Partnering to Survive: Reflections on the Pursuit of Campus-Community Initiatives Prior to Tenure

Daniel J. Sherman

Abstract

How does a early career faculty member survive the pursuit of campus-community initiatives? This article draws on experiences gained through a unique faculty position that combines community engagement with full academic responsibilities. "Survival" in this position emerges from the integration of community engagement with the institutional values of scholarship, as articulated by campus leaders and applied through academic disciplines in teaching and research, as well as the careful creation and institutionalization of reciprocal campus-community partnerships. The article provides lessons learned through adventures in applied teaching, negotiated criteria for tenure and promotion, and the cultivation of community relationships that have culminated in a truly "civic scholarship."

Introduction

*T*he week before a new academic year was about to begin, my academic dean was motioning me to approach the podium and address the assembled faculty of our private liberal arts institution. I had just completed my first 2 years as an assistant professor of environmental studies, and it was now my turn to speak about the development of campus-community initiatives. This was the annual Faculty Conversation, a kind of State of the Union, where the president and academic dean review our endowment—as it ranks relative to other private liberal arts institutions—and progress toward our long-term and short-term goals.

After a decade or so of rocky relations with our surrounding urban community, the new university leadership prioritized not only the improvement of community relations, but also the integration of campus-community initiatives with our scholarly mission. I was one of a handful of faculty members asked to speak about initial progress toward this goal, and perhaps the only faculty member who had community engagement responsibilities built into their academic job description. Three years prior I had responded to a unique tenure-track job description through the American Political Science Association for a "professor of environmental decision-making and policy" who would establish an "interdisciplinary ini-

tiative" that would "build bridges" to community stakeholders on environmental issues "so that students and faculty become more involved with specific regional conflicts in their classes, research, and service-learning." This was unlike any of the other jobs I was pursuing in American politics and policy, because it asked me to assume not only the role of a teacher and scholar in my discipline, but also that of a broker between campus and community. I had accepted the job, and now it was time to report on my progress while making the case to the faculty for community engagement as a legitimate pursuit—in no more than five minutes.

My remarks followed two broad themes; one was well chosen, but the other was a mistake, and quite possibly contradicted the first. Both themes reflected lessons learned about wading into community engagement as a junior faculty member. This essay expands on the lessons that stemmed from these two themes. The remarks I believe were well chosen emphasized the ways community engagement had enriched the fulfillment of my professional responsibilities. I linked community engagement to the educational mission of the university, and I described how working with the community made me a better scholar. These remarks reflected lessons I had learned on the importance of integrating campus-community initiatives with the scholarly values and mission of my institution.

As I received a signal that my time at the podium was coming to a close, I hastily blundered into the second theme of my remarks— a long list of past and upcoming community engagement events and programs I had planned. The list was about as clear as the walls plastered with layers of posters, announcements, and advertisements around campus. It contradicted my initial remarks, in that it cast community engagement as an overwhelming array of events outside the scope of the formal bounds of teaching, learning, and research. Perhaps more important, the list betrayed lessons I had already learned about first building relationships and trust among community stakeholders in order to identify shared goals and methods of coordinating campus and community needs, before rushing to perform a campus-generated "community" event. The list of events and programs obscured the fact that I was attempting to move beyond one-time events by institutionalizing campus-community partnerships.

If given another opportunity to contribute to the Faculty Conversation on my campus, I would edit my remarks to emphasize three points: integration, reciprocity, and institutionalization. The lessons I have learned as a junior faculty member pursuing campus-community initiatives center on three factors: (a) integrating the

initiatives with scholarship as established by institutional values, articulated by campus leadership, and applied through the academic disciplines in faculty teaching and research; (b) building reciprocal relationships of respect and trust between and among campus and community stakeholders by identifying shared goals and coordinating needs; and (c) institutionalizing engagement to build reliable and sustained campus-community partnerships that endure beyond a class activity or event and weather the many changes of participating individuals.

Integrating With Institutional Values, Leadership, and Faculty Responsibilities

Advocates for campus-community initiatives often call for the creation of "a new type of university," as the first president of the University of Chicago did when he championed a scholarship of civic responsibility *(Harper, 1905, p. 158)*. Nearly 100 years later the chancellor of the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee spoke of creating "a new kind of university" as she worked to engage aspects of each school and college with the local community *(quoted in Brukhardt, Percy, & Zimpher, 2006, p. 5)*. Others have called for a "new American college" *(Boyer, 1994)* or argued that becoming an "engaged institution" is an "extraordinary quest that requires taking extraordinary measures" *(Rosaen, Foster-Fishman, & Fear, 2001, p. 24)*.

