

From the Editor ...

Moving on from a “Third Mission”

Ready for good substantive summer reading? Authors in this issue have taken on heady topics—dueling perspectives on the purpose of engagement, paradoxical tensions and contradictions in community–university partnership that influence collaborations, and other critical concerns. Higher education strategy sessions often see engagement for economic development and engagement for social justice purposes pitted against each other. In other discussions, engagement is relegated to and described as a “third mission” of higher education. In “The Concept and Context of the Engaged University in the Global South: Lessons from Latin America to Guide a Research Agenda,” Susan Appe, Nadia Rubaii, Sebastian Lippez-De Castro, and Stephen Capobianco constructively address both of these prevailing challenges by taking a global perspective and offering us the university social responsibility or *responsabilidad social universitaria* (RSU) model of university engagement. This model brings together elements of the market-oriented and social justice approaches, then adopts an expanded scope to address all aspects of university management. Instead of positioning economic development and social equity as competing goals, as the market-oriented and social justice models suggest, RSU pursues these goals simultaneously. What a contribution! There has been limited academic scholarship written in English about this model of university engagement, which is gaining a foothold across Latin America. The model described by the authors and illustrated through the case studies of Chilean and Jesuit university networks provides an alternative worthy of additional study. The two case studies demonstrate (a) the power of a network approach to promoting engagement and (b) the potential for the RSU model to be adapted to the needs of a particular country or type of university. The authors tidily sum up their case: “If universities have been hesitant to choose a model of engagement that emphasizes their contributions to economic development, innovation, and entrepreneurship (the hallmarks of a market-oriented model of community engagement) or a model that promotes activism, social equity, and empowerment of the disenfranchised (per the social justice model), RSU may offer a good alternative” (p. 30).

The growing participation in the field of engaged scholarship continues to yield literature that explores greater depths, recognizes (and offers solutions for) persistent problems, and provides a dif-

ferent set of insights into the challenges and benefits of producing a sustainable model of engagement, as three articles in this issue do. Drawing extensively on engaged scholarship and organizational theory literatures and analyzing existing community–university partnership models, Amanda Bowers, from the University of Louisville, argues for integrating an additional element to better address the inherent conflicts and tensions. That additional element is *employing paradox*, which she develops into a four-component framework that offers a “means toward realizing the goal of sustainable models of collaboration that account for competing and mutable organizational structures and priorities” (p. 50). That is, sustained, reciprocal community–university partnerships can be achieved through “embracing rather than avoiding contradictions,” (p. 55) and Bowers offers a model that shows us how.

Sherrie Steiner, a professor of sociology at Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne, addresses the sustainability of collaborative relationships by presenting a curricula-as-research model, which offers a risk-reduction strategy for faculty involved in community-engaged scholarship. In “Undergraduate Learning Through Engaged Scholarship and University–Community Partnerships,” Kristen Tarantino, from William and Mary, highlights a project and organization that moved beyond student volunteer service or service-learning opportunities and brought together the spectrum of engaged scholarship in a single community-based research endeavor. Both these articles provide evaluated examples of programs that transcend a semester or even several semesters to achieve authentically engaged research and learning outcomes.

Faculty development would seem necessary and appropriate to undergird advancement of robust community engagement, but what do we know about its content, formats, duration, or impact assessment? Marshall Welch and Star Plaxton-Moore explore this fundamental but underresearched topic through a conceptual review of the literature and a survey of Carnegie-classified community-engaged institutions.

This issue offers two Projects with Promise. Writing from the Middletown Regional Campus at Miami of Ohio, Susan Baim, a professor of commerce, describes the evolution, execution, and evaluation of The Knowledge Café, a partnership between a community foundation and a regional campus to advance social media practices for small to medium-sized business. Julie Koldewyn, Roslynn Brain, and Kate Stephens present a thorough evaluation of the pilot classes in Utah State University’s integrated service-learning project, its Community Bridge Initiative, which is aimed at

improving local environmental sustainability issues. Although not the first instance of service-learning at Utah State, the Community Bridge Initiative was designed to offer a formal and targeted connection between the university and the city of Logan, Utah.

The three books reviewed in this issue take three very different approaches to engagement as a strategy for social and civic justice. Gasman's book *Academics Going Public*, reviewed by Kristina Killgrove at the University of West Florida, provides guidance for communicating with the public using traditional and virtual media. The advice in this edited volume ranges from "Don't feed the trolls" to cultivating the acceptability of publication in popular media.

Frank A. Fear, professor emeritus of Michigan State University, focuses on Novella Zett Keith's *Engaging in Social Partnerships* as not just another book about partnerships but a "book about higher education engagement with a defining theme of *democratic practices that advance the public good*" (p. 223). Addressing related themes, Keith herself, an emerita professor at Temple University, examines *Educating for Civic-Mindedness*, Carolin Kreber's conceptual work that seeks to deepen our thinking on what civic-mindedness means and the importance of the civic-minded professional in higher education. Fear and Keith use detailed examination of the works they review to comment on the current state of higher education and engagement, as well as indicating what the respective works offer to the reader and to the field.

We at JHEOE sincerely appreciate the authors, the peer reviewers, the associate editors, and the editorial management team for bringing this issue to fruition. It serves as a rich resource to heighten our conceptual and theoretical understandings, as well as our evidence-based leadership and practices, as community engagement and community-engaged scholarship encompass and then move beyond higher education's Third Mission.

With best regards,
Lorilee R. Sandmann
Coeditor

