© *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, Volume 9, Number 1, p. 53, (2004)

Real Time, Real Life Journeys Toward Institutional Engagement

Margaret A. Adamek
Theodore Alter
Jeffrey Bridger
John Ferrick
Kenneth Shapiro

Abstract

Creating a culture of engagement on college campuses requires investment and energy at the individual and institutional level. For a decade, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has sponsored the Food Systems Professions Education initiative involving thirteen land-grant colleges of agriculture and their partners, designed to transform higher education and the food system. This endeavor was conceived to foster a culture of engagement and encourage outreach scholarship. Important lessons can be learned from this process, gleaned from individual and institutional examples of engagement. Learning more about the historical context for change in higher education, partnerships between philanthropy and land-grant colleges of agriculture, and theories of implementing organizational change can all contribute to our collective knowledge about institutional change and engagement. Reward systems and scholarly praxis are emphasized in this exploration.

The epigraph from E. M. Forster's novel, *Howard's End,* states "Only connect." This apt, simple statement summarizes the impulse to engage—as institutions, scholars, and citizens. As higher education responds to the Kellogg Commission report on institutional engagement, Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution *(Kellogg Commission 1999)*, it is critical that the literature provide concrete examples of individual and institutional efforts to connect in various units and disciplines. This article explores the inclination to "connect," recounting how a recent, purposeful nationwide initiative to change land-grant colleges of agriculture fits within a larger, longer trajectory of organizational change around questions of public influence, civic involvement, and the academy.

Engagement, in the context of this paper, is understood as a process by which "institutions . . . have redesigned their teaching,

research and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined" *(Kellogg Commission 1999)*. During the last decade, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation invested $30 million in the Food Systems Professions Education (FSPE) program, intended to stimulate transformative, sustainable change in public universities and the food system with the ultimate aim of developing a culture of engagement in land-grant universities *(W. K. Kellogg Foundation 2001)*. This article articulates FSPE's best practices and institutional outcomes. It also describes the context and setting for this effort, including social ideals about the civic role of higher education, the relationship between philanthropic and academic sectors, historical and emergent definitions of engagement, and approaches to generating change in land-grant universities.

Investments in Change: Philanthropy and Agricultural Science

For several decades, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation supported various efforts to generate civic engagement in higher education and multiple initiatives fostering a sustainable food system and vibrant rural communities *(W. K. Kellogg Foundation 2000)*. A decade ago, the foundation launched FSPE—an ambitious agenda for institutional change that combined these priorities—based on intriguing historical philanthropic precedents and a groundswell of calls for change within colleges of agriculture. Change is a constant in American higher education *(Castagnera 2002–2003, Cohen 1998, Bourdieu 1977)*. FSPE was premised on this rich history of change in higher education, democratic principles of land-grant universities, profound influence of land-grant colleges of agriculture (LGCAs) on the architecture of the global food system and American rural communities, and the historic precedent of

"The slow exodus of population from farm to city and the Cold War flurry to build 'research institutions' significantly shifted the role, purpose, and public covenant of LGCAs and higher education more generally."

philanthropic collaboration on major social change through public, agricultural entities *(National Research Council Board on Agriculture 1995, Berry 1996, Keller 2001, Medina López Portillo 2002).*

The notion that philanthropy and public research universities could play a critical role in producing knowledge to resolve global food concerns is not new *(Sears 1922, National Research Council Board on Agriculture 2003).* The unleashing of the Green Revolution was the result of the Rockefeller Foundation's philanthropic partnership with agricultural science and was largely responsible for the development of hybrid, disease-resistant crops created for developing countries plagued with chronic hunger. The Green Revolution represented a fundamental shift in how food was produced, forever altering on a global scale the way communities produce and consume food and construct economies to facilitate and sustain food systems *(Borlaug 1972, Perkins 1998, Shiva 1989, Medina 2002).* Core to this movement was the land grant college of agriculture and its research and outreach enterprises.

