The Inheritance of Next Generation Engagement Scholars

John Saltmarsh, University of Massachusetts, Boston

Matthew Hartley, University of Pennsylvania

Since the early 2000s, engaged scholars have been part of a generational shift in higher education, inheriting a legacy and rich history informed by the sweeping civic engagement movement that emerged in the late 1970s. Understanding this inheritance is foundational to contemporary efforts to shape engaged scholarship and change higher education institutions in ways that support engaged scholars and serve a larger public, democratic purpose. There are lessons to be learned from this movement's past. Examining its trajectory also points to common ideals that continue to draw people together. Like all movements, the civic engagement movement has been sustained by support networks, the vast majority of which have been established in the past two decades (Hartley, 2011; Hollander & Hartley, 2000). Perhaps more importantly, movements are sustained by a clear understanding of what they hope to achieve and what they are moving against (Della Porta & Diani, 2006). For example, the civil rights movement not only sought to create a world of racial understanding and equality, but also opposed bigotry and the laws that upheld a system of segregation. In the same way, the civic engagement movement has been animated by a desire to promote civic agency and to foster participatory democracy. Its ideals have constituted a sustained critique of the notion of the university as an "ivory tower" and schooling as an exercise in depositing knowledge into the minds of passively receptive students (Freire, 1970). Recognizing these common purposes and adopting new tactics to achieve them in a changing world comprise the foundation of any successful, sustained movement.

<div align="center">**A Meta History of the Civic Engagement Movement**</div>

Cold War Science

  The institutions and individuals that shaped the civic engagement movement were

working within a larger history that was seeking to redefine colleges and universities as social,

political, economic, and moral institutions. Higher education in the United States was

fundamentally shaped by Cold War science and the infusion of federal funding that fueled the

military, industrial, and university complex. Vannevar Bush's (1945) *Science, the Endless*

Frontier framed an epistemological and methodological case both for the primacy of pure

science as the standard for research and for basic research to reside at the top of a hierarchy of

knowledge production and dissemination, with applied research and knowledge then flowing

from the university outward to society (Stokes, 1997). *Science, the Endless Frontier* laid the

groundwork for the creation of the National Science Foundation (NSF), and postwar

appropriations for the NSF began to reshape research universities, a trend propelled by Sputnik

and a deepening national crisis defined by the Cold War and fought with scientific advances

(Leslie, 1993).

  In short, the civic engagement movement inherited what Schön (1995) referred to as an

institutional epistemology of "technical rationality" (p. 27) that privileged basic research and an

epistemological architecture that fragmented knowledge into increasingly narrow specializations.

This fragmentation was mirrored institutionally in siloed departments, a splintering that began at

the turn of the 20th century with the rise of the academic disciplines (Benson, Harkavy, &

Hartley, 2005). Increased fragmentation and academic work that privileged interests of

disciplinary knowledge over knowledge to serve the public good gave rise to a growing chorus

of critiques about the university as out of touch, unable to address pressing social issues whose

complexity required transdisciplinary approaches.

The Cognitive Sciences and Learning

One of the problems with the institutional epistemology and architecture was that it

largely ignored student learning and development. By the mid-1980s, there emerged an endless

stream of reports on the failure of undergraduate education—for instance, *Involvement in*

Learning (1984), *Integrity in the College Curriculum* (1985), *To Secure Our Blessings* (1986),

Transforming the State Role in Undergraduate Education (1986) (Cross, 1993, p. 288).

Campuses that were constructed around a cult of objectification and positivism and that

separated students' cognitive development from their socio-emotional development (i.e.,

divisions of academic affairs and student affairs) were, according to critics, fundamentally

dehumanizing and undermined educational ideals. Coincident with the rise of the civic

engagement movement was a period of significant advances in the cognitive sciences and in

developmental psychology. By the late 1980s and early 1990s, research had clearly demonstrated

both how people learn and how the structures and practices of colleges and universities were not

designed for optimal student learning. This period is littered with national reports that brought

the research forward to reveal that the pedagogical architecture of lecture halls and what Freire

called a "banking" model of education (1994)—depositing information into empty-headed

students—was not the way to produce learning. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's

(1982) *Women's Ways of Knowing*, Chickering and Gamson's (1987) "Seven Principles of Good

Practice in Undergraduate Education," Barr and Tagg's (1994) "From Teaching to Learning,"

