Full Participation:

Building the Architecture for Diversity and Public Engagement in Higher Education

Susan Sturm
Tim Eatman
John Saltmarsh
Adam Bush

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

About the Authors

Susan Sturm is the George M. Jaffin Professor of Law and Social Responsibility and the founding director of the Center for Institutional and Social Change at Columbia Law School. She has published numerous articles, case studies, and books on "the architecture of inclusion," institutional change, transformative leadership, workplace equality, legal education, and inclusion and diversity in higher education. She collaborates with organizations and networks involved in initiatives aimed at increasing full participation, including Syracuse University, Imagining America, the University of Southern California (USC), Rutgers Future Scholars, Liberal Arts Diversity Officers (LADO), the University of Michigan, the Reentry Education Network, the Ford Foundation, and Harvard Business School.

Timothy Eatman is Assistant Professor of Higher Education at Syracuse University and Director for Research of Imagining America (IA). He provides leadership for the Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship and is co-author, with Julie Ellison, of *Scholarship in Public*, a work on faculty rewards for engaged scholarship that extends to a recent study of the aspirations and decisions of graduate students and early-career scholars. Tim has published in such venues as the *Journal of Educational Finance* and *Readings on Equal Education*, and has written many other book chapters and reports. He sits on the editorial board of *Urban Education* and reviews for several scholarly journals. Tim's research also explores the pipeline to graduate school and the professoriate for students from traditionally underrepresented groups in higher education.

John Saltmarsh co-directs the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, and is a faculty member in the Higher Education Administration Doctoral Program. He co-wrote, with Edward Zlotkowski, *Higher Education and Democracy,* and has authored numerous chapters and articles on civic engagement, service-learning, and experiential education. He also co-edited the recent book *"To Serve a Larger Purpose": Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education.* He serves on numerous boards, including the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement, and sits on the editorial board of the *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning* and the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*.

Adam Bush is the founding Director of Curriculum for College Unbound, a college-degree, outcomes-based model in Providence, RI, working to create a more just higher education for first-generation college students and influence higher education policy by incorporating voices outside of the academy in the teaching and assessment of its student body and program. Adam is also a doctoral candidate in American Studies and Ethnicity at USC (where he is completing his dissertation, "Passing Notes in Class: Listening to Pedagogical Improvisations in Jazz History"), serves as a member of NERCHE's Next Generation Engagement Project, and directs Imagining America's PAGE program.

Introduction

This catalyst paper offers a conceptual framework for connecting a set of conversations about change in higher education that often proceed separately but need to be brought together to gain traction within both the institutional and national policy arenas. By offering a framework to integrate projects and people working under the umbrella of equity, diversity, and inclusion with those working under the umbrella of community, public, and civic engagement, we aim to integrate both of these change agendas with efforts on campus to address the access and success of traditionally underserved students. We also hope to connect efforts targeting students, faculty, and broader communities in each of these arenas. We offer an approach that situates the integration of these change agendas squarely within the core values and mission of higher education.

This paper grew out of a realization by each of the authors (and the organizations they represent) that the long-term success of diversity, public engagement, and student success initiatives requires that these efforts become more fully integrated and that their larger institutional settings undergo transformation. The Center for Institutional and Social Change at Columbia University Law School; Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life ("IA") and its Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) program; the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE); and Syracuse University's Scholarship in Action have come together to build knowledge and momentum for integrating these initiatives. This catalyst paper is intended to stimulate conversations and movement in this direction.

We pull these strands together with the overarching idea of *full participation*, drawing on the work of Susan Sturm (2006, 2010, 2011). Full participation is an affirmative value focused on creating institutions that enable people, whatever their identity, background, or institutional position, to thrive, realize their capabilities, engage meaningfully in institutional life, and contribute to the flourishing of others (Sturm 2006, 2010). This concept offers a holistic set of goals that focus attention on (1) the institutional conditions that enable people in different roles to flourish, and (2) the questions designed to mobilize change at the multiple levels and leverage points where change is needed. It covers the continuum of decisions and practices affecting who joins institutions, how people receive support for their activities, whether they feel respected and valued, how work is conducted, and what kinds of activities count as important work.

Within the context of higher education, full participation is employed as a way of conceptualizing the intersections of student and faculty diversity, community engagement, and academic success as a nexus for the transformation of communities on and off campus. Full participation incorporates the idea that higher education institutions are rooted in and accountable to multiple communities—both to those who live, work, and matriculate within higher education and those who physically or practically occupy physical or project spaces connected to higher education institutions. Campuses advancing full participation are engaged campuses that are both *in* and *of* the community, participating in reciprocal, mutually beneficial partnerships between campus and community.   In this sense, "institutional

citizenship operates both to enable full participation by a diverse citizenry and to enable universities to meet their obligations as institutional citizens of a broader polity" (Sturm, 2006, p. 304).