Calls for and Responses to Change in the LGCA

Closer to home, social forces also contributed to changing the role and function of LGCAs. The slow exodus of population from farm to city and the Cold War flurry to build "research institutions" significantly shifted the role, purpose, and public covenant of LGCAs and higher education more generally *(Chomsky et al.1997).* As the U.S. food system became primarily industrial, public investment in land-grant universities and agricultural research began a precipitous downslide, as did the family farm and the fabric of rural communities *(Berry 1996, Wilkinson 1991).* And the democratic ideal of academic engagement in community life was eclipsed by careerism, the search for disciplinary prestige, and increasingly close connections between land-grants and the private sector *(Cooper 1999, Giroux 2002).*

> *"FSPE was designed to . . . involve the institutional and organizational status quo in a positive, proactive way."*

In the 1990s, a robust dialogue involving leading scholars and administrators from LGCAs gave rise to burgeoning calls for

change, including a return to the civic roots of the land-grant university, a reexamination of public investment in higher education, an arrest of the increasing disengagement of LGCAs from community life, and proactive responses to troublesome concerns about the ecological, economic, and social sustainability of the global food system *(Bonnen 1996, Schuh 1993, National Research Council Board on Agriculture 1992b)*. James Meyer, chancellor emeritus of the University of California system, published a series of monographs addressing the history and philosophy of LGCAs, challenges preventing critical change efforts, and a template around which these colleges could mold themselves *(Meyer 1992, 1995)*. The National Academy of Sciences and the USDA also published widely read books on postsecondary agriculture education and its impact on the future food system *(National Research Council Board on Agriculture 1992a, Kunkel, Maw and Skaggs 1996)*. The design, approach, and goals of the FSPE initiative emerged from this historical, political, and social milieu.

In proactive response, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation launched FSPE. Thirteen land-grant universities, with most projects residing within LGCAs, received major, multiyear support to build collaborations with an additional 127 institutions of higher education, including community colleges, other regional land-grant state universities, and relevant nonprofit organizations. At the onset of the program, the two major objectives of the FSPE were to *(W. K. Kellogg Foundation 2003)*:

- Encourage land-grant universities to involve community stakeholders and meet their changing needs, and continue to make institutional changes necessary to serve effectively through the twenty-first century.
- Bring about significant positive change in university-based education.

FSPE was designed as an intentional and internal change mechanism created as much to make an impact on the faculty reward system and institutional engagement as to generate education and outreach that facilitated a sustainable food system.

At the same time that FSPE unfolded using a grassroots and local model for change, recommendations were published by the National Academy of Sciences proposing that LGCAs offer *(National Research Council 1997)*:

- more relevant and accessible offerings through the inclusion of more diverse perspectives in LGCA programs, audiences, and stakeholders;
- creation of open, seamless, and highly collaborative institutional culture that builds relationships and encourages interdisciplinary, inter-institutional, and intercultural alliances;
- stronger connections between teaching, research, and extension functions while more deeply demonstrating the land-grant philosophy of institutional engagement and accessibility;
- improved accountability and evaluation mechanisms to become even better stewards of public resources and needs.

Clearly, there was significant conceptual symmetry about the direction, future, and role of LGCAs in American society. Embedded in the priorities and change agendas of both the National Research Council and the FSPE initiative was a clear commitment to outreach scholarship and engagement.

LGCAs, FSPE, and Their Role in the Engagement Movement

"The ethos of partnership, engagement, and public involvement impelled the processes for institutional change and redefinition of scholarship and faculty rewards."

This momentum in LGCAs was particularly salient in light of a broader, growing movement around outreach scholarship and institutional engagement in American higher education. Historically, LGCAs and the closely affiliated extension services exemplified "institutional engagement," encompassing expert-driven, research-based knowledge that contributed through technology transfer to economic vitality of rural communities and agricultural enterprises *(Knapp 1910)*. In more recent years, a new paradigm of engagement has surfaced—one based on collaborative relationships where learning and contribution to the public good is shared among all participants *(Peters 1996)*. This shifting definition of engagement gained further visibility following the 1997 Kellogg Commission report on institutional engagement. This document gave credence to both the historical commitment to public work and partnership of LGCAs and extension ervices and the newly emerging definitions of

engagement as reciprocal partnerships in knowledge production and social development *(Kellogg Commission 1999)*. The NASULGC Presidents' Commission emerged out of the FSPE program, where the call for increased social engagement and relevance was a key part of organizational change nationwide in LGCAs.

