Outreach Scholarship 2001: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement

A MONOGRAPH

October 14–16, 2001
The Penn Stater
Conference Center Hotel

an annual conference sponsored by:
The Ohio State University
The Pennsylvania State University
University of Wisconsin-Extension

Table of Contents


THE PENN STATER

Colleagues,

B. Moser

K. Reilly

J. Ryan

We are pleased to share with you the monograph from the Outreach Scholarship 2001 conference, held October 14–16, 2001, at The Penn Stater Conference Center Hotel and sponsored by The Ohio State University, The Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Wisconsin-Extension.

This monograph represents key issues, challenges, successes, and opportunities discussed among the more than 250 college and university leaders, outreach practitioners, and faculty involved in outreach at more than forty colleges and universities.

As noted in the report *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution,* "it is time to go beyond outreach and service to what the Kellogg Commission now defines as 'engagement.' By engagement, we refer to redesigned teaching, research, and extension and service functions that are more sympathetically and productively involved with communities."

It is critical for public universities to become even more engaged; furthermore, our institutions must be focused on enhancing existing models and creating new models for sharing scholarship in ways that have a greater impact on society. This conference provided a forum for sharing approaches and experiences that can lead to a new level of understanding and promise.

Outreach Scholarship 2001 was the first conference in a series sponsored by our three universities. We have established this partnership to support university outreach and engagement and to share and explore best practices for higher education institutions that conduct outreach. We invite you to attend the next conference, at Ohio State from October 6–8, 2002.

We hope this monograph will contribute to the ongoing dialogue around these critical topics.

Sincerely,

Dr. Bobby D. Moser
Vice President
University Outreach
The Ohio State University

Dr. Kevin P. Reilly
Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-Extension

Dr. James H. Ryan
Vice President
Outreach and Cooperative Extension
The Pennsylvania State University

Outreach Scholarship 2001: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement

The Role of Outreach Today

By Deborah A. Benedetti

Outreach leaders at Penn State, Ohio State, and the University of Wisconsin-Extension outlined their vision for engaging their institutions with individuals, organizations, and communities during the conference Outreach Scholarship 2001: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement.

Dr. James H. Ryan, vice president for Outreach and Cooperative Extension at Penn State, and host of the conference; **Dr. Bobby D. Moser,** vice president of University Outreach at Ohio State; and **Dr. Kevin P. Reilly,** chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Extension, addressed conference participants at the opening session, titled "Learning, Discovery, and Engagement: Creating an Outreach Culture."

More than 250 college and university leaders, outreach practitioners, and faculty involved in outreach at more than forty colleges and universities participated in the national conference held at The Penn Stater Conference Center Hotel at the University Park campus. Penn State, Ohio State, and UW-Extension sponsored the conference. The three universities have established a partnership to support university outreach and engagement. As part of the partnership, the institutions will host a series of national conferences to share and explore best practices for higher education institutions that conduct outreach and public service:

- Ohio State will host the next Outreach Scholarship conference October 6–8, 2002 *www.outreachscholarship.org*
- The University of Wisconsin-Extension will host the conference October 5–7, 2003.
- Penn State will host the conference October 10–12, 2004.

Dr. James H. Ryan, Vice President, Outreach and Cooperative Extension, The Pennsylvania State University

James H. Ryan

In his welcoming remarks, Ryan emphasized the critical role that outreach leaders, researchers, and educators play in today's society by linking individuals, organizations, and communities with the knowledge resources of higher education institutions. Such outreach enables universities to respond to society's problems, concerns, and needs, Ryan added, and he pointed to the September 11 events as an example of such need.

"The September 11 events in our nation and our world summon all of our institutions to greater levels of engagement," Ryan said. "No other event in recent history has generated such need for support from every member of society as the terrorist attacks. Never has there been a more pressing need to develop two-way interaction with families, communities, schools, government, business, and health care organizations. Never has higher learning been of such broad-based importance to the future, and never has the challenge been so great—both within and outside the academy."

In response to the attacks, Penn State mobilized its teaching, research, and service resources to rapidly respond to communities locally, nationally, and worldwide. Ryan cited examples of how Penn State marshaled the expertise of its faculty and staff:

- A team of Penn State acoustics specialists traveled to the World Trade Center site to assist rescue and recovery workers with data collection and analysis, using prototype instruments and specialized acoustic technologies.
- The Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center Critical Incident Stress Management Team provided services for emergency and recovery personnel working at the crash site of United Airlines Flight 93 in Somerset County in Pennsylvania.
- As the September 11 events unfolded, Penn State Public Broadcasting began radio coverage of the events. For many rural Pennsylvanians, public broadcasting is the only media available without cable or satellite service. WPSX-TV made a strategic decision on the morning of the attacks to stay with children's programming to provide a safe haven for children.
- Penn State Webmasters converted Penn State Public Broadcasting's public television and radio station Web sites to sources of local information about blood drives, donation efforts, and other community events.
- Penn State **President Graham Spanier's** monthly call-in show, *To the Best of My Knowledge,* featured faculty members who discussed appropriate responses to these attacks, as well as the ways in which life in the United States will change as a result of the

attacks. The program was simulcast locally, and Internet users worldwide were able to link to sound and pictures from the program.

- Penn State Public Broadcasting producers prepared local call-in programs with faculty experts and worked with faculty in the College of Education to revise production of *What's in the News,* a nationally distributed, educational current events show delivered to a third of all fourth- through seventh-grade classrooms nationwide. Producers also worked with several child psychologists and the National Association of School Psychologists to shape the content of this broadcast and supporting materials for teachers, parents, and students. The *What's in the News* Web site included information for parents and teachers about helping children cope with the tragedy.
- Family living agents across Pennsylvania used their Cooperative Extension network to provide parents with resources to answer children's questions about the September 11 events.

Ryan said Penn State's response to the terrorist attacks was guided by listening carefully to stakeholders. He offered it as a model for future outreach efforts.

"We recognized our stakeholders had immediate needs. We assessed those needs and responded quickly. We collaborated where necessary to deliver a solution or an intervention. We made engagement and responsiveness University-wide priorities. We were inclusive; students, faculty, staff, and communities worked together to address the challenge. Face-to-face interaction, print materials, and technology all played an integral role in our outreach efforts. We had the expertise we needed, we had an infrastructure to support our efforts, and we had compassion for the people we were serving."

According to Ryan, the University has made a commitment to facilitate the cultural change needed to support a fully engaged institution. Operating from within a culture of engagement was critical to enabling a rapid response to the tragedy, Ryan said.

Among Penn State's guiding principles for outreach are:

- having the President and Provost serve as visible champions for outreach
- creating an office for outreach at a senior level for leadership, advocacy, and coordination
- recognizing outreach as a vital component of the teaching, research, and service mission of the University and not just equating outreach with service
- developing an organizational structure that facilitates coordination and collaboration across colleges and outreach units
- integrating outreach into institutional planning and resource allocation processes
- requiring that outreach become a part of every academic unit's mission and strategic plan
- preparing and supporting faculty to engage in outreach
- developing new tools for measuring the quality and impact of outreach
- engaging students in outreach activities
- recording and communicating outreach activities with stakeholders

Dr. Bobby D. Moser, Vice President, University Outreach, The Ohio State University

Bobby D. Moser

In his remarks, Moser discussed some of the issues facing all institutions engaged in outreach.

"It is important to get people to understand outreach," he said. "There are different definitions for outreach, depending on whom you ask. At Ohio State, outreach is not a fourth function of the university; rather, it is an integral part of our teaching, research, and service functions."

Ohio State defines outreach and engagement as "that aspect of teaching that goes beyond the campus walls, that aspect of research that makes what we discover useful for those outside the academic community, and that aspect of service that has direct impact upon the community," Moser said. "The engagement portion of the definition focuses on our efforts to reach out. We want to engage school systems, communities, businesses, farmers, and others in mutually beneficial relationships where we learn as much from the experience as our partners learn.

"Once our department chairs and faculty members understood the definition of outreach and engagement, we recognized there are many things we are already doing that meet the definition," he noted. "Outreach and engagement takes good, solid scholarly research and adds value by putting it into a form people can understand and apply. Adding value to research really clicks with people."

Moser said the challenge for outreach institutions is to broaden people's understanding of outreach and engagement so that it is valued. Equally critical is developing two-way partnerships that are mutually beneficial. The best way to build mutually beneficial partnerships is for the partners to sit down together early in the process to discuss ideas, identify problems, and develop ways to solve the problems.

As Ohio State builds its outreach partnerships, it is focusing on three important areas:

- P–12 (preschool to high school) reform. "We are asking ourselves: What can we do to assist school systems with reform?"
- Health and safety. "What area can we narrow in on to make a contribution? The September 11 terrorist attacks created a teachable opportunity for

us. It is our obligation as land-grant institutions to get engaged with difficult issues.”

➤ Economic development. “What contribution can Ohio State make to our state, nation, and world?”

To enhance its development of outreach partnerships and programs for individuals, organizations, and communities, Ohio State is exploring its outreach structure.

“Leadership for outreach has to start at the top. That’s a must,” Moser said. “We have that. Our president is very outspoken on outreach and engagement. We have also established an Office of Outreach and Engagement at the vice president level, and all nineteen colleges have identified a person responsible for outreach and engagement. Our challenge is to work with these colleges to help them get their task done.”

Ohio State has also renamed its Cooperative Extension program OSU-Extension. Within OSU-Extension is OSU CARES (Community Access to Research and Educational Services), which emphasizes that a vehicle already exists for building partnerships and bringing extension resources to bear on community issues and needs, Moser said.

Dr. Kevin P. Reilly, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Extension

Kevin P. Reilly

Reilly provided some historical background for the Outreach Scholarship conference, noting that in looking forward to where outreach institutions need to go it is helpful to examine the past. The 2001 conference was not the first time outreach leaders gathered for a national conference. In 1913, several Cooperative Extension directors thought it was time for a conference to consider the problems they were facing. **J. J. Pettijohn** at the University of North Dakota suggested that **Lewis E. Reber,** the first dean of extension at the University of Wisconsin, was the logical person to call such a meeting.

During that same era the muckraking journalist **Lincoln Steffens** visited the University of Wisconsin. He was so impressed with the “very personal hands-on work of extension” and the university labs helping Wisconsin farmers, union workers, and manufacturers that he wrote that the university was “drawing nearer than the school around the corner” and that it was “a part of the citizen’s own mind.”

“If we are not more supportive of the learning needs of people of all ages and the expanding knowledge needs of society, other educational enterprises will supersede us—enterprises that won’t have the rich interplay of disciplines and missions that enables our institutions to promote economic, human, and cultural progress.”

—Graham Spanier
President of Penn State

In his writings about the University of Wisconsin, Steffens touched on the functions of Cooperative Extension, continuing education, and public broadcasting that remain integral components of the outreach mission today, Reilly said.

“One of the challenges, if outreach and extension are to function up to their potential, is that we will have to take a look at our own silos and how we are organized,” Reilly said. “We are going to have to figure ways to jump silos and get people working together.”

The University of Wisconsin is bridging its silos with a Cross-divisional Program Innovation Fund. The fund is helping to support outreach programs that involve at least two university divisions. One example: Cooperative Extension and Wisconsin Public Television received funding to integrate a Web function into the *Wisconsin Gardener* public TV show. The fund has also enabled the university to begin working with interactive television through the Reforging the Links/Evolving the Links project, a collaborative effort among a number of higher education institutions and public television stations licensed to universities to reenergize the link between public broadcasting and higher education and prepare for the conversion from analog to digital television technologies.

UW-Extension has also established the Broadcasting and Media Innovations unit to join together continuing education needs with new developments in technology and pedagogy. **Byron E. Knight** is heading the unit, and **Dr. Mary Grant,** associate dean for continuing education, is associate director.

“We need to break down and build up the traditional outreach and extension functions if we are to deliver on our outreach promise,” Reilly said. “How to do that will vary across the country. We need more cross-divisional cooperation, and that is my challenge to you today.”