Sturm (2006) elaborates that, although full participation articulates goals in affirmative terms, its pursuit evokes an inquiry about who is—and is not—included in the prevailing definitions and practices of the academy. Because full participation is constrained by "cultural dynamics that reproduce patterns of under-participation and exclusion," it cannot be achieved "without examining…multi-level decisions, cultural norms, and underlying structures" (p. 256-257). Full participation also articulates the processes involved in moving toward a desired outcome: What actions and decisions account for different patterns among different groups? Achieving full participation requires a critical assessment of the obstacles facing groups at the various institutional locations that shape inclusion and advancement. It also informs the targeting of initiatives to focus attention on groups and communities that are not flourishing within existing institutional arrangements (Sturm, 2011).

Many higher education diversity, equity, community engagement, and student success projects grow out of a commitment to changing practices and settings that do not provide full participation for all their constituents, particularly those from groups that are traditionally underrepresented in higher education—i.e., first-generation students and faculty, low-income students, community members, and publicly engaged scholars. On many campuses and communities, these initiatives might include:

1. Increasing student access and success, particularly for underrepresented, first-generation, and low-income students;

2. Diversifying higher education faculties, often with separate projects for hiring, retention, and climate;

3. Promoting community, civic, or public engagement for students; and,

4. Increasing support for faculty's public or engaged scholarship.

These full participation projects often proceed on separate tracks, without ongoing interaction or collaboration among them. The language of full participation embraces a set of values that are often communicated differently by different communities. The language of diversity, equity, inclusion, or equal opportunity does not, in our view, sufficiently express the more robust goal of creating "conditions so that people of all races, genders, religions, sexual orientations, abilities, and backgrounds can realize their capabilities as they understand them and participate fully in the life of the institutions that matter to their well-being" (Sturm, 2011). Similarly, the term "public engagement" embraces work often proceeding under different labels (Bush, 2010), intended to focus on institutional responses to the wider public or civic mission of higher education through the "collaboration between higher education and their larger communities" (Carnegie Foundation, 2006). Full participation entails collaborations carried out in reciprocal, co-equal ways (Ellison & Eatman, 2008, p. 39). A significant part of the challenge we hope to meet involves developing

language and narratives that effectively communicate these values across different communities, projects, and venues (Berger, 2009). The success of these narratives depends on understanding and mobilizing their interconnections—indeed on building an "architecture"—that supports their integration with each other and the "hardwiring" of their institutional settings.

An architectural approach invites consideration of these initiatives in relation to the systems within which they operate, the structures that shape their actions, the design that creates the structures, and the spaces within which they work (Sturm, 2006, 2007, 2011b). The systems approach exposes the interactions across different levels of the system (e.g., department, discipline, role, stakeholder, issue area), and how they affect the experience of full participation. Many of the features that affect whether and how full participation is achieved result from values, priorities, and patterns that cut across discrete programs, departments, and initiatives. So, for example, students' experiences of full participation and engagement are influenced by how and with whom they interact on the faculty, and these interactions are in turn shaped by the values affecting faculty members' choices and priorities. The value system of an institution, discipline, or field profoundly shapes how faculty members spend their time and how they are rewarded for those choices. These dynamics result from choices that are susceptible to change if they are made visible across these different contexts (Sturm, 2011a).

Many of these choices become embedded in formal and informal structures—policies and routinized practices built into the setting. Institutional structure reflects human involvement in shaping experience. Structure regularizes human interaction, establishes value hierarchies, steers information flows, frames perception, and channels movement and status within social systems. It creates the social context influencing how people understand themselves, what they perceive, and what they value.

This raises another aspect of the architectural metaphor, that of design. Architecture connotes intentional design choices. Some practices or ways of interacting, which are taken as given, are the result of choices that carry consequences, such as what counts for tenure and promotion or who participates in setting research agendas. The architectural metaphor makes those choices visible and thus amenable to change. An architectural approach is essential for constructing the conditions and practices enabling institutional mindfulness—careful attention to decisions that accumulate to determine whether women and men of all races, identities, and backgrounds will have the opportunity to succeed and advance.

