Journal of Public Service & Outreach, Volume 1, Number 1, pp. 46-56 (1996)

THE CHALLENGE FOR OUTREACH FOR LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES AS THEY MOVE INTO THE 21ST CENTURY

Russell G. Mawby, Ph.D.
Chairman Emeritus
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Editor's note: Dr. Mawby presented these remarks at the first Walter Barnard Hill Distinguished Lecture in Hugh B. Masters Hall at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education, The University of Georgia, Athens, in October 1995.

Thank you for the pleasure and privilege of being with you here in Athens this day. It is a pleasure to again be with old and new friends at The University of Georgia. The relationship of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with this university extends back more than half a century, with our first modest grant made in 1942 to provide student loan/scholarship funds in medicine. Then, in 1954, we provided major assistance to the university and the people of Georgia in establishing this Georgia Center for Continuing Education. Subsequently, we have provided assistance to a number of university initiatives in the broad fields of health, agriculture, rural development, leadership, and youth programming, with total commitments of more than $13 million. On a personal note, I have been involved for more than three decades in this relationship, developing a host of professional colleagues and personal friends. Thus, it is great to be here again to experience the dynamics of this great university, the people who comprise it, and the mission and people it serves.

And it is a privilege — indeed a singular honor for which I am most grateful — to present the inaugural lecture of the Walter Barnard Hill Distinguished Lecture Series. Mr. Hill was a remarkable man who provided leadership for this university at the beginning of this century. A native of Talbotton, Georgia, Hill graduated from this university in 1870. He then moved forward in a remarkable career in law and the judiciary, as well as public service, before being elected chancellor in 1899.

In the memorial to W. B. Hill in the Proceedings of the Georgia Bar Association, 1906, his distinguished career is documented:

> But the world of letters will know Mr. Hill best as Chancellor of the University of Georgia. Hill's willingness to accept this place in 1899 was a great surprise to his friends. Yet on the mention of his name for the position there was an almost unanimous response throughout the State in favor of his election.
>
> Those who knew and appreciated his many fine traits of character and his splendid intellect believed that he was eminently fitted to discharge the duties of the place, in fact that he possessed every qualification both of head and of heart to achieve success in this new field.

Before his election the State had held aloof from the institution — the competition with the denominational colleges necessarily giving rise to some friction — and this fact kept the State institution from occupying the position of confidence and good will in the eyes of the lawmakers of the State that its position entitled it to claim. The appropriations that had been made to it before Mr. Hill's election were few and far between.

The memorial then continues:

While the State has been gradually awakening to the wants of all her educational institutions and is coming to recognize the claims upon her resources, yet it is almost certain that but for Mr. Hill's efforts in this respect, the awakened interest would not have taken the direction toward the University which we now find to exist.

He brought to the support of the University all the advocates of education in the State, and especially enlisted the confidence of the mothers and fathers who committed their sons to his care. By his exercise of constant interest in and deep solicitude for the welfare of the young men in his charge, he soon put out of questions entirely any suggestion of demoralization or vicious practices in the University.

The attendance at the institution during this time was more than doubled — reaching the highest point in its history at the term following his decease.

The Bar Association concludes:

He despised all shams, and knew few of the arts of the politician — laying no claim to leadership, in the ordinary sense of the term, save as his powerful advocacy of a cause compelled his associates to recognize such right.

He regarded no sacrifice of self as too great where the advancement of morality and honest administration of law was concerned.

It was an oft-repeated suggestion of his that no man ever yet succeeded before the people who did not at some time of his life espouse and advocate an unpopular cause. He used to claim that this was the test of a man's merit — the ability to stand up against public pressure and public denunciation.

His work as Chancellor has placed him in the very forefront of what has been called the South's educational statesmen, and given him a name and fame among the greatest of Georgia's great men. Had he lived, his plans touching the expansion of the University would doubtless have been fully realized, and the benefits of his work would have redounded to the good of generations yet unborn.