I would argue that what is required is much less radical. Rather than being cast as "new" or "extraordinary," campus-community initiatives should be integrated into existing institutional values. Research on the results of various institutional change efforts in higher education shows that changes rooted in an institution's mission and values are most likely to be successful *(Eckel, Hill, & Green, 1998)*. Similarly, progress on benchmarks for campus-community partnerships is most often aligned with existing institutional missions *(Torres, 1990)*. If it is true that every university "has a signature culture, a way of thinking about itself and what it aspires to become," *(Wergin, 2006, p. 30),* then the more closely community engagement is integrated into that way of thinking, the more likely it will be to gain wide acceptance and active support. Fortunately, as Jacoby *(2003)* notes, "nearly every college or university mission statement includes some reference to citizenship" *(p. 318),* which can serve as a point of integration for community engagement initiatives. A tradition of service for the public good has also been well documented in the history of higher education *(Bender, 1988; Benson, Harkavy, & Hartley, 2005; Lerner & Simon, 1998).*

When I began working on campus-community initiatives, I searched for support in my university's various statements of mission and values as well as current marketing materials. The mission statement committed my institution to developing "capacities for critical analysis" that could "sustain a lifetime of intellectual curiosity, active inquiry and reasoned independence" in order to "meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship" *(University of Puget Sound, n.d.)*. As I will argue, the integration of civic engagement with curricula fosters just this kind of learning and application for the greater good. The university's statement of educational values encourages faculty and students to "make a difference in the world" and argues that "the university and the wider community sustain each other" *(University of Puget Sound, n.d.)*. I found marketing materials emphasizing the university's "abundant opportunities for campus and community involvement," as well as its academic core that is designed to foster "active participation as a citizen leader" *(University of Puget Sound, n.d.)*.

Campus Leadership

Of course, values and mission statements mean little if they fail to gain a high priority or influence the implementation of day-to-day planning and action. Harkavy *(1997)* has noted that currently on college campuses "the rhetoric of engagement far exceeds the reality of university engagement" *(p. xv)*. Leadership can certainly help give civic engagement a high priority among the many values implicitly and explicitly vying for institutional importance. Some have considered the support of a chancellor, provost, and/or academic leadership team necessary, if not sufficient, for institutionalizing engagement *(Brukardt et al., 2006, p.18)*. I have found the support of administrative leaders essential to my work on campus-community initiatives.

Some elements of community engagement initiatives are uniquely attractive to campus leadership. Presidents and deans feel the need to foster good community relations most directly *(Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. xix)* and must confront the ways that external pressures such as decaying neighborhoods affect the university on a day-to-day basis *(Holland, 2001)*. Successful presidents must find ways to work with a unique campus culture while distinguishing the university from its peer institutions and establishing their own accomplishments *(Birnbaum, 1992)*. As I discovered through my exploration of the university mission statement and marketing materials, community engagement initiatives are one way to link

to historic institutional values while marketing a unique "place-based" experience to prospective students.

A year before I arrived on campus, my university inaugurated President Ronald Thomas, who had successfully led an ambitious community engagement plan at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, that included work with neighborhood schools, non-profits, and businesses through a campus research institute, a general education curriculum called the Cities Program, and a master plan that improved community access to campus. He argued that initiatives such as these not only served the highest ideals of education and citizenship, but also "enabled us to distinguish ourselves from our competition rather than to pretend we were just like them" *(Thomas, n.d.)*. As I began my work on campus-community initiatives, Thomas was forging a link between institutional values establishing the university as a "good citizen" in the community, with a "distinction and uniqueness" stemming from "an engaged and engaging educational experience" with a "profound sense of place" *(2003; 2005)*. That my work on campus-community initiatives aligned with the president's priorities provided me with legitimacy both on campus and in the community.

Scholarship and the Disciplines

As powerful as it is to have university leadership champion campus-community initiatives, institutions of higher education are loosely arranged organizations in which the fundamental working units—disciplinary departments—are relatively autonomous from other parts of the larger organization, making it difficult or impossible to transform the institution from the top down *(Orton & Weick, 1990)*. Ultimately, the faculty must believe in the "academic worth" of community engagement—it must align with scholarship *(Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 2)*. As Boyer *(1990)* writes, "scholarship is not an esoteric appendage; it is at the heart of what the profession is all about" *(p. 1)*. Scholarship in higher education is organized by academic discipline and applied by faculty in teaching and research. Campus-community initiatives must work with the disciplines and complement teaching and research.