This catalyst paper invites consideration of the architecture shaping whether and how diversity, public engagement, and student success efforts relate to one another. We see these goals and practices as deeply interdependent. The architecture of the setting—what and who is valued, how decisions are made, which interests matter, who gets to participate, how work is organized, how problems are addressed—cuts across diversity, public scholarship, and student success work, and currently poses barriers to all. The frameworks and practices needed to change student access and

success depend upon making progress on faculty diversity. The conversation about diversity and inclusion has profound implications for the legitimacy and efficacy of community engagement work (Sanchez, 2005). The lack of integration profoundly limits the efficacy and sustainability of this work, particularly in tough economic times. There is tremendous untapped potential for knowledge and resource sharing and collective impact if these efforts are more effectively connected with each other and built into the core values and practices of higher education.

Research and experience suggest that:

1. Public engagement encourages and enables full participation of diverse groups and communities;

2. Full participation of diverse communities is a critical attribute of successful and legitimate public engagement; and,

3. The systems that take account of these synergies are likely to enable the successful pursuit of both public engagement and full participation/ diversity, and to enhance the legitimacy, levels of engagement, and robustness of higher education institutions.

The challenges of advancing full participation vary depending on the nature of the higher education institution and its relationship to its communities. A highly selective university oriented around faculty research will face different challenges in advancing full participation, for example, than a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) or liberal arts institution. In every setting, however, the challenges will require a process of institutional transformation.

Sturm (2006) explains that "full participation in the academy requires a process of institutional attentiveness across the spectrum of decisions that ultimately determine whether women and men of all races will have the opportunity to thrive, succeed, and advance" (p. 251). This paper is intended to stimulate conversations in a wide variety of settings to develop the language, narratives, and relationships that could provide the basis for taking action.

Diversity, Civic Engagement, and the Core Mission of Higher Education: The Need for an Architectural Approach

The concept of full participation brings together three different dimensions of higher education's public mission. First, it involves building pathways to social and economic citizenship for diverse publics through education, particularly for students from communities that have not been afforded access or enabled to succeed. Second, it involves connecting the knowledge resources of the academy with the pressing and complex problems facing multiple communities. Finally, it involves building the capacity and commitment of diverse leadership equipped to tackle these social problems.

Many campuses have explicit commitments to advancing their public mission. These commitments appear in institutional mission statements, many of which embrace the goals of building knowledge and educating people who will serve society as workers, citizens, and leaders. Some public and private funders now include diversity and social impact goals in their preambles and funding requirements. Inclusion and civic engagement outcomes have also emerged as part of accreditation, and community engagement has been added as a way to classify campuses (Carnegie Foundation, 2006).

Yet, while higher education as a sector has publicly acknowledged that it has an important public mission, there remains a gap between intention and practice. The problem lies in the incongruity between institutions' stated mission and their cultural and institutional architecture, which is not currently set up to fulfill that mission. As Arizona State University's *New American University* states, "American society has undergone massive shifts over the past 50 years, but our universities have hardly changed at all" (p. 8). The kind of change that is now needed is architectural in nature, resulting in redesigned structures, policies, practices, and cultures that link inclusion, engagement, and success.

The growing emphasis on fulfilling higher education's public mission occurs at a time of urgency. The economic downturn has placed great pressure on universities to make hard choices that cannot be met with add-on programs. To fulfill their public mission, higher education institutions will have to figure out how to build full participation values into their core priorities and day-to-day practices (Cantor, 2011). As the challenges have heightened, the need to fulfill this public mandate has also taken on greater urgency; indeed, more than ever before, postsecondary education has become a pre-requisite to economic and social citizenship. The Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce has estimated that by 2018, 63 percent of the nation's jobs will require some form of postsecondary education or training (Carnevale, Smith, & Strohl, 2010). With this kind of economic imperative, a much higher fraction of high school graduates enter college today than they did a quarter century ago. Yet, the rise in the proportion of high school graduates attending college has not been met by a proportional increase in the fraction of college students who finish (Bound, Lovenheim, & Turner, 2009).

Additionally, the demographic profile of students entering into postsecondary education is more diverse than at any time in our history. College enrollments for Blacks and Latinos have increased nationwide. Even though the number of underrepresented students (including low-income or first-generation students, and students of color) who go to college and earn a degree has increased considerably in comparison to 40 years ago, the gap between Blacks and Latinos, on the one hand, and their White counterparts persists and continues to grow (Ruppert, 2003). In 2001, of high school completers ages 25 to 29, about 37 percent of Whites, 21 percent of Blacks, and 16 percent of Latinos had received a bachelor's degree. Evidence suggests that progress has not been made *beyond access* into higher education for Blacks and Latinos (Swail et al., 2003). The gap among these groups is substantial nationwide and has not diminished in the last 15 years (Bok, 2003). Colleges and universities must integrate into their cultures the conditions and

practices that enable these students to enter and succeed in college if they are to fulfill their stated public mission.

