

Longo, Nicholas. "Deliberative Pedagogy and the Community: Making the Connection." *Higher Education Exchange* (2013): 49-57.

Longo, Nicholas, et al. "Catalyzing Political Engagement: Lessons for Civic Educators from the Voices of Students," *Journal of Political Science Education* 2 (2006): 313-329.

Lumina Foundation. *The Degree Qualifications Profile 2.0 (Draft)*. Lumina Foundation for Education, Inc., 2014.

Mathews, David. "Preface." In *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*, edited by John Saltmarsh and Matt Hartley, vii-xi. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2011.

Mathews, David. "Reviewing and Previewing Civics." In *Educating the Democratic Mind*, edited by Walter Parker, 265-285. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1996.

Mitchell, Tania. "Traditional vs. Critical Service-Learning: Engaging the Literature to Differentiate Two Models." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 14, no. 2 (2008): 50–65.

Mitchell, Tania, et al. "Educating for Democratic Leadership at Stanford, UMass, and Providence College." In *From Command to Community: A New Approach to Leadership Education in Colleges and Universities*, edited by Nicholas Longo and Cynthia Gibson, 115-148. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press, 2011.

Mitchell, Tania, et al. "Reflection That Transforms: Connections Between Reflection in Service Learning and Reflection in Current Life." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (in press 2014).

Rhodes, Terrell, ed. *Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement: Tips and Tools for Using Rubrics*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2010.

Roholt, VeLure, et al. *Becoming Citizens: Deepening the Craft of Youth Civic Engagement*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Saltmarsh, John. *The Civic Purpose of Higher Education: A Focus on Civic Learning*. Unpublished manuscript, Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts, 2004.

Saltmarsh, John. "The Civic Promise of Service Learning." *Liberal Education and the New Academy* 91, no. 2, (2005): 50-55.

Saltmarsh, John, and Matt Hartley, eds. "Democratic Engagement." In *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement For Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*, edited by John Saltmarsh and Matt Hartley, 14-24. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011.

Wallace, John "The Problem of Time: Enabling Students to Make Long-Term Commitments to Community-Based Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 7, no. 1 (2000): 133-141.

Wilson, Mark. *Living Democracy Project: Reflecting on the First Cohort*. Unpublished paper presented at Kettering Beyond Service and Service Learning meeting, November, 2012.

Youniss, James, et al. "What We Know About Engendering Civic Identity." *American Behavioral Scientist* 40, no.5 (1997): 620-631.

Zlotkowski, Edward, et al., eds. *Students As Colleagues: Expanding the Circle of Service-Learning Leadership*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2006.

BEYOND ENCLOSURE: PEDAGOGY FOR A DEMOCRATIC COMMONWEALTH

By Romand Coles and Blase Scarnati

Enclosure and Democratic Commonwealth

We live in a time when higher education (along with democratic institutions and practices) is under severe assault. This attack has many different, yet overlapping, fronts, advancing in the name of austerity, efficiency, privatization, consumer preference, technocratic expertise, outcome-based metrics, continual assessment, and culture war. In this context, some faculty members are sliding toward despair and cynicism. Meanwhile, some of the most visible responses to the shrinking box of higher education have been primarily defensive: letters, rallies, and protests calling for a return to previous levels of funding and tenure density, renewed support for the traditional disciplines, and rather anemic calls for faculty governance in resistance to top-heavy administrations. While we are sympathetic to many of these calls, we note that, in their most common forms, they seem to lack sufficient resonance to alter broader political dynamics. Moreover, insofar as they assume primarily reactive articulations, they fail to address aspects of higher education that have long been intimately involved in the decline of democratic culture, public goods, and educational quality.

It is easy to view this mix of attack, despair, and reaction as a sign of dark times, but inventive possibilities exist that are largely ignored by the leading protagonists. There are possibilities for an emerging confluence of vision, interests, and power that harbor significant promise for altering interconnected cultural and political dynamics in higher education, democracy, and work. Gathering steam is a series

of initiatives that may deepen and broaden traditions of democratic engagement, freedom, and commonwealth.

How shall we characterize the dominant tendencies that shape the academy today? We believe that it is useful to understand them in terms of the history of *enclosure* (our reflections here are informed by Polanyi 1944 and Wolin 2008). The story of enclosure is centuries old, beginning with early moves to enclose and privatize the common lands upon which most ordinary people depended for their livelihood. While the enclosure movement started with land, in the ensuing centuries it spread to many other domains: to corporate charters that were once tethered to public purposes, to agricultural seeds, to the knowledge commons, to medicine, to the genetic code, to the airwaves, to education, to government itself. Movements toward enclosure typically aim to seize and rearticulate spaces and practices that have had significant public governance and purposes. These movements seek to curtail or eliminate public involvement, enhance comparatively narrow private interests, and limit people's freedom. Advantages gained in one arena are typically used to enhance one's hand in other arenas, in a process that tends to generate a system of interconnected and sometimes runaway power. Though enclosure often involves walls, exclusions, and limitations, in contemporary times enclosure works in tandem with privatization. It works in ways that tend to intensify plutocratic oligarchy and restrict the freedom, governance, and commonwealth of democratic publics.

In almost every case, movements of enclosure have been challenged by movements to defend the commons, and in some instances the latter have made advances that significantly contribute to the growth of democratic knowledge, cultures, power, freedoms, and commonwealth. Transformations in higher education—reforms brought about by the American Revolution, land-grant and historically black colleges in the nineteenth century, the GI Bill and other post-World War II programs, and democracy and diversity initiatives in the 1960s—all contained significant elements that have advanced commonwealth and democracy, even as they illustrate the messy complexities of political development in the United States.

But recent decades have seen a remarkable curtailment of initiatives for democratization and commonwealth in higher

education. While the system of enclosure that is at work here has a recognizable logic that serves the interests of very few at the expense of many, the actors who are implicated in this highly erosive process are a multifarious and cacophonous crew. They include:

- corporate powers that seek to restrict education according to the imperatives of private industry;
- legislatures that dogmatically pursue ideological agendas;
- university administrations that seek their own advancement by conforming to imperatives that have little to do with the goods of education;
- faculty so limited by the enclosures of hyper-professionalized disciplines that they increasingly mirror narrow interest groups, and find it difficult to connect with broader public interests;
- students molded by a consumer culture that misconstrues education as a form of shopping;
- angry publics enflamed by culture wars, fueled in part by billionaires;
- and those who resent perceived manipulation and humiliation by the technocrats they associate with higher education.

Most of us would need more fingers than we have to target all those who are implicated in the assault on higher education—including some that curve back to the bodies from which they extend.