Most faculty members enter the academy, form their professional identities, and pursue their intellectual passions through disciplines. This is true even for me, a faculty member in an interdisciplinary position with an applied community engagement responsibility. When I describe my research on rural community responses to radioactive waste disposal, people most often assume

that my professional trajectory emerged from a personal interest in the antinuclear movement, but this is not the case. My interest grew purely out of an academic curiosity in social movement behavior that stemmed from questions in my discipline on political science concerning collective action. My research topic emerged from a search for cases best suited to adding to my discipline's understanding of these questions. In other words, I latched onto an academic question in my discipline, chose a topic that would help me explore that question, and only then developed a compelling personal interest in the topic during my research *(Sherman, 2005)*.

I am not arguing that my research trajectory is representative of all academics. Perhaps just as many faculty members are pursuing studies that emerged from a personal interest, which they subsequently matched to more general academic questions. My point is that disciplines organize and prioritize the knowledge and understanding that most faculty members pursue and most students experience in higher education. Despite the well-chronicled shortcomings of disciplines and "disciplinary thinking" *(Harkavy, 1997; M'Gonigle & Starke, 2006; Orr, 1994)*, most scholarship in higher education, whether through the practice of teaching or research, is directed toward expanding the knowledge base of its academic discipline *(Nyden, 2003)*. Academic disciplines are designed to "cultivate powers of the mind" that can be applied to any number of topics *(Levine, 2003, p. 233)*; they coalesce around paradigms with commonly understood methods, concepts, themes or theories, and avenues of inquiry *(Kuhn, 1970)* that enable teachers and students to "understand, apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate evidence and conclusions" *(Bain, 2004, p. 85)*. Disciplines, typically represented by departments, create the organizational culture and establish the incentives that govern the professional lives of most faculty members *(Birnbaum, 1992; Tagg, 2003)*. For campus-community initiatives to achieve broad integration within the higher education curriculum, they must come to be seen as an intellectual approach that complements academic priorities within the disciplines as they are applied in teaching and research.

Teaching

Students generally like the integration of community engagement with coursework. I have received comments such as "this class was the most useful class I have ever taken at this school," "we learned a lot more outside the classroom instead of relying on just reading material and lecture," and "I really enjoyed the practical application, more classes on campus should be set up this way"

on my end-of-semester evaluation forms. These reactions are consistent with research on student responses in such courses, which finds that students believe community engagement increases the quality of their understanding and facilitates more intellectual stimulation than other types of coursework *(Eyler & Giles, 1999)*. That students like community engagement or believe in its educational benefits, however, is not enough on its own to demonstrate pedagogical merit and overcome the sentiment that "community service is a wonderful thing for students to do, but they should do it on their own time, not as part of class" *(Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 57)*. The student comments point to the importance of application for understanding—the marriage of knowing and doing—a relationship well documented by educational scholars, cognitive scientists, and research on service-learning programs.

John Dewey, Jean Piaget, and Alfred North Whitehead each advocated applied learning as a way to get beyond what Dewey *(1916)* called aloof education and what Whitehead *(1929)* called inert knowledge. Piaget *(1977)* argued that "true understanding manifests itself by new spontaneous applications" *(p. 731)*. More recently, cognitive scientists such as Pinker *(2005)* have found that people are rarely able to generalize factual information or abstract principles to new domains unless they learn through application. Resnich *(1987)* found that the more a learning experience approximated an actual problem-solving context, the more likely students are to appropriately use knowledge and demonstrate understanding. Eyler and Giles *(1999)* used extensive surveys and interview responses across many colleges and universities to determine that student participation in "well-integrated" and "highly reflective" service-learning classes was a predictor of increased "complexity in analysis of both causes and solutions to social problems" and that learning by application was associated with enhanced problem solving ability, critical thinking, and a deeper understanding of the subject matter *(p. 75)*.

In my own teaching, I have used Wiggins and McTighe's *(2005)* prioritization framework to guide the integration of applied work with the community into my course design. These authors distinguish understanding from facts and knowledge. Understanding, they write, "is about making meaning of facts and transferring knowledge to other problems, tasks, and domains" *(p. 46)*. Their prioritization framework progresses from the "enduring understandings" or "big ideas" that a teacher wants students to internalize, to "things that are important to know and do," and culminates with content that is merely "worth being familiar with" *(p. 71)*. When

applying this framework, each course and each class session should be designed to help students arrive at enduring understandings and grasp the big ideas. How do we know when students are grasping the big ideas? One answer is application; students demonstrate understanding by "using it, adapting it, and customizing it" to a given context *(p. 93)*. Thus, assessing understanding requires that students provide evidence of learning through what Wiggins and McTighe call authentic performance tasks, which are realistically complex contextualized problems requiring judgment, innovation, and the effective use of "a repertoire of knowledge and skill" *(p. 155)*. Carefully crafted civic engagement experiences provide ideal performance tasks.