Often, the kind of change occurring on campus aimed at addressing diversity, inclusion, retention, college completion, improving teaching and learning, or community engagement (Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009) is associated with what Larry Cuban (1988) has described as "first-order change," which aims to improve "the efficiency and effectiveness of what is done…to make what already exists more efficient and more effective, without disturbing the basic organizational features, [and] without substantially altering the ways in which [faculty and students] perform their roles" (p. 341). First-order changes do not address the core culture of the institution. They do not get at the institutional architecture. They do not require what Eckel, Hill, and Green (1998) refer to as changes that "alter the culture of the institution," those which require "major shifts in an institution's culture—the common set of beliefs and values that creates a shared interpretation and understanding of events and actions" (p. 3).

Change in the institutional culture of colleges and universities, or what Cuban (1988) identifies as "second-order changes," seeks "to alter the fundamental ways in which organizations are put together. These changes reflect major dissatisfaction with present arrangements. Second-order changes introduce new goals, structures, and roles that transform familiar ways of doing things into new ways of solving persistent problems" (p. 341). Second-order changes are associated with transformational change, which "(1) alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products; (2) is deep and pervasive, affecting the whole institution; (3) is intentional; and (4) occurs over time" (Eckel, Hill, & Green, 1998, p. 3). Most importantly, for these efforts to be transformative, there needs to be integration of change efforts focused on cultural change: "Institution-wide patterns of perceiving, thinking, and feeling; shared understandings; collective assumptions; and common interpretive frameworks are the ingredients of this 'invisible glue' called institutional culture" (p. 3). An architectural approach is aimed at culture change that creates more welcoming environments that respond more fully to the needs of diverse students, faculty, and staff, allowing campuses to more fully achieve their public mission.

Excavating the Current Design

The institutional architecture that dominates campus organizational culture fosters disconnection and fragmentation. This is often expressed in terms of the siloed nature of academic organizations, reflecting an internal manifestation of the well-known Ivory Tower metaphor. It can also be understood as the disconnection between the public mission and institutional practices. Too often, the strides to "diversify" higher education are insufficiently linked in concept and practice to the public mission of leveraging intellectual capital to address the most pressing problems facing underserved communities. Most higher education institutions have yet to make diversity or civic engagement a core institutional commitment, or to forge the critical connections needed to create and reap the benefits of the synergies

between them (Sanchez, 2005). Diversity and engagement are not built into the architecture that structures how people interact and what the institution values.

Most colleges and universities have undertaken pipeline initiatives and efforts to achieve greater diversity and participation among students, faculty, and staff, and many have undertaken various forms of community engagement and service-learning in order to inculcate citizenship values and connect the institution to the community. But these efforts are often pursued piecemeal; they are not conceptualized or coordinated across systems in the integrated way necessary to have broad-scale impact. Because of this, they tend to operate at the periphery of core institutional strategies and practices.

Similarly, initiatives focused on faculty, students, and community members often proceed in separate spheres, without sustained attention to their interdependence and potential synergy. Faculty diversity initiatives frequently focus on expanding the pool of faculty and reducing bias in search practices, without connecting with the relationship of faculty diversity to teaching, research, and engagement. Student diversity and inclusion rarely connect to initiatives aimed at increasing faculty diversity or involving students in public scholarship. Yet, research suggests that the engagement of diverse faculty has a significant impact on student diversity and engagement, and that publicly engaged scholarship positively affects the levels of engagement of diverse faculty and students. The relationship of staff inclusion and diversity to other diversity and civic engagement work is even less well understood (Eatman et al., 2011).

Additionally, research indicates that faculty roles and rewards—criteria for research, scholarship, and creative activity—either (1) reward community engagement as service (counting little in promotion and tenure) or (2) do not specifically reward community engagement as either teaching, research and creative activity, or service. Institutional policies often create disincentives for faculty to undertake community engagement through their faculty roles (Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Part of building an architecture of full participation is bringing together research findings in an integrated way to better understand the synergies between student and faculty diversity, community engagement, and student success.

Demographic Imperatives

Research indicates that the academic success of systematically and traditionally underserved students is enhanced by increased opportunities to participate in high-impact teaching and learning practices—practices that involve greater engagement in learning. One of these practices is community-based teaching and learning (often referred to as service-learning or community engagement tied to the curriculum) (Kuh, 2008). Research also suggests that the academic success of underserved students is enhanced by increased opportunities to identify with faculty and staff who represent ethnic, racial, gender, and cultural diversity (Hurtado, 2001, 2007; Milem et al., 2005).

