

**THE UNIVERSITY IN CIVIC ENGAGEMENT:  
SERVICE IN OUR UNIVERSITY'S MISSION**

**Report on the Spring Senate Plenary  
March 21, 2001  
William Pitt Union  
University of Pittsburgh**

**Report Prepared and Submitted by  
Community Relations Committee  
University Senate  
University of Pittsburgh**

## **Executive Summary**

The Senate Plenary of March 21, 2001, *University in Civic Engagement: Service in the University's Mission*, demonstrated broad and active participation from across the University community and generated productive discussions summarized and enhanced in this report. All indications are that this topic is an important one for the University community and one that merits ongoing inquiry and communication within the academy. The Plenary session and this report are intended to stimulate focused discussion about these issues within schools, disciplines, and units, as well as within the University's leadership and governance bodies.

Introductory remarks from Chancellor Nordenberg noted that one of the institutional goals explicitly calls for the university to be an active partner in local community development in keeping with our teaching and research mission; Dr. Nordenberg also emphasized the importance of service in his leadership role and underscored the theme that the *City is our Campus* is a vital component of the academic mission and should enhance the teaching/learning experience. In his keynote address Ira Harkavy, Director of the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Community partnership focused on the historic public service role of higher education institutions. Dr. Harkavy further noted how that role is evolving into what he termed the *cosmopolitan democratic civic university* that enhances teaching and research through targeted community outreach initiatives and civic engagement partnerships to strengthen student, faculty and staff citizenship. Provost James Maher and Pittsburgh Planning Director, Susan Golomb, each noted that the University has made considerable progress in developing effective relationship with our broader community, and all emphasized the virtue of maintaining respect and responsiveness toward our community partners and the importance of a long-term commitment to collaboration.

Round-table discussions were lively and several overarching themes were identified as the focus for the Plenary and follow-up efforts. From these themes emerged a range of issues and recommendations for consideration in the University community. The Senate's Community Relations Committee, that organized the March 21<sup>st</sup> Plenary and the accompanying Celebration of Service fair, has focused considerable attention on these issues since the Plenary. The following is a summary of the main issues and recommendations:

### **Issue I: Defining Service in the University**

Transforming our vision of service from a limited view of "academic charity" to an enriched and broader conception of service-based learning and scholarship was a critical focus of discussion. Community outreach and civic engagement have emerged as common terms for defining service that is linked to the academic mission of higher education and characterized by collaboration with community partners. How we can most effectively coordinate and advance our community outreach and civic engagement efforts is critical to this enterprise.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1) Conduct follow-up efforts to report on the Plenary and to sustain the momentum generated by the Plenary and subsequent discussions.*
- 2) Define a continuum of community service modes that facilitate the engagement of both individual academic units and campus-wide forum.*

- 3) *Support coordination and communications of service activities, e.g., developing a centralized, web-based inventory of relevant service opportunities and activities.*
- 4) *Encourage effective community representation in community outreach and civic engagement initiatives to promote productive university-community dialogue about how to best apply the knowledge, energies, and resources of the University and our community partners.*

## **Issue II: Linking Service to Teaching and Research**

Administrative support and incentives to encourage great faculty investment in service-based teaching and research is crucial to develop more effective faculty mentors and role models for students. Expanding our concept of research to accommodate the scholarship of teaching, integration, and engagement (Boyer 1990) will likewise require institutional investment to ensure academic rigor, long-term commitments, and a broader dissemination and application of knowledge to the community. Extending the scope of service learning and scholarship beyond a narrow range of professional schools and programs to the broader academic community is a considerable challenge that must be addressed.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1) *Raise the level of discussion/inquiry about awareness of service in teaching and research in ways that help define our institutional leadership in the city and the region.*
- 2) *Develop and provide resources seed and sustain service learning, university-community partnerships, and service scholarship.*
- 3) *Engage community partners as a co-learner, co-worker, and co-creator in building mutually beneficial relationships conducive to service-based teaching and research.*

## **Issue III: Recognition and Reward for Service Scholarship**

Advancing the recognition of service learning and teaching opportunities and service-based scholarship (research) has become a priority in several national higher education forums, i.e., Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, American Association of Higher Education, Campus Compact. While a university-wide dialogue on recognition and rewards would almost certainly be beneficial, focused discussions at the academic unit level must be part of an effective strategy if we are to shape the University culture by encouraging new thinking about how community outreach and civic engagement can enhance the teaching and research of individuals schools and disciplines while addressing real needs identified through community partnership.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1) *Encourage ongoing dialogue to build academic recognition for service learning and scholarship at the department, School, and university levels.*
- 2) *Develop and establish a mechanism to encourage, support, fund, and monitor service-based scholarship.*
- 3) *Support and reward collaboration and interdisciplinary approaches to community outreach, service learning, and service scholarship.*
- 4) *Involve the community in University recognition of and rewards for service and civic engagement.*

## **Issue IV: Service Learning Opportunities for Students**

Students are actively participating in and seeking additional service learning opportunities, but they have expressed concern about how little emphasis is given to their interest within and outside the classroom. Whether service enhances the student academic experience in terms of providing more diverse social networks, deeper multi-cultural understanding, leadership and career development, and scholarship should be explored. Also, serious consideration must be given to faculty rewards and incentive systems if we are to transform a vision of how service can move from being extra-curricular or co-curricular to a more curriculum-grounded, core component of our education mission.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1) Develop a center or office to support and promote service learning on campus that builds on our strong student volunteer program and use this resource to build leadership and career development programs for students strongly linked with Student Affairs.*
- 2) Engage students in ongoing discussion, planning, and participation in community service, service learning, and civic responsibility initiatives that further the implementation of the vision of the “City is our Campus”.*
- 3) Develop mechanisms to recognize and reward community service and scholarship within our University community and the academic disciplines.*

### **Conclusions**

The Community Relations Committee asks the Faculty Assembly and Senate Council to give special attention to the following considerations:

- # Service and community outreach must be linked to our teaching and research, and we should strive to raise the level of scholarship around service and civic engagement to promote a deeper recognition and reward for this work.*
- # Students see a value in community service as it relates to their learning and personal development in the college experience, and they look to faculty and academic leadership to model community service and civic engagement within and outside the classroom.*
- # Recognition and rewards for service, while important across the entire campus, might best be addressed first at the department or school level where more direct linkage to teaching and research might foster greater scholarship in this arena. However, the university should encourage and support these efforts, including the allocation of resources to support innovative and promising ideas.*
- # Service Learning and Service Scholarship would benefit from enhanced resources and incentives to help encourage and nurture this effort.*
- # University-Community partnerships are critical for this work to have impact at both the academic institutional and community levels; both partners should anticipate mutual benefits from working together to solve community problems.*
- # Coordination of community outreach and access to university resources to help community problem-solving is an important goal for the short and long-term.*

## Introduction

On March 21, 2001 the Senate of the University of Pittsburgh conducted a Plenary that focused on *The University in Civic Engagement: Service in Our University Mission*. Nearly 200 people participated in the session to hear the opening and keynote presentations, join in roundtable group dialogues, and engage in the panel discussion wrap-up. Participants included administration, faculty, students, staff, and community leaders. A *Celebration of Service*, an informational fair featuring a representative sampling of the many community service projects conducted by university schools, programs and departments, preceded the Plenary.

As conceived by the Senate's Community Relations Committee, the afternoon was, first, an opportunity to call attention to the role of service in our University and of our University's many civic engagements initiatives. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, the Plenary sought to provide a forum in the University community on four proactive discussion points:

- How do we define service in our mission?
- How can we more effectively link service to teaching and research?
- How can we better recognize and reward service scholarship?
- How can we enhance student opportunities for service learning?

In his opening comments, Chancellor Mark Nordenberg addressed the importance of service in the scope of the institutions overarching goals. Keynote presenter, Ira Harkavy, Director of the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Community Partnerships and a leading scholar and advocate in this field, provided a national and historical perspective on civic engagement and the role of higher education institutions in service to community. Following a lively period of facilitated dialogue in small, roundtable groups, Provost James Maher lead a reactor panel that also featured Susan Golomb, Director of Pittsburgh Planning Department and former Director of Oakland Planning and Development Corporation, and Dr. Harkavy.

With the help of student recorders, discussions of issues and recommendations from the small group roundtable dialogues were summarized, and about 25% of participants also completed an evaluation on the plenary session that afforded open-ended comments about and from the Plenary. A preliminary outline report was developed and distributed generally in the University community through the Faculty Assembly and the Senate Council at closing meetings for the last academic year.

