© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 10, Number 2, p. 25, (2005)

Factors Influencing Civic Engagement at Australian and U.S. Research Universities: Two Illustrative Examples

Matthew Hartley, Alexandra Winter
Leroy D. Nunery II, Bruce Muirhead
Ira Harkavy

Abstract

The founding of the Australian system of higher education closely parallels the creation of public postsecondary education in the United States during the nineteenth century. Their subsequent histories reflect a growing recognition of postsecondary education's capacity to shape the economic prospects not only of individuals, but of entire nations. Less recognized are the ways individual institutions (which collectively constitute these systems) affect their local communities. In this article, we briefly outline the economic impact of postsecondary education in Australia and the United States and then describe how a research university in each country, the University of Pennsylvania in West Philadelphia and the University of Queensland, has served as a key anchor institution for its local area. A variety of factors are explored, including local context, funding sources, university leadership, and institutional mission.

Introduction

The founding of the Australian system of higher education closely parallels the creation of public postsecondary education in the United States during the nineteenth century. Each country invested, in part, out of pragmatic and economic motives. As the two systems expanded in the twentieth century, particularly after World War II, they helped firmly establish an educated middle class, which enabled the countries to compete in the postindustrial global economy. These histories reflect a growing recognition of postsecondary education's capacity to shape the economic prospects not only of individuals, but of entire nations. Less recognized are the ways in which individual institutions (which collectively constitute these systems) affect their local communities. In this article, we briefly outline the economic impact of postsecondary education in Australia and the United States and then describe how a research university in each country, the

University of Pennsylvania in West Philadelphia and the University of Queensland, has served as a key anchor institution for its local area.

The Economic Purposes of American Higher Education: A Historical Overview

Over the past two hundred years, America's postsecondary system has grown from a handful of small colleges to a diverse system of approximately four thousand public and private institutions. During this time, the economic purpose of American colleges and universities expanded from one principally aimed at serving local interests to encompassing state and national interests as well *(Benson, Harkavy, and Hartley, forthcoming)*.

America's nine colonial colleges were founded to train the future civic and religious leaders of a particular locale. These institutions (little more than academies initially) were also viewed as a means of supporting the local economy. The Brown brothers who provided the funding for their namesake institution in Providence, Rhode Island, with a notable absence of lofty sentiment, appealed to local businessmen for support by arguing that "building the college here will be the means of bringing great quantities of money into the place, and thereby greatly increasing the markets for all kinds of the country's produce, and consequently increasing the value of estates to which the town is a market" *(Cochran 1972)*. After the American Revolution, literally hundreds of colleges were founded in the next few decades by religious denominations whose ideals were coupled with the pragmatic desire to compete for members, financial support, and status. Colleges founded along the expanding frontier were also seen as cultural resources and economic assets, or at least portrayed as such by "real estate speculators" *(Brubaker and Rudy 1976)*.

In the nineteenth century, the states became primary beneficiaries of higher education when Congress passed the Morrill Acts (1862 and 1890), which gave material resources to the states in the form of land. The land-grant colleges that were subsequently created promoted both the teaching of trades and the application of scholarship to the practical needs of the states. When Charles Van Hise became the president of the University of Wisconsin in 1903, he underscored the link between the university and the economic fortunes of the state and worked with former classmate Governor Robert L. Follette to make "the boundaries of the university . . . the boundaries of the state." The

Wisconsin Idea, as it came to be known, focused academic resources on materially improving the life of citizens of that state *(Rudolph 1962, 355–72)*.

In the twentieth century, higher education's purpose broadened even further to serve national interests through the enactment of several key federal policies. Near the end of World War II, the U.S. government made an unprecedented investment in higher education through the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 (the G.I. Bill), which enabled 2.25 million veterans to attend colleges and universities across the country. The act was supported for a variety of reasons, chief among them the fear of a renewed economic depression spurred by a vast number of unemployed veterans. No one predicted the economic boom that resulted. Serendipitously, the veterans who attended college did so at precisely the time when manufacturing jobs began their decline only to be replaced by skilled (and higher-paying) labor. The G.I. Bill's inadvertent success provided convincing evidence of the efficacy of higher education as a means of remaining economically competitive. Subsequently, the recommendations of the Truman Commission on Higher Education in the 1950s led to the creation of a community college system, which increased access and provided vocational training. In 1958, in the midst of the Cold War, the National Defense Education Act created the first federal student loan program *(Hansen 1991)*. Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty produced the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (the Pell grants). The proportion of high school graduates attending college reached 45 percent by 1970 and by the end of the twentieth century exceeded 60 percent.

"Over the past two hundred years . . . the economic purpose of American colleges and universities expanded from one principally aimed at serving local interests to encompassing state and national interests as well."