Peter Ewell's (1997) "Organizing for Learning," and many other seminal pieces were widely

read and discussed. While all of these drew upon a long history of educational theorists who

championed active learning—including Dewey, Lewin, Kolb, and others—they arrived at the same conclusion: Learning happens when students' affective and cognitive development is seen as integrated, when their knowledge and experiences are validated, when they are engaged actively and collaboratively in the learning process, when they have opportunities for direct experience, and when they reflect on their experiences and on who they are as learners. In the most widely cited article published in the influential *Change* magazine, Barr and Tagg (1995) wrote that in a "learning-centered" environment, the "purpose is not to transfer knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learners that make discoveries and solve problems" (p. 15). The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) emerged from developments in the cognitive sciences and the quest for improving undergraduate education. Piloted in 1999 and first administered in 2000, the NSSE was a means for campuses to understand whether students perceived that they were engaged in learning and that they were participating in active and collaborative learning processes as part of their educational experience.

The university and society

During this time period, questions were also being asked about the role of the university in society. As Ernest Boyer wrote in his groundbreaking 1996 essay, "The Scholarship of Engagement," the university had failed in addressing the country's most significant social, civic, and ethical issues. Something had to change in order to create "a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and creatively with each other" (p. 20). The "special climate" that recognized knowledge assets and expertise outside of academia meant that academics would need to rethink the core processes of generating and disseminating

knowledge. The engagement he envisioned would make room for a different way to generate knowledge, which was needed in order for the university to "to serve a larger purpose" (p. 13). It required a renewed way of thinking about "knowledge and scholarship," a phrase that served as the title of a 1994 article by Lynton in which he explored two key ideas: the flow of knowledge and an "ecosystem" of knowledge. Interrogating the flow of knowledge, Lynton noted that "the current primacy of research in the academic value system" fostered a "persistent misconception of a unidirectional flow of knowledge, from the locus of research to the place of application, from scholar to practitioner, teacher to student, expert to client" (p. 87). Such a "linear view of knowledge flow," he added, "inevitably creates a hierarchy of values according to which research is the most important, and all other knowledge-based activities are derivative and secondary." "In short," he wrote, "the domain of knowledge has no one-way streets." This logic of a multi-directional flow led Lynton to conceptualize knowledge as an "eco-system," in which it "is everywhere fed back, constantly enhanced. We need to think of knowledge in an ecological fashion, recognizing the complex, multifaceted and multiply-connected system" and to recognize that "knowledge moves through this system in many directions" (pp. 88-89).

The notion of focusing knowledge generation on addressing critical social issues was manifested in the rise of action research, teacher research, and practitioner inquiry. It was also taken up by federal agencies that provided large amounts of research funding to universities. The National Institutes for Health and the Centers for Disease Control recognized the importance of collaborative research in partnership with affected communities. The National Science Foundation (NSF) focused attention on "broader impacts," "the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes" (National Science Board, 2011, p. 2). While the NSF considered broader impacts beginning in the 1960s, it was not until

1997 that this focus became a separate and distinct criterion, and only in 2007 did the NSF further clarify the criteria to emphasize transformative research (NSF, 2014). The NSF considered five questions in assessing the broader impacts criteria:

> How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society? (National Science Board, 2011, p. 4)

At the core of the goal of broader impacts were another set of questions: "What is the nature of the system within which scientific knowledge is transformed into public policy or social action?"; "What interactions characterize this system?"; and, "What skill sets and partnerships do scientists need to develop in order to optimize the transformation of their science into actionable and useful knowledge?" (National Science Foundation, 2013).

Civic disengagement

Central to the rise of the civic engagement movement was the need to reclaim what Boyer (1990) called higher education's "civic mandate" (p.16), particularly as the campus foment of the sixties gave way to a disquieting calm that was interpreted widely as student apathy and self-absorption. The focus on higher education's civic mission and the concern with student political disengagement were two sides of the same civic-engagement coin. American culture during the 1970s had fostered what the social historian Christopher Lasch (1979) called "a culture of narcissism," a state of affairs popularly described by the writer Tom Wolf (1976) as

"the 'Me' decade." By 1985, sociologist Robert Bellah and his colleagues argued in the

bestseller, *Habits of the Heart*, that although individualism was a distinguishing characteristic of

American social thought and behavior, it had "grown cancerous" (p. xlvii). There was an

undercurrent of discontent felt by faculty and expressed in the popularity of writers like Page

Smith (*Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America, 1990*) and Parker Palmer ("Divided No

More," 1992). In 1985, Frank Newman, while at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement

of Teaching, wrote in *Higher Education and the American Resurgence* that "the most critical

demand is to restore to higher education its original purpose of preparing graduates for a life of

involved and committed citizenship" (p. xiv).