Outreach Scholarship 2001

“A conference like this one provides us with an opportunity to network, benchmark, and share best practices,” Ryan said. “It enables us to continue an important national dialogue that is necessary if we are to address issues facing our nation and world, such as workforce preparation and education, welfare to work, preservation of and appreciation for diversity, illness prevention and wellness enhancement, youth and family development, environmental issues, agricultural productivity and competitiveness, economic and community development, and how to move on in the aftermath of the September 11 events that have changed our world.”

"Creating Partnerships and Community: The Impact of Digital Technology"

By Pat Mitchell, President and CEO of the Public Broadcasting Service

This conference comes at a critical time and defining moment for our country and our institutions. As we all try to find a new balance between "life must go on" and anxiety about what comes next, you and I have important work to do, perhaps more important than ever before.

Pat Mitchell, President and CEO, Public Broadcasting Service

During this time, as we reassert our leadership and recommit ourselves to serving our communities, public service institutions, like those represented in this room, must also reevaluate priorities in light of new harsh realities that demand of us new responses.

How to shape those responses is certainly a focus of your work at this conference. One thing is clear: we have a unique opportunity, indeed a special responsibility, to demonstrate in new and significant ways that our institutions—colleges, universities, and all public service media (in the United States these media include 347 public television stations and more than 600 public radio stations)—are relevant in good times and bad, are essential to the well-being of this country, and are valued by its citizens.

Of course, we are not the only ones engaged in a process of introspection. Government, business, philanthropy, all sectors of society are contemplating their roles in this new world, a world where nearly incomprehensible hate has unleashed unprecedented terror, a world where fear and uncertainty threaten to replace freedom and security.

At this point, there are no clear answers and certainly no road maps based on experience because we have never been at this intersection before. Some of us may have experienced world wars, global depressions, or political assassinations, but it bears remembering that among those we strive to reach with our services is an entire generation of Americans—the ones you teach and the ones we also reach out to as citizens—who have grown up in a post-Cold War peace and have never known a severe economic downturn.

They will look to us for leadership and understanding as events in this new war redefine priorities and create seismic shifts in values at work and at home, domestically and around the world.

Napoleon defined a leader as someone who "deals in hope." That is certainly part of a leader's mandate, and surely each of us deals in the hope that an educated, engaged citizenry is our best defense and our best hope for a resolution that will protect freedom, restore our sense of security, and create a sustainable global community, free of hate, fear, and intolerance.

The title of this conference, "Learning, Discovery, and Engagement," is aptly chosen. Each of those endeavors—learning, discovery, and engagement—will certainly be necessary for all of our hopes to be realized.

I understand that the title was taken from a report of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. You may already know that the full title of that report concluded with the words "in a new and different world." Little did the authors of the report know how prophetic those words would be—or how relevant in ways they never imagined.

The report calls for a new kind of public institution, one that reaches out to "engage" the larger community and serve as the "engine" of lifelong learning in the United States. You need to look no further than the brochure for this conference to understand that this is the current mandate for each and every one of us.

Never has it been more important to put our public service values front and center—to put forward our assets in ways that both build on a legacy of trust and performance and respond in new ways to new needs.

Never has it been more important to move beyond territorial interests and create new partnerships and collaborations.

And never has it been more important to harness all the new technologies and techniques for the common good.

That may mean, in some cases, moving beyond our own comfort zone, our academic ivory towers, and our broadcast transmitters to extend the value of what we're doing now to every possible platform of delivery of our services. And, of course, that means building on the strong foundation of outreach that is already an integral part of higher education and public broadcasting to reach further and deeper and with greater impact.

I have learned about outreach firsthand from the more than 100 public television stations I have visited as president of the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). In community after community, I have discovered innovative partnerships between stations and local organizations—many of them including colleges and universities—that help solve community problems and expand learning opportunities. Since September 11, these organizations have forged new partnerships to meet very specific needs. **Maria Alvarez Stroud** at the National Center for Outreach in Madison has given out more than 100 new grants to help public television and community groups design and execute new programs to meet new needs.

Public television and higher education are natural allies in both good and bad times, but in our difficult and dangerous times these partnerships have provided great resources and underscored the educational foundation of our shared mission.

For example, two programs that we broadcast on PBS in the days following the attacks were certainly intended to educate a public desperately searching for answers and knowledge that would help us comprehend what had happened and why. PBS's weekly investigative documentary series, *FRONTLINE,* had prepared a profile of **Osama bin Laden** nearly one year earlier. Within hours, they were working with *The New York Times* to update the profile. The new program aired on Thursday, September 13.

On Friday morning, **Vice President Dick Cheney's** office called, asking for a copy of the program. They also inquired about a program we had scheduled for rebroadcast the next evening, *Islam: Empire of Faith.* That three-hour documentary had also been produced months earlier, broadcast first in the summer to very little notice. Now we knew that its explanation of the first 1,000 years of the Islam empire and its retelling of the origins of the Muslim faith, leaders, and past conflicts would add very significantly to the understanding of a culture, a people, a faith. Such background, perspective, and information were of sudden and significant importance to a much larger group of citizens.

We were asked to deliver both tapes to the metro stop at 15th Street and told that a representative of the vice president's office would meet the messenger to retrieve them. On Sunday morning, when Cheney appeared on *Meet the Press,* he seemed remarkably well informed about the Muslim faith, talking with impressive familiarity about the culture and the history. He clearly had a lot of information to share about the man put forth quickly as the force behind the acts of terror, Osama bin Laden.

I will not take full credit for the vice president's education on either subject, but apparently he credited PBS and these programs for providing him with much needed and valued information.

In the week following the attacks, the phone began to ring in my office. Requesting tapes were several members of Congress, **Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld** and **Secretary of State Colin Powell.** As we scrambled to make additional copies, even Buckingham Palace rang requesting them for the **Queen of England.**

> ***"Never has it been more important to put our public service values front and center—to put forward our assets in ways that both build on a legacy of trust and performance and respond in new ways to new needs."***
>
> ***—Pat Mitchell, President and CEO of the Public Broadcasting Service***

Clearly, the programs had new significance. Within days, the history of Islam became the #10 best-selling video on *Amazon.com,* and the bin Laden Web site on *PBS.org* went from 433 visitors on September 10 to 655,458 last week.

Of course, these programs, suddenly relevant, were not produced in response to a crisis, but merely gained in importance because of one. I wanted to make that message clear to our stakeholders, particularly those on Capitol Hill who vote on our appropriations. Public television, like institutions of higher education, may take on added value in times of crisis, but the work that prepares us for response during critical times is the work we are doing all the time.

Of course, like all media enterprises, we did produce special programming to respond to the extraordinary events happening around us. But rather than focus on the what, when, where, and how of the events, public television programming tried to answer WHY. Why is this happening? Why do they hate us? Why were we so unprepared?

Bill Moyers in Conversation programs brought theologians, academics, theatre directors, teachers, and financiers to address those questions night after night. On *Washington Week,* **Gwen Ifill** asked those and other questions of reporters on the frontlines of the new war for which the president was trying to prepare us. In a way that only public television can do, we marshaled the resources of our system of local, community stations to provide forums for listening to each other through town halls held in many different communities.

As each day led to new horrors, we relied on our mission to guide us to the right responses while our commercial colleagues struggled to figure out what to offer their audiences, whose tastes and interests and needs had dramatically changed. As someone said, the tragic events have so far taken the lives of more than 3,000 people, but they have wounded more than 200 million. In light of this change, the networks could not just broadcast the same old sitcoms or reality programs and expect to attract an audience that had clearly lost its taste for fake survivors' perils or watching quiz show contestants go for big bucks.

Instead, Americans needed to see these events in a global context. In the days and weeks following September 11, the networks had to start spending big bucks on international coverage. Perhaps you had noticed that there has not been much global reporting on commercial television since the 1970s, when networks began to close foreign bureaus as the American public turned inward. Maintaining foreign bureaus is expensive, and since international news never delivered large audiences, it became harder and harder for media companies to justify global coverage in an industry measured by the marketplace forces of ratings and revenues.

Only one news organization during this three-decade period of retracted foreign news coverage increased its international operations. That was National Public Radio. During my years on the commercial side of the media business, I was alarmed to see network television becoming the weakest link in the chain of social responsibility. Understandably, I am proud to be a part of the only media enterprise in this country that was founded free of marketplace factors, and I am determined to keep it so.

Since September 11, every network and news channel has provided extensive, live, international coverage and in-depth reporting helping to identify the interconnections between international and domestic issues. All media—television, radio and Internet—now have a big role to play in educating and informing the public, and I am hoping this new and much better balance between informing and entertaining is here to stay.

I want to assure you that in this time of need, public television is clear and focused and committed to the mission we share with you. Never more urgently than today, it is our mission to educate, to inform, to enlighten, and to provide a forum for diverse voices, to offer a basis for fair and sound judgments, and to make the connections that contribute to social capital and build healthy communities.

Never have we needed more social capital, and if public service institutions come together in new and innovative ways, we will be the builders and the sustainers of healthy communities capable of coping with bad times and prepared to engage in activities that create better ones. You may have read that all the indicators of social capital as outlined by many sociologists—most notably, **Dr. Robert Putnam** in his book *Bowling Alone: The Decline of Social Capital in America*—are on the incline now. That is no surprise. An upswing in civic engagement conventionally follows disasters, but there is generally a rather swift fallback to predisaster levels. Dr. Putnam and others are watching this closely to determine whether the unparalleled nature of these events will produce unparalleled and sustained civic engagement. Frankly, I think the answer to that question depends in some significant part on how we—public service media and institutions of learning—respond.

Our mandates and missions are enshrined in legislation—for higher education it is the Morrill-Land Grant College Act of 1862, and for public television it is the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, in which **President Lyndon Johnson** spoke of the miracles of education he expected from the use of the miracles of communications. Reading this legislation again recently, I was struck by how prescient Johnson was in the examples he used in his remarks on the day he signed the bill to create a public television and radio system. He imagined the day when a student in Atlanta would be learning from a library in Boston, and the lectures of one of the most brilliant teachers at an urban university would educate students in rural America.

Both our institutions were created for the betterment and enlightenment of all Americans. While there are perhaps more challenges to delivering on that mission than could have been predicted, there are also greater opportunities and even greater responsibilities to use the "miraculous" new technologies fairly and fully.

Carly Fiorina, CEO of Hewlett-Packard Corporation, said recently, "We are now entering the Renaissance phase of the Information Age, where creativity and ideas are the new currency and invention is a primary virtue, where technology truly has the power to transform our lives."

I would add to that a new urgency to apply the creativity, the innovation, to shaping new ways to learn, discover, and engage. And I would emphasize "engage."

At critical points in the past, American lives were transformed by three bold public investments in an educated citizenry: the Northwest Ordinance, which set aside public land for public schools in every new state; the Morrill Act, which led to the establishment of 105 land-grant colleges (I graduated from one of the first, the University of Georgia); and the GI Bill, which made us arguably the best-educated country in the world.

Now it is time for another bold investment that will make the next great leap forward. I am sure you would agree that this leap forward, like the others, will require an investment of both public and private funding, and it will be successful only if it is executed by the best minds and largest capabilities from both the public and private worlds of education, culture, government, and the media.

There are several proposals that set forth ways to do just that. I am quite sure that you are familiar with them, and I will not try to explain them here. What you may not be familiar with are some of the ways in which public television, often in partnership with other learning institutions, is using current and new technologies to extend the value of our content and services to engage our citizenry.

In public television, the points of impact only begin with the television broadcast. Consider, for instance, our children's programming. It is among the most watched children's programming on television, and parents rely on its educational value, its prosocial messages, and its noncommercial presentation to provide a safe haven for children. But that is only the beginning of its value. Each of the programs is also a part of a vast educational service called Ready To Learn, public television's response to this nation's goal to prepare all children to succeed in school. Through workshops, outreach activities, teacher training, and book distribution, Ready To Learn collaborates with early childhood and educational organizations at the national and local levels. Supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Ready To Learn reaches hundreds of thousands of children, parents, and caregivers in nearly every community nationwide.