The U.S. government also invested heavily in research. The National Institutes of Health achieved bureau status in 1943. Vannevar Bush, director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during World War II, wrote an influential report for President Roosevelt, which prompted the Truman administration

to establish the National Science Foundation (NSF) in 1950. These federal agencies, along with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), founded in 1958, invested heavily in research conducted at U.S. universities. The windfall had its price. Stuart Leslie *(1993)* argues persuasively that the capacious research and development grants doled out during the Cold War constrained intellectual freedom by rewarding only a narrow band of research aimed at pragmatic and economic ends. By 1964, $1.25 billion in federal funds had been allocated for academic research *(Cohen 1998)*. The emphasis on "usable" knowledge continued throughout the twentieth century, fueled in part by the Bayh-Dole act of 1980, which allowed universities to keep the proceeds from commercialized products produced through research funded by the federal government. According to recent statistics from the Association of University Technology Managers, commercialized intellectual property earned 142 colleges and universities $959 million in 2002 alone *(Foster 2004)*.

"[A] liberal education is valued for its social development of citizens, but citizenship is closely linked to nation building, in both social and economic terms."

The Economic Purposes of Australian Higher Education

Australian universities are overwhelmingly public institutions: of thirty-nine universities, only three are private organizations *(AVCC 2004)*. The first university was established in Sydney in 1850, in the context of the discovery of gold and associated expansion, closely followed by the University of Melbourne in 1853. The University of Queensland, discussed below, was not established until 1909. These early Australian universities were based on their British counterparts, but rather than turning to the great universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Australian universities drew inspiration from the secular and pragmatic orientation of the universities of London and Scotland *(Coaldrake and Stedman 1998, 8–11)*. Initially, their central task was building the British colony and their emphasis was, not surprisingly, on practical considerations such as engineering and the building of infrastructure rather than the pursuit of disinterested knowledge. The establishment of the University of Sydney, for example, was in

no small part motivated by the opening of the New South Wales bar and related requirements for legal training *(Coaldrake and Stedman 1998, 9)*:

> The need to find solutions pushed Australian education toward pragmatism rather than theory, and that tendency was assisted by the early universities, which saw themselves as creating a professional middle class to assist the development of the colonies, rather than as beacons of intellectual light and truth in the midst of a dark wasteland. *(Aitkin 1997, 40)*

An economic, or at least materialist, imperative has thus been central to the initial foundation of Australian universities.

As was the case in the United States, Australian universities helped produce an educated middle class. The social and cultural capital that is gained from higher education has been and continues to be closely linked to the distribution of economic capital, as well as avenues to pursue it *(Bourdieu 1986)*. Following World War II, there was a tremendous expansion in enrollment in the Australian universities. Returned servicemen took the opportunity to participate in higher education as part of the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme (CRTS), while the booming economy magnified the demand for skilled labor. There was also a pressing need to train a large cohort of teachers to cope with the influx of school-age baby boomers. In this climate of increasing demand, two key reports on tertiary education set the scene for the rapid expansion of publicly funded education, and for a shift from primarily state to increased federal funding. The Murray report of 1957 *(Murray 1957)* argued that the expansion of access to higher education was in the national interest, while the Martin Report of 1964 *(Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia 1964–65)* presented a more comprehensive case for a national investment in tertiary education and an egalitarian principle of access. In both reports, a liberal education is valued for its social development of citizens, but citizenship is closely linked to nation building, in both social and economic terms *(Marginson and Considine 2000)*. This general trend of access and equity culminated in the commonwealth funding of all higher education under Prime Minister Gough Whitlam in 1975, and higher education provision remained free in Australia until 1992, when the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS) was introduced.

Research on the Economic Benefits of Higher Education

Much of the research on the economic impact of higher education has tended to focus on the state or national level. A great deal of research demonstrates the economic value of higher education. Most notably, Gary S. Becker's analysis of earnings using U.S. 1950 census data provided convincing evidence that investment in a college education (tuition and earnings lost by stepping out of the workforce) yielded a 13 percent rate of return *(1964)*. Subsequent analysts have translated these individual economic benefits into collective ones by measuring increased worker productivity, lower unemployment, and higher wages, all of which yield more tax revenues. Various international studies argue that investment in higher education reaps economic rewards, both individually and socially *(Wolf 2002)*. In individual terms, Frank P. Larkins suggests that there are significant and direct economic benefits to be made by investing in higher education. For the individual, the benefits of higher education are economically measured as increased income, giving a private rate of return of 20.1 percent (although this is lower for the social sciences or humanities graduate). The social rate of return is between 12.1 and 8.7 percent *(Larkins 2001)*. Such studies, however, also tend to mention that it is extremely difficult to quantify the social and cultural contribution of higher education. The emphasis on research that can be commercialized or applied and strategic research evident in recent policy directions also asserts an important role for Australian universities as economic drivers, in which knowledge functions as a commodity *(Marginson 1997)*. This is reflected in the most recent financial statistics collated by the federal Department of Education, Science and Training, which show that in 2000 applied research accounted for 37.8 percent of research funds, pure basic research for 30.5 percent, strategic basic research for 37.5 percent, and experimental development for 7.7 percent. Similarly, education itself has become a saleable commodity, particularly in terms of the internationalization of education markets; the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee values Australian education exports at A$5.6 billion *(2004)*.