Newman and other higher education leaders over the next decades were concerned with

the future of American democracy as study after study revealed that 18- to 24-year-olds

expressed little interest in participating in mainstream politics. Trend data from "The American

Freshman," a key survey of college students conducted annually by the University of California,

Los Angeles (UCLA), showed a sharp decline in student political engagement. The percentage of

freshmen who considered "keeping up to date with political affairs" to be an "essential or very

important" objective dropped from 60% in 1966 to 45.2% in 1980. (The percentage eventually

reached a low of 28.1% in 2000.)[1] In 2000, campus presidents who joined the national coalition

Campus Compact issued the *Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher

Education*, stating that: "we share a special concern about the disengagement of college students

from democratic participation. A chorus of studies reveals that students are not connected to the

larger purposes and aspirations of the American democracy. Voter turnout is low. Feelings that

political participation will not make any difference are high. Added to this, there is a profound

sense of cynicism and lack of trust in the political process" (p. 1).

---

[1] http://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/pubs/TFS/Trends/Monographs/TheAmericanFreshman40YearTrends.pdf

At the same time, a fierce national debate sprang up in the country around how campuses ought to respond to the political disaffection of America's youth. For many, students who volunteered for community service were performing good deeds but were not acting politically, and campuses that promoted service were not promoting the knowledge, skills, and values needed for active political participation in a democracy. The politics of service surfaced amidst President George H. W. Bush's support for the National Community Services Act of 1990: "I am particularly pleased that [this act] will promote an ethic of community service … Government cannot rebuild a family or reclaim a sense of neighborhood, and no bureaucratic program will ever solve the pressing human problems that can be addressed by a vast galaxy of people working voluntarily in their own backyards." (quoted in Kahn and Westhiemer, 1996, p. 8). However, as Kahne and Westhiemer (1996) noted, "Bush was advancing voluntary community service as an alternative to government programs … [W]hile requiring students to 'serve America' (the rhetoric of the federal legislation) might produce George Bush's 'thousand points of light,' it might also promote a thousand points of the status quo" (p. 8).

Social justice and change

It was one thing to raise the question of whether the purpose of the civic engagement movement was to change American higher education, but it was another to ask whether its purpose was to change American society. This was the larger politics of the movement that Kahne and Westheimer (1996) were raising. At bottom, it was a question of whether the civic engagement movement was a movement for social justice, and, if so, what were the implications for higher education? How one's identity as an engaged scholar intersected with the larger history of American higher education and its role in advancing social justice had implications for how one positioned themselves in relation to the college or university as an institution.

As a movement sharing demands for social justice in the 1960s, the civic engagement movement overlapped and intersected with a movement for diversity and inclusion in higher education, a movement with deep roots in the struggles for civil rights (Vogelgesang, 2004). While both movements sought legitimacy within the academy, by the 1990s tensions emerged as the civic engagement movement realized greater acceptance through an emphasis on de-politicized pedagogy, curriculum, and student learning. Those in the civic engagement movement often seemed oblivious to the potential synergy of their work with the work of diversity and inclusion on campuses and in local communities (Battistoni, 1995). In the first short history of the "community service movement in American higher education" (Liu, 1996), there is no mention of issues of diversity work on campus or how the efforts at advancing service-learning and community service might advance social justice in a diverse democracy. As structures supporting community service and service-learning emerged on campuses in the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s—at the same time that campuses had established or were establishing multicultural centers and ethnic studies departments—there was "a strong tendency to separate and compartmentalize these two efforts on college campuses" (Vogelgesang, 2004, p. 34). The two movements struggled to find greater connection on campuses even as they used very different frameworks and languages to describe their work; as Beckham (1999) noted in the late 1990s, "supporters of each reform movement tend to discount the complexities of the other" (p. 5).