Change as a Process

Change in higher education is usually stimulated by crisis or intention. *Transformational* change is most often instigated by sudden shifts in extenuating circumstances that disrupt or puncture organizational stability, resulting in radical or revolutionary change *(Gersick 1991)*. *Transformational change* focuses on shifting the deep structure of an institution, where such fundamental elements of the organization as curricular content, funding sources, and epistemological orientations are profoundly altered over the long term. *Transitional* change in higher education emerges through an intentional strategic planning process that charts priorities and offers an accompanying framework for incremental action to successfully achieve these objectives *(Gersick 1991)*. *Transitional change* demands deliberation and intention, focusing on questions of climate, programs and services, and is oriented toward the mid term.

"Systemic institutional change happens when there is impetus for, commitment to, and alignment with the change agenda from all layers of the organization."

FSPE as a Change Process

The FSPE process was an investment in transformational change, with resources from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation used to leverage changes in the deep structure of participating organizations. While the FSPE initiative demonstrates the traits of transformational change, it has also featured the intentional nature of transitional change and involved those systems (administrative units) typically seen as the agents of incremental changes. This hybrid identity suggests that FSPE was designed to evoke major systems changes in the deepest values, policies, and organizational structures, while involving the resources positioned to support and encourage transitional change. FSPE was designed to serve as a "strange attractor" and

systems perturbation that would disrupt and involve the institutional and organizational status quo in a positive, proactive way *(Maturana and Varela 1987)*. This change process began with a mandatory visioning process at each project. Many institutions adopted a futures search conference format, generating a vision for the future of higher education, the food system, and land-grant colleges of agriculture *(Weisbord and Janoff 2000)*. This visioning process involved over fifty thousand people nationwide and enabled the participating LGCAs to construct a shared vision of our ecological, educational, and food systems future.

Following this first phase of visioning, many FSPE institutions adopted an organizational learning and living systems framework *(Senge 1990, Capra 1996)* for understanding and initiating sustainable change. Teams of internal and external stakeholders collaborated, built processes for organizational learning and feedback, and offered continuous opportunities for learning and experimenting with how to position, launch, and leverage institutional change in many ways and at many levels, from the grassroots to the highest echelons of some participating institutions. This organizational learning approach enabled institutions to develop enhanced understanding of and capacity for generating change.

These change efforts varied among institutions, but many focused on (1) improving a culture of engagement and recognition for outreach scholarship; (2) shifting policy to create a faculty rewards system that included Boyer's four forms of scholarship and further emphasis on public scholarship; (3) creating more cultural diversity among the stakeholder base; (4) developing broader commitments to ecological sustainability; (5) incorporating new technology in the design and delivery of curriculum and outreach programs; (6) fostering unprecedented and more effective inter-institutional collaborations and stakeholder partnerships (including other educational institutions and the public and private sectors) that broadened the reach and approach; and (7) leveraging and increasing investments to provide sustainable support for these endeavors *(Boyer 1997, WIRE 2002, W. K. Kellogg Foundation 2003)*. It is compelling to note that the recommendations and efforts of FSPE visioning (much of which was conducted at the grassroots, outside the academy), which transpired separately from and preceded the work of the aforementioned 1997 National Research Council recommendations, so accurately and synergistically mirrored the federal framework for change.

Following this galvanizing process of carefully facilitated grassroots citizen and stakeholder involvement, FSPE institutions commenced exploration of how to design and implement change processes that encouraged engagement and outreach scholarship, transformed curriculum, and brought about new ways of relating to other units, institutions, and communities. Execution of the seven-year change process often involved unprecedented mini-grant/regranting efforts, program development, capacity building, and policy change within the institutions, among their partners, and at state and regional levels. Evaluating and documenting the implementation of these visions resulted in the identification of four major themes that emerged across the cluster of thirteen projects: (1) partnerships and collaboration; (2) engagement and public involvement; (3) changing campus culture/redefining scholarship and faculty rewards; and (4) institutional change *(WIRE 2002)*.

All of these themes allude to that "impulse to connect." The ethos of partnership, engagement, and public involvement impelled the processes for institutional change and redefinition of scholarship and faculty rewards. Two "on the ground" examples of how this change process worked in two FSPE land-grant institutions give greater clarity, detail, and insight into creating a culture of engagement in the American academy.