At the same time, there are numerous initiatives that are beginning to generate some of the vision, coalescence of interests, and political dynamics needed to revitalize quality education, democracy, and commonwealth. Initiatives at Northern Arizona University (where we teach) and other institutions are re-envisioning pedagogical practices in ways that appear to be resonating with faculty, students, and members of diverse communities, as well as with the university administration, local government, and business community. There are heartening trends in the nationwide education movement that are being explored by networks such as the American Commonwealth Partnership, Imagining America, CIRCLE, the American Democracy Project, the Kettering Foundation, and the

New Economy Institute. Though relatively young, there are promising signs these initiatives may lead to a more diverse and powerful public that supports the type of high quality education for vocations that contributes to democracy and commonwealth.

In this article, we sketch a theoretical framework that pushes the accepted model for liberal education into deep articulation with vocation and engaged democracy. On a practical level, we also begin to see ways in which this framework is having substantial democratizing impacts on the culture, practices, and institutional spaces at Northern Arizona University and among our community partners. In particular, we focus on theorizing and on cultivating the fertile intersection that is emerging among liberal education, civic agency through democratic pedagogy, and vocational formation. We believe that the space where these three overlap is the most promising location for democratic reformation of higher education. It is at this intersection that we find some of the richest and most engaging ideas about education. It is also here that we find a confluence of emergent interests among diverse constituencies, one that holds the potential for cultivating a powerful network capable of fostering deep and broadly democratic institutional and cultural change in higher education.

A Frame for Democratic Pedagogy, Institutional Culture Change, and Commonwealth

Many faculty embrace *liberal education* in the hope of breaking through the complex dynamics of contemporary enclosure. Education for human freedom involves far-ranging inquiries through which we may, on the one hand, critically illuminate, and liberate ourselves from, dogmas that serve antagonistic interests and, on the other, discern more genuine paths toward personal flourishing. Liberal education has always had the latent capacity to promote activities of *public* freedom that involve inquiry, collaborative work, and political action—through which we shape and generate the basic conditions and commonwealth of our polities. We believe that the academy can open liberal education to a more profoundly interdisciplinary dialogical process, widening the dialogue to include faculty in collaborative groups, students, and community members. Moreover, this sort of liberal education can bring disciplinary

knowledges into dialogue with other knowledges—especially community knowledges—as students, faculty, and community members collaborate to develop democratic capacities and agency. This mode of radically dialogical liberal education can create a thick braid of activity and articulation, with diverse participants sharing their problems, aspirations, and knowledges on how to co-create a complex and diverse commonwealth. The university thus becomes a dialogical catalyzing agent in the community, rather than a locus of research that is segregated from the community and its concerns.

Learning is broadened, deepened, and vivified by practices of liberal education that replace the enclosures of disciplines, narrow interests, and the academy itself in favor of profound dialogue across differences. It is a vision for liberal education that can cultivate the *democratic agency* that many hunger for. Such agency does not involve "dumbed-down" disciplinary knowledge (as some fear), but rather *enriches* these knowledges through conversation about the complexities of the world and the diversity of our communities. Through such engagements, many participants—particularly "first generation" students—newly discover the profound pertinence of academic learning, and become passionate about higher education. Democratic pedagogy instills a sense that learning and scholarship aim to not only *understand* the world, but also to *change* it for the better, despite the profound problems we face. This conjunction *animates* educational practices *and* democratic agency in a reciprocal process.

In this context, conceptions and practices of *vocational education* are profoundly enriched as well. The call for vocational education resounds from many quarters today, bringing the hope that students may acquire good jobs and good wages. At the same time, many in the academy fear that the focus on vocational education will truncate and narrowly instrumentalize the broader aspirations of liberal education that have informed post-World War II visions of higher education. Much of the technocratic rhetoric around vocational education does, indeed, feed this concern. Yet in the context of deepened liberal education and democratic pedagogy, we find that the implications are far brighter.

With theorists such as Max Weber and Richard Sennett, we seek to recover and amplify the more profound dimensions of

vocation, particularly those evoked by the German word *Beruf*, which "contains two resonances: the gradual accumulation of knowledge and skills and the ever-stronger conviction that one was meant to do this one particular thing in one's life" (Sennett 2009, 263). Consider each of these in turn. For Sennett, drawing on the craftsperson tradition, engaged pedagogy and the complex sorts of agency that are cultivated in democratic pedagogy are integral to a rich sense of vocational knowledge: "The craftsman represents the special human condition of being engaged" and illuminates how both "understanding and expression are impaired" when the "head is separated from the hand" (20). For "all skills, even the most abstract, begin as bodily practices," on the one hand, and "technical understanding [that] develops through the powers of imagination," on the other (10). Our engagement with the world is indispensable because "materiality talks back, it continually corrects our projections" with experiences of complexity that resist, puncture, and spill beyond our simplifications (272). Vocational education, thus understood, is a process of enlightenment that breaks out of enclosures. It exceeds privatization insofar as it facilitates the discernment and cultivation of one's "calling," which emerges through the profound inquiry flourishing at the intersection of one's deepest gifts and significant public purposes. A rich conception of vocational education is both enhanced by and implicated in similarly rich understandings of liberal education and democratic pedagogies for civic engagement.

In dialogues with scores of faculty and students, we have found that there is a fertile intersection that resonates with people from a wide range of academic backgrounds, aspirations, and political ideologies. Many hunger for a conception of liberal education that connects the flourishing of individuals to the complex commonwealth of our communities—one that prepares people to pursue meaningful work and political action that extends, rather than terminates, the existential journeys initiated in higher education. Many are drawn into the work of serious teaching, learning, civic engagement, and institutional change in this context.

Each institution in higher education has its own specific contexts, cultures, traditions, and "brands." Organizing for change has always involved making connections between transformative

frames and the dimensions of one's context. In the following section, we briefly discuss how we have sought to make these connections at Northern Arizona University.