PBS TeacherSource is another example. It is an online neighborhood for preK–12 educators that extends the educational value of PBS's award-winning programming by helping teachers to incorporate video and Web content in the classroom. TeacherSource includes more than 2,000 free lesson plans, teacher's guides, and online activities—all correlated to more than 200 sets of national and state curriculum standards. Presently, you can download for free three different lesson plans for teaching the history of Afghanistan.

PBS TeacherLine is creating new, Web-based professional development services for preK–16 teachers in mathematics. It is a unique national-local collaboration, with PBS, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) at the national level and public television stations and education agencies at the local level.

PBS Adult Learning Service (ALS) is the largest source of distance learning courses in the nation. Since 1981, local partnerships of public television stations and colleges have made it possible for more than five million adults to earn college credit by taking ALS telecourses. Every year, nearly 500,000 students enroll in PBS courses. Students may also earn a degree through the PBS Going the Distance Project offered by seventy PBS member stations in partnership with more than 210 colleges.

PBS LiteracyLink helps adults improve their basic literacy skills, prepare for the workforce and acquire a high school equivalency diploma. LiteracyLink's award-winning *Workplace Essential Skills* series is being broadcast by more than 175 local public TV stations, reaching more than 60 percent of U.S. households. LiteracyLink is a collaboration with KET (the Kentucky Network), the National Center on Adult Literacy of the University of Pennsylvania, local public television stations, and adult education organizations.

All this and much more is going on now with our analog broadcast system, our Web content, and our outreach services. Imagine what we can and will do with digital broadcast capabilities. In fact, we look at the new extra spectrum that the digital conversion, mandated by Congress, will give public television as "beachfront property." It is expensive but worth developing for long-term value. Digital, which will create a global, electronic nervous system allowing for instant and interactive video and audio, gives all of us in the business of lifelong learning a huge new capacity to teach, to reach, to create connections, to inform, educate, uplift, enlighten, and, in every way, create a strong and sustainable link in the chain of social responsibility.

We in public broadcasting look at digital as "technology finally catching up with our mission." While, like many of you, we are still determining exactly how we will deliver on its promise, we are convinced that as public service media we have a big role to play. And there are big new opportunities for us to work together. Together, we can apply the power and potential of new technology for the greater good, not the bottom line.

We have the unprecedented opportunity to harness the Internet, emerging digital technologies, and expanded distribution capacity in the public's interest. However, a recent report from the Morino Institute, *From Access to Outcomes,* warns us not to be satisfied with efforts to close the digital divide in lower-income communities with better access to technologies. The report argues that the real opportunity is to apply technology to achieve outcomes—meaningful improvements in the lives of millions of people who are living on the margins of our society.

The report also suggests how this nation can meet the challenge. Three points stand out as particularly relevant to our efforts:

- We should focus on narrowing social, not just digital, divides.
- The benefits of technology must be directed toward achieving tangible improvements in people's standard of living, not just in advancing technology as an end in itself.
- We should work through trusted leaders in the community. That means you and that means public television stations.

Existing organizations and individuals who have the trust of the community and channels of communication are key to the success of any technology initiative. And the use of technology must be relevant to the lives of those we are seeking to help.

The Morino report echoes the findings of The Children's Partnership in its report, *Online Content for Low Income and Underserved Americans.* The Partnership found that there is little content of value or relevance on the Web to attract low-income people. Together, we can change that.

Another provocative new publication, *A Digital Gift to the Nation,* by **Larry Grossman** and **Newton Minow,** cautions that a new generation of "haves" and "have-nots" will be created if marketplace forces are the only disseminators of digital technologies. The report calls for new alliances of universities, school systems, museums, libraries, public broadcasting, government, and artistic and cultural organizations. These new alliances would develop innovative models for using technology that build the knowledge and skills of our citizens, make lifelong learning a reality, and promote civic engagement. Grossman and Minow further propose that public broadcasting serve as the public service digital highway to deliver on the promise of the digital age.

Think of the possibilities. We could

deliver interactive learning, information, and training to meet the needs of every child and adult in this country. We could provide access to cultural and artistic experiences and resources now available to only a select few. And we could encourage civic participation by giving voters timely, up-to-date election information anytime they want it.

The digital future offers extraordinary opportunities to add depth, impact, and new dimensions to our outreach efforts. Universities generally define outreach as extending knowledge, research, and content beyond the classroom and the campus. For public television, it is much the same; for us, however, all of that happens in addition to TV broadcast. In many ways, digital will redefine outreach. But why wait? We can begin to explore and exploit the potential of digital today. And we are.

"Now it is time for another bold investment that will make the next great leap forward. I am sure you would agree that this leap forward, like the others, will require an investment of both public and private funding, and it will be successful only if it is executed by the best minds and largest capabilities from both the public and private worlds of education, culture, government, and the media."

—Pat Mitchell, President and CEO of the Public Broadcasting Service

Across the country, public television stations and their local partners are experimenting with new models of outreach and pioneering new technological prototypes. Let me describe a few:

Right here in Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Public Television Network and the Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission are opening the real and virtual doors to Pennsylvania's past and present. *ExplorePAHistory.com* is a Web site designed for Pennsylvanians, tourists, students, teachers, and heritage travelers. Using roadside historical markers as a springboard for presenting the past, this site enables visitors to extend the markers' brief stories with additional content and depth. It will eventually include digital, enhanced television programming, CD- and DVD-ROMs, wireless delivery to PDAs, and radio transmitters embedded in the roadside historical markers.

WHRO in Norfolk, Virginia, is creating *Magic,* a project that combines online components and community events to connect area citizens, local musicians, and students from more than sixty schools in the Norfolk–Virginia Beach area. Local performers compose and record original songs, which are then digitized and posted to the *Magic* Web site. Area educators create interdisciplinary, standards-based curriculum incorporating these musical compositions and encourage their students to create artwork that responds to these songs. The artwork is also scanned and loaded on to the *Magic* Web site to create an ever-changing multimedia gallery of work. The project culminates in a free concert featuring the musicians performing their songs and the student artwork projected onto the stage.

In my home state of Georgia, PeachStar Education Services (through Georgia Public Broadcasting) is currently the largest educational satellite network, serving 2,500 buildings, 89,000 teachers, and 1.4 million students. Master teachers in Georgia serve as content experts. Looking to the future, PeachStar is planning to move from its existing satellite network to a complete videostreaming model. It plans to dedicate part of the new digital spectrum to additional curriculum-based educational services, fulfilling a promise that public television stations have made to the FCC and Congress.

WNEO in Ohio has launched *NEwsOhio,* an interactive television project designed to involve students in grades six through nine in civic participation through broadcast news, Web-based curriculum, videoconferencing, and community service. *NEwsOhio* employs journalism students from Kent State University to present news from three different commercial television stations and the Ohio News Network. These stories are tailored for teachers' use in the classroom so that they can relate curriculum to real-world events. Their news programs compare favorably in content to many of the twenty-four-hour news channels.

These are just some of the extraordinary new models of digital outreach. In a world once defined by borders on the map, the only real limits we face today are the limits of our imaginations. It is in the imagining—in finding solutions that build on our experience, our foundations of trust, and connections in our communities—that allows us to dream bigger dreams and try bolder solutions than ever before.

Today, the biggest test is not just whether we will be smart enough to dream up new things—it is whether we will have the daring and discipline to make them happen, to create the digital public square for the twenty-first century, to ensure that the future, which certainly feels less secure and clear than it did one month ago, is one that benefits from the full contributions and informed participation of all its citizens who may enjoy the fully engaged services of all the institutions in which they have placed their trust.

That is the trust we hold together.

Public Broadcasting's Commitment to Outreach Remains Strong

By Deborah A. Benedetti

Public broadcasting has always been committed to public service. From their inception, the hundreds of public television and radio stations across the nation have made it their mission to reach out to their audiences, providing valuable information, fostering the exchange of ideas, and creating forums for airing diverse views on a wide range of topics.

During the conference on Outreach Scholarship 2001: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement, leaders in public broadcasting discussed the value of engaging communities, higher education institutions, and public broadcasting stations in outreach.

Byron Knight, director of Broadcasting and Media Innovations at the University of Wisconsin-Extension, moderated the session on "Creating Community Partnerships with Public Broadcasting." The panelists were **Ted Krichels,** assistant vice president for outreach and general manager of Penn State Public Broadcasting; **Dale Ouzts,** general manager of WOSU stations and director of the Telecommunications Center at Ohio State; and **Maria Alvarez Stroud,** executive director of the National Center for Outreach and director of outreach at Wisconsin Public Television, University of Wisconsin-Extension.

"In public broadcasting, outreach is very important," Knight said. "We can extend the value of our programs beyond the broadcast of a program. We can convene groups to talk about issues and services that are important to them and extend this information into the community. This is what outreach has come to mean in public broadcasting. Why do we do this? Public broadcasting attracts tremendous audiences, and we have found we are able to provide an initial activity that can bring people together."

Stroud agrees. The National Center for Outreach has produced a video illustrating the potential of outreach and highlighting how public broadcasting stations can touch lives beyond the programs they broadcast. The center has distributed the video to public broadcasting stations around the nation.

"The power of television is very strong," Stroud said. "We think the power of outreach is equally strong. We are focusing our attention on what happens when the TV is turned off. What can we offer around a public broadcasting program to make it more relevant to local viewers?"

The goal of the National Center for Outreach is "to assist public television stations to provide meaningful outreach to local communities, helping to foster and deepen existing community partnerships." The center is funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and hosted by Wisconsin Public Television.

The center also awards program development grants to public broadcasting stations that are striving to meet new community needs. In response to the September 11 terrorist attacks, the center made $100,000 available to help heal communities. Stroud said the center was able to fund sixty proposals for a variety of activities, including convening community groups to talk about the events of September 11. On its Web site (*www.nationaloutreach.org/*), the center also posted information about programs that public broadcasting stations can use as the basis for creating outreach activities related to the terrorist attacks.

Stroud described the National Center for Outreach as a pipeline of resources for public broadcasting and a clearinghouse of information and research about public broadcasting. The center is focusing on research to measure the impact of public broadcasting programs and to evaluate the results of these programs.

"We need to do more to record the impact of the brochures we distribute, the programs we develop, and the tools we provide," she said. "We are also beginning to improve the evaluation process, and we are working hand in hand with PBS on research into social capital."

The center is partnering with the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) on the *American Family* series. The center is providing grants, with funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, for public broadcasting stations to build new relationships with community partners to offer activities related to the PBS series.

Ouzts, who oversees Ohio State's public television and radio stations, said the WOSU stations try to develop local programming around PBS programs, as well.

"We had a local follow-up program to the PBS *Evolution* series," Ouzts said. "It was an interesting discussion with many opinions represented. We believe we should include as many viewpoints as possible."

The WOSU public broadcasting stations also tackled an important local education issue. When the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that funding for Ohio public education was unconstitutional, WOSU staff partnered with more than thirty groups to engage communities in discussion about the issue, Ouzts said.

"We partnered with the League of Women Voters, the Chamber of Commerce, AARP, and even the Council of Churches," he noted. "We found new partners for *Funding Ohio's Future,* which the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* called 'the largest town hall meeting in Ohio.' We had 108 schools involved. People met at these schools with trained facilitators. We also conducted a survey that generated thousands of responses, which we shared with legislators."

Some of the new partners WOSU brought together for *Funding Ohio's Future* have continued to work with the public broadcasting stations on other programs.

"Every year, we have about 100 good outreach ideas," Ouzts said. "We engage in twenty to twenty-five projects. Funding new programs is always a challenge."