FSPE Case Studies: Organizational and Individual Change

The Pennsylvania State University and University of Wisconsin–Madison each implemented FSPE projects. PSU's program—Keystone 21—aimed to "meet the challenges created by the rapid changes occurring in the food system. . . . [and] focuse[d] on enhancing the relevance of land-grant universities by addressing the public's changing needs, values, and priorities" *(Hyman et al. 2000)*. To achieve these goals, Keystone 21 sponsored over twenty mini-projects that involved numerous collaborating institutions and stakeholders, numerous leveraged resources, and multiple emphases, including curriculum, research, and outreach. Partners in Keystone 21 included PSU, Cheyney University of Pennsylvania (a historically black institution), and the Rodale Institute Experimental Farm. Meanwhile, the University of Wisconsin–Madison hosted the Wisconsin Food Systems Partnership (WFSP), which "promote[d] partnerships between the citizens and the universities of Wisconsin through activities that deal[t] with the food system; focus[ed] on underserved populations; and encourage[d] the land grant philosophy of 'learning in service to society'" *(University of*

Wisconsin–Madison 2000). This program involved six coordinate campuses in the UW system, the extension service, and numerous representatives from diverse stakeholder groups around the state. As was the case with Keystone 21, the WFSP supported numerous mini-projects that exemplified engagement and partnership. A signature project within each of these initiatives offers a glimpse into how transformational change efforts influenced an individual academician's movement toward outreach scholarship and an institution's commitment to implementing policy that rewards and supports engaged scholarly practice, both of which are critical dimensions in the development of engaged institutions.

Because the transformation of the faculty rewards system was a major priority for the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and most of the participating FSPE projects, Keystone 21 explored an institutional change process around what type of scholarship was rewarded and how at Pennsylvania State University. This work resulted in the authorship and publication of the document *UniSCOPE 2000: A Multidimensional Model of Scholarship for the 21st Century.* UniSCOPE outlines "a multidimensional model that conceptualizes each of the three missions of higher education—teaching, research, and service—as a continuum of scholarship" *(Hyman et al. 2000).* It also articulates how these three missions intersect with Ernest Boyer's four forms of scholarship—discovery, integration, application and education—and "views outreach scholarship as an integral component of each" *(Alter 2003, 1999, Boyer 1997; Hyman et al. 2001–2002, Hyman et al. 2000).* UniSCOPE not only details these intersecting aspects of scholarship, but also provides a substantive framework used to reconfigure reward structures to assess, adequately acknowledge, and ultimately reward various forms of scholarship. The UniSCOPE document is a template for implementing at all levels the concepts, policies, and procedures that will validate and incorporate outreach scholarship in the reward systems of a major institution. Implicit in UniSCOPE is

"Numerous partnerships with community-based and public-sector organizations have emerged to generate local policy outcomes . . . and broader involvement with local food systems issues."

the public mission and commitment to public work of the land-grant university. It offers a means to revitalize and uplift the civic nature of public institutions in a time when faculty reward systems struggle to understand and appropriately reward multiple forms of scholarship, particularly those that emphasize outreach and engagement.

Yet report content is just one facet of institutional change emerging from the UniSCOPE process. Just as interesting is the organizational learning and change process that accompanied it, which offers important lessons around how to create momentum for engagement through policy change and shifts in institutional culture. The story around UniSCOPE's development and adoption by the PSU Faculty Senate is one of transformational and transactional change that involved grassroots individuals representing various sectors and levels of influence within PSU. Using a theoretical framework for their change process based on principles of organizational learning and living systems theory, key stakeholders involved in UniSCOPE designed a process of collaborative and individual inquiry around the core questions involved in the content and means of transforming the faculty reward system *(WIRE 2002, Senge 1990)*. One such principle suggested that creating a culture of shared inquiry would result in meaningful conversation, giving rise to critical questions and subsequent content for faculty rewards policy. Another presumed that investments in individual learning (supporting the exploration of the issues and questions associated with creating faculty rewards systems that incorporated multiple forms of scholarship and validated outreach scholarship) would give rise to organizational learning and transformational change.