Connections for Action at Northern Arizona University

Northern Arizona University (NAU), like most institutions of higher education, readily articulates values and aspirations in our institutional mission and strategic planning documents. These statements ostensibly embody values the university community has established over time—much like the curricula that actualize these values—as well as other values embraced by the faculty, even if those are not formally stated by the institution. NAU's strategic goals include student success, excellence in research, global engagement, a commitment to Native Americans, sustainability, and "diversity, civic engagement, and community building." The latter is a recent addition, and a very important recognition of the impact our civic engagement and democratic pedagogy initiative at NAU has had on the institution and, increasingly, on the national scene. This initiative has been able to gain rapid and widespread faculty and administrative support because we have connected it with NAU's commitment to quality, face-to-face interactive undergraduate education and efforts to increase student success. Indeed, this focus on undergraduate education is central to what distinguishes NAU among the three four-year public institutions of higher education in Arizona. Our civic agency and engagement initiative framed democratic pedagogy and civic engagement as powerful ways to enhance NAU's identity and effectiveness in promoting student success. Its effectiveness has been supported by quantitative and qualitative data, as we discuss below. The initiative places hundreds of students in First Year Seminars (FYS), linked to action research teams (ARTs) working in the community on such issues as sustainability, Native American concerns, diversity, local economics, and regional impacts of globalization. As such, we have quickly become one of the most visible initiatives to support NAU's strategic goals and its identity as an institution that seeks to be a responsible steward in the region.

This collaborative work resonates with the university and the region because it is grounded in practices of civic agency and

engagement that involve students, faculty, and community members in a thoroughly democratic pedagogy. In courses in the FYS Program, Second Year Seminars (SYS), and soon in NAU's new Civic Engagement Minor (sponsored by the Program for Community, Culture, and Environment and the FYS-ARTS Program), students, faculty, and community members engage together to generate vibrant, creative, and non-hierarchical educational learning spaces in a radically expanded concept of what higher education can be. We seek to provide a powerful frame for intellectual learning and public research through democratic pedagogy—indeed, one that is reminiscent of the frame used by historian Gordon Wood to argue that there is a false dichotomy in attributing either ideas or passion as means by which change was effected in the American Revolution and early republic (Wood 2011). We adapt the term action research and connect to the powerful passions of our students, faculty, and community members to bring about change.

Democratic pedagogy begins in the first class meeting between our faculty and first year students, where many collaborative decisions are made on the direction that the course will take—including projects, assessments, and ways of interacting with one another—and that all agree upon. A key democratic pedagogy that is deployed in the first week of the FYS is the Public Narrative. Based upon the classic narrative framework developed by Marshall Ganz of Harvard University, first year students begin to find their voice and develop agency through several steps that explore the individual's story (self), connect with others, then motivate the group (us), and provide an opportunity to strategize for action (now) (Ganz 2009). Additionally, faculty, peer teaching assistants, and graduate mentors help build the students' democratic capacities and skills through the process of organizing; developing relational capacities by practicing effective one-on-one meetings, developing analytical and power-mapping skills as taught by the Industrial Areas Foundation and other community organizations, cultivating practices of mutual accountability, and learning how to strategize action.

By conceptually reworking the educational experiences found in liberal education courses in the first year, we seek to unleash the potential for cultivating more engaged, agentic, and change-oriented practices of democracy, as well as richer visions of vocation. We

must foster learning experiences that prepare our students to build broad coalitions to actively bring about change. Developing these skills will help students build political support for higher education that encompasses a much wider range of constituencies than are presently represented. Democratic pedagogies and these active learning experiences must engender dialogues and collaborative public work that produce appropriately complex understandings born at the intersection of many different communities and forms of knowledge.

For liberal education, democratic pedagogies seek to develop diverse knowledges embodied in the community, like the knowledge K-12 teachers or members of diverse traditions bring to the table. In addition, we seek to democratically develop knowledges engendered by those in occupations that connect deeply with craft and vocation—knowledge that is formed by those who struggle to survive on the undersides of particular forms of power, and knowledge of those who wrestle with the radical specificities of particular places and ecological circumstances.

As demonstrated by the example of NAU's recent adoption of civic engagement as a strategic goal, democratic pedagogy through action research can both draw upon and inform the brand of the institution by making civic engagement a key signature undergraduate experience. By situating public work at the heart of the discourse about what the institution is and what it aspires to, we seek to not only frame action and drive institutional transformation, but also to expand what the possibilities are for a democratic space in the academy. This becomes not only a learning space for students, but also a deeply collaborative and creative space for commonwealth. Through the learning experiences of democratic pedagogy, much like those of the Public Narrative, students move from self to the community—moving from the singularity of the individual into a larger dialogue with the community, or broader frame of commonwealth. As students move beyond the self, they begin to engage vocation in its larger sense, asking not just "who am I?" but "what do I see for my life?" and "how does my life articulate with broader communities and ecosystems of which I am a part?"

Discussion of NAU's ARTs Movement

Students at NAU are working non-hierarchically and collaboratively to build new alliances with community-based partners in order to create dense rhizomatic webs of practice called Action Research Teams (ARTs). Each ART includes a diverse mix of members: first year students enrolled in FYS-ARTs courses, sophomores and juniors who want to continue in the public work of the ARTs and assume leadership and organizing responsibilities for initiatives within each ART, sophomore or junior peer teaching assistants from the FYS-ARTs Program who work with the students in each seminar, graduate student mentors assigned to an ART, and multigenerational community partners, including K-12 students and their parents, community members and organizations, political leaders, sustainable business entrepreneurs, and Navajo elders.

In the fall of 2009, after spending a year primarily listening and building relationships both on campus and throughout the community, a leadership collaborative consisting of the Program for Community, Culture and Environment (CC&E), FYS, and the Masters of Sustainable Communities Program (MSUS) launched an initiative in which students in a MSUS core course served as facilitators of Action Research Teams made up largely of students in an FYS course. Students opted into one of the following ARTs: Public Achievement (coaching teams of K-12 students on the theory and practice of grassroots democracy); Weatherization and Community Building; Immigration; Water Conservation and Rights; Urban Gardening and Alternative Agriculture; Food Security; and Public Spaces for Civic Engagement. During that semester, ARTs participants catalyzed numerous projects, from coaching teams of children in democratic organizing and organizing with the immigrant community against abusive policing to working in urban gardens. Forums led to action plans for a Sustainable Café, community organizing around residential energy efficiency, and hosting an educational/celebratory event that drew five hundred people to Flagstaff, an event that longtime residents said was the most diverse large gathering in the town's history. At the end of the semester, most of the students involved were very enthusiastic about the emerging transformative possibilities. The ARTs continued into the next semester,

largely led by graduate students, faculty, community partners, and some undergraduates who stayed involved.

A vortex of excitement gathered the following fall, as the FYS Program recruited more faculty to offer seminars connected with the ARTs, the MSUS Program doubled its incoming class and provided more facilitation and mentorship (aided by stipends for graduate assistants from CC&E), and our collaborations with community groups strengthened. In each year since, the number of FYS-ARTs courses has grown, as have enrollments of first year students engaged in the ARTs, which totaled 450 in fall of 2013 and are expected to nearly double this fall. Many new ARTs have been added to the mix, and have developed sub-teams focused on different modes of public work and political action in relation to the problems they address. For example, the Immigration ART engages in humanitarian work on border issues with No More Deaths, broad-based community organizing strategies with Northern Arizona Interfaith Council, radical abolitionist democracy visions and strategies with Repeal Coalition, and educational events with a variety of campus and community partners.