In follow-up from the Plenary the Community Relations Committee convened its membership over the summer months in a series of focused discussion sessions that reviewed and deliberated on the issues and recommendations from the Plenary panel, roundtable groups, and evaluations. The Committee members also reviewed a number of contemporary articles and reports on civic engagement, service learning and scholarship, and university-community partnerships that have contributed to current programs, research, and dialogue at the higher education institutions across the country. Based on the Committee's informed deliberations, this formal report from the Spring Plenary was developed as a vehicle for continuing the dialogue.

This Report addresses the issues and recommendations coming out of the Spring Plenary and filters this commentary through reflections on current scholarship and campus initiatives of a national scope, as well as through the Committee's own deliberations on these matters. Recommendations for further University action are presented in the conclusion of the report as a framework for furthering the dialogue begun at the Plenary.

## **I Summary of Opening and Keynote Presentation and Closing Panel**

*Dr. Nathan Hershey*, Chairman of the University Senate, opened the Plenary by acknowledging the turnout for this important topic and by challenging participants to take an active part in the proceedings. Dr. Hershey introduced *Chancellor Mark Nordenberg* who provided relevant introductory remarks. *Dr. Morton “Moe” Coleman* followed with an introduction of keynote presenter, *Dr. Ira Harkavy*, Associate Vice President and Director of The Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania. Following Dr. Harkavy’s presentation, Plenary attendees participated in an abbreviated round-table discussions facilitated by members of the Senate Community Relations Committee and the University’s Community Outreach Partnership Center. *Dr. Audrey Murrell*, Secretary of the University Senate, then moderated a Reactor Panel discussion that included audience questions. The panel included: *Dr. James V. Maher* - Provost of the University of Pittsburgh, *Ms. Susan Golomb* – Director of Planning for the City of Pittsburgh and former Executive Director of Oakland Planning and Development Corporation, and *Dr. Harkavy*. Dr. Hershey closed the Plenary by thanking attendees for their very active participation in and engagement with the program that went a bit beyond the schedule time.

The following narrative is a summary of the presentations at the Plenary:

### **A. Chancellor Mark Nordenberg – Introductory Remarks**

In his introductory remarks Chancellor Mark Nordenberg noted that of the five overarching institutional goals set by the Trustees in 1996, one explicitly calls for the University to be an active partner in community development. Chancellor Nordenberg recognized that we live in a rapidly changing world, and we ought to be appropriately connected to it. He acknowledged that the strength and health of Western Pennsylvania and the University of Pittsburgh are inextricably tied to one another. The Chancellor further noted that in his professional life, a day does not go by when he is not asked to participate in some significant way in civic initiative of one kind or another from chairing a statewide commission on urban schools or a committee for a regional workforce development plan or a local committee addressing the accessibility of educational institutions for persons with disabilities or, more traditionally, chairing the United Ways Soutwestern PA campaign.

Just as he recognizes his own decisions to invest time and resources into a community initiative, Chancellor Nordenberg noted the University must assess requests for community service directed to the University with a very different set of challenges. Quite frequently, he underscored, the most effective response will require interdisciplinary collaboration. He cited the successful interdisciplinary Community Outreach Partnership Center grant proposal as one example. Noting that, just as our impact can be great when our initiative are on the mark, he added that missing the goal can be very frustrating for both university and community partners. In acknowledging the mutual benefits of university-community partnerships, the Chancellor remarked that service opportunities provide avenues for building stronger university programs while at the same time building strong communities. He further recognized that we are coming to place a higher value on the benefits our students derive from the service learning experience we create for them. By our claim “The City Is Our Campus”, Chancellor Nordenberg said, the University realizes a wealth of civic engagement, service learning, internships, and other growth experiences for our students and university community.

In introducing Dr. Morton “Moe” Coleman to introduce Keynote presenter, Dr. Harkavy, Chancellor Nordenberg discussed a recent administration cross-state visit to see the community development efforts of the University of Pennsylvania, and he was pleased to learn that Penn’s nationally recognized efforts were significantly stimulated by work at the University of Pittsburgh some years ago. He further supported the importance of maintaining our cross-commonwealth stimulation, and hoped the Plenary would hold promise for ongoing exchange.

## **B. Keynote Presentation – Dr. Ira Harkavy**

Dr. Harkavy began his presentation by recognizing the University and, in particular, the early university-community partnership work of Dr. Morton “Moe” Coleman at the University of Pittsburgh, as instrumental to not only the University of Pennsylvania’s efforts, but the development of community service initiatives through the Urban 13 and later influencing the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Recognizing the grand possibilities or the potential risks of this new century, Dr. Harkavy underscored the importance of democracy and the work of the democratic, cosmopolitan, civic university he sees emerging in this new age of knowledge and technology. His key argument was that no institution is more central to deciding the vision and direction of our future than higher education. “Higher education is the core institution that will shape the nature of American society and society worldwide”.

Dr. Harkavy discussed his international work in South Africa, Latin America, and Europe, and in so doing advanced the discussion and work in other parts of the world that similarly recognize the critical role higher education institution can, should, and will play in shaping democratic society. He noted the Budapest Declaration, a statement uniting 42 European societies around the concept of linking democratic society to the work of universities.

Dr. Harkavy cited Derek Bok’s book, University and the Future of America, based on a series of lectures at Duke University that articulated universities as the core institution for advanced societies. Bok focused on three key contributions from universities: 1) new discoveries, 2) expert knowledge, and 3) educating highly trained personnel. In recognizing how individual success has never been more dependent on levels of education, he noted the extensive work Penn has undertaken with local Philadelphia schools and the importance of higher education in leading and shaping our educational systems as a whole. As he harkened back to Harper and Dewey, leading educators a century ago, Harkavy cited Harper’s comment that “democratic education is crucial to a democratic society” and Dewey’s contention that the nature of our schooling system determine the nature of our society.

In recalling the past history of higher education, Dr. Harkavy stated his conviction that there is a university civic responsibility movement occurring nationally and locally today. He echoed the sentiments of former Stanford President, Don Kennedy, who wrote in his book, *Academic Duty*, that we are “witnessing the third revolution for universities in this century”. The other two, as Kennedy and Harkavy recognize were, first, the adoption and adaptation of the German research model at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and, secondly, the Cold War entrepreneurial university that grew over the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century as we advanced our knowledge in physics, engineering, medicine, education, and other disciplines spurred by competition with the Soviet Union. Dr. Harkavy termed this third revolution/evolution of higher education the emergence of the *democratic cosmopolitan civic university*.

To support this contention of a third revolution in higher education, Dr. Harkavy discussed a number of indicators, including:

- Wingspread's (a group of leading academics and university administrators) declaration of universities civic responsibilities in 1998.
- Campus Compact's July 4, 1999 President's Declaration of Civic Responsibility now signed by over 380 university presidents.
- The Budapest Declaration signed by 42 European nations and the Council of Europe
- Development of an international consortium on higher education civic responsibility and democracy.

Why this revolution/evolution is occurring in higher education is the result of several, largely external, factors influencing higher education. Echoing Chancellor Nordenberg's remarks, Dr. Harkavy related that the environment of an institution determines mightily the present and future of that institution. As he noted the difficulty an institution can have in attracting students, faculty, and staff or retaining them if the local environment or your city is deteriorating – as was the situation at Penn and its surrounding neighborhood – can be a significant driver of civic engagement and community outreach partnership. He noted further that we are being pressured by state institutions to contribute to solving the pressing problems of our times. Legislators and funders at all levels are increasingly turning to higher education and its knowledge and resources to make a greater contribution. Government programs like HUD and its Office of University Partnership have, for years, provide funding incentives like Community Outreach Partnership Center and other grants, to engage higher education in helping solve the pressing urban problems of our times. On a more benignly cynical note, Harkavy noted that the strong funding interests in university-community partnerships make it possible that “doing good might be one of the best ways to do well.”

Perhaps, Harkavy argued, the most compelling reason for this new revolution in higher education stems to what Sir Francis Bacon and John Dewey posited long ago. He sounded Bacon's notion that “Knowledge should not be for its own sake, because that's why man fell. Knowledge should not be for power, because that's why the angels fell”. Instead Bacon argued that there needed to be an integration of production, organization, and the use of knowledge to advance scholarship and the world. Harkavy stressed Dewey's concept that we learn best by focusing on the strategic problems of our time. In addition, Harkavy remarked on Donald Stokes, former head of Princeton's Wilson School, who wrote in discussing models of learning that most human beings learn best by engagement with concrete, real-world issues.