In their assessment of the UniSCOPE development process, the Keystone 21 project confirmed that these assumptions proved true. The adoption of the UniSCOPE document began with a learning community of individuals who were responsible for the ultimate development of the concepts, recommendations, and frameworks for assessment included in this new model of faculty rewards and recognition. Using an inquiry-based model that was grounded in the literature, the individuals involved in the development of UniSCOPE treated the UniSCOPE development process as a scholarly endeavor in itself, demonstrated a theoretical model, and reflected the nature of the very changes they hoped to create.

Also vital to this transformational change process was the vertical alignment of support, involvement, and oversight by staff, faculty, and mid- and high-level administrators for this effort's theoretical approach, the report, and the final approval and adoption by the governing bodies of the institution. In assessing the key lessons learned from this transformational change process, three that stand out most significantly are *(WIRE 2002)*:

- Systemic institutional change happens when there is impetus for, commitment to, and alignment with the change agenda from all layers of the organization.
- Using organizational learning theory to encourage individual learning and subsequent organizational transformation fosters deeper and more lasting change.
- Creating a process for policy change and developing the new policy itself are only two of the three critical factors in fostering institutional change. The third addresses the issue of successful implementation and interpretation—this unfolds at the departmental level.

The UniSCOPE effort demonstrates how partnerships between the philanthropic and academic sectors can evoke transformational change related to questions of outreach and engagement.

UniSCOPE provides a powerful framework for how to understand, reward, and recognize multiple forms of outreach scholarship. Important to this nexus of organizational learning, engagement, systems change, and the public aspects of land-grant universities is the question of successful implementation. PSU will offer a national example, important litmus test, and opportunity for learning how deep structure transformational change can unfold to support a culture of engagement in our land-grant universities. PSU's fundamental premise is that creating policy through an inclusive, inquiry-based process will give rise to new expectations and guidelines that are implementable at all levels of the institution. The hope, of course, is that the UniSCOPE document will change institutional culture. One important element of this change is the improvement in faculty rewards systems to better understand, assess, and recognize engaged scholarship. A second critical transformation lies with individual faculty who take these new guidelines seriously and begin to adopt a more engaged stance and practice in their scholarship. The implementation of UniSCOPE as institutional policy will enable PSU and

interested onlookers to learn about the effectiveness of new policy accompanied by an intentional process of widespread organizational learning as a process to foment institutional change.

Creating transformational change at the individual faculty level is equally important to building a culture of engagement. The Wisconsin Food System Partnership supported the Troy Gardens Project, a useful example of how a faculty member practices and is rewarded for outreach scholarship, while cocreating with communities a contribution to the public good *(Caton Campbell 2003)*. The Troy Gardens Project addressed numerous goals of the FSPE enterprise, touching on institutional engagement, new partnerships with diverse communities, ecological sustainability, new forms of scholarship, inter-institutional collaborations, and the intersection of the food system and higher education. Troy Gardens is a public land trust consisting of twenty-six acres of open space on the north side of Madison, where there is the largest concentration of poverty and cultural diversity in Wisconsin's capital city. Developed for multi-purpose use, the land includes a large community garden, youth gardens, handicapped-accessible gardens, a community farm, woodland and prairie restoration, nature trails, and edible landscaping. On five adjacent additional acres, the Madison Area Community Land Trust is building up to thirty units of affordable housing.

"Momentum for engaged universities is built simultaneously at the individual and institutional level, and emphasis should be placed on both when working to craft a culture of engagement in an institution."

This collaborative venture reflects key facets of engaged scholarship, where the agenda is set and led by residents of affected communities. This process of mutual agenda setting addresses issues of local concern that pertain to the public good. Over twenty scholars from numerous disciplines are involved in teaching, outreach, and research related to the community's priorities. Involved faculty have combined their scholarship with civic work, creating service-learning opportunities for students, conducting environmental research, and allocating institutional

resources to support programs, internships, and student service-learning projects. Numerous partnerships with community-based and public-sector organizations have emerged to generate local policy outcomes, program expansion and replication, and broader involvement with local food systems issues.

As a collaborating faculty member, Dr. Marcia Caton Campbell exemplifies productive outreach scholarly activity. As a scholar of community food systems planning and social and environmental conflicts, Caton Campbell conducted research, created service-learning projects for students, brought guest experts from Troy Gardens to campus, and offered her services as a community food systems planner. All of these functions were applied based on the demands and interests of the Troy Gardens community. The portfolio and diversity of Caton Campbell's scholarship (using Boyer's multiple definitions) have been recognized by her peers through review and publication in her disciplinary journals. It should also be noted that Caton Campbell is an assistant professor and therefore will use her relationship with and outreach scholarship for Troy Gardens as a key part of her tenure consideration portfolio *(Caton Campbell 2003)*.