Other ARTs have multiplied their sites and projects. The number of partnering organizations and social movements has burgeoned, and it is fair to say that the ARTs movement is an energetic partici-pant—or catalyst—in most of the major initiatives in Flagstaff for sustainability, social justice, and grassroots democracy.

University Resources for Democratic Pedagogy, Civic Engagement, and Public Work

While initial funding for faculty and graduate student involvement in this initiative came from the three programs that formed the core leadership, we have since gained substantial funding from the NAU President's Innovation Fund, a Dean's Faculty Development Grant, the National Science Foundation, and others. Increasingly NAU is channeling significant resources toward this initiative, and research is beginning to confirm the previously hypothesized effectiveness of democratic pedagogical practices and civic engagement. One vital measure of the power of such pedagogy can be seen with respect to first-year students engaged with the ARTs. NAU students have very high dropout

rates, with roughly 27 percent of students leaving NAU before the second year. A recent assessment study of the FYS-ARTs found significant increases in retention rates from the first to the second year among students who take one such seminar. Minority students who took a FYS-ARTs course showed increased retention rates of 17 percent; women's retention rates increased by 9 percent; and overall rates were up 7 percent. These findings strongly suggest that students who connect their education with public engagement, purposes, and agency not only "turn on" to education, but are also less likely to "turn off."

We have been fortunate to received significant institutional investment in our civic engagement initiative at NAU. The FYS-ARTs Program budget has grown from $70,000 in 2007-08 to nearly $900,000 this academic year. We have also seen growth in personnel, from utilizing tenured and part-time faculty on loan from other departments to teach individual sections of FYS-ARTs courses to 6-1/2 lecturer positions and two full-time staff coordinator positions dedicated to the program. Two tenure-track searches are currently underway to fill positions directly linked to this work. One is for a scholar in community-based sustainable economics, and the other is for a civic scholar whose focus is on water and food with the ability to work with diverse food-producing communities across the Southwest. We also fund and hire 167 undergraduate peer teaching assistant positions, as well as 8-1/2 graduate assistant positions to work with the ARTs.

The civic engagement curriculum offers courses developed from individual faculty research and interests in each of the four distribution areas of our liberal education program (serving first and second year students). We have recently established a Civic Engagement Minor at NAU that will begin enrolling students in the spring of 2015 in courses jointly offered by the CCE Program and the FYS-ARTs. Students in the minor will explore the relationships between the discipline that they study and a comprehensive knowledge of civic engagement history, theories, practices, and experiences. The minor will combine scholarly knowledge and research with a variety of experiential opportunities in which students become involved in action research with community organizations aimed at creating more democratic, just, and sustainable communities.

The premise of this minor is that grassroots democratic theory and practice can and should mutually inform one other, as should the scholarly and various other knowledges and traditions in the wider community.

Students who complete the Civic Engagement Minor will acquire a broad education in democracy, power, and the skills that bring about change to enhance commonwealth—from the local level to national and transnational scales—through a series of intentional and sequenced learning experiences. Experiential and leadership training will provide students with a deep understanding of a career as a vocation in which personal flourishing and broad public purposes are intertwined. This will enhance students' employability, vocational connections, and relationships, as well as their capacities to work in diverse, complex, and dynamic situations. The minor enables students to participate in a transformative initiative in which the NAU community participates in numerous partnerships with surrounding communities in order to become better stewards and citizens.

As we have focused on developing and growing the numerous collaborative projects associated with the ARTs initiative, the deans of several of NAU's Colleges—along with leaders of service, deliberative dialogue, and civic engagement projects on campus—invited us to become founding members of a campus-wide Civic Engagement Consortium. To date, the consortium has focused largely on coordinating efforts and communicating among its members. We believe the consortium has great potential, and we seek to help it become an active agent for catalyzing new civic agency and engagement work in the university-community realm.

Finally, the FYS-ARTs Program faculty have been the most valuable of all resources. They deployed the democratic pedagogy used in their courses to organize with one another to collectively draft a new differential load policy for the program that was approved by the provost. Beginning this fall, FYS-ARTs faculty will receive four units of load credit for each three-unit course taught, due to the significant investment of time in civic engagement and democratic pedagogy by each faculty member involved with the ARTs. This differential loading applies to both full-time and part-time faculty. Based on this successful organizing experience, the FYS-ARTs faculty

self-constituted themselves as a Faculty Steering Committee for the program, where they will have an active role in determining the direction, growth, funding priorities, staffing, and curriculum of the FYS-ARTs Program. We see this as a particularly exciting and hopeful moment, as do many of the faculty themselves. Much like our faculty, who co-create horizontal learning spaces with students and community members through democratic pedagogies that push back against the non-active and hierarchical pedagogy of the traditional lecture, faculty self-governance in the FYS-ARTs Program will push against the tenured/non-tenured class structure and the viciously hierarchical department/college structure to foster faculty agency and self-determination.

Looking Ahead

In all of this, we are beginning to discern a set of self-perpetuating dynamics that are promising, even if they are still somewhat precarious. Perhaps most significant, faculty who are engaged in or otherwise experience the democratic pedagogies, practices, and outcomes of the ARTs movement increasingly appear to be bringing their insights and enthusiasm to other locations around NAU. Thus, growing numbers of departments and programs are beginning conversations on how they might ramp up their own civic engagement pedagogical practices. More faculty are beginning to think of themselves as civic scholars and active agents of change with broader communities. An atmosphere of cynicism and despair among faculty, students, and community members is giving way to an ethos we might call "visionary pragmatism," as we encounter myriad examples of people working and acting together to create positive changes and commonwealth in a new horizontal space that draws together campus, community centers, K-12 schools, burgeoning gardens, community markets for cooperative entrepreneurship, and others.