Among WOSU's outreach efforts are:

- **Pharmaceutical Education Network.** WOSU-TV provides production services to the Council of Ohio Colleges of Pharmacy to offer continuing education courses to participating physicians, pharmacists, and nurses through seventy-six cable TV systems in three states.
- **Instructional Technology Services of Central Ohio.** For thirty-nine years, WOSU-TV has worked with this organization to deliver instructional TV programming for schools.
- **Early Childhood Education Partners.** Dozens of organizations assist WOSU-TV in delivering services and resources to families and caregivers to encourage and promote learning with young children.
- ***Open Line.*** In partnership with the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, WOSU-AM presents a weekly ninety-minute call-in show on agricultural topics, featuring a variety of faculty members and experts from the community.
- ***The Black Studies Broadcast Journal.*** In partnership with the Department of African-American and African Studies, WOSU-AM presents a weekly thirty-minute forum hosted by an Ohio State faculty member.
- **Classical Music.** WOSU-FM partners with the College of the Arts to record and broadcast musical programs by faculty, students, and guest performers for its all-classical radio station.

WOSU public television and radio stations have a long history of providing outreach, beginning with Ohio's first public radio station in 1922. For many years, the *Ohio School of the Air* delivered courses by radio to residents. This public broadcasting tradition continues today, Ouzts said.

Penn State also has a long tradition of public broadcasting, dating to April 20, 1952, when more than 100 leaders in education, broadcasting, and government from around the nation gathered at The Nittany Lion Inn to accept a challenge from the Federal Communications Commission to begin a noncommercial educational television service. As a result of this meeting, The Nittany Lion Inn became the birthplace of national educational television and what would later become the Public Broadcasting Service.

Krichels, who heads Penn State Public Broadcasting, said he often speaks at national conferences and meetings about the importance of collaborations and partnerships with universities to enhance public broadcasting's outreach efforts.

"There is a change in thinking about public broadcasting going on now, partly triggered by the conversion to digital television technologies, which will give us a larger capacity," Krichels said. "The whole notion of 'What is outreach?' goes to the foundations of universities. University public television licensees are in a very unique position. They are sitting on a ton of content. And we can help take this content to communities. We can provide some leadership in this area."

One way Penn State Public Broadcasting is tapping the vast reservoir of Penn State's content is with the new *Creating Health* initiative. Krichels noted that this initiative is based on an idea pioneered by Knight at Wisconsin Public Television. Penn State Public Broadcasting launched its first *Creating Health* program in October 2001 on the topic of osteoporosis.

In addition to producing a thirty-minute video on osteoporosis, Penn State Public Broadcasting and its University partners are developing print and Web materials and related public radio programming and are working with community groups to hold health screenings and other programs to reach people in rural and urban communities. The goal is to raise awareness about the risks of osteoporosis and provide the public with prevention strategies. Penn State Public Broadcasting also plans to measure the impact of this series in collaboration with other University groups.

"This is a model we hope other public television stations will adopt," Krichels said.

Our Town is another important program model. Developed by Penn State Public Broadcasting, this model of showcasing communities in the WPSX-TV viewing area is now being shared nationally with other public broadcasting stations,

Byron Knight, Director of Broadcasting and Media Innovations, University of Wisconsin-Extension

Ted Krichels, Assistant Vice President for Outreach and General Manager, Penn State Public Broadcasting, The Pennsylvania State University

thanks to funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. WPSX-TV gives video cameras to local residents, who capture on videotape the people and places of importance in their community. WPSX-TV then edits the video, hosts a premier in the community, and airs the program for all its viewers to enjoy.

The *Our Town* series has consistently been the number one pledge show, in terms of increasing membership for WPSX-TV, Krichels said.

Dale Ouzts, General Manager, WOSU Stations, and Director, Telecommunications Center, The Ohio State University

"These kinds of programs build support and appreciation for public broadcasting," he said.

Krichels cited other examples of how Penn State Public Broadcasting is partnering with Penn State units and other public broadcasting stations to make a difference in the lives of individuals, organizations, and communities:

- **Partners in Public Service.** In partnership with Penn State's University Libraries, Palmer Museum of Art, and Institute for Information Policy in the College of Communications, Penn State Public Broadcasting led a national experiment in collaboration among libraries, museums, and public TV stations to leverage the organizations' respective assets for public service projects.
- **Evolving the Links.** This coalition of university-licensee public broadcasting stations is designed to reenergize the link between public broadcasting and higher education. The impetus for the project is the transition to digital television technologies.
- ***Race Matters.*** Penn State Public Broadcasting's WPSU-FM is developing a series of public radio programs to inform and educate listeners on the critical issues surrounding race on college campuses and in surrounding communities.
- ***What's in the News.*** Penn State Public Broadcasting delivers this award-winning weekly children's news program to classrooms nationwide. The fifteen-minute program is geared to fourth- through seventh-graders.
- **OnCourse (Online Educational Service).** This national coalition supported by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is aimed at developing and delivering online and broadband educational content and services for K–12 educators.

Knight also offered examples of outreach programs developed by Wisconsin Public Television (WPT) and Wisconsin Public Radio (WPR):

- ***Creating Health.*** A collaboration among WPT, WPR, and the University of Wisconsin-Extension, this series focuses on women's health issues and includes a variety of public TV and radio programs, a Web site, interactive television development, print materials, community education events, and a traveling photo exhibit.
- **UW-Extension Family Living Programs.** WPT collaborates with the UW-Extension on a broad range of outreach programs for children, youth, and families, including First Book. WPT partners with the Wisconsin Association for Home and Community Education for this intergenerational reading program.
- **Radio Talk Shows.** Every year, about 1,000 faculty members appear on issue-oriented WPR radio talk shows.
- **News.** WPR news reporters regularly interview faculty members and other experts around the state for news stories and also cover university events and issues.
- **Classical Music.** WPR broadcasts University of Wisconsin music performances, as well as recording and broadcasting music performances from other Wisconsin colleges and universities and other music venues.

During the question-and-answer session, one participant asked about the feasibility of community partnerships with public radio stations. Knight said that there are tremendous opportunities for such partnerships. "You just have to initiate the conversation," he said.

Knight also pointed out public broadcasters have for years "guarded our airwaves as precious cargo and have been reluctant to give up our editorial control of programming."

"We're not trying to hold people off today," he said. "We're saying: 'Let us help you interpret what you want to say.' Public broadcasting tells really good stories."

Ouzts said that issues impeding public broadcasting and university partnerships can be overcome.

"It's quite easy to find a way to work together, especially if an institution wants to share content."

Maria Alvarez Stroud, Executive Director, National Center for Outreach, and Director of Outreach, Wisconsin Public Television, University of Wisconsin-Extension

Krichels added, "Today partnerships between public broadcasting and universities are based on a shared commitment to the philosophy of engagement. We also share similar outreach visions, missions, and goals. This has changed the way we partner to try to make life better for individuals, organizations, and communities in our local areas and throughout the nation and world."

"Many Societal Changes are Incremental, Often Discernible Only in the Mirror of History"

By Dr. Samuel H. Smith, President Emeritus of Washington State University

Thank you for inviting me to join you for Outreach Scholarship 2001. This conference provides me with an opportunity to comment on the subjects of outreach and engagement while, at the same time, returning for a visit to Penn State. I was a faculty member here from 1969 to 1985, and it was here that I first became aware of the need for American public universities to increase their outreach and engagement.

Dr. Samuel H. Smith, President Emeritus, Washington State University

First, I will highlight some major trends that are driving institutional change and that I think provide clues to future changes. Second, I will discuss the emerging model of an American public university that has changed and will continue to change dramatically. And then I will close my comments by discussing some of the major issues and tensions these changes are causing on our campuses and within our individual states.

Many societal changes are incremental and often difficult to discern except in the mirror of history. But many of these changes have historically appeared first on our university or college campuses, later being reflected in the attitudes and lives of our graduates as they become leaders in both the public and private sectors of our society.

I have lived on or around university campuses for well over forty years. Starting in the late 1950s, I spent a dozen years at the University of California, Berkeley, followed, as I mentioned earlier, by sixteen years here at Penn State and most recently, fifteen years at Washington State University as president and campus resident.

I am one of those fortunate individuals that have lived daily among thousands and thousands of students. At Washington State University alone, I signed the diplomas of more than 65,000 graduates, over one-third of all the graduates in the 111-year history of that institution.

Thus, I have had the pleasure of knowing a significant number of individuals as students and then remaining in touch with many of them as they moved through their lives and careers. I have observed three consistent trends and one still-emerging trend that I feel are creating changes in how we in universities do our business.

The first trend is, of course, the use of information technology. Our traditional students and graduates of the last decade have never known a world without information technology, computers, and the Internet. Most have never seen a slide rule, a rotary dial telephone, a 78 RPM record, or a manual typewriter. They assume open, instant access to information, events, and each other.

The second trend is what I have heard termed *narrowcasting*—in contrast to *broadcasting.* Students and young adults, and I include some individuals up into their 50s, do not want information broadcast to them in a one-size-fits-all, assembly line manner. They are already inundated with immense amounts of available information. As any good teacher knows, they want this information digested specifically for them in a manner relevant to their needs and to the other events going on in their lives.

There is also a subtheme, perhaps, developing out of the area of "narrowcasting" that I wish to mention. This rapidly growing subtheme has the potential to grow in momentum and involves not only digesting information specifically for the individual but also presenting it in a manner that matches each person's "learning fingerprint." The phrase "learning fingerprint" refers to the fact that each of us acquires and retains information or concepts in a manner unique to ourselves. Using retention or memory as an example—some individuals make lists to facilitate memory, some must be reminded, and some learn only by experiencing the consequences of forgetting. Each individual acquires and retains information in a manner unique to him- or herself. Students want information and concepts presented to them in a manner that matches their specific "fingerprints."

Along these same lines, please carefully note the emergence of competency-based degrees or certificates. Competency-based degrees are not popular with many traditional academics. These, I remind you, are degrees or certifications granted after the completion of an examination and are not based on numbers of credit hours or completing a sequence of courses. There is usually a pretest to give credit for what has already been learned and then a course designed to be flexible to meet the specific needs of the individual student. In some states, there are more individuals enrolled in the corporate, high-technology certificate programs that are competency-based than there are enrolled in some public universities.

Much of the current debate about accountability in education reflects the disdain that traditional academics have for competency-based educational programs. Ironically, our awarding of graduate degrees is very much competency-based, with the securing of the degree based on passing an examination and having a thesis approved.

The third and final trend that I will discuss on is the student's becoming a "paying customer." Let me be very direct; I know that universities do not like to think of themselves as businesses, and they are often offended when compared with a business or corporation. But, realistically, many of our universities are indeed big businesses, with billion-dollar budgets, tens of thousands of employees, huge physical plants and landholdings, unions, corporate structures, and lawyers, and they have many other descriptors that most any business would love to have. As direct state support continues to decrease as a portion of its total budget, the description of an American public university as a business in a competitive environment becomes even more accurate.

In higher education, we have often stated that our goal is to provide an education and document it with a degree. The students and those around them who provide advice and support will continue to decide whether the value of the degree is worth the investment of time and money. To get what they want, students have learned to stand up for themselves and demand value for payment of funds. In other words, we are dealing with experienced customers. As the cost of higher education increases, new competitors are also emerging.

How have these trends affected the basic model of an American public university?

I was fortunate to be one of the members of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, which, in a series of reports, illustrated that our current era of change was being initiated by institutional and individual leadership and not by federal legislation, as we have seen in the past.

When the commission initiated its efforts, it quickly found that a significant number of institutions had undergone and were undergoing dramatic organizational and structural changes. If you have not seen these reports from the Kellogg Commission, I would encourage you to seek out the Web site of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges: *www.nasulgc.org.*

We as members of the commission—primarily CEOs of institutions that had or were undergoing major change—knew that our own institutions had changed, but we were not generally aware that similar and often dramatic changes were occurring throughout many other American public universities. The Kellogg Commission provided a forum for a national dialogue on the new model of an American public university.

Some of us, like most faculty and administrators, had a mental image of American public universities that would have been descriptive of those institutions as they existed when we were undergraduates in the 1950s or 1960s, that is, institutions that were primarily composed of residential campuses offering undergraduate and graduate degrees. The majority of students entered from high school and came from a single geographic service area, usually the state, as indicated by the differing fees for in-state and out-of-state students. The majority of the budget came directly from the state. And, if a land-grant institution, the institution possessed a Cooperative Extension service and some county responsibilities that were largely invisible to all except the members of the local College of Agriculture. Today, this is still a common view among the general public and those they elect to office.