The outreach scholarship conducted by Caton Campbell and its contribution to the overall Troy Gardens endeavor resulted in several key outcomes, including:

- Coconstruction of local knowledge with diverse communities
- Development of sustainable and influential interorganizational partnerships that extend the learning and impact of Troy Gardens programs and associated outreach scholarship
- Involvement of students in the local community—a critical example of the outreach dimensions of scholarship of teaching
- Enhanced ecological diversity involving food systems–related concerns
- Validation and recognition of scholarship by disciplinary peers
- Deepened trust and mutual respect between communities and universities that has emerged and is a critical component of the ongoing work.

These outcomes demonstrate that a rich and varied practice of outreach scholarship by an individual faculty member can simultaneously augment departments, disciplines, communities,

and land-grant institutions and lead to promotion and tenure, even if reward systems are not yet explicitly geared to support or encourage it. Caton Campbell's scholarship not only demonstrates the public value of engaged scholarship and its fit within the civic mission of the land-grant university, it also exemplifies how individual actions can contribute to change toward more deeply engaged institutions and sustainable food systems.

Conclusion

The FSPE initiative—a partnership of philanthropy and higher education to encourage systemic change in universities and the food system—has offered important lessons and best practices about change. Several lessons have emerged from FSPE that are useful to the engagement movement as a whole. Momentum for engaged universities is built simultaneously at the individual and institutional level, and emphasis should be placed on both when working to craft a culture of engagement in an institution. Gaining faculty involvement in this type of work is most effective when it intersects with their ongoing work—can they engage in the context of their ongoing teaching or research? In the case of Troy Gardens, Caton Campbell's scholarship seamlessly blends her faculty responsibilities with public needs and interests. In this vein, her work is not a small "service" contribution or an add-on to her already heavy responsibilities as a tenure-track faculty member. It becomes central to her work as a scholar, an important contribution to her discipline from methodological and philosophical standpoints, and an embodied invocation of the civic mission of land-grant institutions. Having examples of faculty who elegantly and successfully conduct engaged scholarship is important for the engagement movement, particularly when there may not be explicit institutional policy or standards for how to reward and recognize this type of work. Hopefully, the more examples of this type of scholarship are shared within professional disciplinary societies, the more models scholars will have and the more courage to try this approach to inquiry.

With respect to addressing institutional questions like faculty reward policy at PSU, faculty were able to contribute to a learning community around institutional questions as a dimension of their service to the institution. They were also able to publish scholarly articles about UniSCOPE in peer-reviewed publications. It therefore fulfilled important existing expectations, instead of merely adding to an already heavy workload.

Other unresolved questions about approaches related to outreach scholarship—individual and institutional—have surfaced through this process. Was FSPE an institutional or individual development project? How does one sustain change? What is the critical mass of faculty required to evoke institutional change? Will the average faculty member undertake outreach scholarship without clear policies that suggest its legitimacy? What are the most effective means for fomenting effective institutional and individual faculty behavior change around engaged scholarship?

From the individual scholar's point of view, learning how to integrate the demands of one's teaching, research, and outreach responsibilities with long-term societal goals (like food systems sustainability) and involvement in the engaged scholarship movement is both challenging and rewarding. Creatively partnering where community support is widespread, generating significant additional resources including other faculty and student partners, and conducting rigorous research that passes peer review muster are all facets of contributing to a culture of engagement as an individual scholar. Clearly, this practice of scholarship not only looks different in terms of who is involved and how, it also demands both disciplinary expertise and a complex set of skills outside the parameters of one's academic training. Skill at building and sustaining relationships, a solid understanding of democratic practice and community-based knowledge, and community organizing skills (applied in university and community contexts) are all critical to this type of scholarly practice. It is important to note that scholarly and disciplinary rigor must not be forsaken in exchange for these other skills—practice must be a synergistic blend of all these capabilities. From the institutional standpoint, learning communities, a culture of inquiry, and alignment and involvement from the bottom to the top of the organization all contributed to what Keystone 21 believes is a sustainable and long-term institutional change.