The finally rationale for this emerging higher education movement, Dr. Harkavy contended, is a recognition that every undergraduate institution in this country has a primary function to educate young people for citizenship and for general knowledge. He noted there is a critique developing – Robert Putnam's “Bowling Alone” and others – that the decrease democratic participation by young people in the United States and across the world is in part because universities are not taking their responsibility for cultivating citizenship seriously. Surveys of mission statements at leading colleges and universities find that all of them identify education as serving the public good. He argued “we are not educating students to be rich and famous or to give money back as alums – at least not directly. We are educating young people to do well and to do good and to be contributing members of American society and the world.”

Briefly tracing the history of higher education in America for those colleagues who might argue that service to the public good is not at the root of higher education, Dr. Harkavy noted the

earliest colleges were founded with two purposes: to advance and educate a learned clergy to spread the gospel and to increase the wealth of civic leaders. Even religious service has community service at its core. Surely, he contended, the land-grant tradition served to advance democracy in the western territory, and the Wisconsin Idea stressed the boundaries of the university *are* the boundaries of the state. John Hopkins, founder of that great research university, advanced the purpose of his institution and other research universities were “to end misery among the poor”. Columbia, Harkavy noted, transformed from a modest preppy institution to greatness by Seth Lowe by the “not just the extent that Columbia is part of New York but that New York is part of Columbia”. The reputation of the University of Chicago was built by pragmatically focusing its academic work on improving Chicago communities. Penn, Harkavy’s own institution was established as the Academy of Philadelphia and recognized by Ben Franklin (1749), as is the purpose of all higher education, “to educate young people to serve”.

Dr. Harkavy concluded his presentation by sharing some examples of their university-community partnership work at Penn that addresses the role of both community schools and higher education institutions in focusing the work of all schools on solving problems of the community. In their work, he reported, that they follow Bacon’s argument that, “every individual, no matter how high or low their qualifications, can contribute to learning”. In Penn partnership efforts the community is a co-learner and a co-creator of knowledge with the university. What they are striving for at his institution, he stressed, is to make sure that service is intrinsically connected to teaching and research, and, further, that service is seen as a key component that not only advances learning, but improves the community.

### **C. Reactor Panel Comments – Provost Jim Maher, Ms. Susan Golomb, Dr. Ira Harkavy**

Members of the panel had an opportunity to make comments. Following those comments, questions and comments were taken from the floor.

Provost Maher, while noting his excitement about this process, remarked that the University is not quite sure how to go about doing this civic engagement and community outreach work. He noted that communities and universities had been burnt before – during the 1960s – when much of the promise of community change did not last. Developing and maintaining this thrust for the long-term is most important to avoid the pitfalls of the past. We need to work “with” community organizations, realizing that neither of us knows the solution. It is important for us to approach communities as “humble” academics and be willing to put together teams that can effectively address a problem. We should look to broaden our view of service so that it is more than volunteerism. The University should not advance itself as a service organization, always keeping in mind that we are a higher education institution. We have many programs outreaching into the community, and these can tend to overlap without coordination. Look to develop community partnerships that first allow for links to research and teaching to emerge from partnerships, and we should build from faculty expertise where we can combine curriculum with outreach. The faculty also needs to be creative in trying service to teaching and scholarship (publication).

Susan Golomb recognized that our University is changing how it interacts with Oakland and surrounding communities in a positive way – inviting the community to describe its needs and strengths. She asked that the university not duplicate projects already in the community, and that our efforts not undermine or dis-empower the community. She echoed Dr. Maher’s concern with the continuity of our efforts – not “here today, gone tomorrow”. She stressed that

partnership is doing “with” not “for” or “to” communities. The university is not the expert but the resource, and our work should empower and build community by co-creating mutual learning. Often the community is not sure where or how to approach the university, and efforts should be made to improve access to the university for helping communities solve problems.

Ira noted that our focus should not just be on locality but on democracy and collaboration in a broader sense of public service. We should look at what connects faculty to one another around service, and we need to recognize that both faculty and students look for recognition and rewards. He noted the importance of using leading faculty and students to enhance service on campus. Co-creation with university and community is crucial to service learning success, and reflection and active learning require “real world” problem-solving. He underscored that engagement in solving core community problems can enhance the university research process, and he stressed strategic, academically-based service as the cornerstone for civic engagement.

Questions and comments from the participants were significantly student initiated and reflected a concern with enhancing service learning. Several participants noted the importance that service plays in improving student cultural experiences and the culture of the campus. Others asked consideration of credits or other recognition of service, as well as whether service should be a requirement for students. Faculty need to model service and service-learning to help students better understand how it ties to their development, and more discussion on service should occur in our classrooms.

## **II Defining Service in the University**

### **A. Issues from the Plenary - Need to Define Service**

Among the most frequent comments heard at the Plenary was the need to define service for our University. While we all talk about service and its importance in the University mission, are we all working from a similar concept of service? There is a tendency to think of service as “volunteerism”, but the University is a higher education institution, not an “academic charity agency”. Several other frameworks for understanding service emerged from the Plenary:

- Service as citizenship – the university as an community of citizens
- Service as democracy and collaboration, not just locality-based
- Service as community outreach in partnership with communities
- Service as leadership development for faculty, students, and staff
- Service as career development, particularly for students
- Service as a support for multi-cultural learning

Clearly, there is a need to better understand the range of service definitions and to develop a dialogue within the University to better define what we mean by service, as well as defining the communities with whom we engage this service.

Also emerging from the Plenary were issues related to how the university relates with the community, and panelists and presenters recognized that our University has substantially changed – improved - how it interacts with the surrounding community. There has been a tendency for the University to always be the expert, doing things “to” and “for” the community. Many at the Plenary stressed that community outreach should empower and build community capacity and resources. By working “with” communities we can co-create service for mutual learning and support multi-cultural learning that makes service efforts more inclusive. Again,

understanding our communities of engagement and the nature of our relationship with those communities is a critical part of our ongoing dialogue on service in our university.

A third issue for concern expressed at the Plenary was the lack of coordination of our service efforts. While the Celebration of Service clearly acknowledges a wealth of service efforts by many schools and units engaged with various communities, there is not a coordinated sense of our collective service efforts nor is there a communications mechanism to keep the academy informed. Similarly, without a coordinated approach to service it is also difficult to communicate our efforts and successes to the local and larger community. Not only does each discipline need to address service relevance and coordination in their own unit, but also the University needs to understand how these efforts compliment one another and lead to a collective understanding of our civic engagement.

## **B. Current Literature on Service and Civic Engagement**

The Community Relations Committee examined a number of writings and reports addressing service and *civic engagement* in higher education institutions, and several issues emerged. In today shifting social landscape higher education, like many social institutions, is uncertain about its social responsibilities, and with this uncertainty comes a blurring of identity and relationship that grow out of responsibilities. Writing for the Council on Public Policy Education, William Sullivan (Sullivan 1999) notes that relationships grow out of our purposes and, conversely, our relationships continually shape our goals. Many colleges and universities, as well as the entire academic enterprise, are engaged in an exploration and a rediscovery of purpose and identity in this changing social environment. Service and civic responsibility have become a large measure of that exploration.

Initiatives like *Campus Compact*, formed in the late 1980s to foster cooperation and mutual support for civic responsibility on American campuses, have begun to encourage assessment of civic responsibilities in accreditation procedures, Carnegie classifications, national rankings, and public system expectations for colleges and universities. In its *Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*, a series of questions serve as guidelines for university leadership, students, faculty, administration and staff, and the institution as a whole. Critical constructs of this institutional role in civic responsibility include:

- Democratic practice on our campus - do we model democratic behavior?
- Campus/community partnerships – do we support mutually beneficial partnerships?
- Communications with our community – do we communicate our civic work and share our knowledge with the community?
- Community improvement – how do we particularly help our surrounding communities?
- Campus engagement – how well do we coordinate and track our efforts?

Civic engagement and responsibility provides important baselines for defining service in our University mission. The relationship between educational attainment and civic engagement has long been established, and higher education is seen as the leading institution in building a democratic and civically engaged society. From Jefferson to Dewey to Boyer a major role for higher education has been defined as the development of productive and engaged citizens in a democratic society. Professor Robert Putnam's telling article, *Bowling Alone* (1995), chronicled the growing decline in American civic engagement from voting to membership in civic associations, to community organizations that Alexis de Tocqueville once celebrated as unique keys to America's democratic society. Surprisingly, Putnam found this decline in civic engagement greatest among the better educated. Thomas Ehrlich of the Carnegie Foundation for

the Advancement of Teaching has helped prepare *Measuring Up 2000: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education* that examines the work on campus across the U.S. to reverse this decline in civic engagement that is so vitally linked democracy in our civil life. Integrating service into teaching and scholarship seems an essential tool in building civic engagement and democratic experiences.