Beckham, the first African-American dean of the college at Wesleyan University and a program officer at the Ford Foundation leading campus diversity initiatives during the 1990s, also noted "we face another obstacle to collaboration" that had to do with a "certain lack of fit…especially having to do with the ways is which" some scholars "describe the past and the

future ”(6). Beckham surfaced a difficult reality about the work of scholars who identified their

scholarship as “engaged” or “activist” and who viewed the university as an institution of

oppression that fueled wider social injustices. For many of these scholars, often from

underrepresented racial and ethnic groups and women, their goal was to direct their intellectual

resources and the resources of the university to addressing social injustices in local communities.

They did not position themselves as part of the civic engagement movement, in part because they

did not see their work as the reform of the institutions of higher education. Theirs was a

historical relationship to institutions of higher education captured by Moten and Harney (2004)

when they claimed that “the only possible relationship” of the “subversive intellectual” to “the

university today is criminal one…to sneak into the university and steal what one can” (p. 101).

Resistance to a stakeholder relationship came from the concern that the university would

appropriate and corrupt these scholars’ social justice work, following the academy’s past record

of exclusion, oppression, and injustice. Thus, there was an orientation that distanced activist

scholars from service learning efforts and wider claims towards an engaged campus because

such efforts could appear to serve as cover for the ways in which the university was part of a

wider social culture of injustice and, thus, part of the problem. The politics of activist scholarship

invoked collaboration with those in local communities, but resisted the politics of scholars being

collaborators with the university.

     This historical and political undercurrent ran deep. Beckham named it as a historical

divide between aspirational and historical democracy. He wrote that those in the civic

engagement movement aspired to strengthening “the civic mission of the research university,”

and that they “discern something in history that should be ‘recovered ’”(6). According to

Beckham, these scholars viewed the civic mission of higher education as “something that once

existed, but which has been lost,(p. 6)" something that required retrieval. For many others, whose scholarly work was defined by a social justice agenda, "the rhetoric of civic renewal can sound dangerous, threatening to smooth over the gross injustices of the past…for America's minority populations"(7).

Amidst the often un-acknowledged repercussions of a divided history, Beckham and others were striving to find a way for advocates of campus diversity and those advancing the civic engagement movement to find common ground. By the 2000s, those in the civic engagement movement were forced to account for the complexities of diversity. Students were increasingly diverse in every way, as were the graduate students and the young faculty entering the professoriate. Moreover, many of the communities that urban campuses in particular were partnering with were predominantly historically underserved communities of color.

By the mid-2000s, efforts to connect service-learning programs to college readiness in the K-12 schools had arisen, particularly for underserved students in underperforming schools. Often, however, that access did not mean access to the campus that sent the college students into the schools, and it had few implications for changing campus culture. By the late 2000s, greater connection between the two movements, greater accounting of their complexities, and the associated need for organizational change on campus led to the emergence of structural connections. For example, a number of campuses combined offices of diversity and inclusion with offices of civic engagement, recognizing the inherently intertwined nature of the work (Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh, & Bush, 2011).

While the civic engagement movement did seek to promote deeper partnerships between colleges and universities and their communities and to enact positive social change, it did not necessarily embrace social justice as a chief aim or adopt political activism as a means for

challenging the status quo. It failed to encourage what Barber (1984) called "strong democracy."

Boyte joined Barber in critiquing apolitical conceptions of service because it met students' needs

for "personal relevance and a sense of membership in a community [but they] … usually

disavow[ed] concern with larger policy questions, seeing service as an *alternative* to politics"

(1991, p. 766). In the early 1980s, with the formation of COOL, and again in the early 2000s,

beginning with the Wingspread summit on student civic engagement, students called for campus

leaders to recognize student altruism and provide opportunities to express it. In 2001, when a

group of 33 undergraduates representing 27 colleges and universities came together at

Wingspread, they challenged the critics as well as their institutions. The students waded into a

simmering debate about the varieties of community service experiences (ex. charity versus

justice projects), and "argued that community service is a form of alternative politics, not an

alternative to politics" (Long, 2002, p. vi). They argued that campuses needed to structure

educational opportunities to connect individual acts of service to a broader framework of

systematic social change, leading, potentially, to institutional transformation as campuses,

government, and public policy become more responsive, public-spirited, and citizen-centered.

These two themes—student political engagement and the role of the campus in preparing

citizens—were woven together by the vexing problem of the role of higher education in

preparing students as citizens in a democracy.