Changing campus culture, in the face of fiscal, professional, and institutional realities, is a very difficult enterprise indeed. In the midst of these challenging times and contexts, FSPE has provided an important means and testing ground for land-grant universities, colleges of agriculture, the philanthropic sector, and the outreach scholarship movement to learn more about the process for invoking and sustaining a culture of engagement through individual and institutional means in American public higher education.

References

Alter, T. R. 1999. Leadership strategies for organizational change: Linking individual and organizational learning. Paper presenter at the Association of Leadership Educators Conference, San Diego, California.

Alter, T. 2003. Engagement and community service: A Penn State perspective. Invited plenary presentation at the University of the West Indies: Bridging the Gap with the Community Conference. University of West Indies, Mona Campus, Kingston, Jamaica.

Berry, W. 1996. *The unsettling of America: Culture and agriculture.* San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Bonnen, B. 1996. Land grant universities are changing. Staff paper 96-100, Department of Agricultural Economics. East Lansing, Michigan State University.

Borlaug, N. 1972. *The Green Revolution, peace and humanity.* Mexico: International Wheat and Maize Center.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Reproduction in education, society and culture.* London; Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Boyer, E. 1997. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate.* Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Capra, F. 1996. *The web of life: A new scientific understanding of living systems.* New York: Anchor Books.

Castagnera, J. 2002–2003. The next great wave in American higher education. *Planning for Higher Education 31*(2): 55–59.

Caton Campbell, M. 2003. Community and conservation land trusts as unlikely partners? The case of Troy Gardens, Madison, Wisconsin. *Land Use Policy 20*: 169–80.

Chomsky, Noam, et al., eds. 1997. *The Cold War and the university: Toward an intellectual history of the postwar years.* New York: New Press; Norton.

Cohen, A. 1998. *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system.* New York: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, D. 1999. Academic professionalism and the betrayal of the land grant tradition. *American Behavioral Scientist 42*(5): 776–85.

Fischer, J. et al. 1994. *Challenges confronting agricultural research at land grant universities.* Washington, D.C.: Council for Agricultural Research and Technology.

Forster, E. 1985. *Howard's end.* New York: Bantam Books.

Gersick, C. 1991. Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review 16*(31): 10–36.

Giroux, H. 2002. Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a public democratic sphere. *Harvard Educational Review 72*(4): 425–63.

Hyman, Drew, et al. 2001–2002. Beyond Boyer: The UniSCOPE model of scholarship in the 21st century, *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 7*(1–2): 42–65.

Hyman, Drew, et al. 2000. UniSCOPE 2000: A Multidimensional Model of Scholarship for the 21st Century, University Park, Pa.: The UniSCOPE Learning Community. <http://www.cas.psu.edu/docs/CASPROF/keystone21/uniscope200.pdf>.

Keller, G. 2001. The new demographics of higher education. *Review of Higher Education 24*(3): 219–35.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 1999. *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Knapp, S. 1910. *The mission of cooperative demonstration work in the South.* Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture.

Kunkel, H., I. Maw, and C. Skaggs. 1996. *Revolutionizing higher education in agriculture: Framework for change.* Ames, IA: Robson and Associates.

Maturana, H. and F. Varela. 1987. *The tree of knowledge.* London: Shambala Books.

McDowell, G. 1993. Structural change in higher education: Implications for agricultural economics extension; or does diffidence, decadence and dissonance make a difference? *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics 25*: 131–137.

Medina López Portillo, A. 2002. The impact of globalization on higher education. *LLC Review 1*(2). <http://www.umbc.edu/llc/PDFfiles/theimpactofglobalization.pdf>.

Meyer, J. 1992. *Rethinking the outlook of colleges whose roots have been in agriculture.* Davis: University of California–Davis.

Meyer, J. 1995. *Transforming the land grant college of agriculture for the twenty-first century.* Davis: University of California–Davis.

National Research Council. 1997. Colleges of agriculture at the land grant universities: Public service and public policy. Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences USA 94: 1610–1611.

National Research Council Board on Agriculture. 1992a. *Agriculture and the undergraduate.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

National Research Council Board on Agriculture. 1992b. Courage to change: Land grant colleges of agriculture at 130. Washington, D.C. Unpublished monograph.