In a labor market characterized by short-term contracts and rapid change, higher education is increasingly regarded as crucial to national economic stability. The recent *Our Universities: Backing Australia's Future* released by federal Minister for Education Brendan Nelson *(2003b)* makes clear the importance of

universities as competitive players in a global knowledge economy in which information commodities and prosperity are closely linked and lifelong learning plays an important role in ameliorating workplace change.

While the connection between national prosperity and publicly funded education is a link that has been made in various forms for some years, for the past two decades the emphasis has been not only on economic output, but enabling this output by means of the internal restructuring of Australian universities in economic terms, with a focus on businesslike managerial structures and market-like competition between universities *(Marginson 1997; Marginson and Considine 2000)*. The restructuring of universities along economic lines began to be undertaken by the Hawke and Keating labor governments, in line with a general policy of neoliberal economic reform. The Dawkins reforms of the late 1980s, for example, introduced competition between universities, amalgamated universities, and colleges of technical and further education (TAFE) and reintroduced a user-pays system (albeit a deferred one). Successive Liberal governments have further advanced these market tendencies.

"In a labor market characterized by short-term contracts and rapid change, higher education is increasingly regarded as crucial to national economic stability."

In its most basic form, the neoclassical shift has entailed a shift from previous policies of equity and citizenship to the logic of the student and consumer and/or product, and education and knowledge as marketable commodities *(Marginson 1997)*, as evidenced in the internationalization of education and the increasing importance of the commercial arms of universities (indeed, the focus of this year's Research Week at the University of Queensland was on the commercialization of research).

More explicitly, a market depends on competition and a scarcity of resources, and the objectives of equity and marketization are obviously opposed. This produces some strange tensions in Australian universities: the vast majority of universities are commonwealth-funded public institutions subject to centralized policy decisions, while the neoclassical economic approach is characterized by an emphasis on diversity and competition. In the

context of such a quasi-market in higher education *(Marginson 1997)*, federal government maintains an overt financial obligation to universities and a rhetorical commitment to the role of universities in the community (although the frequent elision of community interests with economic prerogatives is telling). Interestingly, the return to a community engagement agenda seems to have gained a particular currency in the mid-1990s in Australia. This raises questions regarding the deployment of community partnerships as a genuine attempt to ameliorate the neoclassical restructuring of universities, or a manifestation of this same push. Michael Daxner argues for a middle ground in which the university, as an "academic corporation," must recognize the framework of stakeholders alongside the "non-functional" aspects of academia *(2001)*.

State lawmakers in the United States have tended to characterize the benefit of higher education in rather stark economic terms. Indeed, a 2001 Higher Educational Issues Survey, based on interviews with sixty-four state legislative leaders from all fifty states, found that support for state funding of higher education is strong; however, it also reveals that legislators view these institutions primarily as a means of promoting state economic development *(Ruppert 2001)*. A number of public institutions and systems have developed costly economic-impact studies to demonstrate the "payoff" on the investment lawmakers have made *(Potter 2003)*.

Whither the Local Community?

Lost in these larger discussions of state or national economic competitiveness is the very real impact that individual institutions (which constitute these "systems" of higher education) have on their local communities. Universities, even if they recruit students and faculty members nationally, are place-based: rooted in a particular locale. Critics have pointed out that the role of research universities as local institutional citizens has been less than exemplary. Universities in depressed urban settings barricade themselves behind iron gates. If economic "revitalization" occurs, it is on the university's terms and is produced by displacing longtime residents and erecting a gentrified residential and retail moat around the campus to shield it from surrounding neighborhoods. Once this is accomplished, the façade alleviates the anxieties of prospective customers (students) and their parents, which boosts application numbers and increases selectivity and prestige. University lab schools allow faculty children to avoid

the disastrous public system of education. Faculty members engage in research in the community: it is their "laboratory," and its proximity affords easy access to every kind of urban pathology. The theories derived from these studies are discussed and debated by erudite subdisciplinary associations at far-off conferences.

Happily, this bleak picture is fantastical (though it is an amalgam of elements we have seen on campuses). The point is that institutional economic self-interest has the capacity to horribly distort the civic mission of the university. Fortunately, many universities today have developed meaningful partnerships with local community-based organizations, municipal governments, and businesses to better serve the people who live there *(Maurasse 2001)*.

"A number of public institutions and systems have developed costly economic-impact studies to demonstrate the 'payoff' on the [higher education] investment lawmakers have made."

In many blighted urban areas, universities provide large, powerful, and stable economic centers that draw on local businesses and provide a sizable employment base. Richard Geruson noted a decade ago:

> There are a variety of roles that educational and medical organizations are already playing in their local areas. The more obvious roles are those as consumer/spender in the community, in the short term and the long term; investor in physical and human capital; provider of services through community outreach involving students and staff. *(1994, 70)*

Harkavy and Zuckerman *(1999)* have underscored the extent to which "eds and meds" (universities and medical centers) serve as key (though often overlooked) fixed assets for their local communities. Their analysis of employers in the twenty largest U.S. cities found that 550,000, or 35 percent, of the 1.6 million people working for the top ten private employers in these cities work at eds or meds. They go on to argue that the purchasing power, hiring practices, and influence on local real estate could allow universities and medical complexes to play a central role in economic revitalization efforts. A report recently issued by Initiative for a