In his bicentennial history of this university, [Dr.] Thomas G. Dyer describes in detail the evolution of the university in the Progressive Era, the first two decades of this twentieth century. Dyer observes:

Perhaps the strongest evidence of Hill's progressive bent, however, came from his emphasis on the necessity for higher education to become more utilitarian and to render services to society. In the post-Civil War period, many American public and private universities had shown new interest in utilitarian subjects and in research. From the 1870s forward,

these institutions moved farther away from the traditional approach to liberal arts education toward a model which ultimately blended utilitarianism, research, and liberal culture .... Hill embraced the new philosophy. A state university, he contended, should include in its faculty a variety of experts upon whom the public could rely for aid in solving difficult social problems.

Through new emphases on expertise, research, and extension, a university fundamentally different from its nineteenth-century forerunner would emerge. The University of the twentieth Century will be differentiated from its predecessors in this,' Hill told a Georgia audience in 1905, '*It will connect its activities more closely with the business and life of the people*' (Hill's emphasis).

Hill was a visionary leader of remarkable skill and energy who assumed the chancellorship of this university at a critical time in its history. Dyer notes that this visionary and pragmatist moved toward resolution of three of the largest problems facing public higher education in the state: the relationship to the legislature, the role of agricultural education, and the expansion of the college at Athens into a true university. In addition to public financial support through the legislature, he sought private assistance as well. In this regard, he recruited George Foster Peabody, a native Georgian who had amassed a great fortune. In addition to providing financial assistance, Peabody served as a valued counselor and advocate. As one example, in letters to Hill, Peabody strongly suggested that the chancellor should be bold about the amount of money requested from the legislature.

Chancellor Hill was bold, not only in his financial aspirations, but in his vision for The University of Georgia. He launched initiatives which broadened curriculum, strengthened the faculty, deepened the commitment to the needs of the people of Georgia, and articulated the tripartite dimensions of teaching, research, and outreach/service. A century later, this university and the people of Georgia and beyond are the beneficiaries of his vision and contributions. Thus, it is appropriate that we celebrate his memory through this lecture series. I congratulate the university and appreciate the opportunity of being a part of this celebration.

The mission of public service

When Dr. S. E. Younts, Vice President for Services (Outreach), called to extend the invitation to this lectureship, he and I discussed the outreach dimension of the university's mission in the broader context of public service. When the leaders of Georgia took action to make this the first state-chartered institution of higher education as our country was being formed, when George Washington promoted his plan for a national university, when Thomas Jefferson nurtured the University of Virginia, a central intent of all these founders was to set higher learning within a public context. In their view, collegiate study should be guided by the principles of the constitution, by democracy and independence, by ability and ambition, not by religion or heredity. Our new nation needed an abundant supply of leaders to serve its various needs. Access to education should be open to all who could benefit from it, and the curriculum should include practical and contemporary subjects as well as theoretical and classical ones. Research, the creation of new knowledge, was not a clearly articulated role for these institutions, though the records show frequent references to experimentation and demonstration. Such were the aspirations of these pioneers.

The cluster of little state colleges established in the earliest days of our country's history were augmented midway through the 19th century and again 30 years later when Congress created two waves of land-grant institutions, each intended to bring the benefits of higher education to a sector of the population hitherto denied it, a new part of the public. For these 18th- and 19th-century pioneers, public service meant essentially the instruction on campus of young, white, free men [who were] 16-20 years of age. The enlargement of the clientele even within that age group was not to come until much later and after much strife.

It took 100 years for research to become a formal part of higher education, culminating in 1887 with passage of the Hatch Act supporting research. Public service, as a clear-cut, separate principle, distinguishing it from the service of the public interests through collegiate programs of teaching and research, entered the American university about a quarter of a century after research did. Seaman Knapp, by remarkable coincidence an ancestor of the current president [Charles B. Knapp] of this university, pioneered agricultural extension, which resulted in passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914. And the movement for general university extension, which began at Cambridge and Oxford Universities in England in the 1870s, swept through public colleges in this country in the early part of this century. Chancellor Hill, whose memory we honor, was a catalytic and effective leader in these movements.

As our public universities have grown and matured, the triumvirate of their mission — teaching, research, and public service/outreach — has become generally accepted, at least in rhetoric.