National Research Council Board on Agriculture. 1995. *Colleges of agriculture at land-grant universities: A profile.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

National Research Council Board on Agriculture. 2003. *Frontiers in agricultural research: Food, health, environment and communities.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Pennsylvania State University. 2000. Keystone 21. Home Page. <http://www.cas.psu.edu/docs/CASPROF/keystone21/keystone21hm.html>.

Perkins, J. 1998. Geopolitics and the Green Revolution: Wheat, genes and the Cold War. New York: Oxford University Press.

Peters, S. 1996. *Cooperative extension and the democratic promise of the land grant idea.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Extension Service.

Schuh, G. 1993. The future of land grant universities. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics 25*: 112–121.

Sears, J. 1922. *Philanthropy in the history of higher education*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Senge, P. 1990. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Shiva, V. 1989. *The violence of the Green Revolution: Third World agriculture, ecology and politics*. Panang, Malaysia: Zed Books.

University of Wisconsin–Madison. 2000. Wisconsin Food Systems Partnership. <http://www.cals.wisc.edu/wfsp/.>

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. 2000. *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Kellogg Foundation Press.

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. 2001. *Changing how higher education works*. Battle Creek, Mich.: Kellogg Foundation Press.

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. 2003. Overview: Food systems professions education (FSPE) initiative. <http://www.wkkf.org/Programming/Overview.aspx?CID=20>.

Western Institute for Research and Evaluation (WIRE). 2002. Final cluster evaluation report: Food Systems Professions Education Initiative, Phase II. Submitted to W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Weisbord, M., and S. Janoff. 2000. *Future search: An action guide to finding common ground in organizations and communities*. San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.

Wilkinson, Kenneth P. 1991. *The community in rural America*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

About the Authors

• Margaret Adamek has served as the coordinator and chair of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation–sponsored Food Systems Professions Education (FSPE) initiative for the last three years. FSPE is an informal consortium of land-grant universities working together to positively influence higher education and the food system. Her relevant areas of specialization include organizational change in higher education, public scholarship and institutional engagement, multicultural and community/university enterprises, and faculty leadership development around institutional engagement. She is the co-editor of a book focusing on public scholarship in agricultural and natural resource sciences to be published by the Kettering Foundation in 2004. Adamek holds a baccalaureate degree in African American studies and French literature from Carleton College and is currently completing coursework for a doctorate in community development.

• Theodore R. Alter is the associate vice president for outreach, director of Cooperative Extension, and associate dean, College of Agricultural Sciences, at Penn State University. His research and extension programs have focused on rural and community economic development, public sector economics, and comparative rural development policy.

• Jeffrey C. Bridger is senior research associate in Outreach and Cooperative Extension at Penn State University. His current research focuses on strategies to achieve sustainable rural community development in the face of economic globalization. As part of this effort, he is also working to better understand the ways in which public scholarship can promote social, economic, and environmental well-being in rural America.

• John Ferrick's educational background includes a B.S. in education and an M.S. in international adult education with an emphasis on international agricultural extension. He holds the titles faculty associate and director of Study Abroad Programs in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) and currently teaches courses focusing on International Topics in Agriculture and Natural Resources, Health and Nutrition in Developing Countries, and Learning through Service. Ferrick was the deputy director and lead evaluator for the Wisconsin Food System Partnership, a project funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. He has been active in facilitating strategic planning process and evaluation efforts for various departments in CALS and was lead coordinator of a collegewide strategic planning process. He has worked for the U.S. Peace Corps as country director and program and training officer in Fiji, Tuvalu, and Papua New Guinea and as a Peace Corps volunteer and program trainer in Lesotho and Botswana. Other international experiences include working as program director of a refugee camp for Southeast Asian refugees in the Philippines and directing health-related programs in Vietnam and Laos.

• Kenneth H. Shapiro is professor of agricultural and applied economics and associate dean of International Agricultural Programs at the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin–Madison. He directed the FSPE project at Wisconsin, known as the Wisconsin Food Systems Partnership. Shapiro received his Ph.D. and M.A. from Stanford University, his M.S. from the University of Maryland, and his B.S. from Cornell University. His research has focused mainly on economic development in Africa, and his teaching focuses on global nutrition problems.