I have used performance tasks that directly engage my students in community initiatives both to apply big ideas and to master specialized skills. As an example of the former, I teach an environmental politics class that is based on the big idea of agenda setting—the way that some problems rise on governmental agendas while other problems are neglected—and related ideas such as the role of public involvement, media sources, and the strategic use of values in policymaking. Once we have delved into theories of agenda setting in the context of environmental policy problems, my students assume the roles of political consultants and pair with environmental stakeholders to prepare bills and political strategy for the upcoming state legislative session. By working together with political actors in the community, the students apply and reflect on the big ideas of agenda setting in the policy process. In a different course, Environment and Society, I use performance tasks that are designed to help students master specialized skills required for survey research such as the conduct of focus groups, participant observation, and interviews. Students use these skills to work with the city public works department in identifying factors influencing individual waste generation and disposal practices, and methods of encouraging citizen waste reduction, reuse, and recycling.

The use of performance tasks that integrate community engagement with big ideas or specialized skills in classes translates well across disciplines. I have hosted faculty workshops in an effort to encourage the broad adoption of community engagement for environmental sustainability in our liberal arts curriculum. After I give a brief presentation on our campus-community sustainability initiatives, I ask my colleagues to complete the following short planning exercise: (1) Identify some big ideas or specialized skills in your discipline or individual class. (2) Identify some fit or linkage between one or two of these ideas or skills and a sustain-

ability initiative. (3) Design an applied class component that integrates the discipline with the sustainability initiative. Two hours of work by faculty teams organized across a range of disciplines produced some promising results. The biology team integrated the study of biodiversity and the life cycles of fish with a performance task that has students working with supermarkets and restaurants to determine the relative sustainability of various seafood options. The business team developed a class module that has students apply principles of marketing to help local businesses encourage the use of reusable shopping bags. These workshops dealing with aspects of environmental sustainability only scratch the surface of this methodology. The American Association for Higher Education has compiled a series of 18 monographs presenting course modules and syllabi that integrate a range of community engagement performance tasks across 18 disciplines *(Lisman & Harvey, 2000)*.

Research

The integration of campus-community initiatives with scholarship is perhaps more easily accomplished with the portion of a faculty member's responsibilities labeled "teaching" than it is with those responsibilities labeled "research" or "professional growth." Wergin *(2006)* relays this quote from a leader of a campus-community initiative: "young faculty would die to work with us, but would die if they did" *(p. 32)*. Junior faculty often perceive such activities as an unrewarding and risky use of time that competes with research *(Nyden, 2003)*. Indeed, the emphasis on research in the tenure review and promotion process poses some significant obstacles for the integration of community engagement, including the need for acceptable documentation and disciplinary fit *(Driscoll & Lynton, 1999)* and the perception that applied relevance is associated with decreased academic rigor *(Wergin, 2006, p. 36; Nyden, 2003, p. 214)*. There is nonetheless a growing movement for the inclusion of participatory action research or the scholarship of engagement as legitimate faculty research *(Boyer, 1990; Nyden, 2003; Troppe, 1994)*. In my own review process, I have found openings for the integration of campus-community initiatives with the evaluation of professional growth in existing university and departmental standards, as well as opportunities to negotiate new criteria with unique emphasis on community engagement. I have benefited from review standards negotiated with expectations carefully clarified among my colleagues, academic dean, and professional standards committee. Ultimately, my written review criteria, as well as the understandings and interpretations that have emerged through the clari-

fication of expectations, assure me that my professional pursuit of campus-community initiatives is neither unrewarding nor risky for my advancement. My review criteria now reflect and respect the integration of my work on campus-community initiatives with all aspects of my professional responsibilities, including professional growth.

As with institutional mission statements, values reflecting a commitment to civic engagement or an advancement of the common good are often present in professional standards. The time-honored American Association of University Professors *(1940)* "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" begins with a charge that research be conducted "for the common good" *(p. 3)*. The disciplines also typically make some mention of research for the greater good. For example, the American Chemical Society *(1948)*, the world's largest professional scientific society, is constituted to encourage the "usefulness of chemists" and to "foster public welfare" *(p. 1)*. The Modern Language Association *(2001)* charges its members with a commitment to pursue the "philosophical defense of humanity." My own professional association, the American Political Science Association *(2008),* has approved "core objectives" for scholarship that include "serving the public, including . . . preparing citizens to be effective citizens and political participants" *(p. 1)*. My university standards for professional growth follow this theme, encouraging engagement in public forums with a wider community of learning. My departmental criteria value not only professional growth that leads to publications and conference presentations, but also that which improves the community.