One of the most recent reports of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities stresses the need for universities to go beyond outreach and service to “engagement” wherein institutions redesign their teaching, research, and service functions to be more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined. This commission, chaired by President Spanier of Pennsylvania State University, looked at the direction state and land-grant universities are taking and need to take in the future. Their report, *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution* (1999) proposes a strategy that presents a seven-part test that defines an engage institution:

1. *Responsiveness* – are we listening to the communities, region, and states we serve?
2. *Respect for Partners* – do we encourage joint academic-community definitions of problems, solutions, and success?
3. *Academic Neutrality* – even in contentious issues can our outreach maintain the university in a role of neutral facilitator and source of information?
4. *Accessibility* – in our complex university system is all of the community aware of and do all sectors needing support have access to our resources and expertise?
5. *Integration* – how well do we promote interdisciplinary work so as to integrate our scholarship with our service and teaching missions?
6. *Coordination* – how effectively do we communicate our service efforts across the university community and between the university and the larger community?
7. *Resource Partnership* – do we commit sufficient resources to the tasks of engagement?

In light of the University’s recently funded Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC), we have the opportunity to participate in an ongoing exchange with many other higher education institutions that are similarly redefining their service engagement. COPCs grants are funded through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of University Partnerships, as one of a number of urban initiatives partnering higher education with communities to address urban revitalization. Over 125 colleges and universities, including more than 30 Research I and II institutions, have received COPC three-year grants to help institutionalize a university-community partnership mechanism on those campuses. While this COPC initiative is particularly targeted to working with communities immediately surrounding the University, it does provide the opportunity to address the issues raised at the Plenary for how we work “with” communities in ways that empower and build community capacity as partners rather than “the experts”. Recent literature and research on COPCs have demonstrated these outreach initiatives to be strong bases for institutionalizing the civic engagement on campus and building institutional capacity to respond to emerging standards and guidelines for civic engagement. While COPC don’t solely define or embody a university’s service mission, they are useful rallying points for the university community in collaboration with its local communities to keep service as an integral part of the university purpose.

### **C. Clarifying Our Definition of Service and Engagement**

The Community Relations Committee did not see as its role as presenting a final definition of service and engagement for the University Community. Part of our challenge was

to recognize that service varies dependent on faculty, student, staff, or administration role in engagement with communities. While volunteerism might more closely reflect the engagement role of staff in service to communities, the service role of faculty demands a more academically rigorous framework for engagement. The Committed had several discussions and examined a number of definitions, including our current University Mission statement that reads in this regards:

*Make available to local communities and public agencies the expertise of the University in ways that are consistent with the primary teaching and research functions and contribute to social, intellectual, and economic development in the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world.*

The ideas and writings of the late Ernest Boyer, former President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, also informed discussions, particularly from his last seminal treatise, *Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990). Boyer stressed that within the academic community a clear differentiation must be made between “citizenship” activities – i.e. campus committees, community boards – and activities that relate to scholarship. For service activities to be considered scholarship, Boyer argues, they must be tied immediately to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to and derive from ones professional activity. In such service the rigor and accountability are reflective of research activities.

One of our own colleagues Robert McCall of the Office of Child Development and the Psychology Department, in his article *The Concept and Practice of Education, Research, and Public Service in University Psychology Departments* provided a further delineation between public service and service that is integrated within the framework of teaching and research. While ideally he argues against the need for having a separate academic tradition of public service, in favor of the integration of service within the teaching and research tradition, he also recognizes that having some defined “public involvement” mission makes a priority for applying our knowledge to community problem solving from both teaching and research traditions.

For our institution as a whole, the framework of “civic engagement” provides the most encompassing one for defining our service mission. The work of the Kellogg Commission is especially helpful, given our “state-related” status in providing parameters for our conception of service. Likewise, the Campus Compact addresses an operational definition for our civic engagement that is both internally and externally focused. Our ongoing university dialogue on how we define our service mission might benefit more by these operational frameworks for an “engaged institution” than by any one term. What is important is the need to carry on this dialogue on how we operationally define our community outreach and application of our knowledge and resources to the community and world around us. This dialogue should occur within our own disciplines and departments, across disciplines, and within the University as a community. The more meaningful definition of service seems to be in how we apply our knowledge, how we recognize and reward this application, and how we engage our students in applying their knowledge.

#### **D. Recommendations and Actions**

The Community Relations Community has had an opportunity to clarify and build on a number of the recommendations emerging from the Plenary on this issue of service definition. The following recommendations and actions – some already underway - will help guide us in our civic engagement efforts:

- 1) **Recommendation:** *The Plenary called for a follow-up committee and a follow-up report to be debriefed with the Senate.*  
**Actions Taken or Considered:**
  - a) The *Community Relations Committee*, comprised of faculty, administration, students, and staff, *formed the follow-up committee, and this report draft is the outcome.* We hope it is a vehicle for ongoing dialogue.
  
- 2) **Recommendation:** *Defining a spectrum or hierarchy of service in the university community.*  
**Action Taken or Considered:**
  - a) This report has begun that process, but *further dialogue on service/civic engagement within disciplines and departments, across disciplines, and within the university community should be encouraged.*
  - b) Feedback from the Plenary suggests that *campus-wide forums on service and civic engagement be promoted throughout the year. The Community Relations Committee should take leadership for such forums*, perhaps in collaboration with other Senate committees, e.g., Promotion and Tenure, Commonwealth Relations
  
- 3) **Recommendation:** *Support the coordination and communication of service activities. Plenary recommendations underscored the need for a centralized and web-based data-base/inventory on service, as well as on enhancing internal and external communications on service.*  
**Actions Taken or Considered:**
  - a) The Community Relations Committee has already initiated development of this *centralized, web-based service inventory.* Both the emerging service inventory and the Community Outreach Partnership Center *websites will serve as internal and external communication vehicles*, and a *speaker's bureau* could be created from these resources.
  - b) The University's *Campaign Chronicle* has certainly emerged as another important communication vehicle of our civic engagement efforts, and *other publications of schools and University units* should continue a focus on service initiatives.
  - c) The Committee further recommends that the *Celebration of Service* be developed as an annual recognition and communication of service. A *permanent display on service* might also make an important community statement on our civic engagement.
  
- 4) **Recommendation:** *Community representation on our university and academic advisory bodies was also recommended as a strategy to promote a strong university-community dialogue on the application of our knowledge and resource.*  
**Action Taken or Considered:**
  - a) *Many schools and units already have community representation or mechanisms for community input*; however, further Senate discussion on this recommendation should define community representation and avenues for representation.

### **III Linking Service to Teaching and Research**

#### **A. Summary of Issues from Plenary**

The general sense from the Plenary is that faculty are not significantly engaged in community service and that service learning has little focus in our courses and curriculum. Students particularly expressed concerns that service is rarely discussed in classrooms and not a common topic of faculty-student interactions. Connecting service to curriculum is a creative challenge, and teaching via service learning takes faculty time and resources. Questions were raised as to the relevance of service within each discipline and what connects faculty members within and across disciplines to one another around service. We need to model behaviors we expect in our students, and civic engagement is one of those behaviors.

At the same time there is a concern that service and civic engagement fit more naturally with certain disciplines, especially those in professional schools. The Liberal Arts, Natural Sciences, and related disciplines must have a better concept of how service fits within their curriculum. There is little recognition, reward, or encouragement for teaching and curriculum development that incorporate service learning.

Concerns were raised at the Plenary that our research and scholarship are focused on too narrow a band of activities, and that traditional research - the “scholarship of discovery” – is the only model of research recognized and rewarded. If we are to link service to teaching and research, we need to expand our definition of scholarship and provide incentives and recognition for making this linkage. Faculty members, particularly junior faculty, are dissuaded from service activities and models of scholarship outside the traditional framework.

A number of participants expressed a lack of continuity in our service and outreach that does not help keep an ongoing focus needed to integrate service with teaching and research. Some participants wondered if the community might help us more effectively link service to teaching and research.