As our public universities have grown and matured, the triumvirate of their mission — teaching, research, and public service/outreach — has become generally accepted, at least in rhetoric. In this process, two clearly identifiable tendencies have occurred. First, teaching has become narrowly defined, referring essentially to that which occurs in a classroom or laboratory setting, usually on campus, with students enrolled in courses for credit leading to credentials. The vast array of other teaching carried out by university faculty in less formal settings and structure is lumped ignominiously into public service. Nontraditional patterns of teaching, often with nontraditional students in nontraditional settings, is thus relegated to a position of lesser status.

Second, the research mission of the university, though the latest entrant on the scene in some respects, has become omnipotent. Professors who neither teach nor directly address attention to public concerns are exalted. Publication is essential to faculty success. Basic research is pre-eminent, while those research efforts described as "applied" are viewed with less acclaim. Thus, in the academic life of public institutions today, research represents the ultimate exercise, with teaching — especially at the undergraduate level — seen as a mandated duty, and public service an obligation too often accepted with reluctance.

In examining in detail the public-service dimension of public higher education, it becomes apparent that these institutions carry on certain kinds of public-service activities which are not central to their teaching and research missions. Five examples will illustrate this dimension:

The first is the preservation of knowledge, a goal which universities seek in myriad ways, but most notably in libraries, museums, galleries, and special collections.

A second kind of activity is the provision of aesthetic experience. The rich profusion of music, paintings, sculpture, ballet, drama, and all the other arts which pours forth on a university campus and which are often made available to audiences throughout the state and beyond, represents a magnificent contribution to American culture.

The third cluster of such university activities are those related to the direct consumer services which universities provide to their communities. These include hospitals, clinics, testing laboratories, publishing companies, hotels, restaurants, bookstores, and many other kinds of institutions and services.

A fourth contribution of universities is the custodianship of young people of collegiate age.

A fifth kind of activity is the university's role as entertainer for the masses, particularly the masses who watch intercollegiate athletic events.

But a full century of experience, launched by Chancellor Hill and his contemporaries, has taught us that university-based public service is best conceived as dynamic and creative teaching and research carried out in the full dimensions of the human life span and the broad range of human association both on and off campus. In this sense, public service should be seen not as a function, but [as] a principle which animates and guides the basic work of a university.

Programmatically, it meant one thing at the founding of this institution two centuries ago and to Chancellor Hill and his peers a century past; it means something quite different now. It isthe desire to serve directly the social order which created, needs, and nourishes the public university. It is not the only such principle. One can readily think of at least three other guiding influences: the tradition of the university as an institution, the development of the disciplines as bodies of knowledge, and the desire to serve the specific students enrolled both on and off campus.

All four principles are evident in a university's structure and are powerfully felt in its operation. Constant tension exists among them, since each, if carried to its extreme, contradicts or denies the others. While both private and public universities now engage in public service, the concept has been most truly fulfilled in the state universities, which is why they proclaim it to be part of their central triad of purposes. The desire to respond directly to society — and, in turn, to incorporate the ideas thus gained into the central fabric and processes of the institution — has become a powerfully generative force. It has helped bring this and other state universities to their worldwide eminence. It has led to the creation of new categories of institutions of higher learning, such as the regional state colleges and universities and the community colleges. In summation, public service is the spirit which animates some of the best things our public universities do.

Critical challenges, observations, needs

In turning now to the challenges for outreach for our land-grant universities as we move into the 21st century, let us start with the simplistic notion that our public universities are knowledge resources/reservoirs created and sustained by society to serve societal purposes through activities of preserving knowledge, generating new knowledge, organizing and synthesizing knowledge, and transmitting knowledge in multiple ways. The term "outreach" has come into usage to summarize the "transmitting" functions of the university with audiences and with methodology not characteristic of that typically used in dealing with young students enrolled in courses on campus.

- *The first observation concerns the seeming "shift back" to local responsibility and control in addressing societal needs.*

For a span of about six decades — from the "progressive era" at the turn of the century to the late 1960s, and particularly beginning with the "New Deal" in the decade of the 1930s, the federal government took an ever-increasing part in meeting the needs of the American people. Since the early 1970s, that trend first slowed, then seemed to reverse. Increasingly, states and localities are being called upon to deliver services and provide benefits to people at the community level. This shift of responsibility and authority back to the community suggests at least two dimensions of outreach opportunities for universities.