The problem with most review criteria is that they are separated and prioritized into three or four areas of professional responsibility. My university criteria for tenure are compartmentalized, in order of importance, into teaching, professional growth, and university and community service. Community service is not only held apart from the other areas of professional responsibility, it is accorded a mere one-sentence description stating that it should be given "consideration." Indeed, in my observations on campus, the very term *service* seems to signify something less than and apart from our primary professional responsibilities. On more than one occasion I have heard service referred to as simply a "box to check" by sitting on committees and attending meetings.

Criteria should be cast in a way that integrates the many elements of scholarship. Boyer *(1990)* has proposed as much through his description of the dynamic interplay among scholarship as discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Application is an

aspect of scholarship that is underrepresented in review criteria, yet, just as in teaching and learning, it is the key point of confluence for campus-community initiatives. Scholarship of application uses the knowledge gained from discovery to address real-world problems. Although scholarship of application is often perceived as less worthy than scholarship of discovery, it poses its own intellectual challenges. As Enos and Morton *(2003)* note, "expertise is easier to maintain when it is not challenged by application" *(p. 35)*; or, as Wergin *(2006)* phrases it, application often reveals that academic "claims on 'truth' are rather fragile and incomplete" *(p. 36)*. Applied research that integrates with community engagement can pose questions for the extension of theory *(Rice, 1996)* and add relevance to theory directly by addressing pressing and proximate problems *(Harkavy, 1997)*.

In the months leading up to my third-year review, the academic dean and the Professional Standards Committee approved an addendum to my review criteria that better integrated campus-community initiatives into all aspects of scholarship. The addendum expands on the term "service" by outlining my responsibility to "build relationships with local and regional groups" so that the university community can better engage with the wider public on environmental issues. It provides for a balance between my community engagement and other aspects of scholarship, while allowing for documentation through self-analysis, letters from community members, and reviews of events and course materials. I found the openings for the recognition of community engagement in the university, departmental, and addendum review documents alike to be more than mere words—they were genuine reflections of university and departmental norms of review and advancement that were honored and given significant weight by my colleagues during the review process.

Building Reciprocal Relationships

As important as it is to align campus-community initiatives with the campus side of this equation through integration with institutional values, leadership, and scholarship in the form of teaching and research, it is just as important to carefully cultivate relationships characterized by trust and respect with the community side of the equation. As is revealed by the way "service" is often depicted in university criteria for tenure and promotion, the campus approach to the community is too often cast as "benefits bestowed *on* the community *by* the university" *(London, 2002, p. 10)*, a kind of noblesse oblige *(Wergin, 2006, p. 31)* characterized by

a "paternalistic, one-way approach to service, where one person or group has resources that they share with a person or group that they assume lacks resources" *(Jacoby, 2003, p. 4)*. In contrast, university neighbors believe that the campus and community should be one domain with a shared identity *(Enos & Morton, 2003, p. 23)*. Research on community perceptions of campus-community initiatives reveals that campus neighbors expect *partnerships* with higher education that carry a commitment to outcomes with mutual satisfaction and sustained involvement, as well as shared authority, responsibility, and resources *(Leiderman, Furko, Zapf, & Goss, 2003; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992)*. In short, community leaders expect campus-community initiatives to be reciprocal efforts to meet collective needs, rather than "something carried out on behalf of the community" *(London, 2002, p. 4)*.

There are no shortcuts to cultivating the trust and respect required for reciprocal campus-community relationships. In many ways the field research I conducted for my dissertation in rural counties across the United States prepared me for the slow and steady work that is required to create such relationships. When I began this research I expected to augment my quantitative data with interviews gathered relatively quickly through phone conversations. I soon learned that in order to cultivate trust, I not only had to travel to each community and meet face-to-face with respondents, but I also had to build rapport by committing significant time and effort to learning about the community's history and identity, and genuinely getting to know respondents apart from any research objective. I had to sincerely value the getting-acquainted process and the relationships with my respondents. This process involved everything from reading years of local newspapers on microfilm, to walking the fence with people and sharing meals. I spent far more time learning about the communities and getting to know the respondents than I did conducting the actual interviews *(Sherman, 2005)*. A large part of this acquainting process between my respondents and me involved the development of shared understandings of our respective needs and goals. Just as I had needs and goals for research, they had needs and goals for the communication and dissemination of their stories.