Next Generation Academic Professionals

It is also apparent that along with demographic shifts among students, there are demographic shifts among faculty. There is greater diversity among graduate students and early-career faculty—and, at the same time, a rotating door for underrepresented faculty seeking careers in higher education. The academy is attracting more underrepresented faculty than ever before, but those faculty are leaving in greater numbers than they are entering academic careers (Moreno, 2006; Sanchez, 2005).

A growing body of research has demonstrated that women and faculty of color are more likely to engage in both interdisciplinary and community-service-related behaviors, including community engaged and inclusive pedagogical practice in teaching and learning and building research agendas related to public problem-solving in local communities. They are also more likely to cite such experiences as critical to their purpose in the academy (Baez, 2000; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Antonio, 2002; Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2010; Rhoads et al., 2008; Hale, 2008; Ibarra, 2001).

One study in particular provides evidence related to the aspirations and career decisions of publicly engaged scholars (Eatman et al., 2011). Data from this research demonstrates that fully 75 percent of the respondents indicated that it was important, very important, or extremely important for them to find employment at a college or university that values publicly engaged scholarship. This study explores the importance of issues of identity, motivations, and career paths of public scholars as well as the challenges faced in navigating existing structures in the academy.

Diversity, Civic Engagement, and Student Success

Efforts to connect diversity, community engagement, and student success in higher education have gained increased attention (Cress, Burack, Giles, Elkins, & Stevens, 2010; Carpio, Luk, & Bush, 2011). Yet, the dominant approach continues to focus primarily on what might be considered "thin" responses: typically programs aimed at expanding access to higher education through projects in which undergraduate student volunteers support programs that help prepare underserved high school students for access to higher education.

Such efforts are not integrated with associated and complementary institutional reforms and thus are unable to effect wider organizational change. While laudable, these programs are not sufficient, in part because they do not address organizational cultures in higher education that shift the focus from *access to* higher education to *success through* postsecondary education. Consequently, these efforts do not lead institutions of higher education to undertake significant organizational change aimed at creating environments in which underserved students and underrepresented faculty can thrive and succeed. Furthermore, the dominant approaches do not examine systemic organizational issues in a way that links institutional reward policies to two critical domains: (1) student diversity, including diverse learning styles and asset-based educational environments, and (2) faculty diversity, including preferences for diverse pedagogical practices and diverse forms of scholarship.

An organizational architecture that fosters integration can produce what might be considered a "thick" approach aimed at making connections among innovations in active and collaborative teaching and learning, collaborative knowledge generation and discovery, and the success of underserved students—all with the goal of more effectively fulfilling the academic and public missions of higher education. A thick approach explores connecting, in a systemic way, *(1) student success with faculty diversity, (2) faculty diversity with community engagement and inclusive pedagogical practices, (3) faculty diversity with engaged scholarship, and (4) engaged scholarship with institutional rewards and supportive institutional cultures.* Such an approach uses integration of these efforts to construct a new organizational architecture.

Taking an Architectural Approach to Full Participation

The realization of full participation in higher education thus requires building an architecture of full participation—an institutional transformation strategy that sustains ongoing improvement and integrates publicly engaged scholarship, diversity, and student success with each other and with core values and priorities (Sturm, 2010). This kind of transformation involves the co-creation of spaces, relationships, and practices that support movement toward full participation. This architectural approach is both a mindset and a set of practices enabling institutional mindfulness. Integration and innovation requires an orientation toward understanding how practices and programs relate to a larger system (Sturm, 2011; Saltmarsh, 2009, 2011; Eatman et al., 2011). This orientation engages a wide range of stakeholders in an ongoing practice of institutional design—how to construct spaces and practices that enable people of different backgrounds to enter, thrive, and contribute to using knowledge and transformative leadership to advance similar goals in communities both local and global.

An architectural approach thus depends on developing institutional mindfulness—ongoing reflection about outcomes in relation to values and strategies—that enables people in many different positions to understand the patterns and practices and to use that knowledge to develop contexts enabling people to enter, flourish, and contribute value. Those who lead and teach and shape institutions of higher education have the ability to make choices, determine commitments, and enact strategies that address change in organizational structures and cultures to achieve full participation for the next generation of students and faculty. Drawing on Sturm's work (2011), we outline an approach to institutional mindfulness that engages the "who, what, where, when and how" involved in developing this architecture of full participation:

- ▪ *Who:* Who are the "organizational catalysts" and drivers of change, and how can the institution facilitate their connection to each other and provide support for their work to advance full participation? Who needs to be at the table in order for the values of full participation to be realized?