#### **B. Relevant Literature on Integrating Service with Teaching and Research**

Much of the Community Relations Committee deliberations on linking service to teaching and research drew on the writings of Ernest Boyer who as head of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was a leading proponent of such integration to enhance our scholarship. Boyer was concerned with the predominance of what he termed the “Scholarship of Discovery”, the traditional, scientific framework of research that cut deeply into a narrow band of knowledge and that is often communicated to a narrow audience of like minded academics. In *Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professorate* Boyer expressed concern that this scholarship of discovery may limit our exploration of knowledge and the usefulness of knowledge to society. He argued for academia to expand its view of scholarship to include three other levels of rigorous scholarship that he termed:

- *Scholarship of Integration* – exploration of knowledge across disciplines examining common themes that unify or integrate knowledge as a means for enhancing understanding.
- *Scholarship of Teaching* – research and exploration of our own pedagogy and professional as to how we most effectively convey knowledge.

- *Scholarship of Engagement* – also called applied research, engagement scholarship represents rigorous study of problems and issues that the communities deems as useful and for which university knowledge, resources, and research skills can best be put to work for a improving society or the local community.

McCall’s assumption that education and scholarship have among their purposes the improvement of life underscores the natural integration of service with our teaching and research activities. Building from Boyer’s framework, McCall argues that an enhanced focus on real-world application in our teaching and research can also help enhance knowledge and access to that knowledge. By engaging with community in our curriculum and research activities we can expand learning and scholarship in ways that not only serve our institutions, but that casts our universities in a more favorable light to the community, legislators, and grant-makers. Like Boyer, McCall also stress the importance of interdisciplinary scholarship – scholarship of integration – that advances interdisciplinary education and scholarship in response to the interdisciplinary nature of today’s social issues. He also stresses the need to broaden what we value in academia, as well as broaden the audience for our education and research beyond our students and academic colleagues. Partnering in collaboration with the community can be mutually beneficial to society and the university.

Still others, like Barry Checkoway, take an even more proactive stance to “Reinvent the Research University for Public Service”. Checkoway stresses that communities have needs, universities have resources, and collaborations have mutual benefits for all partners. Among the challenges in this “reinvention” is to redefine service as scholarship, and again, this requires a greater focus on application of research and teaching to addressing community issues and needs. Another part of this agenda is making knowledge more accessible to the larger community.

In each of these complementary views of integrating service in education and scholarship there is a recognition of certain institutional supports that are essential to shifting the academic paradigm: institutional leadership and resources, faculty involvement, modified reward structures, infusing service into the curriculum (service learning), changing the institutional culture by making service integration a desirable end, and partnering with communities. Civic engagement seems a cornerstone for reinventing, rediscovering, or otherwise reinvigorating our higher education institutions.

### C. Recommendations and Actions

While there were a number of recommendations the Community Relations Committee discussed for follow-up action, this was an area where the Committee felt further deliberations beyond the scope of Community Relations were essential and where administrative and unit support would be critical.

- 1) **Recommendation:** *Raise the level of dialogue on and awareness of service in teaching and research in ways that help define our institutional leadership.*

#### **Action Taken or Considered:**

- a) Already the University recognizes community service through the annual *Chancellor’s Awards for Public Service to both faculty and staff*, and this initiative is well-recognized.
- b) Encourage *greater classroom dialogue* on how service might be incorporated into teaching and the course experience.

- c) *Provide training to faculty to understand and develop service in teaching.* The Center for Instructional Development and Distance Education and Center for Teaching Excellent have sponsored limited topics in this area.
  - d) Establish *informational resources* on campus to promote best practices, publications, scholarly work, and web-based networks *that link our campus to the growing field of service learning and scholarship.*
  - e) *Cultivate and engage “leading” faculty and students* by continuing service forums to discuss connections to teaching and research and combine best practice workshops with Celebration of Service.
  - f) *Create models or initiatives for understanding service and community*, e.g. Department of Pittsburgh – an initiative to use the history of our region to help address the future of our region) *and the university role as an engaged citizen of the community.*
- 2) **Recommendation:** *Develop and provide resources to support or seed service learning, university-community partnerships, and service scholarship.*
- Action Taken or Considered:**
- a) The *University already provides significantly support*, both direct and in-kind, as matching contributions *to its Community Outreach Partnership Center* grant, a three-year HUD-funded initiative begun in late 2000 to help institutionalize university-community partnership efforts at the university. Establish an
  - b) *Educational Innovation Fund* – perhaps a special focus under the Provost existing Innovations in Education Grant Award program – *to help seed and advance service learning.*
- 3) **Recommendation:** *Look to the community as a co-learner, co-worker and co-creator in making this connection of service to teaching and research.*
- Action Take or Considered:**
- a) *Engage with our local foundation community around service learning and scholarship and building university-community partnerships* to address local issues and problems. (Penn State McKeesport has already received a major local foundation grant to pursue service learning partnerships in the Mon Valley area)
  - b) *Engage the community to partner with us teaching and research* by describing their needs and issues as focal points *for student learning activities, faculty applied research, and community outreach strategies* for applying university knowledge and resources.

## IV Recognition and Reward for Service Scholarship

### A. Issues Raised in Plenary – Defining Service Scholarship and the Engaged Scholar

It was a common issue expressed at the conference that little recognition is given community and professional service within the academy, whether that is at the department or School level or in the overall University tenure process. Many expressed the sentiment that service learning and scholarship take time away from tenure work. In some departments, junior faculty, especially, are warned to stay away from community and professional service as a distraction to their “tenure” scholarship. Service is not counted for promotion in medicine unless related to a clinical trial. In many schools, e.g. Pharmacy, faculty evaluations have no category

for service. Overall, there was a sense that little incentive or funding support is available for service learning and service research.

Further concerns were raised that there is a divergent relevance of service across disciplines, and those schools or professions with strong and inherent service focus are not seen as a favorably in our research hierarchy. Moreover, interdisciplinary collaboration, particularly collaboration on service, receives little encouragement. At the same time there were many expressions that community outreach, civic engagement, and applied research have gained increasing interest in many disciplines and professional associations, and that these themes, regardless of discipline, are coming to share some common language and relevance. In several disciplines community service and civic engagement are emerging as new aspects of accreditation and professional standards.

While service is seen as a leadership development opportunity for faculty and students alike, the value of service within the research arena is not accorded much favorable regard. There was a consensus that research is perceived as been done in a certain way - the scholarship of discovery and quantitative methodology. Action research with application to community issues and needs and even many aspects of qualitative research are not as highly valued in academia. Although this was a common perception, there was not a sense that participants strongly agreed with this limited view of scholarship. Many tables discussed the value and legitimacy of applied research, as well as the growing recognition of such scholarship in professional and refereed journals.

## **B. Current Literature on Service Scholarship**

That the 2002 theme of the American Association on Higher Education conference is “Knowledge for What: The Engage Scholar” seems a telling indicator of the growing interest in service scholarship in academia. Part of this initiative stems from a recognized growing public pressure on higher education to apply its knowledge and resources for the public good (Rubin 1998; Lucas 1999; Edwards and Marullo 1999). Another practical aspect of this emergent direction comes from the reality that many college campuses have become islands amidst seas of urban distress detracting from the college experience and making recruitment difficult. Issue like safety, local amenities, and quality of off-campus life provide for a mutuality of interest for community service, but, perhaps more telling, the juxtaposition of a higher education institution next to a struggling community raise a social warning sign over how the application of our higher knowledge is occurring in that community (Cuomo 1998). Finally, the sweep of our technological age has advanced a knowledge, information, and service driven social economy in which higher education can only be seen as a major participant, contributor, and beneficiary. It is from within this framework that educators like Ernest Boyer contemplated the emerging role of higher education and how its work should be considered and valued in this new society.

Ernest Boyer’s challenge to higher education in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (1990) was to offer a new paradigm that recognized the full range of scholarly activity by higher education faculty. His concern that higher education’s reward system is geared to pushing faculty toward a narrow band of research and publication and away from teaching, interdisciplinary collaboration, and applied service research was a clarion call for much of the emerging scholarship on service learning and university-community partnership that emerged in the 1990s. In 1997 Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff followed up with Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate that addressed the recognition outreach/applied scholarship as distinct from campus and community citizenship activity. The Carnegie

Foundation on the Advancement of Teaching is currently developing new higher education guidelines and standards that address the recognition of the scholarship of teaching, integration, and engagement, along with the traditional scholarship of discovery. The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Institutions' report, Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution (1999), as noted earlier, presents similar guidelines and challenges to these historically service-oriented higher education institutions. Campus Compact, with a substantial membership from AAU, Research I university presidents, has, likewise, advanced a civic responsibility declaration (1999) for our teaching and research mission that, ideally, would impact the culture of the academy.

