© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 15, Number 3, p. 151, (2011)
 ISSN 1534-6104

Berube, M. R., and Berube, C. T. (2010). *The Moral University*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Review by James J. Zuiches

This short monograph on *The Moral University* by Maurice R. Berube and Clair T. Berube focuses on a significant question in the history and culture of higher education. Does or should the university have a moral dimension in its educational activities, its research, and its relationship to society? The authors review the importance of ethics and morality in the various conceptions of the university, its curricula, and its leadership roles in society. They also discuss the impact of gender bias, and, implicitly, socioeconomic inequities, and the importance of an institutional position on these issues. Finally, they assess the state of the university in relation to the nation and propose a "profile of the exemplar moral university."

After a brief history of the conceptualization of the university, beginning with John Henry Cardinal Newman's "The Idea of a University," they sketch out the major competing theses of knowledge for its own sake in contrast to the usefulness of knowledge to society. This balanced summary of critics and proponents of a moral university sets the stage for the rest of the book. Unfortunately, it is so brief and uncritical that the reader must resort to drawing the connections among the references, rather than reading a well-constructed argument that compares, contrasts, and explicates implications.

The authors cite much research and seem to conclude that it is hard to translate theories of ethics, even with instructional case studies, into practice and that colleges often produce students who are smart and knowledgeable but still ethically challenged. However, they also note in a couple of places that service-learning courses and participation in community service facilitate the development of moral reasoning.

The authors provide a comparison of courses offered at private, public, and religious universities. Each institutional archetype has incorporated into the core curriculum or general education program courses that address questions of social justice, moral positions, and ethics. The authors conclude that "from the sample a modern curriculum should both emphasize the great moral philosophers and apply their principles to contemporary social justice problems" *(p. 21)*.

Two chapters deal with leadership for social change and the role of presidents and the community of scholars in demonstrating leadership, values, and ethics in education. The authors sketch out programs, experiences, and institutional commitment to public service, society, spirituality, and personal growth. They argue that when presidents of universities focus on fundraising instead of intellectual leadership, it is the faculty who must become the moral leaders, addressing significant societal problems with their research and their outreach programs.

One chapter addresses the significant social justice issue of gender bias in academia and its consequences for tenure, promotion, salary, and opportunities for women in science and administration. Another chapter addresses the relationship of the university to the nation and the tension that results when the university lends itself to purposes other than education, (i.e., the purposes and goals of government, the military, and industry often associated with research). They conclude, "The American university is far from finished in its development, and one must be ever vigilant to preserve its educational function free from outside influences that would compromise it" *(p. 51)*.

I would argue that there is an alternative way to frame the discussion. Rather than advocating vigilance to avoid "outside influences compromising" the university, one might frame the issue in terms of public-private partnerships, as engaged interaction, focused on the influences that are mutually beneficial and supportive of the purposes of democracy.

I was looking forward to reading Chapter 7, "Toward a Moral University," and discovering the characteristics and attributes of an exemplary moral university. Rather than directly addressing the question; however, the authors again provide examples of institutions and efforts that they think reflect appropriately on the engagement of universities with communities. More interestingly, the authors call for the faculty to perform their first moral responsibility of the transmission of knowledge, and assert that this also requires faculty members to be active research scholars. Unfortunately, this transmission of knowledge focuses only on the classroom and ignores the larger community.

One fascinating element of the book is the 2.5 years of e-mail correspondence cited from 16 public intellectuals, reflecting dialogues that the authors created with other scholars on these topics.

The authors conclude that universities are moral institutions with moral responsibilities to their constituencies, both students

and faculty members, and to their communities and the nation, and that there is mounting evidence that universities are increasingly evolving in a more moral direction.

I agree completely with their conclusion, but I am disappointed that in a monograph that cites work from the 19th century and literature through 2009, they completely miss the engagement of universities with communities that has permeated land-grant universities, public universities, urban serving universities, and now private universities as a result of the Carnegie Foundation elective classification in community engagement.

This major contemporary reframing of the university and its role in society began with Ernest Boyer *(1990)*, but it had its origin in the historical establishment of the land-grant universities as well as many private universities that adopted the principle of public service as a core function of the institution. The authors do recognize the public service role of the Morrill Act but fail to follow through on this insight.

Although the Morrill Act, which established land-grant universities, is often cited for its commitment to education of the "industrial classes," it was based on a commitment to economic development in the states, starting with the transfer of federal lands (the land grant) to the states to invest in educational programs. These programs were designated to include agriculture, the dominant industry at the time, engineering, military science, and liberal arts. The goal was to educate and train the population to apply their knowledge to the major issues of society: feeding, building, and protecting the nation, and good citizenship.

Private universities likewise were making a commitment to public service and outreach to the community. William Rainey Harper, aware of the success of the Extension movement at the University of Cambridge, incorporated it into the University of Chicago's mission statement in 1890. "The basic principle on which he would build a university was service—service not only to the students within its walls but also to the public, to mankind" *(Goodspeed, 1916/1972, p. 137)*. In 1893 the University of Chicago provided 122 courses in the evening and on Saturday for 20,000 teachers and others who wished to pursue college studies but who could not attend the university.