In the Kellogg Commission discussions, the image that quickly emerged was that the American public university now must be considered extremely diverse in composition and structure, best described as having a "spectrum of delivery" of courses, programs, and services. On one end of the spectrum is the traditional residential campus of the 1950s or 1960s, except that it is now highly wired with the latest information technology capabilities. At the other end of the spectrum of delivery is the student or program participant sitting alone in front of a computer screen somewhere in the world. In between the two extremes are other types of campuses, carrying designations such as undergraduate, graduate, professional, co-located, and business, and many others. These campuses are supplemented with a significant number of other delivery sites, called centers, carrying designations such as extension, research, and small business. These many university locations through- out the state are tied together by communications systems and served by university or public radio or television. There is an irony in that information technology has physically moved us into a much more distributed model.

In other words, the ivory tower of the 1950s and 1960s is now located throughout the state and serves students or program participants throughout the world. The American public university has entered an era of significantly enhanced public engagement but has done it so incrementally that it has largely undergone this change unnoticed except by a few.

Now that some portion of the general public and our many constituents are becoming aware that we have changed, what are some of the pressing policy issues that must be addressed and what about our own internal institutional tensions?

While the universities were becoming more fully engaged, they also changed their business model. This is demonstrated most dramatically in our sources of funding. State support has generally not kept pace with increasing university budgets, and consequently, as a percentage of the total university budget, the amount coming from the state has generally decreased. Ironically, as universities have become more engaged in their state, support as a percentage of the total budget has decreased. This trend continues downward, with many states reporting their funding of the university budget to be less than 30–40 percent. I know that many universities quote smaller percentages, but I prefer to include all state funds, including construction or capital funds.

In many cases, student tuition and fees have not increased at a pace comparable to that seen in the areas of funding from research or services, grants and contracts, private fund-raising in both campaign and annual fund drives, public-private business ventures, and university-related businesses.

Thus, we often find ourselves designated as a *state university* with the state paying much less than half of the budget but expecting full control. The very designation *university* would indicate that our primary mission is to educate students when indeed this may not be what we are actually emphasizing if one looks at our business model. Often our business model does not match our self-image and how we describe ourselves. This mismatch between our perceived image and our business model is creating tension.

Let's look further at the interaction with our state government. With the advent of information technology, the concepts of geography and time have been greatly diminished. As universities increasingly reach students throughout the world, what does a state do with the concept of in-state and out-of-state students? Which state or country should be responsible for financial aid? Is it better to give the state-based student aid directly to the students and let them choose their institution? With most states having councils or commissions to establish state policy for higher education, it is often easier to expand the university's programs in other states or countries, which do not have applicable regulatory authority.

Students now have a range of choices and as educated customers can pick and choose how much of their time, energy, and educational funds they want to spend, and where. This has been quite evident at the graduate level for many years. At the graduate student level, the final selection of which institution to attend is often strongly influenced by the offered stipend and medical benefits. Graduate and undergraduate students, as employees and customers, have already adjusted to the new model perhaps better than many of our traditional faculty.

"I was fortunate to be one of the members of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, which, in a series of reports, illustrated that our current era of change was being initiated by institutional and individual leadership and not by federal legislation, as we have seen in the past."

—Dr. Samuel H. Smith, President Emeritus, Washington State University

The more traditional faculty member, with a high level of responsibility for teaching, has always been and will continue to be a proud and valued member of our universities. But, with decreasing state support, enhanced financial support for faculty involved in research, and the emergence of the outreach or engagement professional, the traditional, teaching faculty member has a right to question universities about their priorities and faithfulness to their perceived mission of residential education.

With the increasing interest in acquiring funds as private gifts or contracts, many universities are moving toward what, in my opinion, is the next area of major change. These funds are without any question often the key to maintaining and enhancing the quality of many of our universities' programs. It has also been my experience that major donors, be they individuals or business organizations, have usually provided the greatest amount of flexibility to use their funds in the best interest of the university.

The opportunities to interact with successful individuals or business organizations as donors of private funds have stimulated numerous discussions of public-private partnerships. Successful donors are usually successful problem solvers and entrepreneurs that genuinely want to help their universities.

The involvement of our universities with the private sector is increasing rapidly. One has only to list the major universities announcing fund-raising campaigns with goals in the billions of dollars and compare them with similar campaigns of a decade ago.

Linked with these major fund-raising campaigns is the emergence of public-private partnerships forming centers, institutes, or "think tanks." Many similarly named partnerships already exist and are often a joint project of the university and a state or federal agency. The entities I wish to describe may share names with earlier organizations, but they are new and evolving.

Over the last year or so, I have been investigating the organizational structure of these new public-private partnerships. I could use several as examples but will describe the one with which I am most familiar, the Talaris Research Institute (TRI) in Seattle, Washington. As the president of the TRI board of directors, I can state that we have been applying what we have been learning about these new partnerships.

The primary source of private funding for TRI came from a couple of thoughtful individuals that had been very successful in the business arena and wanted to combine the best aspects of public universities with the best attributes of a private institute. Their goal was to understand and distribute information on the cognitive development of children from birth to age five. TRI brings with it a significant piece of land adjacent to the University of Washington and is building a state-of-the-art research facility designed by the involved researchers and outreach specialists. University contracts similar in structure to competitive grants are established with researchers in a wide range of departments, schools, colleges, and universities, bringing them together in teams not often seen within any single university. TRI also directly employs a growing number of outreach and media specialists to report new research findings and evaluate the soundness of concepts found in both the scientific and popular literature. The intended audiences are parents and organizations that deal with young children. The goal of TRI is to provide the best, reliable information to those that nurture or provide services to children from birth to age five.

Thus, significant sums of money are being used to build on existing high-quality research programs to help them further their work within a defined area and distribute to the public what they learn.

I know that many of you can cite similar partnerships, as the intent of this concept is not really new. This concept, though, is being rapidly enhanced, and the partnerships are increasingly popular and sophisticated.

Let me close my comments by including a few additional observations on the emerging model of an American public university. Having been the CEO of such a university for fifteen years and having participated in the discussions of the Kellogg Commission, I would like to mention a couple of issues.

The Kellogg Commission was successful in that it initiated a national dialogue among the CEOs of public universities, but the issues raised have not been addressed widely by individual universities within their own states. Thus, the national dialogue has preceded the state dialogue.

Several unresolved issues are causing tension within our universities and with those they serve:

First, universities are supposed to be stable, changing only slightly to adapt to their surroundings. We, however, are going through dramatic change, and the general public is becoming aware of these changes.

Second, the concept of a student has changed. We no longer deal with just the traditional student; instead, all individuals—regardless of age, physical characteristics, or location—are potential students. Each university is free to decide which segments of the student market they wish to serve.

Third, in this increasingly competitive environment, only the highest quality programs will succeed, and we do not always know how to assess quality in this new era. The whole concept of accreditation needs to be reexamined.

Fourth, many of those that teach and work in universities are finding their jobs and careers threatened, and they will actively resist change. The traditionalists do not particularly like what is happening to their universities and their perception of the academy.

Fifth, many of our state's elected officials do not place sufficient priority on funding our universities but wish to maintain policy and regulatory control. In many cases, the state is the minority shareholder and the other shareholders want a greater say in the setting of policies and priorities.

Sixth, our universities must now deal with a wider, ever-growing range of constituents who all want to guide our directions, and these constituencies are often at odds with each other. We have new shareholders—or, if you prefer, stakeholders—with potentially conflicting intents.

With these and many other issues facing us, what are our options? I suggest we consider a comment that I made earlier in these remarks: change is occurring due to institutional leadership and not by federal legislation as we have seen in the past. We have entered an era of "narrowcasting," having left the era of "broadcasting." The national dialogue is occurring, but we now need state or local dialogue.

I would encourage Kellogg Commission-type discussions internally at your institutions. We, as universities, have historically done our best when we have made educated decisions in a thoughtful manner and not simply reacted to our changing environment.

This is a wonderful time to be in higher education. We are not discussing whether we should change but instead how much to change and how to use our change to make a better world.

Implementing an Engagement Strategy: Academic, Government, and Business Leaders Discuss Issues Facing Higher Education

By Deborah A. Benedetti

Using the Socratic method, leaders from higher education, government, and business discussed the challenges facing colleges and universities as they move beyond historical models of outreach and public service to become more fully engaged with their communities.

This session on "Implementing the University Engagement Strategy: A Dialogue with the Key Stakeholders" took place during the conference on Outreach Scholarship 2001: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement. Eight panelists, ranging from honors student to provost, director to consultant, addressed many of the challenges that institutions must overcome to serve society's needs in coherent, productive, and scholarly ways.

Dr. Joseph DiGregorio, vice provost for distance learning, continuing education, and outreach at the Georgia Institute of Technology, moderated the dialogue. The panelists were:

- **Chelsey Bilka,** senior Schreyer Honors Scholar majoring in human development and family studies, Penn State
- **Dr. Amy Driscoll,** director of teaching, learning, and assessment, California State University, Monterey Bay
- **Dr. Ann Hoyt,** professor of consumer sciences, School of Human Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison; consumer cooperative state specialist, University of Wisconsin-Extension
- **Dr. Gary E. Miller,** associate vice president, Distance Education, and executive director, World Campus, Penn State
- **Dr. Judith A. Ramaley,** assistant director, Directorate for Education and Human Resources, National Science Foundation
- **Dr. Ted Settle,** director, Continuing Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
- **Dr. Marvin Van Kekerix,** provost and vice chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Extension
- **Rudy Younger,** skills and learning consultant, IBM

To set the tone for the dialogue, DiGregorio called upon the Kellogg Commission's "landmark report" on university engagement, *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. He began by quoting from the report:

> One challenge we face is growing public frustration with what is seen to be our unresponsiveness. At the root of the criticism is a perception that we are out of touch and out of date. Another part of the issue is that although society has problems, our institutions have "disciplines." In the end, what these complaints add up to is a perception that, despite the resources and expertise available on our campuses, our institutions are not well organized to bring them to bear on local problems in a coherent way.

This report, DiGregorio noted, charges institutions to redesign, rethink, and recommit in order to implement an engagement strategy. Yet he wondered how much of the engagement philosophy is really new.

Launching into the Socratic Dialogue, DiGregorio asked the panelists: "Are we reinventing the wheel, or are we creating new perspectives for something we've been doing?"

Van Kekerix responded, "We have to reinvent ourselves. Our commitment to engaging our constituents and involving

Dr. Ted Settle, Director, Continuing Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Rudy Younger, Skills and Learning Consultant, IBM

Dr. Joseph DiGregorio, Vice Provost for Distance Learning, Continuing Education, and Outreach, Georgia Institute of Technology

Chelsey Bilka, Senior, Schreyer Honors College, The Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Amy Driscoll, Director of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, California State University, Monterey Bay

them in the university must go much deeper than it currently does."

Ramaley, who served on the Kellogg Commission when she was president of the University of Vermont, concurred. She highlighted three issues the commission explored while developing the report. "First, the classic teaching, research, and service functions are not severable functions," she said. "Second, the relationship between the university and a community must be seen as mutual. Third, the process of scholarship is a cycle, with discovery leading to integration, application, and education. The Kellogg Commission report asks us to make basic changes in our thinking about engagement."

Hoyt, however, pointed out the challenges of such fundamental reform, noting, "The faculty is not familiar with the new words, and we're having a hard time putting *outreach* into practice."

If reinventing means changing the very terms with which institutions describe themselves, she argued, it is easy to see the language changes as superficial or even a passing trend. "How do we become credible to a community that doesn't have a lot of resources and doesn't think we'll stay long?" she asked.

Driscoll responded by emphasizing the ways that engagement does build on current higher education practices. "We do need some new language," she admitted. "I've been visiting campuses that have been doing what we're talking about, but the work they're doing is not being recognized."