Recognition of this growing *scholarship of engagement*, as Boyer termed it, can be seen in a number of professional journals and publications. American Behavioral Scientist dedicated its February 1999 issue to this scholarship in a collection of writings and research that addressed its theme, *Universities in Troubled Times – Institutional Responses*, and it followed up on this theme again a year later with an issue entitled *Service Learning Pedagogies – Universities' Response to Troubled Times* (2000). In 1998 The Journal of Planning Education and Research devoted an entire issue to scholarship presented at a Community Outreach Partnership Centers Symposium entitled *Forging New Relationships Between University and Community*. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of Policy Development and Research likewise devoted an issue of its journal Cityscape to *Community Outreach Partnership Centers: Connecting Communities and Institutions of Higher Education* (2000). A number of other national, refereed journals have maintained a long record of publishing scholarship on service learning and applied research, among these are the Journal of Community Practice published by the Association of Community Organization and Social Administration and the Journal of Service Learning published by the University of Michigan.

What each of these represents is that service linked with teaching and research has legitimate value as scholarship in higher education that is deserving of faculty energies and, ultimately, recognition in tenure and promotion. Both Campus Compact ([www.compact.org](http://www.compact.org)) and HUD's Office of University Partnerships ([www.oup.org](http://www.oup.org)) provide further opportunities, encouragement, and dissemination of scholarship of engagement. HUD, for example, is not only interested in advancing university knowledge and service in partnership with communities to improve urban conditions, it actively promotes research and scholarly writing about these partnership experiences. More importantly, as Boyer, the Kellogg Commission, and others have stressed, this scholarship of engagement must be communicated outside narrow professional or academic ranks to interdisciplinary collaborations and to the immediate and larger community who are partners in this work and a new audience for our knowledge dissemination.

This new scholarship of engagement addresses the core of how we teach and how we apply our knowledge in partnership with community, and as it gains recognition and credibility in larger society, recognizing and rewarding this work in college and universities becomes the next challenge. At the International Conference on the University as Citizen: Engaging Universities & Communities in February 2001, Lynn Hattendorf Westney, Associate Professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago presented a paper *What's In It for Me? Does Community Outreach and Service-Base Scholarship Equal Tenure?* that struck a cord with faculty from across the country. She asked higher education institution to reexamine tenure and promotion in light of Boyer and Glassick's "Priorities" – looking to Boyer to better define levels of scholarship and Glassick for workable criteria applicable to both theoretical and service-based research and scholarship.

Developing specific benchmarks for promotion and tenure relative to community service and scholarship remains the major task at many higher education institutions. Westney and others cite Portland State University's "Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases" as benchmarks for incorporating "community outreach" into the traditional company of research and teaching in promotion and tenure. A forthcoming publication by The New England Center for Higher Education, Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service as Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Decisions may present a further resource for benchmarking community outreach. Perhaps the most specific arguments and frameworks are presented by Barry Checkoway of the University of Michigan who argues for *Reinventing the Research University for Public Service* (1997) in his article of the same name. In this article Checkoway advances the elements of this reinvention as:

- Redefining Service as Scholarship
- Formulating a University Strategy for Public Service
- Reconceptualizing Research in the Boyer Paradigm
- Making Knowledge More Accessible
- Mobilizing Internal Structures to Support Outreach
- Involving Faculty to Strengthen Service
- Modifying the Reward Structure
- Integrating Service Learning into the Curriculum
- Involving the Community
- Changing the Institutional Culture
- Providing Leadership

In a later article *Professionally Related Public Service as Applied Scholarship: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Planning Faculty* (1998), Checkoway delineates a range of service activities that can and should be redefined as scholarship and he presents elements of evaluation including documentation and criteria that can be applied to this service scholarship. The literature of higher education and many professions and disciplines contain a wealth of ideas, guidelines, and benchmarks for enhancing service scholarship in higher education and for recognizing and rewarding this work within the appropriate institutional systems.

### **C. Recommendations from Plenary and Community Relations**

Recognizing and rewarding service was another area in which the recommendation generated by the Plenary session and Community Relations Committee deliberations could only begin to address some longer-term issues. Key recommendations in this area included:

- 1) **Recommendation:** *Encourage ongoing dialogue to build academic recognition for service learning and scholarship at the department and university levels.*

**Actions Taken or Considered:**

- a) *Engage the Senate's Promotion and Tenure Committee to deliberate*, perhaps in collaboration with the Community Relations Committee, to explore service in evaluation, promotion, and tenure.
- 2) **Recommendation:** *Develop and establish mechanisms to encourage, support and fund service scholarship.*

**Actions Taken or Considered:**

- a) Already the *Community Outreach Partnership Center has published several reports on applied research* conducted by staff, students working under faculty

direction, and classroom team projects, and these have included housing inventories, community health inventories, community assessments, street studies, geographic information surveys, planning studies, and photo histories of community development – available for review on the COPC website (pitt.edu/~copc);

- b) Create a *fund to seed and develop* faculty service learning and scholarship efforts;
- c) Recognize faculty and student service scholarship through a *portfolio process*;
- d) *Support and fund qualitative research* as we do quantitative research;
- e) Establish an *annual award or dissertation grants in service scholarship*;
- f) Encourage and support *research on the efficacy of service initiatives and collaboration*.

- 3) **Recommendation:** *Support and reward collaboration and interdisciplinary approach to community service and service scholarship.*

**Actions Taken or Considered:**

- a) *Provide incentives for* seeking grants for service and research in *interdisciplinary teams*;
- b) Develop *mechanisms to enhance interdisciplinary collaboration* in teaching and research.

- 4) **Recommendation:** *Involve the community in our recognition and rewards for service efforts.*

**Actions Taken and Considered:**

- a) The *Community Outreach Partnership Center* already *has an extensive roster of community partners* involved in advising and directing community outreach and applied research efforts.
- b) Include *community representative in discussion on service scholarship* and on committees charged with *sponsoring and recognizing community outreach service and service scholarship*.

## V Service Learning Opportunities for Students

### A. Issues raised at Plenary

There was strong concurrence among students at the Plenary that they don't hear about service learning very often nor do they discuss it in their classes. While Pitt is an urban university in a city of neighborhoods, many students feel they have a limited awareness of communities in Pittsburgh. Professional schools have internships that expose them to service and a larger community, but there were concerns about how other schools connect to service and the larger community. Most Plenary participants see service learning as an opportunity for learning by doing and reflecting on those actions.

What students may gain from service learning was another key concern for round-table discussions. A number of important questions were raised:

- Does service help improve the cultural life on campus?
- Does service promote better multi-cultural understanding and interaction?
- Do students see service modeled by faculty, administrators, and staff?

Community service and service learning were seen as valuable resources in the student experience in terms of providing opportunities for leadership development and for career exploration. In addition, service learning helps students become teachers in many respects, and teaching is the best way to learn. There was a real sense by many students of a need to reach out to “under-schooled” children and youth through service initiatives, much as Harkavy addressed the link between K-12 schools and higher education as a continuum of service learners.

Finally, issues were raised about how students are recognized and rewarded for service. Discussion focused on whether service should be more than extracurricular and whether the University should have a service requirement for students. If service were required would there be opportunities for credit or pay or even some type of certification for ones efforts? As we are placing students in community outreach, most often in distressed communities, efforts to ensure student safety must also be considered. Many of the questions to the Reactor Panel came from students with concerns about their opportunities in service and service learning activities.

## **B. Literature from the field – the Engaged Learner**

Just as Dewey and Stokes stressed the importance of learning by engaging the issues and problems of the day, service learning must take student outside the classroom for a deeper learning experience than they can find solely within the classroom. As Astin found in his comprehensive study of the college experience, What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited (1992), cooperative and service learning can enhance students’ sense of community in the campus experience, as well as their relations with peers and faculty. Similarly, Kuh in his study of the college experience ( 1996) notes that a substantial part of learning occurs beyond the academic classroom experience, and that “out of classroom” experience significantly related to student personal development. Kuh notes that service learning takes the college experience outside the classroom in ways that help promote student development, as well as integrate academic knowledge. In their survey of students at southeastern higher education institutions, Serow and Dreyden (1990) saw service learning as a major variable in student moral development and community service as a major element in prosocial development.