Many of those who engage in and witness such work become ambassadors for it, and growing numbers of faculty, staff, and students are publishing articles on this movement, presenting at conferences, producing videos, and engaging in dialogue with others in civic engagement, sustainability, and community economics networks across the U.S. and beyond. As the work deepens and as

the networks expand, many of us sense the dawning of a new, powerful, and diverse movement to reclaim genuinely *public* forms of education, in tandem with efforts to reclaim and rebuild a genuinely *democratic* polity. Of course, the challenges are numerous and the hurdles are high. Yet as one student said in a breakout conversation at an Action Research Team Symposium at the end of the fall semester in 2013, "You know, I used to feel that everywhere that I found problems, there were walls blocking the way to solving them." He raised his forearm vertically, elbow on the table, to represent the walls. "But coaching elementary students in Public Achievement this semester, seeing the amazing things they can do together when they learn how to collaborate democratically—now everywhere I saw walls, I'm beginning to see pathways for change," he said as he lowered his forearm to the table to represent paths of possibility. There are no concluding words that could be as eloquent and promising as these—and none that make this journey more worthwhile.

REFERENCES

Boyte, Harry, and Blase Scarnati. "Transforming Higher Education in a Larger Context: The Civic Politics of Public Work." In *Civic Studies*, edited by Peter Levine and Karol Soltan. Washington: Bringing Theory to Practice, forthcoming.

Boyte, Harry, and Blase Scarnati. "Building Democracy Colleges: A Different Kind of Politics," in "The Blog: Harry Boyte," *Huffington Post*, May 3, 2012. www.huffingtonpost.com/harry-boyte/building-democracy-colleg_b_1471717.html (accessed October 14, 2014).

Coles, Romand. "Transforming the Game: Democratizing the Publicness of Higher Education and Commonwealth in Neoliberal Times." In *New Political Science*, forthcoming 2014.

Coles, Romand. "Environmental Political Theory and Environmental Action Research Teams." In *Oxford Handbook of Environmental Political Theory*, edited by David Schlosbert, et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2015.

Coles, Romand, and Blase Scarnati. "Transformational Ecotones in Higher Education: Craftsperson-Ethos and Northern Arizona University's CRAFTS Movement." In *Democracy's Education* edited by Harry Boyte. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, forthcoming.

Coles, Romand, and Blase Scarnati. "Supporting Students Through Community Connections," *Diversity & Democracy: Civic Learning for Shared Futures* 14, no. 3 (Fall 2011): 15.

Ganz, Marshall. "Why Stories Matter." In *Sojourners: Faith and Action for Social Justice* (March 2009). www.sojo.net/2009/03/why-stories-matter (accessed October 14, 2014).

Ganz, Marshall. *Telling Your Public Story: Self, Us, Now*, http://www.wholecommunities.org/pdf/Public%20Story%20Worksheet07Ganz.pdf (accessed October 14, 2014).

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1944.

Sennett, Richard. *The Craftsman*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Wolin, Sheldon. *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Wood, Gordon. *The Idea of America: Reflections on the Birth of the United States*. New York: Penguin Press, 2011.

WE ARE THE ONES WE HAVE BEEN WAITING FOR: THE PROMISE OF CIVIC RENEWAL IN AMERICA

Written by Peter Levine

Marietjie Oelofsen, Reviewer

Democracy is not working as it should. Citizens feel sidelined because their representatives in government pay more attention to the wishes of powerful interest groups, and are more interested in using policymaking to settle political scores than in considering the views of their constituents. "Certainly, we Americans are in a bad mood about our nation and our public life."

We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For (Oxford University Press, 2013) invokes a powerful phrase from the civil rights movement. Levine sets out an argument for civic engagement with potential to address the asymmetry of decision-making power between government and citizens. In Levine's definition, civic engagement includes "a combination of deliberation, collaboration, and civic relationships." Current civic engagement efforts, Levine argues, do not have sufficient scale and power to reform the institutionalized culture of problem solving in the country: "The way to achieve such reforms is to organize one million most active citizens into a self-conscious movement for civic renewal." The goal of this book, says Levine, is to "develop practical strategies for expanding and rewarding open-ended politics under difficult circumstances."

Levine begins by describing the "difficult circumstances" Americans face. High dropout rates in schools, disproportionately high rates of incarceration, expensive health care, the troubled economy, global warming, and dysfunctional financial and academic institutions, says Levine, are problems that citizens have to address through "more and better work by the residents of a whole community."

But, says Levine, if citizens want to address serious problems, they need to be more than "thoughtful and committed" citizens. Commitment and thoughtfulness, says Levine, has to be combined with questions about the timeliness of the action, what action

would be most effective, and the "good means and good ends" to be achieved. These questions have to be supported by "a combination of values, facts, and strategies to think wisely about politics." Levine devotes two chapters to the notion of "values," elaborating on the values at the core of talking and listening, civic work, and civic relationships. He also considers the values that give expertise, ideology, and the market new meaning when viewed through the lens of civic engagement and civic renewal. Two chapters address the state of American democracy. Levine provides an historical analysis of the rise and fall of civil society, the part played by the media in (not) recognizing civic engagement, the effects of inequality and class divisions on the potential of diversity and representativeness of civic groups, and the corruption of public institutions that encourage special interests and "discourage civic engagement." Levine details the ongoing citizen-engagement efforts that he sees as the network of civic organizations that could form the basis of an emerging civic renewal movement. He provides concrete proposals on how to aggregate the fragmented efforts of citizens involved in "scattered" pockets of "sophisticated, demanding, and locally effective" civic engagement into a cohesive civic renewal movement.

Levine is clear about civic engagement. He is also clear about what civic engagement is not. Civic engagement is not just about talking or deliberating public problems; it consists of "talk and work." "Work" means taking concrete action. In my reading of Levine, *work*, in this instance, also includes *willingness* to have open-ended discussions with citizens who hold different opinions, or who may look different from us, or who come from different backgrounds. It also includes making difficult choices about finite resources, sharing responsibility, and owning problems by taking action, with other citizens, to try and solve them.

Apart from the theorists and practitioners one would expect to feature in a book dealing with civic engagement—Jane Addams, Hannah Arendt, Harry Boyte, John Dewey, Robert Putnam— three voices stand out, at least for this reviewer, as influential in Levine's conceptualization of a theory of change in the norms for civic engagement and civic renewal: Elinor Ostrom, John Rawls, and Amartya Sen. He recognizes Elinor Ostrom, the 2009 Nobel Laureate in economic sciences, for the way in which she and

her group understand the "creation and management of common resources." Levine finds Ostrom's framework appealing for its emphasis on citizen centeredness and her de-emphasis on the separation between the state and the private sector. This, says Levine, opens up the possibilities for citizens to engage with diverse institutions and a diverse combination of institutions. Levine questions modern academic philosophy's inability to provide theoretical guidance on how to change the world. Levine points to John Rawls as "a leading example" of proponents of *ideal* theory that "does not offer a path to a better society but only an indication of what one would be like. It is a highway without the on-ramp." Levine also draws on Amartya Sen's critique of ideal theory and pushes the critique "further than Sen does"; where Sen argues that changing society happens through "global dialogue" with enough leverage to influence "the actual decision makers" (whether these decision makers are people with votes, or consumers, or powerful leaders), Levine's theory of change, which is also "meant to exemplify a different approach to scholarship," speaks to "readers who can act (collectively) to enhance democracy in the United States."