Neoliberalism

Alongside the problematic institutional epistemology, architecture, and pervasiveness of

passive pedagogies, arose neoliberalism, a political ideology that not only shaped the political

economy of the United States, but also took hold in the political economy of colleges and

universities. The last decades of the 20th century witnessed both the rise of the neoliberal,

market-driven, highly privatized university and the demand for universities to address more

effectively critical social issues, many of which were impervious to market solutions.

Neoliberalism's effects were apparent in the state's withdrawal from funding public universities,

a result of abandoning the overarching notion of higher education as a public good (Bloom,

Hartley, & Rosovsky, 2006). Instead, education became part of the commodification of

everything, and its larger democratic and social goals were either discarded or redefined in

market terms. Trend data from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA show a

significant shift over time in the attitudes of incoming students regarding the purposes of higher

education. In 1967, 85 percent of students indicated that "developing a meaningful philosophy

of life" was an essential or very important objective of higher education. By 2003, however, that

number had dropped to 39.3 percent. During the same time period, the percentage of students

indicating that "being very well off financially" was a priority jumped from 42.2 percent to 73.8

percent.

        As colleges and universities adopted prevailing neoliberal principles, higher education

became viewed as a private benefit, hence the effects of defunding public post-secondary

education, rising tuition costs, increasing student debt, the proliferation of online for-profit

providers, and the dominance of contingent-faculty labor. Philanthropy also shifted its funding

strategies away from higher education. It is hard to know the degree to which funding priorities

were influenced by the broader discourse of privatization, but the result was unambiguous. In

the 1980s and 1990s, the major foundations including the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie

Endowment , Templeton, Pew Charitable Trusts, the Kellogg Foundation, and the Atlantic

Philanthropies—collectively had poured tens of millions of dollars into improving undergraduate

education and building capacity for public engagement. They were committed to higher

education as a public good and invested their resources accordingly. By the early 2000s,

however, each and every one of these foundations had deprioritized their funding of higher

education as a place that educates citizens for a healthy democracy because the self-evident truth

of the public good of colleges and universities had been surpassed by issues of access,

affordability, and workforce preparation—issues predominantly framed as access to the private

benefit of higher education. From a philanthropic perspective, higher education as a place of

teaching and learning to cultivate the intellect, promote ethical growth, and develop interpersonal

competence and professional preparation of students as citizens was abandoned. The civic

engagement movement was often on the defensive, reclaiming the democratic purposes of higher

education, countering the reductionist trends sweeping across the landscape of higher education,

and attempting to counteract neoliberalism's effects on the university.

A new generation of scholars

Enormous demographic shifts in the United States coincided with the emergence of civic

engagement movement. This resulted in greater numbers of women, people of color, and low-

income individuals pursuing higher education, groups that had either not sought a postsecondary

degree or had been excluded from the academy. These changes in the student population were

mirrored, albeit more slowly, in the faculty. For many within the academy, the success of these

underrepresented and underserved students became the litmus test for whether issues of access,

equity, and social justice were embodied in the civic mission and democratic purpose of higher

education. As campuses were slow to change, affirmative action aimed to increase access for

historically excluded groups. Neoliberal reaction led to the decimation of affirmative action, but

many campuses embraced the educational value of diversity as core to their mission and

struggled to adapt to the new demographics—if not for higher ideals than out of enlightened self-interest in attracting an increasingly diverse applicant pool.

For underrepresented faculty pursuing academic careers, the university was often a hostile place. The institution may have opened the door, but once inside, faculty found a narrow environment unaccepting of many ways of knowing and different habits of being. The institutional epistemology of the university was not hospitable to emerging forms of scholarship (or the scholars who used them), often referred to as collaborative or public scholarship, that originated in a rich and complex intersection of feminist, postmodern, postcolonial, and critical race theories, and employed a broad array of disciplinary approaches, schools of thought, and methodological practices. The presence of these scholars, their confrontation with the academy, and their determination to create a different kind of university, would have deep and pervasive implications for higher education—across the curriculum, through teaching and learning practices, in research and scholarship, and in determining the ultimate relevance of the university to the wider society.