This question of recognition opened up another line of inquiry as the panelists discussed how to implement engagement as part of a faculty member's career. Hoyt, who often serves on promotion and tenure committees at the University of Wisconsin, explained the importance of integrating engagement responsibilities into the promotion and tenure process: "Faculty members are very good at supporting their careers," and if engagement is seen as part of their job responsibilities, they will find new ways to implement engagement on their own.

Van Kekerix seconded Hoyt's point, saying, "There are places where outreach and engagement are recognized, but that's not in the mainstream. We need to move these activities that are on the margins into the mainstream, and that is a reinvention of what we're doing."

Miller, however, did not see greater emphasis on outreach as so much of a break with past practices. "The issue of reinvention is really a recommitment," he asserted. "The Kellogg Commission is asking universities to think about recommitment." This suggests that the initial commitment is already there and simply needs greater recognition and support, Miller said.

Ramaley agreed. Reflecting on her conversations with faculty members since 1999, Ramaley said she has noticed changes in their perceptions about engagement. "Faculty members are rediscovering the public aspect of their work," she said. "Slowly but surely, the language and subjects are changing. We're well on the way to rethinking what we're doing."

For Settle, these signs of change do not mean that issues of implementation have been resolved. Imagining the engaged institution of the future, he asked the other panelists: "Are the old faculty criteria still going to apply?"

Settle believes they will and noted that the processes for recognizing faculty work have not kept pace with other progress toward engagement. "I'm concerned about how we'll nurture faculty," he commented. "How we count the work of new faculty is important. We have trouble counting outreach, and I don't think we know how to count engagement."

Younger added that the increased role of technology in the learning environment is further complicating the way we recognize and achieve engagement. As technology becomes an even more important method of delivering outreach outside university walls, he noted, faculty members teaching at a distance will need new skill sets to be successful, and "some faculty aren't comfortable with technology."

Miller stressed that higher education institutions must take the lead in providing faculty development tools to prepare faculty members for greater technology use. The Penn State World Campus, he noted, is trying to use technology to make the learning environment seamless for both students and faculty. "The goal is to prepare faculty to teach in this environment, so that they can bring in guest speakers and co-teach courses at multiple campuses. This is a university issue and a faculty development issue," he said.

The panelists agreed that increasing faculty awareness and skills in the scholarship of engagement could have tremendous benefits in all areas of teaching, research, and service.

Bilka, the student member of the panel, commented that student learning is improved by greater engagement in the classroom and out in the community. "The way things are now," she confessed, "I feel shortchanged by classes that don't seem relevant to society's problems. We need to move toward more engagement in courses so students can see how what we're studying affects people."

As part of The Schreyer Honors College, Bilka is actively involved in service-learning projects that address community needs, including work with AmeriCorps, the Centre County Youth Services Bureau, and a local Montessori school. She explained that service is a requirement of the honors college but wished that service could be integrated into more classes for all students. "Now we're just sitting in a classroom, but we could be applying what we learn to help community organizations," she said.

As the Socratic Dialogue continued, the panelists discussed other issues:

- building engagement into graduate education
- creating professional master's degrees and certificate programs for working adults
- sharing engagement success stories within the institution (campus newspapers, forums) and externally
- introducing elements of engagement through university, college, and departmental faculty development programs so that faculty can decide when and how to become involved in community-based scholarship
- examining faculty entrepreneurship, technology transfer, and commercialization of research
- developing a university strategy in an era of competition with for-profit educational enterprises
- involving professional associations in discussions about engagement
- preparing students with leadership, communication, and negotiation skills for the real world

DiGregorio ended the session by asking the panelists what criteria a fully engaged institution would use to evaluate new faculty members ten years from now.

Van Kekerix suggested that in the future new criteria will reflect increases in team-based and collaborative research. In addition, he said, communities will have greater input in the research agenda, and evaluation criteria will be more responsive to community assessments.

In fact, Settle explained, all faculty members will need good listening skills in order to be effectively engaged. For Driscoll and Bilka, listening to students will be increasingly important. Bilka said the students of the future will be active learners, open-minded, flexible, and self-directed, and their faculty should be interested in innovative teaching that reflects such an audience. Younger added that higher education will need to listen to businesses that need people with skills in coaching, teamwork, and communication.

In this climate of responsiveness and responsibility, Hoyt and Van Kekerix would also like to see future criteria reward candidates who demonstrate flexibility and the ability to design collaborative teaching, research, and service that can cross disciplinary boundaries.

Finally, the engagement commitment itself will be a desirable faculty attribute. Miller predicts that universities will recruit faculty members who can create knowledge to improve the quality of life for people, prepare students for the world, and enhance communities.

Ramaley, too, anticipates similar evaluation criteria based on faculty ability to integrate missions. She remarked that the National Science Foundation is counting on future criteria that expect faculty to integrate research and education. NSF has already launched a career program that prepares leaders in science, technology, engineering, and math to bring their research into the classroom and other educational outlets for the public.

Dr. Ann Hoyt, Professor of Consumer Sciences, School of Human Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Consumer Cooperative State Specialist, University of Wisconsin-Extension

Dr. Gary E. Miller, Associate Vice President, Distance Education, and Executive Director, World Campus, The Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Judith A. Ramaley, Assistant Director, Directorate for Education and Human Resources, National Science Foundation

Clearly, for all of the panelists, the vision of the future of engagement seems bright, and all seem optimistic that institutions of higher education will in the coming years achieve effective implementation strategies.

"Documenting Outreach Scholarship"

By Dr. Charles E. Glassick, Senior Associate Emeritus for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

The Carnegie Foundation's report Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate *(Boyer 1990) has been well received in the United States, where it is contributing to a constructive and vigorous discussion about faculty roles and rewards. For decades, American higher education institutions have been offering the highest rewards for the research accomplishments of their faculty, and they remain committed to research and discovery. But in recent years, higher education institutions have also been reaffirming their historical mission of teaching and seeking new ways to support public engagement through integrative and applied scholarship as well as research.*

The goal of *Scholarship Reconsidered* was to move beyond the debate about faculty priorities as "teaching versus research" and to give *scholarship* a broader, more efficacious meaning. We propose a new paradigm of scholarship, one with four separate yet interlocking parts: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching. The first two kinds of scholarship—the *discovery* and *integration* of knowledge—reflect the investigative and synthesizing traditions of academic life. The third element, the application of knowledge, moves toward *engagement* as the scholar asks: "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?" Finally, the scholarship of *teaching* recognizes that the work of the scholar becomes consequential only as it is made public, available for peer review, and usable by colleagues.

Dr. Charles E. Glasick, Senior Associate Emeritus, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

No one thinks this will be an easy task. How, after all, are teaching, integrative scholarship, and applied scholarship to be shared with colleagues? How can their quality be assessed?

Our own experience speaks both to the seriousness of the problem and to the necessity for change. *Scholarship Reconsidered* was well received on many campuses that were struggling to rethink faculty roles and rewards. But the ink was barely dry when we started to get calls and letters that said, in effect: "It's one thing to give scholarship a larger meaning, but the real issue revolves around assessment."

In these remarks, I want to focus on our central proposition that it will be possible to take account of different kinds of scholarly activity and accord each the recognition it deserves only with agreed-upon standards of scholarly performance for all types of scholarly work.

We recognize that this is not a new task—academics have, after all, been evaluating scholarship for years through journals, scholarly presses, granting agencies, and promotion and tenure committees. So we asked, in effect, can we find standards applicable to all forms of scholarship by examining what standards are already in use?

Through our inquiries, we arrived at some awkward answers: we found institutions where quantitative criteria overemphasized research and undercut scholars' achievement in integration, application, and teaching. But we also found many fine examples of qualitative guidelines in teaching evaluation forms and promotion and tenure committees at dozens of colleges and universities, in addition to guidelines used by fifty-one granting agencies, thirty-one scholarly journal editors, and fifty-eight scholarly press directors. Many of these, of course, focused on discovery, but some granting agencies, presses, and journals funded or published applied work or integrated work.

At first, it seemed that each marched to a different drummer—some guidelines are long, some short; some are systematic, some jumbled; many include items tailored to specific needs. For instance, the *Journal of Organic Chemistry* wants to know whether compounds were adequately characterized, and the University of California Press, like many other university publishers, asks whether a manuscript is "likely to be required reading in specific undergraduate or graduate courses."

The most remarkable finding, however, was not how much was unique, but how much they had in common. In fact, our survey of standards indicated that these commonalities arise out of the process of scholarship itself. If this process can be defined with some clarity, it can provide terms by which scholars can discuss and document almost any project, without denying either uniqueness or connection to other projects, whatever the discipline or type of scholarship. Indeed, we found it possible to identify in these lists and guidelines a set of six shared themes.

All works of scholarship—be they discovery, integration, engagement, or teaching—seem to involve a common sequence of unfolding stages. Thus, we have found that when people praise a work of scholarship, they usually mean that the project in question shows that it has been guided by these qualitative standards:

- clear goals
- adequate preparation
- appropriate methods
- significant results
- effective communication
- reflective critique

I. Clear Goals

First, scholarly work, to be successful, must show clarity of goals. A well-defined purpose is critical, not only in research but also in the integration and application of knowledge and in teaching.

The Johns Hopkins University Press, in its review of a scholarly paper, asks: "What is the author's goal?" The journal *Environmental Science and Technology* asks: "Is the basic question to be addressed clearly stated?"

Our conclusion, then, is that in measuring the effectiveness of scholarship these questions should be asked: "Has the scholar defined, with clarity, his or her objectives?" "Is the purpose of the project stated in a clear and useful way?"

II. Adequate Preparation

Scholarly work also requires the professor to be professionally well prepared. Whether engaging in discovery, integration, application, or teaching, the scholar must bring the wealth of knowledge, depth of experience, and combination of resources the project needs.

In the documents we examined, adequate preparation is identified repeatedly as one of the most basic and important requirements for scholarly work of all kinds. In research, success depends on the scholar's being well versed in the literature. The University of Alabama Press, for example, asks this question of reviewers: "Does the scholarship appear current?" The University Press of New England asks: "Is the author in command of both primary sources and the standard secondary literature of the field?"

"We propose a new paradigm of scholarship, one with four separate yet interlocking parts: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching."

—Dr. Charles E. Glassick, Senior Associate Emeritus for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Without question, those engaged in service, in what we call the scholarship of application, clearly must be judged in part on the way they draw upon resources not only from their own disciplines but also from practitioners in the field. The Foundation for Child Development, which supports applied projects, wants to know about "the capacity of the applicant organization, including the qualifications of prospective staff, for realizing the project's objectives." The Mott Foundation wants to know: "Does the applicant have the leadership and staff competence to carry out the project, or the ability to secure those essential resources?"

In summary, all sources we examined agreed that adequate preparation is a standard of excellence for all scholars, regardless of their work.

III. Appropriate Methods

As a third standard, scholars must use appropriate methods in all aspects of academic work.

The University of Iowa Press, in judging a scholarly manuscript, asks this question: "Is the scholarship adequate in terms of methodology?" The journal *Physical Review Letters* expresses it this way: "Is the work scientifically sound?" The journal *Child Development* asks reviewers to consider "the formal design of the research," that is, its methodology.

To put it simply, in evaluating any form of scholarship we must ask, "Were the methods and procedures appropriate to the project?"

IV. Significant Results

This leads to the fourth standard. In our new report, we conclude that any act of scholarship must ultimately be judged by the significance of its results. In the case of research, this standard has long been viewed as a core dimension of the scientific method.

I admire the directness of the University of Hawaii Press when it asks: "What has the author accomplished?" The University of Arizona Press wants to know whether the manuscript "makes a significant contribution to the field." And the *Journal of Physical Chemistry* asks whether the manuscript has "extremely important results."

The scholarship of engagement must also be judged by outcomes. At the University of Illinois, peers are asked to comment on the extent to which a college's service activity has made a substantial contribution that is "recognized by others."

V. Effective Communication

As a fifth standard, all scholarship requires good communication. **Lee Shulman** of Stanford University has elegantly argued that teaching must become "community property," that ideas must be shared. I would add that good communication is necessary not just for good teaching but also for good scholarship in all its forms. All scholarship must become "community property" through effective communication.