- ***What:*** What does full participation mean in a particular institutional and community setting, given the strengths, capacities, issues, and needs of the relevant stakeholders? What are the narratives that exemplify practices of full participation?   What is the relationship of that full participation vision to concrete goals and institutional priorities?

- ***Where:*** Where are the physical and social spaces and "action arenas" where people, programs, and practices can effectively be brought together?

- ***When:*** When can full participation concerns be put on the table so that they will be hardwired into institutional values and priorities?   What are the occasions and opportunities providing leverage points for institutional transformation advancing full participation?

- ***How:*** What are the strategies that enable and sustain institutional transformation? How do you build transformative leadership development into the everyday practices of the institution? How do you know whether you are improving, and what accounts for the impact you are (or are not) having?

An architecture of full participation thus results from a long-term yet urgent "campaign" animated by a shared vision, guided by institutional mindfulness, and sustained by an ongoing collaboration among leaders at many levels of the institution and community. The process of building this architecture will better equip higher education institutions to make good on their stated commitments to diversity, publicly engaged scholarship, and student success. It will also cultivate vibrant and dynamic communities that build multi-generational knowledge and leadership capacity, in collaboration with communities, to revitalize communities and democratic institutions.

Case Study: Full Participation

The following case study is a composite, based on data collected through Imagining America's National Survey on Pathways for Publicly Engaged Scholars, an ongoing study conducted by Timothy Eatman et al., at Syracuse University.[1]

Linda is an early-career faculty member at an urban public research university. A woman of color trained in cultural anthropology, she has brought her commitment to social issues—stimulated by a community engagement ethos, and cultivated early on by her family and later in her undergraduate experiences—into her faculty roles. It was very important to her to find a faculty position at a university that valued publicly engaged scholarship. During her graduate studies she found that her publicly engaged scholarship was not consistently encouraged by faculty in her program or by her dissertation committee. She found mentors outside of her college and campus—and fellow graduate students on and off campus as well as community partners—who guided her through the process and provided her with support. She was able to complete a dissertation that solidified her identification as a public scholar. She sought a professional home where she could continue her public scholarship without the kind of resistance she encountered in graduate school.

Many of the students she teaches are referred to as underserved: first-generation, low-income, students of color. She does community-engaged scholarly work across the faculty roles. Her teaching, research, and service all have community dimensions (Hale, 2008; Saltmarsh, 2010; Rendon, 2009). She has worked closely with a range of community-based organizations, a broad cross-section of residents, and other key stakeholders in the community to develop new knowledge through both emerging and traditional scholarly venues. In the case of the former, she has produced a community revitalization action plan for the city, a Strengthening Community Status Report for a local community foundation, a report to the local community development corporation, and an evaluation of homeownership in the city for the Housing Authority. These reports are co-authored with community partners as well as with her students. Linda has also published in conventional peer-reviewed journals, namely Urban Anthropology *and* Transforming Anthropology. *As part of her scholarship she has also co-authored a book with a community partner who is also a long-standing collaborator. Her research is meant to serve the local community, and Linda is unapologetic about this. As a cultural anthropologist, the focus of her community engagement revolves around issues of poverty, racism, inequalities, and social justice, particularly as they relate to neighborhood development.*

She has developed relationships with multiple community partners and designed courses that incorporate pedagogy that includes experiential learning and reflection on experience. All of this is quite time-consuming. Some of her colleagues have

---

[1] See Eatman, T., Weber, S., Bush, A., Nastasi, W., Higgins, R., & Imagining America. (2011). Study of publicly engaged scholars: Career aspirations and decisions of graduate students and early career professionals and practitioners. Unpublished research study. Retrieve from http://www.ia-research.org.

Case Study: Full Participation

discouraged her from doing this work, urging her to wait until after tenure. At her third-year review, there was a decided split among the faculty in her department about whether her work developing the curriculum, mentoring her graduate students as public scholars, and collaborating with the community-based organizations would "count" toward tenure. For some faculty members, productivity was measured solely in terms of the number of publications in refereed journals. For them, impact was measured in terms of citations by other scholars, without consideration of public impact. The ethos of individual achievement posed another challenge for Linda. Collaboration is a key component of her scholarship, built into her methodology and her capacity to have impact both on communities and students. Yet, her department struggles with whether and how to credit co-authored work. To succeed, she had to find a way to satisfy constituencies who did not agree on the value of her work, and to persist in the face of considerable uncertainty about how her work would be received by those in a position to evaluate her for tenure and promotion. What sustained her through this project was the power of the ideas, the relationships, and the tangible evidence of impact, knowledge, learning, the cultivation of transformative leaders, and a core valuing of the public purposes of education and the public relevance of her discipline.