Focusing on these significant trends in American higher education, HERI added questions to their faculty survey in 2004-2005 aimed at assessing faculty involvement in civic engagement in their scholarship and teaching and their perceptions of the institutional environment. One of the questions centered on whether, in the previous two years, the faculty member "collaborated with the local community in teaching/research." In the 2013-14 survey, the response to this question from faculty at all undergraduate campuses was 48.8 percent (Eagan et. al, 2014). At public campuses, it was 50.4 percent; among tenure track faculty, 51.1 percent; among women faculty, 52.4 percent ; and among Hispanic faculty, 55.2 percent . By all institutional types, faculty ranks, genders, and race/ethnicity groups, the data indicate increases

in the percentage of faculty identifying community engagement in their teaching and research in

every dimension since the question was first asked a decade earlier. (See Table 1.)

Table 1

Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, Faculty Survey; Changes in Faculty Reports of
"*During the past two years, have you collaborated with the local community in
teaching/research*?"

		Percentage, 2004-2005	Percentage, 2013-2014*	+ Percentage Change in Response
All Baccalaureate Institutions		42.4%	48.8%	6.5%
Institutional Control	Public	44.0%	50.4%	6.4%
	Private	38.3%	46.4%	8.1%
Academic Rank	Professor	40.4%	45.0%	4.6%
	Associate Professor	46.9%	52.5%	5.6%
	Assistant Professor	45.5%	51.1%	5.6%
	Lecturer	35.9%	45.0%	9.1%
	Instructor	35.6%	46.0%	10.4%
Tenure Status	Tenured	43.2%	48.2%	5.0%
	On tenure track, but not tenured	46.8%	51.1%	4.3%
	Not on tenure track, but institution has tenure system	38.6%	47.9%	9.3%
	Institution has no tenure system	34.4%	48.1%	13.7%
Sex	Male	41.1%	46.3%	5.2%
	Female	44.1%	52.4%	8.3%
Race/Ethnicity	American Indian	53.4%	86.8%	33.4%
	Asian	40.9%	46.8%	5.9%
	Black	40.4%	42.4%	2.0%
	Hispanic	38.1%	55.2%	17.1%
	White	42.3%	48.4%	6.1%
	Other	47.4%	53.4%	6.0%
	Two or more	44.7%	57.1%	12.4%

	race/ethnicity			

*Based on responses from 16,112 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty at 269 four-year colleges and universities.

As one data point contributing to an understanding of emerging faculty work during the development of the civic engagement movement, the HERI faculty survey allows us to gain perspective on a new generation of faculty. As the faculty became increasingly diverse, as evidence from the cognitive sciences revealed the importance of experience in student learning, as there was greater understanding of the kinds of knowledge needed to address social issues in communities (despite and perhaps because of the intransigence of neoliberalism), a generation of engaged faculty emerged within the academy. This next generation of engaged scholars is both a product of the civic engagement movement and a foreshadowing of its future.

Next Generation Engaged Scholars and the Rise of the Public Engagement Knowledge

Regime

Part of the inheritance of the next generation of engaged scholars is a history of the civic engagement movement that empowers them to claim agency in creating what can be identified as an emerging "public engagement knowledge/learning regime." Slaughter and Rhoades, in their 2004 book *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy*, make the case that throughout the 20th century, there were two "knowledge/learning regimes" operating within higher education, both coexisting within the dominant institutional cultures of higher education.

The language of "regimes" is significant; it is a language of power, privilege, and politics. It constructs an understanding of knowledge generation and of teaching and learning that is inherently political—with consequences for equity and justice in a democracy. It is a language that can evoke unease and discomfort, suggesting a conflict within an academy that prefers not to have issues of power and politics enter into the heady atmosphere of freedom of

thought and detached objectivity. It makes visible the kind of struggle Schön (1995) discussed

when he wrote of the "battle of epistemologies" (p. 34) on campus. The language of regimes, and

competing regimes, also suggests regime change that challenges the legitimacy and prestige of

the status quo. Slaughter and Rhoads (2004) referred to one regime as the "public good regime;"

the other, the "academic capitalism regime" (pp. 28-29). The academic capitalism

knowledge/learning regime "values privatization and profit taking in which institutions, inventor

faculty, and corporations have claims that come before those of the public," and holds that

"knowledge is constructed as a private good, valued for creating streams of high-technology

products that generate profits as they flow through global markets" (p. 29). In contrast, the public

good knowledge/learning regime is "characterized by valuing knowledge as a public good to

which the citizenry has claims;" its "cornerstone … was basic science that led to the discovery of

new knowledge within academic disciplines, serendipitously leading to public benefits" (p. 28).