Research on campus-community initiatives has demonstrated that much of the initial time and effort spent by campus and community actors should be devoted to identifying common goals based on the needs of all parties *(Jacoby, 2003; London, 2002; Ramaley, 2000)*. If potential collaborators come to view each other as having conflicting agendas, all parties may come to feel exploited and the

initiative will fail for lack of trust and commitment *(Wergin, 2006, p. 26)*. When President Thomas launched his campus-community initiative the year before I arrived on campus, he wrote an op-ed in the local paper explaining that the "first assignment" for campus and community members was "to listen to one another, to help each other address these issues in partnership, and to forge solutions together in good faith" *(2003, p. 1)*. When I assumed my position, I was new to the university and new to the community. I translated the lessons learned from my field research by spending nearly a year and a half attending various community meetings and public events, as well as making appointments to have coffee with local environmental stakeholders, before I attempted to implement any significant campus-community events or programs.

When I did finally undertake major events and programs, I was confident that they would be implemented under goals shared by campus and community actors to meet identified needs of all involved in the partnership with shared resources. One local environmental group identified a long-standing goal of hosting community education classes on regional environmental issues and policy solutions. In order to accomplish this they needed the support of an educational institution as well as space and enhanced organizational capacity. This goal matched university needs, including the creation of a forum for students in environmental policy classes to engage with state political actors and share applied projects from coursework. The university provided space and organizational capacity, and the environmental group worked to create the community class sessions with other stakeholders. Both the university and the environmental group provided funds to implement the program. In another example, the city public works department identified a need to enhance its public outreach efforts on environmental sustainability issues just as the campus was undertaking a new sustainability program. The campus was able to partner with the city on a grant that funded a series of events applying community-based social marketing to city and campus sustainability objectives.

Often the university can also serve as a community convener. Two community needs emerged repeatedly from my listening sessions with environmental stakeholders: more coordinated environmental education and a comprehensive management plan for urban green spaces. Once I identified these needs with community partners, the university could convene work on these issues with a countywide leadership summit on environmental education and a citywide partnership for the restoration of urban green spaces.

These two efforts provided opportunities for students to match curricular and cocurricular learning with "real-time" decision-making on environmental issues.

Each program identified above was carried out by a carefully orchestrated partnership of campus and community actors who ensured that all involved had something to give and something to gain from the interaction. As Grobe *(1990)* writes, one way to identify a partnership is to ask who benefits. "If the answer is not 'all parties,' the arrangement is not a true partnership" *(p. 6)*. Another way to think of this is that "both the server and those served teach, and both learn" *(Kendall, 1990, p. 22)* or that all parties in a relationship recognize the "common capacity to shape one another in profound ways" *(Enos & Morton, 2003, p. 20)*. These programs were the result of reciprocal relationships, and even the funding responsibilities were shared by both campus and community members of the partnerships.

Institutionalizing Partnerships

If establishing the reciprocal relationships required for true campus-community partnerships is time consuming and difficult, sustaining them is even more difficult. One persistent expectation on the part of community actors is consistency in the university's involvement with initiatives over time. This is also one of the most difficult expectations for campus members to fulfill. Some of the most troublesome incongruities between community and campus needs involve timelines. Community needs are not circumscribed by the academic calendar and may have their own associated time pressures. Campus-community initiatives that involve integration with teaching and learning must face the reality that coursework begins and ends within a very narrow window of time, and large portions of the student population may leave the campus community altogether for several months a year. Faculty research also follows an ebb and flow that is influenced by the academic calendar. Finally, individuals working in the community, whether professionally or as volunteers, also experience fluctuations in their ability to commit to projects over time. I have found three ways to improve the continuity of campus-community initiatives and work toward sustained partnerships.

First, initiatives that are integrated with coursework can be designed so that student work builds from one course offering to another. In this way the project extends beyond a semester or academic year and comes to reflect and reinforce the nature of

campus-community partnerships as "accretions that are layered over time" *(Enos & Morton, 2003, p. 26)*. I have had success with such initiatives both by committing a series of courses to a single ongoing project and by committing a series of course offerings to work at a single place with a defined set of community partners. In each case, the knowledge that all contributions are serving more than just an immediate end and are foundations for ongoing work strengthens relationships with the community partners and creates a sense of satisfaction and meaning for students. Some alumni have even checked back to see how a project they had worked on was developing, and others have taken on professional roles with their class projects after graduation.