Through her publicly engaged scholarship, Linda hopes to both expand the knowledge base in her discipline and also broaden the kinds of research methods that allow for inquiry that has public relevance. Promoting social justice forms the backdrop for all of her work. She routinely incorporates her experiences in the community into her teaching and has brought her students into projects in dynamic community contexts as a way of enhancing her courses and student learning. Her students demonstrate engaged learning in significant and measurable ways that positively affect their retention and academic success. The portfolio she has submitted for consideration for promotion and tenure carefully describes and provides evidence for her integrated faculty roles: her teaching, research, and service are all intertwined and mutually reinforcing.

Linda's case in many ways represents the hopeful future of faculty; increasingly diverse, increasingly employing high-impact pedagogical practices in teaching that positively impact the learning and success of students with a range of learning styles, and often committed to scholarly agendas tied to issues in local communities (Rhoads, 2008; Kuh, 2008). Her case also illustrates the concrete impact of the disconnection between the stated commitments to public mission and the values actually built into the current architecture of many higher education institutions. Unfortunately, faculty members characterized by this profile are entering into universities that often do not provide a supportive environment to thrive and succeed (Ibarra, 2001; Vogelgesang, 2010).

What are the implications of the failure to integrate the institutional priorities of community engagement, faculty and student diversity, and the success of underserved students? In the case above, if the public scholarly work the faculty

---

Case Study: Full Participation

member presented for tenure review is counted as service, not as scholarship, it is devalued. Tenure is not granted and the faculty member seeks a position at a campus that will value who she is as a scholar. The students who would benefit from her teaching and learning practices are less successful academically, the campus loses a talented faculty member of color, the community-based organizations that have benefitted from her involvement—her research, service, and preparation of potential future community leaders—no longer have her as a resource.

Let's consider an alternative scenario: The campus values publicly engaged scholarship, and those values are reflected in the promotion and tenure guidelines and review process. Her department provides support for and cultivates relationships that support Linda's work with the community, and takes account of the labor-intensive aspects of this work. It also develops ways to assess collaborative work, and to take this work into account in evaluating impact and scholarly contributions. The tenure review recognizes and rewards her community-based work as legitimate scholarship, and she is awarded tenure. The campus is implementing a strategic priority of community engagement. By taking this priority seriously, it is addressing the priority of increasing the diversity of the faculty. Additionally, it is addressing another priority, which is to increase engaged student learning to increase the academic success and retention of students, particularly traditionally underserved students. By taking community engagement seriously, this campus has been able to take diversity seriously, and it has been able to take student success seriously. Community engagement has been successfully integrated with other institutional priorities.

Discussion Questions

The questions provided below are tools to catalyze conversation across campus around the architecture of full participation from your perspective on campus or as a community partner working with someone from a campus. *We also encourage you to participate in an on-line conversation by going to the website of the Center for Institutional and Social Change at http://www.fullparticipation.net.*

- What are the full participation goals that seem most pressing and actionable for your institution?

- How does work involving your institution bring together the practices of diversity/equity/inclusion and public scholarship/civic engagement? How does this work relate to the broader full participation goals you have identified?

- What is the language used to communicate full participation goals on your campus? Does this word choice appropriately convey campus initiatives and goals? How can these goals best be communicated among diverse stakeholders?

- Who is involved and how do they work together?

- How is work relating to diversity/inclusion and public scholarship/civic engagement situated in relation to the core values of your institution?

- How is this work supported, rewarded, and shared?

- Can you describe examples of integration of these projects and goals, with each other and into the fabric of the institution? What are their features?

- What are examples of products or outcomes of this work that have emerged or can be envisioned?

- What are the obstacles or challenges to integrating these approaches with each other?

- How would your institution have to be transformed for these values to become central to its culture and practices?

- Where do you see momentum or openings to push for this kind of transformation? Who are potential allies? Where are the possibilities for collaboration?

The authors welcome your ideas, feedback, and recommendations. Please contact Susan Sturm (ssturm@law.columbia.edu), Timothy Eatman (tkeatman@syr.edu), John Saltmarsh (john.saltmarsh@umb.edu), or Adam Bush (adambush@usc.edu).

References

Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(5), 582-602.

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, *23*(4), 373–398.

Arizona State University, *The New American University*, December 2010, at http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, *39*, 363–391.