Levine interlaces theory and practice throughout the book, while remaining (deliberately?) vague about the precise roots of his own theoretical lineage. In Chapter Five, Levine discusses the potential of theoretically based solutions to the dysfunctional praxis of politics in America in greater detail. He finds utilitarianism, populism, libertarianism, and egalitarianism wanting as proposed theoretical solutions. What is needed, he says, is "an ongoing dialogue in public forums about what the public interest requires."

Levine's thoughtfulness about the complexity of issues that theorists of participatory and citizen-centered approaches to democratic governance face is a strength of this book. Levine is as mindful of the obstacles encountered by citizens involved in the practice, or work, of civic engagement: "The kinds of practices that I advocate in this book are poorly funded, invisible in federal and state law, understudied by academics, neglected in education, and ignored in news and popular culture." Levine weaves ample examples of civic practice that stumble against the barriers of institutional power throughout the book. But he also has ample, and inspiring, examples of civic practices that work, and he cites concrete examples to

demonstrate why some civic engagement efforts work and why others may not be as successful.

His argument for civic engagement and civic renewal is not "an argument for revolutionary change," and it is not an argument for "participatory democracy" to substitute for the "constitutional order of markets and representative institutions." It is an argument that "more and better civic engagement is a path to social reform." Levine is modest about what could be realistically accomplished in getting a civic renewal movement off the ground: he sets his hopes on levels of civic engagement in the mid-twentieth century, with prospects for added equity and equality. Levine does not pretend to have all the answers: "No one knows for sure how to involve citizens in the administration of health plans over time."

The plan for a road to civic renewal sketched out in the last chapter is specific. The question to start with, says Levine, is not *what is to be done*, but *what should we do?* The former is the "wrong question" because it "hides the subject and suppresses account-ability." The latter is the "better" question, says Levine, as long as the "we" goes beyond a normative concept of citizenship. "Instead, I mean to take the 'we' quite seriously. What should *we* do?—I who writes these words and you who reads them—along with anyone whom we can enlist for our cause." Levine is concrete about potential members, what should be done, what the potential gaps are, how the civic renewal movement will be formed, what the function of the movement would be, and what the priorities for this movement could look like.

Who would benefit from reading this book? Levine asks this question himself, and in the spirit of the book, the question is ac-companied by a call for reflection and a call for action: "Who will read this book, and what can they do?" The audience for the book, he concludes, depends on the way in which the publishing and the media industries are structured to promote it, and the extent to which the topic of the book captures the public's interest. Those who do get to read the book can join organizations and networks avail-able to them. In more general terms, this reviewer would recommend this book to citizens who are interested in civic engagement—why it is in trouble, and what could be done to revive its presence in America's public life.

This book is a powerful and concrete proposal for moving civic engagement from important, but modest, localized efforts to a forceful, cohesive national movement of civic renewal. I, for one, hope the publishers, the media, and the readers will come to the table to help make this happen.

WHO ARE THE CITIZENS WE SERVE? A VIEW FROM THE WETLANDS OF DEMOCRACY

By David Mathews

One of the main objectives of the *Higher Education Exchange (HEX)* is to share with colleges and universities what the Kettering Foundation is learning about what a democratic citizenry is and does, in hopes of finding out, in return, what institutions of higher education are learning about this citizenry. With so many outreach programs, community development efforts, and centers for public life, the academy has never had more opportunities to interact directly with citizens—even more, recently, when institutions across the country engaged the public in deliberations on the mission of higher education. There were more than 100 forums held with citizens in 22 states. If academic institutions continue to hold public deliberations on other issues of mutual concern, a new way of engaging people could emerge.

While full of potential, these outreach projects have revealed significant differences in the way citizens feel and think about their role in democracy as compared to the way academic institutions see the role of citizens. Much of this difference may be the result of the influence of professional culture on academe.

When I talk about professional culture, I am not talking about individual professionals—doctors, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and the like. We depend on them and value their expertise. I mean the culture that has grown out of the way professionals usually see people, which is as those they serve (clients, patients). Patients and clients are largely passive recipients of services. Unfortunately and unintentionally, this mindset tends to diminish any recognition of people as citizens who have to be agents and producers in a healthy democracy. Citizens, as consumers of services, are reduced to *objects* of the actions by others, rather than being seen as essential actors. (For more on this subject, see David Brown's new book *America's Culture of Professionalism*.)

Citizens—when seen in the context of the things they do with others—create a dynamic civic life. This life is more political

than civil society, yet more social than grassroots politics. The citizenry is the workforce that produces public goods that serve the commonweal in a democracy—things ranging from neighbors joining forces to create a community garden to mothers banding together to prevent drunk driving.

At the foundation, we have been thinking about what people do in their civic life as analogous to what happens in the natural ecosystem. The most recent report on Kettering research, *The Ecology of Democracy*, describes the arena where citizens work together to solve problems and produce public goods as the "civic wetlands" of democracy.

Even though I have been talking about citizens, the political ecosystem includes both citizens and institutions like governments, schools, hospitals, and so on. The two are interdependent. Political life usually begins locally and small: that is, in neighborhoods, in informal associations, and around kitchen tables. Then institutions like representative assemblies, government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) bring other resources to bear.

I find the ecology analogy is useful because it provides a broader frame of reference for thinking about the citizenry. The analogy distinguishes the things that citizens do with other citizens, which are often informal or organic, from the things that politicians and government officials do, which are usually formal or institutional. In a political ecosystem, governments, schools, and other established institutions are roughly analogous to oil rigs, docks, and large buildings on the shore. The things citizens do and the associations among them might be thought of as something like barrier islands and the marshes of the wetlands.

I hasten to add that I am not implying that what happens in the wetlands is always good. As in nature, the political wetlands have the equivalents of poisonous snakes and alligators; they can be sources of prejudices, selfishness, and just plain meanness. Although a great many of the fundamental problems of democracy originate in the murky waters of the wetlands, many of the resources for combating these problems can also be found there.

Furthermore, while different, organic and institutional politics are profoundly interdependent. The connection between the organic and institutional spheres is obvious in places like the Gulf Coast.