According to the authors' historical narrative of higher education, the public good regime

prevailed early in the 1900s, but by the end of the 20th century, the academic capitalism regime

had driven out the public good regime; thus, in the early 21st century, academic capitalism was in

ascendancy if not dominance, and the public good was under siege.

A history of the community engagement movement reveals that among and through the

next generation of engagement scholars, an emergent public engagement knowledge/learning

regime is competing for ascendancy in the current historical moment. It is a regime that is

fundamentally different from the public good regime and the academic capitalism regime, a

regime that does not perpetuate the existing institutional structures and cultures—in other words,

a knowledge/learning regime that necessitates institutional change and transformation.

The public good regime reflects the dominant academic culture of higher education, often characterized as "scientific," "rationalized," and "objectified," meaning that the approach to public problems is predominantly shaped by specialized expertise "applied" externally "to" or "on" the community, providing "solutions" to what has been determined to be the community's "needs." In the public good regime, the public service function of the university is defined by an activity (e.g., research or service) that happens in a place (a community) whereby knowledge flows from the university to the community, the university is the center of problem-solving, and the university produces knowledge that the community consumes—all done with the self-proclaimed justification of providing public benefits.

The goal of the public good regime is for academics who create knowledge to move it beyond the ivory tower. In the public engagement regime, the goal is for academics to move beyond the ivory tower to create knowledge. Unlike the public good regime, the public engagement regime comprises core academic norms determined by values such as inclusiveness, participation, task sharing, and reciprocity in public problem-solving, and an equality of respect for the knowledge and experience that everyone contributes to education, knowledge generation, and community building. Within the public engagement regime, academic work is done *with* the public; there is shared authority for knowledge generation and co-creation of knowledge and problem-solving that values relational, localized, contextual knowledge. In the public engagement regime, the university is a part of an ecosystem of knowledge production addressing public problem-solving, with the purpose of advancing an inclusive, collaborative, and deliberative democracy.

For next generation engagement scholars, public engagement raises the relationship of knowledge to power, privilege, politics, and self-interest. In Etienne's 2012 book *Pushing Back*

the Gates, a study of university-community engagement, he maintains that successful

engagement requires three ingredients: long-term, sustained, leadership; substantial

infrastructure; and a widespread sense of self-interest. This element of self-interest shapes next

generation engagement; the institution and those who enact the mission of the institution share a

core understanding that the well-being of the campus is connected to the well-being of the local

community. In the academic capitalism regime, self-interest was market share or shareholder

interest. In the public good regime, self-interest is often translated into the research and prestige

interests of the faculty. Only in the public engagement knowledge regime is there a more

authentic sense of self-interest. That is, it is in the best interest of the knowledge, learning, and

democracy-building mission of the campus to be engaged deeply in the education, health,

housing, employment, and overall well-being of the local community.

As the backbone of the public engagement knowledge regime, next generation scholars

are seeking campuses at which they can thrive as engaged scholars. If they find that the

institution is a barrier to their engagement, they seek regime change. The public good regime

does not require that anything be done differently in the university. All that is needed is to

improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what exists, without disturbing the basic

organizational features or substantially altering the ways in which faculty and students perform

their roles. There is no need for major shifts in institutional culture. As one scholar of literary

studies, who identifies himself as a public good scholar, has written, the existing "structure will

do quite nicely as a home, thank you, though it ever so badly needs paint, perhaps an addition or

two, and a bit of landscaping" (Teres, 2011, p. 34). All that is needed, in this positioning of

higher education's relation to the public good, "are innovative efforts to bring the knowledge,

expertise, and protocols of careful, critical thinking developed over generations within the

academy to bear on the experiences and problems of our fellow citizens who make up the general public" (p. 45). Next generation scholars seek cultural norms that support public engagement and therefore enact agency by bringing about transformational changes in policies and structures. These changes can require major shifts in an institution's culture that are deep and pervasive, altering underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products. The history of the civic engagement movement in American higher education suggests that fundamental culture change in the academy is needed, not merely a new coat of paint.

While the history of the civic engagement movement in American higher education indicates a rich and robust emergence, countervailing forces surround it. Thus, the outcome of the current "movement" around publically engaged scholarship and institutional public engagement of colleges and universities is not certain. This is an auspicious historical moment that one might describe in this way: Located squarely between the neoliberal, market-driven, highly privatized university and the need for universities to more effectively address social issues and improve the human condition are the issues of community engagement, publically engaged scholarship, and university-community partnerships. This is the crux of the "crucible moment" identified by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012), and what David Scobey (2012) terms the "Copernican moment." It is nothing less than the moment for next generation engaged scholars to create the future of higher education.