Engagement requires this standard. The University of Georgia, for example, in its "Guidelines for Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure," states that the effectiveness of public service should be based, at least in part, on "the quality and impact of the written documents produced."

And, of course, the criteria that scholarly presses and professional journals use always include effective communication. Cambridge University Press asks simply: "Is the manuscript well written?" The University Press of Kansas wants to know: "Is the writing style effective?" The American Mathematical Society states, "Papers must be written clearly," and then adds this fascinating comment: "At least the referee should be able to understand them without undue pain." It also notes that the paper must be of interest to an appropriate number of readers, not just to the authors, students, and a few colleagues—suggesting that the intended audience of scholarship should be broad. In this spirit, Kent State University Press asks: "Would there be interest in this book beyond its specialized field?"

I suggest that scholarship, in every form, is a public act, and, while some work is quite specialized, it must in the end be known and understood by many others. Forty years ago, **Robert Oppenheimer,** speaking at the 200th anniversary of Columbia University, said, "It is proper to the role of the scientist … that he try to bring the most honest and intelligible account of new knowledge to all who will try to learn." Scholars, quite simply, must communicate well.

VI. Reflective Critique

Our final standard is that scholarly work should be accompanied by reflective critique. In discovery, integration, engagement, or teaching, the scholar thinks about his or her work, seeks the opinions of others, and develops his or her learning over time.

Reflective critique is not as common in our sources as the other standards, although it is recognized in university guidelines for judging research and teaching. Duquesne University, for example, cites as an indicator of effectiveness in scholarship "significant self-development activities, such as internal faculty development grants, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness." Frostburg State University counts as a criterion for outstanding professional development the undertaking of "a series of courses, workshops, and the like which lead to the development of a new area of expertise."

Insightful reflection begins with a self-conscious practice, which continues after a project is completed. This is especially important in teaching. Regarding professional service, it is surely significant that virtually all funders of applied projects ask that proposals contain an appropriate plan for evaluation.

Careful evaluation enriches scholarly projects by enabling the earlier efforts to better inform the new. Indeed, the quality of reflective critique, though less often recognized in the evaluation of scholarship, may be the most important measure of all.

As I have attempted to demonstrate in my discussion of each of these qualitative standards, the six yardsticks of excellence I have described apply to all forms of scholarship. Within these common criteria are endless variations as the standards are applied in different ways to various disciplines and various types of scholarship. Still, it is hard to imagine any scholarly work worthy of the name that did not meet these standards, which I believe define the core of excellence for all academic work.

Documentation

In order to move the scholarship of engagement into the reward system, scholars must be able to document the quality of their intellectual work on engaged activities. Documentation is difficult even in the area of research, and it must be carefully focused by assessment bodies in areas such as integration, engagement, and teaching.

It is the opinion of The Carnegie Foundation that documentation should, first of all, focus on quality. After all, we do this in research, where we send forward as documentation only our work that was accepted for publication and do not include all of our failures. The scholar should say to the committee: "This is the best I can do." The scholar may list the quantity of his or her work but should document for quality.

In order to achieve such documentation, the scholar should attend to the *six standards.* Nothing more, nothing less. Documentation should speak, then, to the quality with which the goals were derived, the quality with which the preparation was achieved, etc.

Other aspects of the scholar's work, including awards, and previous publications, can be included in the portfolio, but the key point is that the scholar should document to make clear his or her *intellectual contribution* to the project, using the six standards that are the definition of quality scholarship.

All of these efforts to assess scholarship—through standards, documentation, quality, and so forth—are for naught, however, if the process of evaluation is not trustworthy. The question then arises: "How shall we assure a trustworthy tenure and promotion process?" Some years ago, the Young Presidential Scholars carrying out a project for the National Science Foundation reported, "In colleges and universities across the United States, the criteria for tenure are listed as research, teaching, and service. We found, however, that the actual criteria for tenure are research, research, research." If the process itself is not trustworthy, then there is little need for careful documentation.

Again, it is our stance that the process of evaluation should be held to the same six standards that the scholar him- or herself is held. The committee should have clear goals, prepare themselves adequately, use appropriate methods, achieve significant results, practice effective communication, and, finally, undertake a reflective critique. It is of the utmost importance that the committee reflect on the evaluation process, asking: "Could we have done this better? Could we have communicated more fully? How can we train the next committee?" The assessment of scholarship must be undertaken as a form of scholarship itself.

If it is true that the six standards apply to all forms of scholarship—and I surely believe that they do—then we are all members of one *community of scholars,* regardless of discipline or form of scholarship. As we come to recognize this shared membership, perhaps we can become a community where the scholarship of discovery is selectively supported, the scholarship of integration flourishes among our colleagues, the scholarship of engagement is celebrated, and the scholarship of teaching prospers across the campus.

Assessment and Documentation of Outreach Scholarship

By Karen Tuohey Wing

Since the publication of **Ernest Boyer's** *landmark report* Scholarship Reconsidered, *in 1990, and subsequently* Scholarship Assessed: An Evaluation of the Professoriate *by* **Charles Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber,** *and* **Gene Maeroff** *in 1997, a broadened notion of scholarship has begun to take hold in universities across the United States.*

Dr. **Patricia A. Book,** associate vice president for outreach and executive director of the Division of Continuing Education at Penn State, said in her opening remarks for the Outreach Scholarship 2001 session titled "The Dialogue Continues," "There is nothing so relevant, so timely to the conversations we're having here at Penn State."

She noted that both the University Faculty Senate Committee on Outreach Activities and the Faculty Senate have made their priority this year the assessment of outreach scholarship and documentation of this scholarship and will be making recommendations this fall.

"So this is the issue we're talking about at Penn State," said Book.

More specifically, the issue being addressed is that the application of knowledge should be understood as an act of scholarship on par with the discovery of knowledge through research, the integration of knowledge, and the sharing of knowledge through teaching. *Scholarship Assessed* proposes that the academy must confront the central question of evaluation or it will not be able to renew the vitality of college learning, because scholarship will remain too narrowly defined.

To give visibility to the necessary dialogue, the conference gathered together several scholars to share their experiences in evaluating outreach scholarship.

Dr. Patricia A. Book, Associate Vice President for Outreach and Executive Director, Division of Continuing Education, The Pennsylvania State University

Panelists included **Dr. Charles E. Glassick,** senior associate emeritus for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; **Dr. Marilyn A. Corbin,** assistant director of Penn State Cooperative Extension and state program leader for children, youth, and families at Penn State; **Denise M. Retzleff,** associate professor of youth development at the University of Wisconsin-Extension; and **Dr. Joy Pate,** professor and associate chair of the Department of Animal Sciences at Ohio State University.

The essential questions discussed in this session were as follows: Is it possible to develop criteria and procedures for assessing the scholarship? What are the standards for assessing scholarship? How can scholarship be documented? What is the appropriate process for evaluation? What are the qualities of a scholar? Is it possible to develop procedures and have credibility across campus lines?

In addition to his primary role as co-author of *Scholarship Assessed* and contributor to *Scholarship Reconsidered,* Glassick brings a wealth of experience to the subject. He is interim president of North Carolina Wesleyan College and previously served the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as interim president, vice chairman of the board of trustees, and senior fellow. He served as the president of the Robert W. Woodruff Arts Center in Atlanta, Georgia, and of Gettysburg College from 1977 to 1989, during which time he was named in a national survey as one of the 100 "most effective college presidents" in the country.

Glassick recalled some of the conclusions found in his work with Boyer and noted in *Scholarship Reconsidered.* The report proposed that America's colleges and universities need a fresh vision of scholarship in order to tap the full range of faculty talents and encourage other activities that need to be conducted. The report concluded that institutions consider broadening the scope of the term scholarship to recognize these four types of scholarship—discovery (research), integration (interdisciplinary), application (engagement), and teaching (learning)—as separate but overlapping dimensions of scholarship.

"We proposed these activities be announced as equal, evaluated as equal, and rewarded as equal," said Glassick.

Further, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff continued their investigation into scholarship by surveying thousands of faculty members across the United States every five years. With twenty-five years of data from which to draw, they concluded that "a substantial portion of faculty in the U.S. were dissatisfied with their intellectual life."

"Faculty wanted to apply their knowledge to new areas but felt confined by the reward system, which was based on research, research followed by publication, and research followed by publication in a refereed journal," said Glassick.

While there was support, particularly in land-grant universities, for Boyer's appeal that "the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems and must reaffirm its historic commitment to the scholarship of engagement," there was not a reward system in place to make it feasible.

Glassick noted that in order to be successful, this goal must be integrated into the promotion and tenure documents as well as those required for merit increments. Guidelines are needed to document and evaluate outreach scholarship in a way that will not lower the standards.

Glassick and his colleagues looked at the characteristics of outstanding scholarship and developed a set of criteria for identifying and documenting it. Through their research, they distilled six themes that identify the quality of all scholarly works: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation to intended and appropriate audiences, and reflective critique.

"Faculty wanted to apply their knowledge to new areas but felt confined by the reward system, which was based on research, research followed by publication, and research followed by publication in a refereed journal."

—Dr. Charles E. Glassick, Senior Associate Emeritus for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

"These are standards that are now in use, and we believe they represent a vocabulary to begin talking about the work," said Glassick.

"These are the six yardsticks that apply to all forms of scholarship," he added, "although there are endless variations on these standards for the various disciplines and types of work."

Glassick cited the experience of Syracuse University when it adopted these standards. He said difficulty and uncertainty characterized the transition. Perhaps the hardest part was how to do it while still keeping the standards high—a goal shared by everyone.

To this, Glassick said, "Document for quality, list for quantity." Rather than evaluating everything a scholar does, focus on what the scholar presents as "the best I can do," he said. "This is a heavy burden, but a good scholar can do it."

Glassick proposed that the six standards outlined in *Scholarship Assessed* could focus the materials. These standards will give guidance and a starting point for the discussion.

Glassick cautioned that "no matter how carefully we structure the process, it will only work if it is trustworthy. Faculty must feel confident they're being treated fairly, because trust and honor are the primary premises on our campus." He believes that these standards must be discussed within the department as well as at the university level.

Glassick said, "Agreed-upon standards are needed, and I say let the debate begin! And if it is true that there are six criteria that identify all scholarly work, then we are all one community of scholars. Indeed, this could be the leadership where we finally pull together the university, where we can have meaningful and important conversations across departmental lines and join in a great mosaic of intellectual activity on our university campuses."

Panelist **Dr. Marilyn A. Corbin** followed up Glassick's remarks by adding the perspective of Cooperative Extension and its tradition of outreach scholarship. At Penn State, Corbin is assistant director of Penn State Cooperative Extension and state program leader for children, youth, and families.

Dr. Marilyn A. Corbin, Assistant Director of Penn Sate Cooperative Extension and State Program Leader for Children, Youth, and Families

Corbin noted the impact of Cooperative Extension's work on the people in the community and how critically important it is. "Excellence in extension is attained by developing educational programs using quality standards. We need to look more closely at the scholarship of our work," said Corbin. "There are many ways of increasing that intellectual understanding and really documenting the scholarship of the work that occurs in Cooperative Extension."

Visibility and partnering with people across the state characterize the work of many in Cooperative Extension. In addition to the fact that the mission and vision of a land-grant institution is the foundation of Cooperative Extension's scholarship goals, there is also an undeniable financial incentive.

Corbin said, "The stakeholders are a very important constituent group, because the more they value Cooperative Extension's work in the community, the more the stature of the university is enhanced across the state. We have a responsibility of accountability through our scholarship to show impact and program results. In the long run, it's the value of the work to those who pay the bills, the taxes to support us that matters. That is very important—it's the basis of our scholarship as we work toward program results and accomplishments.

"We have moved into issues-based

programming, bringing interdisciplinary teams together to address important issues," said Corbin. "And we've found many ways to make that structure work. We looked at how successful we were at providing education and information to our constituents and what impact it had on their lives."