The pedagogy of serving learning, as advanced by Marullo and Edwards (2000), enhances student learning experiences in ways that create self-motivated learners who become skilled and committed civic participants. They criticism higher education pedagogy that is more concerned with acquiring credentials and accessing jobs, than developing self-motivated learners who can connect with both co-workers and community, as well as demonstrate critical thinking and problem solving skills – traits highly valued by employers. Collaborative learning experience, Gronski and Pigg (2000) assess, present practices and pedagogy that teach collaborative habits and skills needed by today’s professional practitioners to work in the inter-organizational restructuring that is occurring in our country across all sectors. Collaborative skills, they note, help build the social capital that helps our civil society function effectively.

Institutionalizing the structure of service learning is also critical to its success. Hinck and Brandt (2000) in their study of colleges and university service learning initiatives underscored the importance of institutional support to acceptance of service learning and creating a campus culture supportive of student development. They recognized five key factors essential to a strong service-learning program integrated into the institutional structure:

- 1) Presidential and administrative support
- 2) Consideration for faculty roles and rewards
- 3) Clear definition of serving learning

- 4) Centralized office or support systems for service learning
- 5) Public awareness of service learning programs.

Faculty participation is cited as the single most important variable in altering the consciousness and culture of the academy (Zlutkowski 1996). Faculty should see service learning as a way to integrate their work-load, not add to it (Kelly and Wolf-Wendel 2000). Zlutkowski also sees service learning as a vital tool in shifting the educational paradigm.

Initiatives like Community Outreach Partnership Centers offer exciting avenues for service learning, and by linking to the broader academic agenda an engaged university can refine and enhance student learning and faculty teaching and research (Rubin 2000). There is a need to differentiate between academically-based (service learning) and co-curricular (volunteerism) service (Kelly and Wolf-Wendel, 2000). They are concerned that communities are too often the “silent partners” in service learning, and there is also a need, they contend, to stop perpetuating the idea that higher education has all the answers. Service learning provides an opportunity to “work with” communities rather than “doing for” communities and echoes McCall’s sentiments (1996) to rethink public service as public involvement or public partnership in order to remove the onus of extracurricular or academic charity. These activities, he contends, should represent partnership with society aimed at mutual benefits that neither academics nor community partners can achieve on their own.

In their article on “Community-Centered Service Learning” Kelly and Wolf-Wendel (2000) recognize that service is important in different ways to different campus sectors:

- # Students view services as influencing career development, creating awareness of community, and connecting theory to practice;
- # Faculty see service as a way to apply theory and knowledge to local problems;
- # Administrators equate service with improved community relations.

Service learning seems to offer the most accessible form for civic engagement in higher education research institutions and exciting opportunities for scholarship related to teaching, integration, and engagement (Boyer 1990)

### **C. Recommendations from Plenary, Committee, and others in University**

A wide range of ideas and recommendations were generated at the Plenary relative to enhancing service learning opportunities for students. While the Community Relations Committee did deliberate on this area of service, the students engaged at the Plenary were very dynamic and vocal in making recommendations for follow-up. These include:

- 1) **Recommendation:** *Develop a center or office to support and promote service learning on our campus and use this resource to build leadership development programming for students.*

**Action Taken or Considered:**

- a) The University already has *an outstanding community service resource in the Student Volunteer Outreach Center*; however, this is *primarily a co-curricular/extra-curricular service outreach office* enhancing the college experience that has only begun to address stronger, ongoing connections to classroom curriculum. *The Student Volunteer Center should be linked more closely with service learning.*
- b) The *Enrollment Management Steering Committee* of the Provost’s Office has *given considerable exploration to the development of an office for service*

*learning* that focuses on opportunities for growth in leadership and civic responsibility. This work should continue and be supported by the campus.

- c) Service learning should also be *linked to university-community partnership efforts through the Community Outreach Partnership Center*.
  - d) As the Office of Student Affairs has, in recent years, come under the auspices of the Office of the Provost, efforts *to develop the Office of Student Affairs to better link student service to teaching and scholarship* at our institution must be encouraged and supported.
  - e) We should *enhance our resources on campus regarding service learning and scholarship*, perhaps a special library collection and resource center for information and linkages to other local and national efforts – Michigan’s Journal of Service Learning, Campus Compact materials, AmeriCorps recruitment, and more (*Some of these linkages are already available through the Student Volunteer Center in the William Pitt Union*).
  - f) Efforts should be made to *further link university service efforts with K-12 service activities*, as is now done through the Student Volunteer Center, to build a continuum of service learners and to demonstrate articulation in service learning.
  - g) Promote linkages between professionals and classrooms to *use service for career exploration and development*.
- 2) **Recommendation:** *Engage students in the ongoing dialogue on community service, service learning, and civic responsibility.*

**Actions Taken or Considered:**

- a) As part of the students’ Day of Service tied to the United Way Day of Caring on campus this past September, *Provost Maher and Assistant Chancellor Ferketish held a dialogue on community service and service outreach with students involved with the Community Outreach Partnership Center*. These students largely represented professional schools or disciplines with a strong community service orientation, and the dialogue challenged the participants to explore service in the larger scope of undergraduate education.
  - b) *Putting our theme “The City Is Our Campus” into practice*, we should formally *develop ways of introducing students to communities in Pittsburgh*, not only to raise their awareness of the importance of community in our lives, but to also identify opportunities to work in and with communities.
  - c) *Include students in campus community dialogues on civic engagement and service*, such as follow-up from this report to the Senate and on the Community Relations Committee.
  - d) *Build on student activism and dissent as expressions of democracy* and promote democratic ideals and citizenship via civic engagement in the campus and larger community.
- 3) **Recommendation:** *Develop mechanisms to recognize and reward community service and scholarship in our University community and within the academy.*

**Actions Taken or Considered:**

- a) *Cultivate “leading” student in service through some type of recognition or awards* program in the university community - 4,000 students are registered with Student Outreach. Also recognize community partners in service learning efforts.
- b) *Recognize and support student scholarship in service* (National Society of Collegiate Scholars) such as thesis or dissertation awards for research related to service and civic engagement.

- c) *Create a minor in “Interdisciplinary Community Service”* that might provide a certificate or other official university recognition of service, service learning, and service scholarship for students.
- d) *Consider community service for credit, certificate, and/or stipends*, as well as perhaps part of the graduation requirement. Pennsylvania now requires a community service project for high school graduation as part of its learning objectives in secondary education.

## VI. Summary

The general sense from evaluations, involvement of participants in the discussion, and post-Plenary feedback was that the plenary session was very successful in engaging the university community in a dialogue on service in our University mission. Many participants hoped that this session would be the start of an ongoing dialogue in the University community and that there would be some follow-up from the Plenary. This report is on vehicle for helping to promote that ongoing dialogue.

There were several overarching themes that seemed to emerge from the plenary and this report, and these may offer important starting points or benchmarks for civic engagement and service at the University of Pittsburgh:

Service in our mission and our role in civic engagement are worthy topics for discussion and action within our university community, and this process should involve all sectors.

- Service and community outreach must be linked to our teaching and research, and we should strive to raise the level of scholarship around service and civic engagement to promote a deeper recognition and reward for this work within our University.
- Students, in particular, see a value in community service as it relates to their learning and personal development in the college experience, and they ask faculty and administration to model and discuss service in our educational context.
- Recognition and rewards for service, while important across the entire campus, might best be addressed first at the unit or school level where greater linkage to teaching and research might foster greater scholarship in this arena. However, the university should encourage and support this dialogue and be willing to look at its policies.
- Service Learning and Service Scholarship would benefit from greater training, resources, and incentives to help nurture this work.
- University-Community partnerships are critical for this work to have impact at both the educational and community levels; we should look to derive mutual benefits from working together to solve community problems.
- Coordination of community outreach and access to university resources to help in community problem-solving is an important goal for both the short and long-term.

## Appendices: Evaluation Summary

### PLENARY SESSION EVALUATION MARCH 21, 2001

Participants took a few moments at the end of the Plenary to give us feedback concerning today's Session and Celebration of Service. The following represented evaluative feedback:

	Very Important (4)	Important (3)	Somewhat Important (2)	Not Important (1)	<u>Mean</u>
1. How would you rate the importance of this topic for a plenary session?	34	7			<b>3.8</b>
2. What importance do you give to highlighting the University of Pittsburgh service projects?	32	10			<b>3.7</b>
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied	
3. How Satisfied were you with today's Plenary Session format?	20	19	1		<b>3.5</b>
4. In general, how satisfied were you with the program content?	26	13	2		<b>3.6</b>
5. Specifically, how satisfied we you with the round-table discussions?	18	19	4		<b>3.3</b>
6. Specifically, how satisfied were you with the Celebration of Service exhibits?	10	14	1		<b>3.3</b>
7. What would you suggest as follow-up to today's Plenary Session? <i>Future session should provide more time for discussion among a diverse representation of university and community. Other suggestions were consolidated and have been incorporated into the report as issues and recommendations.</i>					
8. Are there other ways of highlighting the University of Pittsburgh service activities? <i>Recommendations and ideas were incorporated into the report.</i>					
		Yes	No	Possibly	
9. If the Celebration of Service were to be an annual event, would you participate?		<b>31</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	
10. Do you have additional comments?					