Competitive Inner City (ICIC) and CEOs for Cities *(2002)* notes that more than half of American colleges and universities are located in or near urban centers. These urban institutions employ two million workers, and two-thirds of these positions are administrative and support staff positions—not faculty positions—and therefore filled through local or regional searches rather than national ones. Collectively, these institutions have significant purchasing power:

> In 1996, the latest year for which data is available, the more than 1,900 urban-core universities spent $136 billion on salaries, goods, and services—nine times greater than federal direct spending on urban business and job development in the same year. *(ICIC and CEOs for Cities 2002, 2)*

In the section that follows we offer two examples of institutions that have renewed their commitment to serving their local communities and that illustrate burgeoning civic engagement initiatives in Australia and the United States.

University of Pennsylvania

The University of Pennsylvania is a highly selective private research university located in West Philadelphia. Its twelve schools are located in 151 buildings on a 269-acre campus with open industrial space to the east and residential neighborhoods elsewhere. In 2003, Penn had more than 23,000 students, approximately half graduates and half undergraduates, and 2,400 standing faculty members. With 22,000 employees, including those from the university health system, Penn is the largest private employer in the city, with an operating budget of $3.59 billion.

Penn had long served as an important employer in West Philadelphia. It also played a role as a cultural resource for the greater Philadelphia region. However, a number of factors impelled the University to pursue a more active partnership with other West Philadelphia organizations. Philadelphia was in decline during the latter half of the twentieth century. From 1950 to 1990, its population diminished from more than two million to fewer than 1.6 million residents. As in many older American cities, the rise of the new knowledge economy brought about a sharp decline in manufacturing jobs; knowledge work did not require an urban setting with its critical mass of workers. When jobs disappeared, people began leaving the city, and vacant homes and

storefronts marred an increasingly bleak urban landscape. The housing market weakened appreciably. In an effort to revitalize the area in the mid-1950s, Penn purchased and demolished the adjoining neighborhood of "Black Bottom," which strained university-community relations for decades to come. As economic conditions declined, the area surrounding the university increasingly was plagued with crime.

In 1992, Penn's Center for Community Partnerships (CCP) was founded by retiring president Sheldon Hackney. CCP was created to promote and coordinate student and faculty involvement in West Philadelphia. The use of the term "partnerships" in the center's name represented an acknowledgment of Penn's interdependence as one institutional citizen participating in the broader civic life of West Philadelphia. Internally, CCP's creation symbolized a presidential commitment to realigning the efforts of the University to better serve its neighbors.

". . . CCP's creation symbolized a presidential commitment to realigning the efforts of the University to better serve its neighbors."

In 1994, the Board of Trustees selected Judith Rodin to succeed President Hackney. Rodin had grown up in West Philadelphia and attended Penn graduate school. After a distinguished academic career culminating in her role as provost of Yale University, the board of trustees selected Rodin in part because of her commitment to improving Penn's local environment. To achieve that far-reaching goal and to rejuvenate undergraduate education, Rodin established the Provost's Council on Undergraduate Education and charged it with designing a model for Penn's undergraduate experience in the twenty-first century. The Council's work emphasized the action-oriented union of theory and practice and "engagement with the material, ethical, and moral concerns of society and community defined broadly, globally, and also locally within Philadelphia" *(Provost's Council on Undergraduate Education 1995, S-1)*.

Since that time, CCP has helped to develop more than 150 service-learning courses taught by Penn faculty from diverse disciplines. The highly publicized murder of a student in 1996 convinced President Rodin that to enact change expeditiously, the university had to take the lead role. Rodin made significant

changes to the administrative structure of Penn. For example, the Board of Trustees created a standing committee on Neighborhood Initiatives. The position of Vice President for Government, Public and Community Affairs was created, to whom the director of CCP reported. An Office of Facilities and Real Estate Services was formed through the merger of two other offices to coordinate the purchasing, development, and sale or rental of off-campus real estate. Between 1998 and 2004, 386 Penn-affiliated households bought homes in University City, a section of West Philadelphia, and 75 percent had mortgages less than $150,000. The Graduate School of Education began working with the Philadelphia School District and the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers to plan a new university-assisted elementary school. Monthly meetings were held between university officials and members of neighborhood organizations and civic groups to discuss ongoing plans. Open community meetings were also held to encourage dialogue.

In addition, Penn instituted an aggressive economic revitalization program:

- Penn actively sought to give their patronage to local suppliers. In 1996, Penn's purchases from West Philadelphia businesses came to $20.1 million; by 2003 that amount had grown to $61.6 million.
- Penn supported construction of a $95 million Sansom Common retail and hotel facility and a multimillion-dollar biomedical research building that relied heavily on local and minority labor. In the short term 170 new construction jobs were created; later more than two hundred permanent jobs were filled by West Philadelphia residents.
- Penn also purchased dozens of nearby homes, refurbished them, and resold them at or below cost to ensure that local families were able to purchase them. It provided financial incentives for Penn faculty to purchase homes in the area as well.
- Crime reports from Penn's division of public safety indicate that overall crime has dropped 40 percent: robberies by 56 percent, assaults by 28 percent, burglaries by 31 percent, and auto thefts by 76 percent.