The first relates to fostering patterns of community leadership. Individuals in their various roles — as elected officials, as volunteers serving on citizen boards and committees, as professionals in public and private non-profit organizations and programs — will need to develop skills and capacities in a broad range of duties they will be called upon to perform — strategic planning, priority setting, consensus building, decision-making, conflict resolution, assessment, and evaluation.

A further major opportunity for universities, as responsibility is returned to community people in their organizations and institutions, both governmental and private nonprofit, will be the provision of technical assistance. Counsel and expertise will be vital in helping communities analyze problems, explore alternatives, establish priorities, and implement solutions to issues which concern them, in a broad range of human concerns — from environmental issues through education and health services, to enabling independent living for the elderly and the handicapped.

As the political rhetoric at both national and state levels is translated into action in the months and years ahead, shifting responsibility, authority, and resources to community stewardship, the opportunities for university outreach to enhance community capacity will be monumental and imperative.

- *The second observation concerns the dichotomy between the nature of the problems which concern us and the solutions we devise.*

The problems of concern to society tend to be complex, multi-disciplinary, overarching, penetrating, and permeating. Each of us can make our own list — inflation, K-12 and higher education, health-care and wellness promotion, ground-water quality, environmental issues, violence, civil relationships, peace. On the contrary, the solutions most often devised to address such issues tend to be narrow, discipline- or profession-oriented and biased, simplistic, and inadequate to the task.

In most fields of knowledge and in most professions, we have benefited from superb specialization. Yet, thoughtful analysis reveals that none of the critical issues confronting society can be dealt with adequately by any one specialty. Thus, while we must continue to benefit from specialization, we must somehow be successful in mobilizing knowledge resources and expertise for a broad range of disciplines, professions, and fields of concentration if we are to be successful in putting to use that which is known. It is a truism that "in most areas of human concern, we know better than we do."

Universities, by tradition and by organizational structure, often have difficulty in mobilizing essential knowledge resources to deal effectively with increasingly complex societal concerns. In looking broadly at societal concerns today, there is an almost desperate need for our state universities to employ their marvelous resources more creatively in serving public interests. The agenda is virtually endless — early childhood development, K-12 education, economic development and job generation, substance abuse, corrections, environmental quality, wellness promotion and health-service delivery, welfare, rural and urban decay, waste disposal — the list goes on. The success of our society in addressing such issues will influence the quality and character of life for both current and future generations.

In looking broadly at societal concerns today, there is an almost desperate need for our state universities to employ their marvelous resources more creatively in serving public interests.

- *Observation three relates to the implications and virtually limitless opportunities which new technology offers to the outreach mission of the university.*

When President O. C. Aderhold submitted on October 31, 1953, the final application from The University of Georgia to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for assistance in developing the Georgia Center for Continuing Education, the emphasis appropriately was upon mission and programmatic initiatives rather than simply the highly visible facility. The application stated that the Georgia Center was built on a big idea from the start — "not just a conference center with eating and sleeping accommodations as useful adjuncts, but a modern adult-learning center to include in addition to the living and learning wings, a full-fledged television station, a radio broadcasting station, and a studio for the production of twenty full-length documentary films annually." The idea was that the "synchronized use of films, television, and radio would prolong the opportunity for learning both prior to and after the visit of groups to the campus."

That language, four decades ago, has a museum-like quality today. The University of Georgia then was, indeed, at the cutting edge in using burgeoning technology to serve its educational mission and has continued to be a pioneer and at the forefront in these dimensions of higher education.

