

A Note from the Guest Editor . . .

Introduction

The idea for this special issue of the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* evolved from discussions between the The Pennsylvania State University, The Ohio State University, the University of Wisconsin–Extension, and Mel Hill, Jr., the *JHEOE* editor. The collaborative came from the shared goal of supporting a learning community of university and community leaders that are defining and sharing models of outreach scholarship.

As the chair of two national conferences held at Penn State focusing on outreach scholarship, Best Practices in Outreach and Public Service: The Scholarship of Engagement, October 1999, and Outreach Scholarship 2001: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement, October 2001, I am pleased to serve as the guest editor of this special issue. This issue provides an opportunity for participants of the 2001 conference to share lessons learned and outcomes with members of the higher education community. The description of the multi-institutional partnership sets the stage for the articles included in this publication.

“This issue provides an opportunity for participants of the 2001 conference to share lessons learned and outcomes with members of the higher education community.”

Background of the Outreach Scholarship Conference Series: Partnership for Change

The conference Outreach Scholarship 2001: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement was held in October, 2001. Topics at the conference addressed the needs of faculty and staff in a variety of functional areas within the institution, including continuing education, distance education, cooperative extension, public broadcasting, public affairs, technology transfer, and other outreach-related areas. Information was shared on creating an outreach culture; recruiting, supporting, and rewarding faculty; dissemination of research; using technology to support outreach; measuring the quality and impact of outreach programs; and the advancement of outreach scholarship. For more information about the 2001 conference, the 2001

conference monograph, the 2002 conference, or the online learning community, please visit: <http://www.outreachscholarship.org>.

An Overview of This Issue

The articles included in this issue of *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* provide an opportunity to hear directly from the participants of the 2001 conference. These articles provide historic perspectives that allow us to reflect on the past and the future of the engaged institution. The authors share new models for (1) building and sustaining the culture of engagement, (2) understanding outreach scholarship, (3) supporting faculty in outreach scholarship, and (4) engaging our communities, e.g., conducting needs assessment, developing partnerships, using appropriate program development models,

using technology to expand access, involving citizens, serving at-risk and diverse populations, and evaluating engagement activities.

“[Preissing] . . . argues that if the challenge of campus academicians is to become more engaged with civil society, the challenge for extension staff is . . . to engage and embrace scholarly work as a part of their mission.”

Melvin B. Hill’s article, “Reflections of a New Outreach Journal Editor,” sets the stage by providing a historic review of the origin and mission of the *Journal of Outreach and Public Service* and the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. He chronicles the journey of a man

and a Journal that have sought to provide a forum for thoughtful reflection and analysis of trends, innovations, and best practices in outreach and engagement.

In the article, “Outreach and Engagement: Building and Sustaining Learning Communities in Higher Education,” Childers and colleagues describe how three universities are partnering to foster networks of leaders who are creating and sustaining outreach cultures in their respective institutions. Each institution is fueling change through the facilitation of learning communities. The partnership is linking learning communities at institutions across the country through a series of conferences that are fostering the dialogue of engagement.

Frank A. Fear and Lorilee Sandmann's article, "The New Scholarship: Implications for Engagement and Extension," dynamically portrays the tension between Boyer's proposals of "the new scholarship" and what Schön called "technical rationality." Fear and Sandmann outline the "norms of engagement," i.e., respectfulness, collaboration, mutuality, and dedication to learning with emphasis on the values of community, responsibility, virtue, stewardship, and mutual concern as they discuss the implications of the new scholarship for the engagement movement.

The article, "The UniSCOPE Model of Scholarship in the Twenty-First Century," written by Drew Hyman and colleagues, presents a framework in which faculty and administrators can develop a creative understanding of other forms of scholarship and how they can be effectively integrated into the promotion and tenure process. They propose that scholarship must be understood broadly enough to adequately address the needs of the professions and the public. The UniSCOPE model can provide a foundation on which scholars of all disciplines can build a structure for identifying, recognizing, and rewarding the specific types of scholarship that apply in their fields.

*"[Cramer and Kostelnick]
... describe a ten-state
collaborative model for
distance education that
promotes faculty and
program development."*

John Preissing's article, "Scholarship from Northern Wisconsin: An Analysis of Efforts to Promote Scholarship in the University of Wisconsin's Cooperative Extension Field-Based Staff," examines the role of scholarship for county-level extension staff. He argues that if the challenge of campus academicians is to become more engaged with civil society, the challenge for extension staff is the opposite—to engage and embrace scholarly work as a part of their mission. He concludes that field staff value scholarship but need to enhance their skills and opportunities in applied research, writing, and presentation of their scholarship.