The second way I have worked to build continuity into campus-community initiatives is to incubate initiatives until they have enough support to stand on their own or find support with another existing institutional arrangement. The university does not have to, and probably should not, permanently own (even in partnership) each initiative it helps orchestrate. If part of the purpose of campus-community initiatives is to build the capacity of community stake-holders, then often it is appropriate for initial university support to yield to independence. This can be facilitated in many ways. The partnership for the restoration of urban green space that was formed over the course of 3 years with university support ultimately formed its own organizational infrastructure and found financial support through a combination of city and nonprofit sources. The sustainability initiative between the university and the city public works department became integrated into a range of campus and city departments. The environmental education leadership summit identified a cadre of leaders to form an advisory committee housed in the county government structure. In each case, the university provided seed resources and acted as an incubator for the initiative until it could ensure continuity of implementation through some other permanent institutional arrangement.

Finally, after engaging in a dizzying array of campus-community initiatives, each with its own set of actors, concerns, events, and timelines, it became clear to me that the university needed an institutional structure to support community engagement. Originally, the external grant that funded my position and my responsibilities was defined exclusively in terms of programs and events. This extended to the way the grant budget was constructed and the regular assessments were conducted, leading to an unmanageable dynamic in which financial support was available only for programs and events, each of which brought with it a greater and

greater need for regularized institutional support. Anyone who
has undertaken this kind of work has learned that both campus
and community partners can quickly become exhausted by pro-
grams and events *(Ramaley, 2000)*. Fortunately, my grantor enabled a
restructuring that provided staff for the creation of an institutional
center to support members of the campus and wider communi-
ties working on issues of regional environmental significance. The
importance of institutionalization is well documented in the litera-
ture on community engagement *(Bringle & Hatcher, 2000)* as a way to
smooth the evolution of campus and community participants over
time and to provide support and a regular point of contact. My
hope is that the newly created hub for environmental engagement
will ensure that our campus-community initiatives are more than
a series of events and programs.

Conclusion

One thing I did confess when I had my moment on the podium
before the faculty was that the integration I pursued between
campus-community initiatives and my other professional respon-
sibilities was initially done out of necessity. I described my first 2
years on the job as "partnering to survive." It was clear to me that
I could not honor either the community engagement or academic
responsibilities of my job if I treated them separately. I commu-
nicated this problem to an external review committee that inter-
viewed me just before I started my job. They asked me how I, as
a junior faculty member, would balance new teaching responsi-
bilities, professional growth, service to campus, and the additional
responsibilities of building bridges to the wider community with
new campus-community engagement initiatives. I answered that
I could achieve balance only if the campus-community initiatives
were not "additional responsibilities," but instead overlapping ele-
ments with the rest of my scholarly responsibilities. Just as my indi-
vidual professional survival necessitated such integration, so too
does the vitality of the initiatives themselves. As Ramaley *(2000)*
argues, "an ideal partnership matches up the academic strengths
and goals of the university with the assets and interests of the
community" *(p. 240)*. Instead of casting community engagement as
an effort to create something new, advocates are better served by
arguing that community engagement enriches what higher edu-
cation already strives to accomplish. As a junior faculty member
I have found that campus-community initiatives work best when
they subscribe to the values already espoused by the university,
serve the needs of university leadership, and integrate with fac-

ulty teaching and research through the disciplines. However, just as campus needs must be met in this way, so too must community needs be met through the careful cultivation of reciprocal relationships and the support of an enduring institutional presence. Campus-community initiatives should be more than a loose collection of service events and programs. Seeking a collective term for such initiatives, my university ran through a long progression of options, including "education for community improvement," "community service," "service-learning," "community engagement," and "civic engagement," before finally settling on "civic scholarship"—a label that properly identifies the integration of campus-community initiatives conducted in partnership with the core purpose of higher education.

References

American Association of University Professors. (1940). *Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure*. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm

American Chemical Society. (1948). *Constitution*. Retrieved from http://portal.acs.org/portal/acs/corg/content?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=PP_TRANSITIONMAIN&node_id=662&use_sec=false&sec_url_var=region1

American Political Science Association. (2008). *Core objectives*. Retrieved from http://www.apsanet.org/content_4403.cfm

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bender, T. (Ed.). (1988). *The university and the city: From medieval origins to the present*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Hartley, M. (2005). Integrating a commitment to the public good into the institutional fabric. In A. Kezar, T. Chambers, & J. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 185–216). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation.

Boyer, E. (1994, March). Creating the new American college. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A48.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 71,* 273–290.