In 2004, President Rodin was succeeded by Amy Gutmann, a highly distinguished political philosopher whose scholarly work focused on the role universities can play in advancing democratic education and democratic societies. In her inaugural address on

October 15, 2004, President Gutmann presented a bold, comprehensive "Penn Compact" unprecedented in its intention to have Penn fulfill its responsibility "to serve humanity and society." Among other far-reaching goals, she observed:

> Through our collaborative engagement with communities all over the world, Penn is poised—and I think uniquely poised—to advance the central values of democracy in a great urban city: life, liberty, opportunity, and mutual respect. *(2004)*

Gutmann's vision, if achieved, would entail the university's transcending academic and disciplinary excellence and aligning the work of the institution with the needs of a diverse democracy. It would also mean recognizing and developing institutional policies to mitigate market forces that influence research and commodify higher education *(Bok 2003)*.

University of Queensland

The University of Queensland is a public university with 38,139 students, including 10,313 postgraduates and 6,396 international students. The university's 5,081 administrative staff and 2,078 academic staff support 4,000 courses and 380 programs; its total operating revenue was A$814,450 million in 2002. University of Queensland assets include 1,940 hectares of land on which stand 692 buildings with an asset replacement value of A$705 million.

Like Penn, the University of Queensland (UQ) has grappled with its relationship with its local community throughout its history. Its founding in 1906 was auspicious: a University Congress produced a draft bill for the establishment of UQ, and a single theme dominated the document: the usefulness of a university to satisfy the needs of the community. The University of Queensland was established by an Act of State Parliament on December 10, 1909. Its foundation four months later made it the first university in the state and the fifth in the nation. In 1911, eighty-three students (including twenty-three women) attended the first classes in Government House, George Street, Brisbane. In 1922, Sir Matthew Nathan reminded Queensland of how the university was benefiting the state, in terms of agricultural and industrial outcomes *(Thomis 1985)*. During this period, community-based research had great popular appeal, providing justification for the existence of the university. Putting scientific and technological knowledge and skill to work on precise problems

of Queensland life was a virtue of the academic's performance; in this way, UQ was doing the job for which it was created *(Senate, 16 July 1920; cited in Thomis 1985)*. In 1936, there was increasing pressure for the funding of pure research and knowledge. However, in March 1944, the *Courier-Mail* stated that many people were disappointed that the university had done so little to stimulate the general intellectual and cultural life of the state. A year later, the *Sunday Mail* argued that the university had maintained a "lofty indifference to the world" *(Thomis 1985, 222)*.

In 1965, Opposition spokesman J. E. Duggan stated that the university's responsibility was to "train personnel to serve the economy and the requirements of industry" *(Thomis 1985, 222)*. During this period, Vice-Chancellor Schonell encouraged staff to involve themselves within the local community and to counteract the existing unfavorable publicity relating to Commemoration festivities. In 1981, the Business School established the Department of Management to respond to the needs of the local business community. This university-community relationship, reflecting a changing understanding of community in relation to economic goods, received a hostile reception from *Semper Floreat* (the student newspaper) and some academic staff. In the late 1980s, there was growing pressure to make universities more accountable to society. Thomis warned that "members of the university community can expect to find themselves under continuing public scrutiny and with increasing need to justify their existence and activities to government and societies" *(1985, 392)*.

"It has been critically important for UQ to remain sufficiently alive to changing social needs to deserve still the description 'a people's university.'"

Even within the current context of the marketization of education, UQ continues to develop its role within the local community and society, and to address major practical problems, such as the ongoing inaccessibility of universities to Aboriginal and working-class students. It has been critically important for UQ to remain sufficiently alive to changing social needs to deserve still the description "a people's university" *(Jones 1982)*.

In response to this ongoing challenge and under the leadership of UQ President and Vice-Chancellor Professor John Hay, UQ's

current stated mission is "to create a community dedicated to achieving national and international levels of excellence in teaching, research and scholarship" and make "significant contributions to the intellectual, cultural, social and economic life of the State . . . and . . . nation" *(University of Queensland Senate 2002, 18)*. This mission is developed through a rolling series of five-year plans that express the mission in terms of long-term strategic objectives and operational priorities in the areas of teaching and learning, research and research training, management and resources, and community partnerships.

The mission of UQ includes making a significant contribution to the intellectual, cultural, social, and economic life of the state of Queensland. Among its key operational objectives, one of the immediate priorities is to increase engagement in mutually beneficial partnerships with a particular focus on regional organizations. And within its commitment to community partnerships, its key strategic objectives include

- to develop closer and more numerous links with the community of which it is part;
- to collaborate in strategic activities for community benefit with industry, business, and professional groups and with instrumentalities at city, state, national, and international levels;
- to champion the role of education and research in underpinning the economic health and social well-being of local, state, national, and international communities;
- to build on the university's strengths in the services it is able to offer the community, helping to find and promote innovative and sustainable solutions to community challenges.