Large structures like oil rigs and docks are affected by what happens on barrier islands and in salt marshes and vice versa. This was obvious when the lack of natural barriers exposed New Orleans and its institutional structures to the full fury of Hurricane Katrina. And it was obvious when a drilling rig exploded in the Gulf of Mexico, sending millions of gallons of oil into the wetlands.

Today, everyone rushes to protect the coastal wetlands when there is an oil spill, even though we once overlooked the value of what goes on in these swampy areas. For years, we filled in the marshes, and the sea life that bred in the wetlands died. We removed barrier islands to make better shipping channels and unintentionally made better hurricane channels. We learned the hard way the important role nature's wetlands play.

In looking at the role that higher education plays in public life, there is reason to worry that, with the best of intentions, academic institutions using their professional expertise might make the same mistakes as developers and engineers once made in "reforming" nature's wetlands. And that is the main point I am trying to make. Since what goes on in the civic wetlands is so unlike what professionals do, it is easy to overlook its importance. Informal gatherings, ad hoc associations, and the seemingly innocuous banter that goes on when people mull over their everyday experiences can appear inconsequential when compared with what happens in elections, legislative bodies, and courts. Yet mulling over the meaning of the day's events at bus stops can be the wellspring of deliberative decision making. Connections made in these informal gatherings can become the basis for civic networks, and the ad hoc associations formed there can morph into civic organizations.

Here is an example of how the citizenry can go unrecognized: Ernesto was a teacher who lived in a Hispanic community that was seen—and to some extent saw itself—as having no civic life, at least as public engagement is usually measured. The people were poor; they appeared to be busy just surviving. For most, English was a second language, limiting contact with those who spoke only English. Voter turnout was low. People protested occasionally, though it was usually about a local matter, and the protests seldom made the news.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' report on volunteering reinforces this perception of a weak civic life in Ernesto's community.

Its 2012 report shows that only 15.2 percent of Hispanics volunteered for "unpaid work . . . through or for an organization," as compared to 27.8 percent of whites and 21.1 percent of African Americans.

If Ernesto had seen these statistics, he would have known that they didn't reflect all that was happening. The bureau's report wouldn't have surprised him because he knew few people were involved in formal volunteer programs. Yet they would help a neighbor in a heartbeat, just not through formal channels. Citizens were constantly joining together to solve problems and creating things that benefited everyone. They started a community garden on a vacant lot and built a clubhouse where they taught classes, held barbecues, and played music. They seldom held formal meetings; still, they talked about political issues over backyard fences, at the doctor's office, and on the neighborhood street corners. These were issues, such as the lack of jobs and what was happening to their children, that affected them personally. This kind of civic life, unfortunately, often went unrecognized as such—even by those most engaged in it.

The political wetlands hold an array of unique and valuable resources like those in Ernesto's community. Like nature's wetlands, they may appear placid, but they are teeming with life. Important work is going on in them. As in nature, harmful substances are being filtered out while birth and regeneration are everywhere. In the civic wetlands, people practice a politics that is quite different from institutional politics—different in objectives, organization, and methods. I would call this politics citizen-centered, because citizens are defined by their relationships with other citizens, not just their connection to the state. These civic relationships are based on reciprocity—receiving and giving in return.

Citizen-to-citizen relationships are not the same as those of family and friends. They can include some who, without being family or friend, are still needed to solve problems. They are pragmatic and work-related. Civic relationships develop when citizens coalesce in order to rebuild their community after a disaster, when they organize to construct houses for the homeless, and when they come together with police to keep young people safe.

The political wetlands also harbor mindsets about how things get done that influence the way people act. Norms prescribe certain

behaviors and proscribe others. (I just mentioned one—reciprocity.) These wetlands are also structured around a multitude of social relationships, some tightly resistant to outsiders and others more open and inclusive. Such ways of relating affect what can and can't be done, as well as the "costs" of conducting the business of politics (the better the relationships, the lower the costs).

The political wetlands aren't silent; they influence how people communicate with one another, which influences the nature of decision making—"who talks to whom about what" is politically significant. And the wetlands develop cultures that determine how well people learn from their experiences and whether they change as their circumstances change.

Political wetlands have their own structures, which are not board tables, but kitchen tables; not assemblies like legislative bodies, but common gatherings, once in post office lobbies and now on the Internet. These structures are more like sand than concrete. Ad hoc groups and alliances form, then fall away as a project is completed, yet reappear when another task is at hand.

At its best, citizen politics in the wetlands is focused on the well being of communities as a whole and their capacity to overcome adversity—their resilience. This politics involves more than volunteering to serve Thanksgiving dinner at a homeless shelter. It goes deeper than voting, obeying laws, and paying taxes. It includes, but goes beyond, serving on advisory bodies and participating in government hearings. It is a politics where citizens don't just comply or advise; they act. They get things done. They produce.

In the wetlands, citizen politics operate on a micro level. The groups that citizens form tend to be informal and aren't large. There may not be a great many of them, but they are powerful when connected. Their influence lies in the significance of the ideas they generate, the work they do by collective effort, the pervasiveness of their associations, and the hope they generate.

The wetlands of democracy can't be ignored because the work citizens do there is needed to complement the work of governments, schools, and other institutions. Elinor Ostrom, who won the Nobel Prize for her research, offered this practical argument for valuing the work of citizens:

> If one presumes that teachers produce education, police produce
> safety, doctors and nurses produce health, and social workers

produce effective households, the focus of attention is on how to professionalize the public service. Obviously, skilled teachers, police officers, medical personnel, and social workers are essential to the development of better public services. Ignoring the important role of children, families, support groups, neighborhood organizations, and churches in the production of these services means, however, that only a portion of the inputs to these processes are taken into account in the way that policy makers think about these problems. The term "client" is used more and more frequently to refer to those who should be viewed as essential co-producers of their own education, safety, health, and communities. A client is the name for a passive role. Being a co-producer makes one an active partner (Ostrom 8).

As Ostrom makes clear, products from the work of citizens can reinforce what institutions do, because citizens make things that institutions can't. I am not talking about volunteer service to take the load off professionals, although that is commendable. I have in mind supplementary projects, or what I would call "complementary production." For example, the work of schools is teaching, but it is just part, but not all, of educating. While most formal instruction is usually best left to professionals, many people can educate. And what children learn in educational settings other than schools can reinforce what happens in classrooms. Schools can benefit enormously from what citizens do to prepare the next generation of young people for the future.

Ostrom notwithstanding, given the powerful resources and orderly routines of professionals, the political wetlands may appear not only dangerous, but also deficient. So, professionalized institutions are prone to act *on* people and communities rather than in league *with* them. And when they concentrate on reforming the wetlands, they miss opportunities for building on the politically regenerative forces that are, in fact, already at work in them.