Brukhardt, M., Percy, S., & Zimpher, N. (Eds). (2006). Moving forward along new lines. In S. L. Percy, N. L. Zimpher, & M. J. Brukardt (Eds.), *Creating a new kind of university: Institutionalizing community-university engagement* (pp. 3–22). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). *On change: En route to transformation* (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Enos, S., & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 20–41). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Grobe, T. (1990). *Synthesis of existing knowledge and practice in the field of educational partnerships.* Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Center for Human Resources.

Harkavy, I. (1997). The demands of the times and the American research university. *Journal of Planning Literature, 11*(3), 333–336.

Harkavy, I. (2006). Foreword. In S. Percy, N. Zimpher, & M. Brukardt (Eds.), *Creating a new kind of university: Institutionalizing community-university engagement* (pp. viii–xvi). Bolton, MA: Anker

Harper, W. (1905). *The trend in higher education.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Holland, B. (2001). Toward a definition and characterization of the engaged campus: *Six cases. Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 12,* 20–29.

Jacoby, B. (2003). *Building partnerships for service learning.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kendall, J. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service.* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Education.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zapf, J., & Goss, M. (2003). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives.* Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Lerner, R. M., & Simon, L. A. K. (Eds.). (1998). *University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century: Outreach scholarship for youth and families.* New York, NY: Garland.

Levine, D. (2003). *Powers of the mind: The reinvention of liberal learning in America.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lisman, D., & Harvey, I. (Eds.). (2000). *Beyond the tower: Concepts and models for service learning in philosophy.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

London, S. (2002). *The civic mission of higher education: From outreach to engagement.* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

Mattessich, P., & Monsey, B. (1992). *Collaboration: What makes it work.* St. Paul, MN: Wilder Foundation.

M'Gonigle, M., & Starke, J. (2006). *Planet U: Sustaining the world, reinventing the university.* Gabriola Island, BC, Canada: New Society.

Modern Language Association. (2001). *Resolution 2001-5*. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/governance/mla_resolutions/2001_resolutions

Nyden, P. (2003). Partnerships for collaborative action research. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Building partnerships for service learning* (pp. 213–233). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Orr, D. (1994). *Earth in mind*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Orton, D., & Weick, K. (1990). Loosely coupled systems: A reconceptualization. *Academy of Management Review, 15*, 203–223.

Piaget, J. (1977). Comments on mathematical education. In H. Gruber & J. Voneche (Eds.), *The essential Piaget* (pp. 726-727). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Pinker, S. (2005, November 16). College makeover: The Matrix revisited. Slate. Retrieved from http://www.slate.com/id/2130334/

Ramaley, J. (2000). The perspective of a comprehensive university. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 227–248). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Resnich, L. (1987). *Education and learning to think*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Rice, E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar force.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rosaen, C. L., Foster-Fishman, P. G., & Fear, F. A. (2001). The citizen scholar: Joining voices and values in the engagement interface. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 12*, 10–29.

Sherman, D. (2005). A drawbridge to the ivory tower. In A. Downs (Ed.), *Why we write: The politics and practice of writing for social change* (pp. 147–158). Florence, KY: Routledge.

Tagg, J. (2003). *The learning paradigm college*. Boston, MA: Anker.

Thomas, R. (n.d.). Planning for the campus and the community in context: Turning town and gown inside-out [online]. Retrieved from http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/office-of-the-president/articles-addresses/planning-for-the-campus-and-th/

Thomas, R. (2003). *UPS, Tacoma benefits from joint lessons in citizenship* [online]. Retrieved from http://www.puget-sound.edu/about/office-of-the-president/articles-addresses/ups-tacoma-benefits-from-joint

Thomas, R. (2005). *Defining moments: A vision for the University of Puget Sound* [online]. Retrieved from http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/office-of-the-president/articles-addresses/a-vision/

Torres, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service.* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Education.

Troppe, M. (1994). *Participatory action research: Merging the community and scholarly agendas*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

University of Puget Sound. (n.d.). *Mission statement and educational goals* [online]. Retrieved from http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/strategic-planning/mission-statement/

Wergin, J. (2006). Elements of effective community engagement. In. S. Percy, N. Zimpher, & M. Brukardt (Eds.), *Creating a new kind of university:*

Institutionalizing community-university engagement (pp. 23–44). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Whitehead, A. (1929). *The aims of education*. Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

About the Author

Daniel J. Sherman is Luce-funded Professor of Environmental Policy & Decision Making, Environmental Policy & Decision Making Program, Department of Politics and Government, University of Puget Sound.