In a direct expression of this mission, the UQ Senior Executive set about instigating a facilitating agency between the university and the west region of Brisbane via the newly established UQ Ipswich campus. The "UQ Boilerhouse" Community Service and Research Centre was launched in 1999 and established its goal to work in partnership with, and have support from, all UQ faculties. The Centre strategically integrates research, teaching, and learning in service and engagement to the needs and aspirations of the university's local communities. The research, teaching, and learning programs and processes of mutual engagement have been directed toward the development, improvement, and enhancement of both the community and the university through applied scholarship. Over time, the Centre has

purposefully become a noncompetitive research, development, and facilitating agency, resourced and supported to develop as a university-wide entity "incubator" that helps strengthen the problem-solving work of the university. It has established itself as a new kind of Australian university-community organization.

The most significant engaged and strategic research, teaching, and learning project undertaken by UQ through the Centre has been the Goodna Service Integration Project. Following the murder of an Ipswich resident in 1999, the Centre facilitated regular and informal breakfast meetings involving key community leaders. These meetings focused on understanding and developing collaboration strategies for improved community well-being in the broader western region. This region is typical of numerous transitional peri-urban communities experiencing long-term and significant social, economic, and environmental challenges. In collaboration with UQ academics, the community leaders collaboratively created the Service Integration Project and its interprofessional leadership accredited and short courses.

Six years later, the academically based engaged learning courses continue to purposefully integrate research, teaching, and learning to collaboratively solve local city issues. Since the first breakfast meeting, the project has injected external funding of more than A$1.2 million into the regional economy. (It is estimated that the Ipswich campus injects more than A$20 million into the local economy.) The most recent (2001/02) data for the Ipswich Police District confirms that recorded crime in the region is decreasing *(Management Advisory Committee 2004)*.

In terms of scholarship and developing new knowledge, the courses have been awarded the 2002 University of Queensland Teaching and Learning Student Enhancement Award and been a finalist in the 2002 and 2003 Australian Award for University Teaching. Most recently they have been recognized by Victoria's Western Region Moving Forward project, Queensland Training Awards 2004, and were one of ten national projects featured alongside the Sydney Olympics, the response to the Bali bombings, and the National Illicit Drugs Strategy in the Australian Government's *Connecting Government: Whole of Government Responses to Australia's Priority Challenges* report. Finally, in 2004 the Centre's role in informing and fulfilling UQ's engaged scholarship agenda was acknowledged in the Australian Universities Quality Agency Review and the Vice-Chancellor's UQ Ipswich Review.

Analysis: The University of Pennsylvania and the University of Queensland illustrate the promise and the continuing challenge of reorienting the mission of elite research-intensive universities to embrace civic engagement. As we have discussed, there are numerous factors that tend to militate against such efforts. In the United States, government and foundations have tended to reward research directed toward serving narrow national interests (e.g., defense) rather than solving local problems. In both countries, the notion of conducting community-based research remains contested by some faculty members who value "pure" over applied research. However, several factors have influenced local engagement.

"In both countries, the notion of conducting community-based research remains contested by some faculty members who value 'pure' over applied research."

1. LOCATION: The evolving local context of these universities had significantly shaped the nature of civic engagement. Presidents Hackney and Rodin (and the board of trustees) were in many respects compelled to respond to the problems of urban West Philadelphia. By contrast, the University of Queensland's oldest and most established campus (St. Lucia) is in a middle-class neighborhood, and community partnering is arguably less of an imperative than at UQ's peri-urban campuses such as Ipswich and Gatton, where the university is actively involved in community consultation and development. For example, the Goodna Service Integration Project focuses on service provision, community-government relations, and community well-being in an area that is economically and socially marginalized. In short, civic engagement is in part a response to pressing need.
2. WHOEVER PAYS THE PIPER CALLS THE TUNE: Pragmatic and prosaic reasons for local civic engagement stem from the fact that universities must remain keenly attuned to the constituents that sustain them. Here some important differences emerge. UQ is heavily reliant on government funding and is subject to central policy directives. More recent initiatives have redirected attention to community-based research. However, the rationale for the policy

shift is to some degree economic. Unlike American institutions, Australian universities have a limited tradition of private bequests and donations. Today, in a context of neoliberal economic reform, Australian universities are increasingly turning to the community as a source of funding. Public universities are also being exhorted by the government to work with community in the context of the much discussed rolling back of the welfare state.

Penn is a private university. Its strategic decisions are shaped by the hypercompetitive higher education market in the United States and a desire to secure the best faculty and students. Tuition continues to be a large (if not the largest) single source of income for the great majority of American colleges and universities, even elite private universities with large endowments. Therefore, shifting perceptions of prospective students (and their parents) about safety at Penn and fears that these would translate into declining enrollment and retention prompted Penn's president and the board of trustees to enact Penn's agenda of engagement.