*Most negative comments related to questions 4 and 5 focused on there not being enough time time for round-table discussions and that some tables did not have adequate representation of the sectors – faculty, student, administration, staff, community – participating in the Plenary session. Overall, however, the majority of comments were favorable and supportive ones incorporated into the report.*

*Most negative comments related to question 9 addressed the process for inclusion in the Celebration of Service and concerns that respondents' programs weren't recognized. Overall, however, the majority of comments were favorable and supportive ones incorporated into the report.*

## Bibliography and References

Astin, Alexander. (1992) What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited. Jossey-Bass; San Francisco.

Benson, L. and Harkavy, I. (2000) *Higher Education's Third Revolution: The Emergence of the Democratic Cosmopolitan University*. Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Office of Policy Development and Research. 5(1). Washington, DC.

Boyer, E.L. (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton, NJ. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Checkoway, B. (1997) *Reinventing the Research University for Public Service*. Journal of Planning Literature. February 1997. 11 (3).

Checkoway, B. (1998) *Professionally Related Public Service as Applied Scholarship: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Planning Faculty*. Journal of Planning Education and Research. Summer 1998 17(4).

Damon, W. (May 2000) *The Path to a Civil Society Goes Through the University*. Campus Compact Reader. Providence, RI. National Campus Compact.

Edwards, Bob and Marullo, Sam (ed.). (1999) *Introduction to Universities in Troubled Times – Institutional Responses*. American Behavioral Scientist. February 1999. 42(5). Sage Publications, Inc.

Gronski, Robert and Pigg, Kenneth. (2000) *University and Community Collaboration: Experiential Learning in Human Services*. American Behavioral Scientist. February 2000. 43(5).

Harkavy, Ira, and Wiewel, Wim. (1995). *University-Community Partnerships: Current State and Future Issues*. Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum. 6(3).

Harkavy, I. and Romer, D. (Summer 1999) *Service Learning as an Integrated Strategy*. Liberal Education. 85(3)

Hinck, S.S. And Brandell, M.E. (2000) *The Relationship Between Institutional Support and Campus Acceptance of Academic Service Learning*. American Behavioral Scientist. February 2000. 43(5).

Huber, Mary Taylor. (2000) *Evaluating Outreach: Scholarship Assessed's Approach*. Penn State Outreach. The Pennsylvania State University; State College, PA.

Kelly, Ward and Wolf-Wendel, Lisa. (2000) *Community-Centered Service Learning: Moving From Doing For to Doing With*. American Behavioral Scientist. February 2000. 43(5).

Kraft, R. (February 1996) *Service Learning: An Introduction to Its Theory, Practice, and Effects*. Education and Urban Society. 28(2).

Kuh, George, D. (1996) *In Their Own Words: What Students Learn Outside the Classroom. College Students: The Evolving Nature of Research.* (Stage, Anaya, Bean, Hossler, and Kuh – ed.) Simon and Schuster. MA.

Marullo, Sam and Edwards, Bob. (2000) *Editors' Introduction; Service-Learning Pedagogy as Universities' Response to Troubled Times.* American Behavioral Scientist. February 2000. 43(5).

McCall, Robert. (1996) *The Concept and Practice of Education, Research, and Public Service in University Psychology Departments.* American Psychologist. April 1996. 51/4.

Presidents Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education (1999) Campus Compact. Brown University; RI.

Putnam, Robert, D. (1995) *Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital.* Journal of Democracy. 6(1). January 1995.

Rubin, Victor. (2000) *Evaluating University-Community Partnerships: An Examination of the Evolution of Questions and Approaches.* Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Office of Policy Development and Research. 5(1). Washington, DC.

Rubin, Victor. (1998) *The Roles of Universities in Community-Building Initiatives.* Journal of Planning Education and Research. Summer 1998. 17(4).

Spanier, G (1999) Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution. Third Report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities.

Sullivan W. M. (May 2000) *The University as Citizen: Institutional Identity and Social Responsibility.* Campus Compact Reader. Providence, RI. National Campus Compact.

Ward, Kelly and Wolf-Wendel, Lisa. (2000) *Community-Centered Service Learning: Moving from Doing For to Doing With.* American Behavioral Scientist. February 2000. 43(5).

Wachter, Susan (ed.). (2000) *Community Outreach Partnership Centers: Connecting Communities and Institutions of Higher Education.* Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research. Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington, DC. 5(1).

Westney, L. C. Hattendorf. (2001) *What's In It for Me? Does Community Outreach and Service Based Scholarship Equal Tenure?* Paper presented at International Conference on the University as Citizen: Engaging Universities & Communities. Feb. 21-24, 2001. Tampa, FL.

Zlutkowski, E. (1996) *Linking Service Learning and the Academy.* Change. January/February 1996. 28 (1).

## Supplement to Bibliography

(The Following are Journals that have devoted *special issues* to service and civic engagement scholarship and related writings.)

*Universities in Trouble - Institutional Responses.* (1999) **American Behavioral Scientist.** February 1999. 42(5). Sage Publications, Inc.

*Service-Learning Pedagogy as Universities' Response to Troubled Times.* (2000) **American Behavioral Scientist.** February 2000. 43(5). Sage Publications.

*Community Outreach Partnership Centers: Connecting Communities and Institutions of Higher Education.* (2000). **Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research.** U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Office of Policy Development and Research. 5(1). Washington, DC.

*Symposium: Community Outreach Partnership Centers – Forging New Relationships Between University and Community.* **Journal of Planning Education and Research.** (1998). Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. Summer 1998. 17(4).

*Colleges and Communities: Gateway to an American Dream.* (Summer 2000) State of the Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

*Community Outreach Partnership Centers: Connecting Communities and Institutions of Higher Education.* (2000) Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research. U. S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. 5 (1). Michigan Journal of Service Learning. University of Michigan

## Web Sites on Topic and Related Issues or Resources

Office of University Partnerships – United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. ([www.oup.org](http://www.oup.org))

Campus Compact ([www.compact.org](http://www.compact.org))

University of Pittsburgh Community Outreach Partnership Center ([www.pitt.edu/~copc](http://www.pitt.edu/~copc))

## Special Thanks and Recognition

A number of groups and individuals merit special recognition and thanks for their help in making the Plenary and this report a successful starting point for this important dialogue in our University community:

- # The leadership and staff of the University’s Community and Government Relations Office and, in particular, Steve Zupcic of that Office, for his outstanding coordination of the *Celebration of Service* event;
- # Fran Czak and Sandra Matthews, Director and Administrative Assistant for the Office of the University Senate, for their help in organizing the Plenary;
- # Students of the Student Volunteer Center in the Office of Student Affairs and students in the Community Organizing and Social Administration Program in the School of Social Work for their help in recording at the Plenary roundtables;
- # Social Work Doctoral and Master’s Graduate Assistants, George Pivetz, Susan Klinedinst, and Jee-Sook Lee for their assistance in set-up, photography, transcription of speeches, and statistical analysis of the Plenary evaluations;
- # our presenters and panelists, Chancellor Mark Nordenberg, Provost James Maher, Ms. Susan Golomb, and, especially, Ira Harkavy, for expanding our vision of civic engagement;
- # Finally, most special appreciations to the members of the Senate Community Relations Committee who worked hard in planning and conducting the Plenary, facilitating our great roundtable discussions, and contributing their deliberations to our focus-sessions and this report.

Thank You.

Tracy M. Soska, Chairman  
Community Relations Committee

## Members of the Senate Community Relations Committee

Kenneth Batista	Andrea Kriska	Tracy M. Soska
Ron Chichowicz	Audrey Portis	Kenneth S. Thompson
G. Reynolds Clark	Margaret A. Potter	John Wilds
B. Jean Ferketish	Wesley M Rohrer	Pearl Woolridge
Lynette Jack	Eli Shorak	Jessica Zolomij
Kristie Horrell	Ann Sinsheimer	Stephen P. Zupcic

James H. Cassing, President – University Senate  
Fran Czak, Director – Office of the University Senate