The article, "Mission Possible: Developing Effective Educational Partnerships," written by Linda C. Cunningham and Lisa A. Tedesco, discusses some of the basic principles essential for institutions of higher education to utilize in establishing and sustaining an effective partnership with a K–12 public school system. Their model

is underpinned by the pillars of defined and shared purpose, commitment and visible support from leaders, shared decision-making power among partners, reciprocity, trust, and sustainability. According to Cunningham and Tedesco, these pillars will need to be in place to form a solid foundation for effective partnerships in the future.

Sheran L. Cramer and Marjorie Kostelnick's article, "Developing a Comprehensive Family Financial Planning Master's Program: Realities, Surprises, and Challenges," describes a ten-state collaborative model for distance education that promotes faculty and program development. The collaborative dealt with the challenges to provide high quality educational experiences within the constraints of tight budgets, limited faculty experiences, and new learning technology. The authors outline a number of factors to consider in building the collaborative model as well as strategies for serving rural communities.

The article, "A Community Addresses Food Security Needs," written by Anne C. Kok and Karen Early, shares a needs assessments strategy and strategies for providing food security among at-risk populations. Using the USDA Household Food Security Survey and the survey results, the authors collaborated with local food distribution networks to develop and implement an action plan to address the inadequate food security in their service delivery area.

"Evaluation to Strengthen Distance Learning Programs," written by Kay S. Taube and colleagues describes how a comprehensive evaluation of a distance education program was used to strengthen and revise programming at five institutions. The authors describe a methodology that focused on issues of cost and access, technologies and learning modalities, availability and quality of support services, and impact of the program on nurses' careers. The authors describe a nursing program, an approach to evaluation, findings, and areas for change that resulted from the study.

Matthew Kaplan and Mary Brintnall-Peterson's article, "In Search of an Intergenerational Agenda for Cooperative Extension," reviews how intergenerational program strategies have been used and can be enhanced to strengthen and enrich cooperative extension programs, particularly in the children, youth, and family area. According to Kaplan and Brintnall-Peterson, intergenerational programs "mobilize the talents, skills, energy, and resources of older adults (as well as young people) in service to people of other generations" and have been an effective countermeasure to patterns of residential and social segregation of age groups.

The article, “Cooperative Extension Response to a Diversity Education Resource: Implications for Extension Programming,” written by Patreese D. Ingram and Ram Radhakrishna, evaluates the effectiveness of a variety of strategies being employed to serve culturally diverse communities. As the cultural landscape of American society is drastically changing, universities must be versatile in serving the elderly, alternative family structures, gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people, as well as physically and mentally disabled members of society. The challenge for the extension professional and others within the university community includes developing knowledge, attitudes, skills, and behaviors that will have universities and communities working effectively across differences.

“Hoorman and Spencer share a spectrum of educational techniques that have proven to be successful in serving Amish families.”

James J. Hoorman and Edith A. Spencer’s article, “Engagement and Outreach with Amish Audiences,” outlines the best practices in working with a rural subculture, the Amish community. Hoorman and Spencer share a spectrum of educational techniques that have proven to be successful in serving Amish families. This article demonstrates the importance of designing and delivering a culturally sensitive program development model.

In their article, “Building the Civic Community in Geopolitically Fragmented Communities,” Nancy Kukay, Jerold Thomas, and Don Lacy frame the challenges and potential responses to engaging citizens in the civic life in their communities. Creating an engagement agenda is key to building and sustaining the civic health of communities. The disconnection between citizens and their government is amplified by geopolitical fragmentation (counties divided into multiple governmental units), which serves as a barrier to meaningful civic engagement. Currently no accepted model exists for encouraging and nurturing effective citizen participation in public decision-making processes. This paper focuses on one means of removing significant barriers to participation, i.e., knowledge of local governmental officials and processes.

The theme of the 2001 conference was built on the notion of creating a dialogue on the scholarship of engagement. As we ponder

definitions and the “new epistemology” of outreach scholarship we must also move from dialogue to action. I want to acknowledge the thought-provoking dialogue created by the contributors to this issue and invite my colleagues to attend the second conference in this series, Outreach Scholarship 2002: Catalyst for Change which will be hosted by OSU and will be held October 6–8, 2002, in Worthington, Ohio. For more information about the conference, please visit: <http://www.outreachscholarship.org>. I encourage you to attend the conference and share your expertise and experiences with your colleagues and join the *partnership for change*.

Jeri L. Childers

Interim Director, Outreach Office of Program Development
Outreach and Cooperative Extension
The Pennsylvania State University