New developments in technology provide boundless opportunities for innovation, for access, for dissemination. Changes are occurring so rapidly

that it is virtually impossible to keep up. Writing in *USA Today* in May 1993, Kevin Maney described "technology's new frontier, merging computers, television, telephones and cable." He wrote, "Over the next decades, a new kind of information and entertainment industry — bigger and more pervasive than anything since the old military-industrial complex — will come together and change our lives at home and work." John Malone, chief executive of cable giant Tele-Communications, Inc., says, "The industry, still nameless, is being formed as the TV, film and news business, the local and long-distance telephone companies, the computer hardware and software industry and the publishing industry all fuse at the borders . . . . New technology is coming so fast, it is taking down any barrier between fulfillment and imagination."

While Maney relates these developments to information and entertainment, the implications and potential for education and university outreach are evident and awesome. These developments will occur, with or without colleges and universities as players. Universities must move decisively and resolutely, with greater speed than is their tradition, if they are to influence and participate in technology's contributions to education at all levels and throughout the life span.

This university has been pre-eminent in the application of new technology to programs of outreach and lifelong education. Extraordinary commitment will be essential to continuation of this status in the field.

- *Observation four relates to the conformation of institutional commitment to outreach.*

In the triumvirate — teaching, research, and outreach — priority has gravitated in the allocation of resources and the reward system to research, then teaching, and, finally, outreach. If institutions of higher education are to continue to deserve and receive public support for their work within the university, this pattern needs to be adjusted. There needs to be a recommitment to Chancellor Hill's philosophy of serving the public need. The mind-set of the university must be committed to the spirit of public service, and to this purpose must be mobilized the strongest of its intellectual resources.

The gradual erosion of public commitment to education in general, and higher education in particular, would seem in part to be a consequence of public disenchantment or disillusionment regarding universities, the professoriate, and their usefulness in serving contemporary societal needs. Society, through the political process, increasingly seems to be looking elsewhere for creative leadership and for answers in dealing with increasingly complex issues.

To be explicit, colleges of education seem to be less than fully responsive to societal concerns regarding early childhood development and the performance of K-12 educational systems. Colleges of the health professions have not contributed in substantial ways to societal concerns about human wellness, health promotion, and health-care services and delivery systems. Colleges and schools of social work and colleges of the social sciences have not been pacesetters in welfare reform and in addressing significant concerns about the human condition.

Faculties, administrative leaders, and trustees must deal thoughtfully and constructively with this internal issue. Outreach and service in the public interest must once again become a characteristic of the university.

Beyond the university, thought must be given to public support for outreach activities. In the budgeting process, outreach has usually been

ancillary or peripheral rather than central to the mission and its budgetary substance. Legislative funding formulas have usually centered around student numbers and reimbursement related to on-campus programs of study leading to degrees or credentials.

With the changing nature of society, burgeoning knowledge and the need for lifelong learning, these patterns of funding must be reviewed and altered. Funding from federal, state, and county sources — for such programs as the Agricultural Extension Service, later the Cooperative Extension Service, and more recently University Extension — has been eroding or vanishing. It will take strong leadership on the part of universities and political partners to develop and institutionalize new formulas and patterns of funding if lifelong learning and outreach initiatives are to be fostered and sustained.

Universities must move decisively and resolutely, with greater speed than is their tradition, if they are to influence and participate in technology's contributions to education at all levels and throughout the life span.

- *The fifth and final observation relates to the structures and processes of life-span education, which need to be strengthened if they are to serve adequately the needs of the next century.*

One important need is the creation and dissemination of a much stronger knowledge base for the field of continuing or adult or life-span education. At present, in continuing education there appears to be a strange discontinuity between its intellectual base and its practice. On the one hand, an impressive body of theoretical knowledge and tested principles is in existence flowing from the work of Seaman Knapp and other towering figures, from multiple graduate theses and scholarly works produced by thoughtful theorists, and from many investigations in allied disciplines. On the other hand, I think I see a great many administrators and other people who carry out adult education solely on the basis of lore, local tradition, habitual routines, hunch, and trial and error, uninformed about the intellectual foundations of their own work.