References

Barber, B. R. (1984) *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA:

    University of California Press.

Barr, R. B, & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate

    education. *Change*, *27*(6), 12-25

Battistoni, R. (1995) Service learning, diversity, and the liberal arts curriculum. *Liberal*

    Education, 81(1), 30-35.

Beckham, E. (1999) Civic learning and campus diversity: bridging the language gap (Peer

    review). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of*

    knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bellah, R.N. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American Life*.

    Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Hartley, M. (2005). Integrating a commitment to the public good into

    the institutional fabric. In A. Kezar, T. Chambers, & J. Burkhardt (Eds)., *Higher*

    education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement. (pp. 185-

    216). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boom, D., Hartley, M., & Rosovsky, H. (2006). Beyond private gain: The public benefits of

    higher education. In P. Altbach & J. Forrest (Eds.), *International handbook of higher*

    education (pp. 293-308). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the

    Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, *1*(1), 11-20.

Boyte, H. B. (1991) Community service and civic education, *Phi Delta Kappan*, *72*(10), 765-67.

Bush, V. (1945) *Science, the endless frontier*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Campus Compact. (2000). *The presidents' declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education*. Providence, RI: Author.

Chickering, A. W. & Gamson, Z. F. (1987, March) Seven principles of good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 3-7.

Cross, K. P. (1993). Improving the quality of instruction. In A. Levine (Ed.), *Higher education in America, 1980-2000*. (pp. 287-308). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

National Science Foundation. (2013, January 30). Dear colleague letter: Workshop for engaging social, behavioral, and economic scientists through social and policy entrepreneurship (nsf13046). Washington, DC: Author.

Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Berdan Lozano, J., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R. & Hurtado, S. (2014). *Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2013-2014 faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Etienne, H. F. *(2012) Pushing back the gates: Neighborhood perspectives on university-driven revitalization in West Philadelphia.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ewell, P. T. (1997). Organizing for learning. *AAHE Bulletin*, *50*(4), 3-6.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1998). *Where's the learning in service learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1960).

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what? The politics of service learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *77*(9), 592-99.

Lash, C. (1979) *A culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations*. New York: Norton.

Leslie, S. W. (1993) *The Cold War and American science*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Liu, G. (1996). Origins, evolution, and progress: Reflections on the community service movement in American higher education, 1985-1995. In *Community service in higher education: A decade of development.* Providence, RI: Providence College

Long, S. E. (2002). *The new student politics: The Wingspread statement on student civic engagement*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Lynton, E. A. (1994). Knowledge and scholarship. *Metropolitan universities: An international forum*, *5*(1), 9-17.

Moten, F. and Harney, S. (2004) The university and the undercommons: Seven theses. *Social Text*, 79 (vol. 22, No. 2) Summer, pp. 101-115.

National Science Board. (2011). National Science Foundation's merit review criteria:

Review and revisions (NSB/MR-11-22). Retrieved from

http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/publications/2011/nsb1211.pdf

National Science Foundation. (2014). *Perspectives on broader impacts* (NSF 15-008). Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/od/iia/publications/Broader_Impacts.pdf

National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Newman, F. (1985). *Higher education and the American resurgence*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie

     Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Rimmerman, C.A. (2005). *The new citizenship: Unconventional politics, activism, and service*.

     Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Scobey, D. (2012). A Copernican moment: On the revolutions in higher education. In

D. Harward (Ed.), *Transforming undergraduate education: Theory that compels and practices*

     that succeed. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Schön, D. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change*, *27*(6), 26-35.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004) *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, the*

     state, and higher education, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sturm, S., Eatman, T., Saltmarsh, J., & Bush, A. (2011). *Full participation: Building the*

     architecture for diversity and public engagement in higher education (White paper).

     New York: Columbia University Law School, Center for Institutional and Social Change.

Teres, H. (2011) *The word on the street: Linking the academy and the common reader.* Ann

     Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Vogelgesang, L. J. (2004) Diversity work and service-learning: Understanding campus

     dynamics. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *10*(2), 34-44.

Wolfe, T. (1976, August 23). The "me" decade and the third great awakening. *New*

York Magazine.