Berger, B. (2009). Political theory, political science, and the end of civic engagement. *Perspectives on Politics, 2, 335-350.*

Bok, D. C. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bound, J., Lovenheim, M., & Turner, S. (2009). Why have college completion rates declined? An analysis of changing student preparation and collegiate resources. NBER Working Papers 15566, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Bush, A. (2010). Live your truth. *IA News,* (15), 10-11.

Cantor, N. (2011). *Scholarship in Action: Remapping Higher Education.* Anna and Samual Pinanski Lecture, Wellesley College. Retrieved from http://www.syr.edu/chancellor/selected_works/

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2006). Community Engagement Classification. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php.

Carnevale, A., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2010). *Help wanted: Projections of jobs and education requirements through 2018*. Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce.

Carpio, G, Luk, S, & Bush, A. (2011). Building people's histories: Graduate student teaching, undergraduate education, and collaborating with community partners. Unpublished research study.

Christensen, C., Horn, M., Caldera, L. & Soares, L. (2011). *Disrupting college: How disruptive innovation can deliver quality and affordability to postsecondary education*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Cress, C., Burack, C., Giles, D., Elkins, J., Stevens, M. (2010). *A promising connection: Increasing college access and success through civic engagement*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(5), 341-342.

Eatman, T., Weber, S., Bush, A., Nastasi, W., Higgins, R., & Imagining America. (2011). Study of publicly engaged scholars: Career aspirations and decisions of graduate students and early career professionals and practitioners. Unpublished research study. Retrieved from http://www.ia-research.org/

Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). *On change: En route to transformation.* Occasional paper no. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship.

Hale, C., (Ed.). (2008). *Engaging contradictions: Theory, politics, and methods of activist scholarship*. Berkeley, CA: GAIA Books, Global, Area, and International Archive, University of California Press.

Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187-203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group and The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Hurtado, S. (2007). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *30*(2), 185-196.

Ibarra, R.A. (2001). *Beyond affirmative action: Reframing the context of higher education.* University of Wisconsin Press.

Kuh, G. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Milem, J., Chang, M., & Antonio, A. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from www.aacu.org/inclusive_excellence/pdfs/Milem_Final.pdf.

Moreno, J., Smith, D., Clayton-Pedersen, A., Parker, S., & Teraguchi, D.H. (2006). *The revolving door for underrepresented minority faculty in higher education: An analysis from the campus diversity initiative*. A research brief from The James Irvine Foundation Campus Diversity Initiative Evaluation Project.

Rendón, L. (2009). *Sentipensante (sensing/thinking) pedagogy: Educating for wholeness, social justice and liberation*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Rhoades, G., Kiyama, J., McCormick, R., & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. *The Review of Higher Education, 31*(2), 209-35.

Saltmarsh, J. (2010a). Book review essay for the *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.* Hale, C.R. (Ed.), *Engaging contradictions: Theory, politics, and methods of activist scholarship*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Saltmarsh, J. (2010b). The new American scholar. Book review essay for the *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning.* Laura I. Rendón, *Sentipensante (sensing/thinking) pedagogy: Educating for wholeness, social justice and liberation*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. (2009). community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: an investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In S. Billig, , B. Moely, & and B. Holland (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement, Vol. 10 in Advances in Service-Learning Research*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2011). *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. (2008). *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

Sanchez, G. (2005). *Crossing Figueroa: The Tangled Web of Diversity and Democracy,* Foreseeable Futures #4. Imagining America.

Sturm, S. (2006). The architecture of inclusion: Advancing workplace equity in higher education. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*, *29*, 247-334.

Sturm, S. (2007). The architecture of inclusion: Interdisciplinary insights on pursuing institutional citizenship. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*, *30*, 409-424.

Sturm, S. (2010). Activating systemic change toward full participation: The pivotal role of mission-driven institutional intermediaries. *Saint Louis Law Journal*, *54*, 1117-1137.

Sturm, S. (2011a). Reframing the equality agenda. Presented at Harvard Law School conference on *Evolutions in Anti-Discrimination Law in Europe and North America*, April 30, 2011.

Sturm, S. (2011b). The architecture of inclusion—core concepts. Retrieved August 30, 2011 at www.changecenter.org/coreconcept.

Swail, W., Redd, K., & Perna, L. (2003). *Retaining minority students in higher education: A framework for success.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, *30*(2).

Yosso, T., Parker, L., Solórzano, D., Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: A critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Education*, *28*, 1-25.

Vogelgesang, L., Denson, N., Jayakumar, U. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *The Review of Higher Education*, *33*(4), 437-472.