Institutional reforms tend to colonize the political wetlands, that is, to remake them in the image of the institutions that want to reform them. Sadly, the consequences of these well-intended efforts are often just the opposite of what the reformers set out to do. For instance, when informal wetland associations are induced to become formal organizations, they lose the characteristics that made them effective. Associations of neighbors-helping-neighbors

may become rule-bound and less responsive to people's varying circumstances. This has happened in some neighborhood associations that were deputized by local governments to help set budget priorities. They became quasi-official bodies.

While thinking of the public as a political wetlands may seem odd, it is relevant to higher education because the institutional domain in our political system is in serious trouble—afflicted by everything from hyperpolarization to a serious loss of public confidence. Institutional politics, with all its expertise, doesn't appear to be able to reform itself. This troubling situation has implications for colleges and universities. Perhaps they should look more closely at the benefits that can come from citizens and their ways of working in the wetlands. And those in academe that are preparing tomorrow's professionals might also look more closely at the assumptions professional culture implicitly makes about the citizenry and democracy.

REFERENCES

Ostrom, Elinor. "Covenanting, Co-Producing, and the Good Society," *The Newsletter of PEGS* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1993): 8.

CONTRIBUTORS

Theodore R. Alter is professor of Agricultural, Environmental, and Regional Economics and codirector of the Center for Economic and Community Development in Penn State's Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education. He is program head for Penn State's Intercollege Minor in Civic and Community Engagement and Scholar-in-Residence with the Penn State Sustainability Institute. He also serves as Adjunct Research Fellow in the School of Law at the University of New England in Australia. Alter's research and teaching focus on community and rural development, institutional and behavioral economics, and public scholarship and civic engagement in higher education.

Richard M. Battistoni is a professor of political science and public and community service studies at Providence College, where he also serves as the director of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service. An accomplished practitioner and scholar of the role of education in a democratic society, Battistoni researches service learning, citizenship education, community organizing, and democratic theory and practice.

Jeffrey C. Bridger is a senior scientist with the Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education in Penn State's College of Agricultural Sciences. He frequently teaches undergraduate courses in community, environment, development, and rural sociology. Bridger's work focuses broadly on community interaction, sustainability, and barriers to community agency, and has contributed to the methodological use of narratives as an explanatory tool for gaining a deep understanding of communities.

David W. Brown is coeditor of the *Higher Education Exchange* and coedited two recent Kettering publications, *Agent of Democracy* and *A Different Kind of Politics*. He taught at Yale's School of Management and New School's Milano Graduate School. Brown is the author of *Organization Smarts* (Amacom 2002), *The Real Change-Makers: Why Government is Not the Problem or the Solution* (Praeger 2012), and *America's Culture of Professionalism: Past, Present, and Prospects* (Palgrave Macmillan 2014).

Romand Coles is the Frances B. McAllister Chair and director of the Program for Community, Culture, and Environment at Northern Arizona University, where he is a leader in the democratic education initiative discussed in his essay in this volume. He has collaborated with the Kettering Foundation, the American Commonwealth Partnership, and the American Democracy Project. Coles is the author of several books, including *Beyond Gated Politics: Reflections for the Possibility of Democracy* (University of Minnesota Press 2005); *Christianity, Democracy, and the Radical Ordinary: Conversations between a Radical Democrat and a Christian* (with Stanley Hauerwas, Wipf and Stock 2008); and *Visionary Pragmatism: Toward Radical and Ecological Democracy* (forthcoming from Duke University Press).

Paloma Z. Frumento is a research associate with the Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education in Penn State's College of Agricultural Sciences. Her research interests include democracy and collective action, community arts and education, paradigms of development, empowerment theory, and emerging technologies and public policy.

Lorlene Hoyt is the director of Programs and Research for the Talloires Network, a global coalition of engaged universities. She is also an associate research professor in the Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning at Tufts University and a visiting scholar at

the University of Massachusetts, Boston's New England Resource Center for Higher Education. From 2002-2011, Hoyt was an assistant, then associate, professor of Urban Studies and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where she founded MIT@Lawrence, an award-winning city-campus partnership with the city of Lawrence, Massachusetts.

David Mathews, president of the Kettering Foundation, was secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Ford administration and, before that, president of the University of Alabama. Mathews has written extensively on Southern history, public policy, education, and international problem solving. His books include *Politics for People: Finding a Responsible Public Voice* (University of Illinois Press 1999), *Reclaiming Public Education by Reclaiming Our Democracy* (Kettering Foundation Press 2006), and *The Ecology of Democracy: Finding Ways to Have a Stronger Hand in Shaping Our Future* (Kettering Foundation Press 2014).

Marietjie Oelofsen is a Kettering Foundation resident researcher from South Africa. Her research focuses on talking and listening as devices for political communication and political participation. She will submit her PhD dissertation in media studies this fall at Rhodes University in South Africa. Oelofsen has published papers in the *Global Media Journal-African Edition* and in *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*.

Blase Scarnati is the director of First and Second Year Learning at Northern Arizona University, which includes the First Year Seminar-Action Research Teams Program. He is also a codirector of the First Year Learning Initiative and associate professor of musicology in the School of Music at NAU. Scarnati has collaborated with the Kettering Foundation, the American Commonwealth Partnership, the American Democracy Project, *The New York Times* Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Claire Snyder-Hall writes popular and scholarly texts on issues of concern to democrats and others. She served as research deputy for the Kettering Foundation on the faculty happiness and civic agency project. A former associate professor of political theory, Snyder-Hall holds a PhD from Rutgers University and a BA cum laude from Smith College. She resides in Rehoboth Beach, Delaware.

Adam Weinberg is the president of Denison University. He began his career at Colgate University, where he also served as dean of the College. Most recently, Weinberg served as president of World Learning, a global organization that runs international education, exchange, and development programs in more than 70 countries. Weinberg is a sociologist by training and has published extensively on civic engagement and higher education.

Deborah Witte, a program officer with the Kettering Foundation, is coeditor of the *Higher Education Exchange*. She also directs the foundation's collaborative research with Russian nongovernmental organizations. Witte serves on the executive committee, as well as the board, of the Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education (SOCHE) and the Ohio Humanities Council. She received her PhD in Leadership and Change from Antioch University.

Kettering Foundation

200 Commons Road, Dayton, Ohio 45459 (937) 434-7300; (800) 221-3657
444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 434, Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 393-4478
6 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016 (212) 686-7016
www.kettering.org