The land-grant universities introduced research, in particular through the agricultural experiment stations, which built on the German model of research to solve public needs, and in the early 20th century the land-grants introduced continuing education and

statewide Extension. North Carolina (NC) State University, for example, was founded in 1887 and in 1889 began to offer summer courses for public school teachers. North Carolina hired its first county extension agent in 1906, well before the 1914 Smith-Lever Act was passed.

Extending the educational resources of the university and the results of its research to diverse constituencies diffused across the nation. Agriculture flourished as a result of the scientific breakthroughs in the labs and the field, which were then rapidly communicated to the farm community. Many universities started an engineering extension program to serve the manufacturing sector of their states. In 1955 NC State University established the Industrial Extension Service, which currently has 16 sites to provide technical assistance, training, continuing education, and field support to manufacturing firms.

In 1995, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation funded the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, made up of presidents of land-grant universities and public universities, to address the commitment of universities to society. The reports of this commission *(1999, 2000)* reinvigorated student and community engagement. This commission articulated principles of engagement that include responsiveness, respect for partners, academic neutrality (often interpreted as maintaining academic integrity), access to the entire universities' resources, integration of engagement into the university for both students and faculty members, a mechanism of coordination on campus, and true resource partnerships. The goal is to be responsive to community needs while enriching student experiences and using the knowledge and expertise of the entire university, working with the community, to solve local problems.

The core values of engagement are the use of democratic processes, collaborative leadership, and mutual respect. I would argue that engagement with communities is completely congruent with the moral university. These values have driven the Extension and engagement programs at NC State University as well as at many universities as they pursue issues of educational equity, social justice, and public service.

For both students and faculty members, engagement is a vital concept whose time is now. Campus Compact is a national enterprise of over 1,100 institutions with presidential commitment to civic engagement of students through service-learning courses and public service activities. Even research universities are increasing

the visibility of civic engagement through The Research University Civic Engagement Network of 36 public and private universities that meet annually to support commitment to such engagement.

A major change in the way the disciplines of art, design, and humanities focus on public service resulted in the establishment of an organization 10 years ago called Imagining America, in which 81 universities actively demonstrate public engagement scholarship. The Coalition of Urban Serving Universities focuses on health and well-being, education and human capital development, and neighborhood and community development. The health education sector, with its medical, dental, nursing, and public health schools, created the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health to recognize and support faculty community-engaged scholarship. Additionally, in 1999 the Outreach Scholarship Partnership was established by the Pennsylvania State University, the University of Wisconsin–Extension, and The Ohio State University. The University of Georgia was added in 2003. Since 2003, the organization has added 11 universities and is called the National Outreach Scholarship Conference. The primary activity of the organization is sponsorship of an annual conference.

Many universities have created offices of engagement or community partnerships to emphasize the importance of this academic function within the institution. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) established the Engagement Academy, a week-long executive education program for university leaders. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (now the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities) established the C. Peter Magrath award for community engagement. There are now 33 refereed journals associated with the scholarship of engagement.

But most significantly, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching created a new elective classification of community engagement in 2006. This new classification raised the visibility and accountability of engagement in the university. The Carnegie Foundation through 2010 has recognized 297 universities and colleges, including public and private institutions, for the curricular engagement of their students and the community outreach and partnerships of their faculty. Eligibility for this recognition requires the incorporation of democratic processes in the identification of problems and their resolution, as well as documentation of the partnerships and the scholarship associated with those partnerships.

The Carnegie classification has contributed to institutionalizing community engagement in higher education and clearly created accountability for the moral activities of universities as they address significant community problems. If the diagnosis and solution of significant community problems—whether they relate to poverty, gender, educational inequality, environmental issues, or other concerns identified by the community—are included in the definition of social justice, they are congruent with the application of the universities' moral dimension.

I concur with the authors' insight that the moral university exists and is exercising a moral influence. The power of their assertion, however, would be substantially increased if they had included the significant documentation demonstrating the national expansion in the education, engagement, and actions of students and faculty in the moral dimension of the university.

References

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

Goodspeed, Thomas Wakefield. (1972). *The history of the University of Chicago—the first quarter century.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1916)

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Available from http://www.aplu.org/NetCommuunity/Page.aspx?pid=305

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (2000). *Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

About the Reviewer

James Zuiches is vice chancellor for Extension, engagement, and economic development at North Carolina State University The Office of the Vice Chancellor includes the Cooperative Extension Service, Industrial Extension Service, Small Business and Technology Development Center, noncredit programs of the Jane S. McKimmon Center for Extension and Continuing Education, the Economic Development Partnership, and the General H. Hugh Shelton Leadership Center, and outreach and public service programs of the colleges and other university programs. Zuiches earned his bachelor's degree in philosophy and sociology from the University of Portland, and his master's degree and Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Acknowledgement

Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement Associate Editor for Book Reviews, Ted Alter (who is Professor of Agricultural, Regional, and Environmental Economics at Penn State), and Editor, Trish Kalivoda (who is Senior Associate Vice President for Public Service and Outreach at the University of Georgia) thank Rowman & Littlefield, for providing complimentary copies of the book for this review.