A second need is for universities to complete their task of reorienting their viewpoint from the teaching of young people to the provision of life-span learning. Even in the most traditional form of university-based continuing education — courses offered for credit — the number and proportion of adults has had an accelerated growth. Adults make up an increasing percentage of the total student body on the campuses of most colleges and universities. But a good deal of anecdotal evidence suggests that the forms of instructions originally designed for an immature student body have not been adequately altered to serve as suitable methods of learning for experienced women and men. Regular class enrollment is important but, as we all know, it is only a small part of a vastly larger whole which includes such continuing-educational services as conferences, seminars, lecture and concert series, telecommunication through many media, field staffs reaching out to places sometimes far distant from the home campus, and the

provision of learning opportunities for many constituencies, including agriculture, industry, commerce, labor, families, voluntary associations, human services, professionals of various specialization, and solitary individuals.

The shift of universities from youth-dominated education to a life-span learning conception will require countless changes in policy within universities, in their relationships with other institutions, and in governmental and other systems of control and reinforcement. Here, we must have real and practical changes involving new lines on organization charts, higher places for administrators of continuing education in the boxes in those charts, pragmatic changes in promotion procedures and reward systems, and major reallocations of resources. We have had enough general testaments to continuing education and evangelistic approaches to it to sustain us for a long time. We now need to see new policies which are rooted in sustained practice.

Universities simply must make such changes for themselves. They can also be the generators of broader change by sponsoring commissions or committees of inquiry into adult continuing education, using their prestige to attract to such enterprises the leaders and policy makers of society.

Again, The University of Georgia has been a leader in professional development and in encouraging unified thrusts, bringing together practitioners of various interests and organizational allegiances, involving many parts of their institutions as well as many outside collaborators.

As the new century unfolds, it will be increasingly evident that learning must, indeed, be a lifelong commitment for all learners, if individuals are to satisfactorily fulfill their aspirations in their career or professional activities, their personal lives, and their civic responsibilities. Policies, patterns, and procedures of the past will increasingly be antiquated and counterproductive.

Two centuries ago, the founders of this university, acting in a spirit of public service, issued a state charter for its establishment. A century later, the university they launched was blessed with the fortuitous election of Chancellor Walter Barnard Hill. Hill, in concert with his faculty and administrative colleagues and political and civic leaders, developed and articulated a vision for The University of Georgia which is still evident today. Deeply committed to the university's service to public needs, he generated a public response which led to unprecedented financial support from both public and private sources. Sensitively tuned to contemporary concerns of individuals, families, and communities, in the short span of his tenure he generated a momentum which carried the university through the early decades of the 20th century and has characterized its subsequent trajectory. Chancellor Hill acted with vision, confidence, courage, and boldness.

All of us realize that, in the final analysis, only people are important — only people make a difference. Any organization is a consequence of the people who comprise it. The University of Georgia is a great institution because of its people — past, present, future — individuals of vision, capacity, confidence, competence, and compassion.

Today, we are the beneficiaries and the stewards of the legacy which those who have gone before have provided. Mrs. Frances Hesselbein, former president and CEO of the Girl Scouts of America and more recently president

of the Peter Drucker Foundation, addressed a group of nonprofit leaders in Michigan not long ago. Mrs. Hesselbein asked us to reexamine our mission — our reason for being in business, if you please. She asked us to ask ourselves three main questions: "What is our business?" "Who are our customers?" "Who provides our support?"

As the new century unfolds, it will be increasingly evident that learning must, indeed, be a lifelong commitment for all learners, if individuals are to satisfactorily fulfill their aspirations in their career or professional activities, their personal lives, and their civic responsibilities.

This same exercise can appropriately be beneficial for higher education today. Mrs. Hesselbein also reminded us that "We must work on sloughing off yesterday's accomplishments for tomorrow's challenges." This statement becomes particularly intriguing as we review the critical points of higher education's history. Without question, today is another critical point in the history of our institutions of higher education. Unless we slough off yesterday's accomplishments and accept tomorrow's challenges, our institutions and our country will falter.

Surely there are no short-term answers. Any idea put into place today cannot be fully measured except in the passage of time. I challenge you now as leaders in higher education to so act that 50 years from now, astute observers will note that you were the cadre that influenced the evolution of high education, and reset its trajectory, dramatically responding to the challenges of your era.

May you as educational leaders respond, as did Chancellor Hill a century ago, with the boldness that our time demands.

I wish you Godspeed. ■