3. University Leadership and institutional mission: The aforementioned contextual issues suggest that civic engagement is based on self-interest and self-preservation. However, we argue that at both institutions the engagement with community also expresses long-held institutional ideals. Organizational values and ideals also impel change. Penn might have erected iron gates and shut the community out (as one trustee suggested in the 1980s). However, Penn's legacy of pragmatism (as espoused by its founder, Benjamin Franklin) has throughout its history directed the institution's efforts toward the resolution of real-world problems. Successive presidents—Hackney, Rodin, and Gutmann—have expressed Penn's recent commitment to this democratic purpose through the creation of infrastructure (the Center for Community Partnerships) and by rhetorically underscoring Penn's mission to serve not only the world (as an elite research university) but the community of which it is a part. UQ's leadership has similarly, albeit more recently, made a commitment in terms of mission statement and strategic objectives, leadership, and infrastructure (the Community Service and Research Centre). For both institutions the engagement with community appears to

consist of an "enlightened self-interest," coupled with a rhetoric befitting an Enlightenment vision of the university. For Penn, the motivating factor has been physical safety of staff and students and the threat of declining enrollment, whereas for UQ there has been significant emphasis on community partnerships in a context of decreasing funding and the necessity of diversified funding sources. Crucially, these are economic drivers. But there is also an abiding interest in fulfilling a larger, nobler public purpose. For the civic engagement effort in both these countries to prosper, there must not only be a need; there must also be a desire of individuals on campuses to take on this important work of maintaining these democracies.

References

Aitkin, D. 1997. Education in Australia: Its structure, context and evolution. In *Australia's future universities*, edited by J. Sharpham and G. Harman, 37–48. Armidale, N.S.W.: University of New England Press.

Association of Commonwealth Universities. 2001. *Engagement as a core value for the university: A consultation document*. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee. 2004. Key data on higher education. http://www.avcc.edu.au/documents/publications/stats/DataCardOct04.pdf (accessed 10 November 2004).

Becker, G. S. 1964. *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis*. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.

Benson, L., I. Harkavy, and M. Hartley. Forthcoming. Problem-solving service learning in university-assisted schools as one practical means to develop democratic schools, democratic universities, and a democratic good society. In *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*, edited by T. Chambers, J. Burkhardt, and A. J. Kezar. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Bohman, J. 1996. *Public deliberation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Bok, D. 2003. *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1986. Forms of capital. In *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, edited by John G. Richardson, 241–58. New York: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1993. *Sociology in question*. Translated by Richard Nice. London: Sage.

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bringle, R. G., and J. A. Hatcher. 2000. Meaningful measurement of theory-based service-learning outcomes: Making the case with quantitative research. Special issue *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Fall): 68–75.

Brown, L., and B. Muirhead. 2001. The civic mission of Australian universities. *Engaged Perspectives 1*: 1–15.

Brubaker, J. S., and W. Rudy. 1976. *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636–1976*. New York, N.Y.: Harper and Row.

Coaldrake, P., and L. Stedman. 1998. *On the brink: Australia's universities confronting their future*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Cochran, T. C. 1972. *Business in American life: A history*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, A. M. 1998. *The shaping of American higher education*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia. 1964–65. *Tertiary education in Australia: Report of the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia to the Australian Universities Commission*. 3 vols. [Melbourne]: Australian Universities Commission.

Dawkins, J. S. 1988. *Higher education: A policy statement*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Daxner, M. 2001 The responsibility of the university in a globalized world. Paper given at The Role of the University in Global Capacity Building symposium, Aalborg University, Denmark. http://www.ia-up.org/daxner.doc (accessed 20 November 2004).

Department of Education, Science and Training. 2000. Research expenditure: Selected higher education statistics. http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/statistics/researchexpend/research_2000.pdf (accessed 11 November 2004).

Dow, G. 1999. Economic rationalism versus the community: Reflections of social democracy and state capacity. *Australian Journal of Social Issues 34*(3): 209–29.

Elkington, J. 1997. *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford: Capstone.

Elkington, J. 2001. *The chrysalis economy: How citizen CEOs and corporations can fuse values and value creation*. Oxford: Capstone.

Elster, J., ed. 1998. *Deliberative democracy: Cambridge studies in the theory of democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Etzkowitz, H., A. Webster, C. Gebhardt, and B. R. C. Terra. 2000. The future of the university and the university of the future: Evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm. *Research Policy 29*: 313–30.

Foster, A. L. 2004. Who should own science? *Chronicle of Higher Education 51*(6): A33.

Friedman, M. 1998. The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. In *Perspectives in business ethics*, edited by L. P. Hartman, 246–51. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Garlick, S. 2000. *Engaging universities and regions*. Canberra: DETYA Evaluations and Investigations Programme.

Geruson, R. 1994. Higher education and medical complexes: The key to revitalizing West Philadelphia. *Universities and Community Schools 4*(102): 70–71.

Gibbons, M., C. Limoges, H. Nowotny, S. Schwarzman, P. Scott, and M. Trow. 1994. *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

Gilbert, R. 1987. The concept of social practice and modes of ideology critique in schools. *Discourse 7*(2): 37–54.

Glaser, B. 1992. *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence vs. forcing*. Mill Valley, Calif.: Sociology Press.

Gutmann, Amy. 2004. Inaugural address. University of Pennsylvania, 15 October. http://www.upenn.edu/secretary/inauguration/speech.html.

Guttman, A., and D. Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and disagreement*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hansen, J. 1991. The roots of federal student aid policy. In *The changing dimensions of student aid*, edited by J. P. Merisotis, 3–19. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Harkavy, I., and H. Zuckerman. 1999. *Eds and meds: Cities' hidden assets*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Hauser, G. A. 1999. *Vernacular voices: The rhetoric of publics and public spheres*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press.

Holland, B. A. 2000. Characteristics of "engaged institutions" and sustainable partnerships, and effective strategies for change. In Conference Proceedings, Invitational Conference on Civic Engagement, Trinity College, Hartford.

Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (ICIC) and CEOs for Cities. 2002. *Leveraging colleges and universities for urban economic revitalization: An action agenda*. Boston: Initiative for a Competitive Inner City; CEOs for Cities.

Isaacs, P. 1998. Medicine, social practices, and the nature of medical ethics. Unpublished paper presented at the Society for Health and Human Values Spring Regional Meeting, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio.

Jones, B. 1982. *Sleepers, wake! Technology and the future of work*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Kerr, C. 1982. *The uses of the university*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Langford, G. 1985. *Education, persons and society: A philosophical enquiry*. Hampshire: Macmillan.

Larkins, F. P. 2001. The economic benefits of Australian university degrees: Bachelor and research higher degrees. *Australian Economic Review 34*(4): 403–14.

Leslie, Stuart. 1993. *The Cold War and American science: The military-industrial-academic complex at MIT and Stanford*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Management Advisory Committee. 2004. *Connecting government: Whole of government responses to Australia's priority challenges*. Canberra: Management Advisory Committee.

Marginson, S. 1997. *Markets in education*. St. Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen and Unwin.

Marginson, S., and M. Considine. 2000. *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Maurasse, D. 2001. *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.

Muirhead, B., P. Graham, and L. Brown. 2002. *Redefining excellence: A strategic policy platform for Victorian higher education and community engagement*. [Melbourne]: Office of Higher Education, Victorian Government, Australia.

Mumford, A., ed. 1997. *Action learning at work*. Aldershot, U.K.: Gower.

Murray, K. 1957. *Report of the Committee on Australian Universities*. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer.

Nelson, B. 2003a. *Higher education at the crossroads: An overview paper*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.

Nelson, B. 2003b. *Our universities: Backing Australia's future*. Canberra: Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts.

Potter, W. 2003. Public colleges try to show their value to states, but not everyone is convinced. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 May, A26.

Poynter, J., and C. Rasmussen. 1996. *A place apart: The University of Melbourne: Decades of challenge*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Provost's Council on Undergraduate Education. 1995. The 21st century Penn undergraduate experience: Phase I. *University of Pennsylvania Almanac*, May.

Rudolph, F. 1962. *The American college and university: A history*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Ruppert, S. S. 2001. *Where we go from here: State legislative views on higher education in the new millennium*. Littleton, Colo.: National Education Association of the United States.

Strauss, A., and J. Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Sunderland, N., and P. Graham. 1998. The importance of academic community in higher learning: Alternatives to a drive-thru education. Paper presented at the Third Pacific Rim Conference on the First Year in Higher Education: Strategies for Success in Transition Years, Auckland Institute of Technology.

Thomis, M. I. 1985. *A place of light and learning—The University of Queensland's first seventy-five years*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.

Tierney, W. G., ed. 1998. *The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

University of Queensland Senate. 2002. *Annual report of the University of Queensland*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland.

Warehime, N. 1993. *To be one of us: Conflict, creative democracy and education*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Watson, D. 2002. What is the university for? Public lecture paper. University of Kent, U.K.

Wolf, A. 2002. *Does education matter?: Myths about education and economic growth*. London: Penguin.

About the Authors

• Matthew Hartley is an assistant professor of education at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education. His research and publications focus on academic governance, organizational change, and civic engagement efforts at colleges and universities.

• Alexandra Winter is a research fellow at the Institute for Educational Research, Policy and Evaluation. As part of the Australian Consortium on Higher Education, Community Engagement and Social Responsibility she is researching theories and strategies of community engagement in Australian higher education.

• Leroy D. Nunery II, M.B.A., Ed.D., is vice president, Business Services for the University of Pennsylvania. He is Penn's principal business officer and has responsibility for its economic inclusion program, skills development initiatives, and several community development efforts.

• Bruce Muirhead is the founding director and professor of the Institute for Educational Research, Policy and Evaluation. As an educationalist, Bruce has a background in social justice policy, strategic planning, research, and practice within the community and government sector.

• Ira Harkavy is associate vice president and founding director of the Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania. A historian with extensive experience building university-community-school partnerships, Dr. Harkavy served as consultant to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to help create its Office of University Partnerships. He is the recipient of Campus Compact's Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service Learning, and under his directorship the Center for Community Partnerships received the inaugural William T. Grant Foundation Youth Development Prize sponsored in collaboration with the National Academy of Sciences' Board on Children, Youth, and Families and a Best Practices/Outstanding Achievement Award from HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research.