To document the important work accomplished in Cooperative Extension, Corbin said, the following examples are worth considering:

- the ability of Cooperative Extension faculty members to involve extension agents in program implementation and their ability to successfully involve the target audience in the educational process
- peer and participant review
- adoption and use of the Cooperative Extension faculty member's program by other states as well as inclusion in national and international programs
- opportunities to apply for patents and/or copyrights
- awards for distinguished or outstanding service
- the ability to be successful in securing grants and contracts, including the ability to sustain and leverage the funding for other programs
- testimony to government groups, coalitions, and committees (In other words, what is the scholar's expertise, and how is it being shared with others in meaningful ways?)

Ultimately, Corbin added, "it is our audience who stands behind us, who will back us, who believes in us, and who will go forward to the legislature for funding requests. When our scholarship demonstrates that we're responding to critical, societal, and economic needs, then Cooperative Extension is truly working as a major and significant partner in the university."

Success in most cases has to do with the impact on the target audience. "When we have very strong, powerful program impacts, then we can show the merit of our scholarship across the university campus and then across the Commonwealth."

Denise M. Retzleff, Associate Professor of Youth Development, University of Wisconsin-Extension

Representing the University of Wisconsin-Extension was **Denise M. Retzleff,** associate professor of youth development and chair of the University Committee. As a scholar who helped bring new ways of documenting scholarship through the University of Wisconsin, she was able to provide a perspective on the challenges and successes of change.

She began by saying, "We have built on many of the concepts highlighted by Glassick in *Scholarship Assessed*. We have also looked at other current work in scholarship and determined that a full range of scholarship can flourish within an institution.

"The mission of UW-Extension is to extend the knowledge and resources of the university to the people of the state where they live and where they work. Primarily we are engaged in outreach," said Retzleff.

This also recognizes that the University of Wisconsin is a major research institution, and, therefore, there are a large number of scholars working and being evaluated on research as well as teaching. Due to this large diversity, Retzleff said, they saw the need for a broader understanding of scholarship that needed to be clearly stated in the articles of governance.

She noted that within the past five years, the definition of scholarship has moved away from the strict tradition of research, and, in 1997, they developed a new definition for their institution. It states:

> Scholarship is creative, intellectual work reviewed by peers who affirm its value. It's added to our intellectual history through its communication and is valued by those for whom it was intended.

Once this definition was accepted across the institution, they began to investigate ways to assess scholarship. They determined that, in order to recognize each of the different forms of scholarship (outreach, teaching and research, and integration) as legitimate forms, they needed to be evaluated by a set of standards that recognize what they share as scholarly acts.

Retzleff's committee looked at the goals Glassick identified.

"In the fall of 2000, we held a faculty forum with all of the academic departments represented," said Retzleff. "After a good deal of internal work, we too developed a set of questions.

"The first part addresses creative, intellectual work. We asked: Does the work build upon work already in the field? Does it respond to an identified need? Does it fill a need through creative methods, adaptations, or approaches?

"The second part concerns an independent evaluation by those within the discipline. Do the scholar's peers affirm its value?

"The third part asks whether the work has been added to our intellectual history through its communication. Has the work been shared by colleagues, and is it accessible for others to use and review?

"Finally, is the work valued by those for whom it was intended? Did it have a measurable impact on the clientele?"

This draft was widely distributed to the university community and spawned many redrafts and revisions. The following standards were then presented and approved by the Faculty Senate and University Committee in June, and the chancellor approved it in September 2001.

1. Scholarship occurs in various forms (research, teaching, service, or outreach) and can be presented in many ways, including performances and papers.
2. Scholarship encompasses all four parts of our definition.
3. Scholarly work may be collaborative.
4. Not everything a faculty member does is scholarly.
5. Scholarship is an approach to the way we do our work—a mindset.

"A committee is looking at how these standards can inform the tenure process," said Retzleff. "We've worked for consensus and understanding across all divisions but realize not everyone will agree. We also realize this takes time and are engaged in reflective critique of the process.

"At UW-Extension, we see scholarship as an evolving process. We expect that internal reflection within our institution and sharing with others will naturally lead to better work and better scholarship," concluded Retzleff.

"When we have very strong, powerful program impacts, then we can show the merit of our scholarship across the university campus and then across the Commonwealth."

—Dr. Marilyn A. Corbin, Assistant Director of Penn State Cooperative Extension and State Program Leader for Children, Youth and Families

Panelist **Dr. Joy Pate,** professor and associate chair of the Department of Animal Sciences in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences at Ohio State, chaired the Reward Team of Project Reinvent. She rounded out the panel, with her perspective grounded primarily in research and teaching.

Dr. Joy Pate, Professor and Associate Chair, Department of Animal Sciences, The Ohio State University

Because she does not have a formal appointment in outreach but has served on tenure and promotion committees, she was able to voice the difficulty in documenting and evaluating that scholarship.

"The tradition has been that research counted more, not necessarily because it was valued more but because it was quantifiable," said Pate. The people on those committees understood the quality of the publications, and there were not as many people from outreach who were able to interpret the outreach scholarship.

Pate chaired a Reward Team that was comprised of stakeholders, researchers, faculty, staff members, and extension specialists.

"I think the most important thing we did is that we tried to figure out how to reward quality scholarship in any form. We didn't distinguish research, teaching, service, and outreach," said Pate. "There were no separate committees. We did it all together, and that was really valuable."

"One of the things I've seen change at Ohio State is that as we assess outreach scholarship, we try very hard to determine what is the impact of that program. The impact can serve as a quality indicator," concluded Pate.

The question-and-answer session and subsequent discussion left little doubt that there is still a long way to go to integrate the documentation and assessment of outreach scholarship into the well-established tenure and promotion process. It was agreed that while the guidelines must have support at the vice president and chancellor levels, without departmental support and advocacy, the ideas will have little chance for success—and that all of this takes time.

Glassick, a veteran of higher education, spoke from experience, "Things change slowly in higher education, and they should."

Documenting Scholarship: Working Models, Future Challenges

By Karen Tuohey Wing

As more and more engaged universities emerge in the twenty-first century, perhaps one of the thorniest issues is creating an equitable system for the recognition and reward of outreach scholarship.

A few years ago, a survey at Penn State found that 66 percent of the faculty reported scholarship in outreach: 57 percent in outreach teaching, 60 percent in outreach service, and 19 percent in integrative outreach. Further, more than 50 percent of those surveyed reported that there are no department-, college-, or university-level rewards for participating in outreach at Penn State. A similar 50 percent cited the lack of rewards relative to outreach and tenure as a primary barrier for outreach activities. Panelist **Dr. Drew Hyman,** professor of public policy and community systems at Penn State, presented this data and noted that it was compatible with national findings.

The issue of rewards and the challenge of how to effectively document and evaluate a full range of scholarly activities have generated a series of models. The three models described in the Outreach Scholarship 2001 session "Super Seminar: Continuing the Discussion" included the UniSCOPE model developed by Penn State faculty, the Reward Team at Ohio State, and the Wisconsin Idea developed in 1995 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. **Dr. Theodore R. Alter,** associate vice president for outreach, director of Cooperative Extension, and associate dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences, moderated the panel discussion.

Dr. Drew Hyman, Professor of Public Policy and Community Systems, The Pennsylvania State University

The UniSCOPE Model

UniSCOPE conceptualizes the three mission areas of the university—teaching, research, and service—as a continuum of scholarship. UniSCOPE has integrated these traditional academic missions with **Ernest Boyer's** four functions—discovery, integration, application, and education—to create a multidimensional model that provides a new way of understanding scholarship.

Hyman presented the highlights of the model and distributed the full report, *UniSCOPE 2000: A Multidimensional Model of Scholarship for the 21st Century,* to conference participants.

The UniSCOPE model, the Unified Scholarship Concept for Overall Performance Evaluation, was developed by the UniSCOPE learning community, a small group of faculty and administrators, which grew out of the Keystone 21 Project, funded under the W. K. Kellogg Foundation's Food System Professions Education Initiative. Hyman said this grassroots group formed in 1998.

"We began with the goal of addressing outreach scholarship, in particular the issue of tenure and promotion. However, we soon recognized that we were in a conceptual quagmire in discussing outreach scholarship and the distinctions of teaching, research, service, and outreach. This led to the desire to develop a means for documenting and assessing the full range of scholarship," he said.

Hyman described the main concepts of the UniSCOPE model by saying, "UniSCOPE begins with the principle that academic scholarship is scholarship that fulfills the mission of the academy, in particular the institution and unit with which that faculty member is affiliated. Scholarship from this perspective involves the thoughtful discovery, integration, application, and/or transmission of knowledge. These four functions follow closely Boyer's report and **Dr. Charles Glassick's** book *Scholarship Assessed.* However, through our learning community deliberation we were able to conceptualize a model that also includes the three missions (teaching, research, and service) of the university.

"In this model, we depict knowledge and creativity as beginning with observation either in the field or in the laboratory. Knowledge and creativity are, in turn, invigorated through the process of application, education, and integration. This is a continuing, iterative process, and in our model it's all scholarship. It articulates teaching scholarship, research scholarship, and service scholarship as being expressed through discovery, integration, application, or education. The results benefit both the academy and the world of action."

Where does outreach fit into this model?

Hyman said that in this model outreach is not a separate function. "Outreach involves extending all forms of scholarship to society. Outreach is most commonly seen in integration, application, and education functions; however, outreach frequently leads to discovery of new principles and new knowledge. Thus, outreach invigorates

Dr. Theodore R. Alter, Associate Vice President for Outreach, Director of Cooperative Extension, and Associate Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University

the cycle of scholarship and leads to creativity and relevance in our work.

"Rather than speaking about research, teaching, and outreach, we should talk about research, teaching, and service scholarship as expressed in the four functions. Outreach really involves extending all forms of scholarship to societal issues."

Alter praised the findings of the report, saying, "One thing that is truly laudable about the UniSCOPE project is that the model views outreach as an integral part of all scholarship. It lies within the continuum of scholarly practice in teaching, in research, and in service."

The UniSCOPE model also creates a framework for documentation of scholarship events for recognition and reward. It does this through another dimension of continua—media, audience, and delivery.

These audiences and outlets can be traditional students in resident courses or in outreach activities. They can include professionals, government officials, and the public, along with a broad range of delivery mechanisms.

"The key to the UniSCOPE model is taking each of the three continua and determining how they intersect in what we call a scholarship event," said Hyman.

"What's being called into question is the reward system. And the key issue is this: What activities of the professor are most highly prized? How can we create a system and collegial culture that equitably rewards the full range of academic scholarship?" said Hyman.

UniSCOPE is currently in the process of gaining the consideration of the administration and the University Faculty Senate (Committee on Outreach Activities and Committee on Faculty Affairs). They are also looking at ways the UniSCOPE ideas can be infused into the culture of Penn State so that departments can have a unified paradigm for dealing with these issues.

The Reward Team

In 1996, Ohio State formed the Vision Challenge Team on Rewards. **Dr. Joy Pate,** professor and associate chair of the Department of Animal Sciences at Ohio State, chaired this committee and presented her findings to the conference participants.

"We were charged with the task of exploring the current issues and best practices in the area of faculty rewards in higher education. We were asked to develop a framework for responding to issues raised in a visioning phase of an earlier project called Reinvent," said Pate.

Those issues were:

- to balance the recognition given to research, teaching, and outreach
- to develop a system of periodic development of tenured faculty
- to develop a model to reward team and interdisciplinary work
- to increase clarity in reward system processes
- to increase clarity of position responsibilities, expectations, and standards of performance
- to develop a promotion and tenure system by which a diversity of scholarly responsibilities held by faculty are equitably assessed

Early in the process, the Reward Team set four goals:

1. Redefine scholarship to include a broader spectrum of faculty roles and responsibilities.

2. Develop a process for regular faculty evaluation, development, and renewal.

3. Clearly define the quality and standards of excellence in teaching, research, and outreach.

4. Develop a framework for alternative rewards.

Pate said the first step in realizing their goals was an effort to define scholarship. After reviewing the work done by other universities and scholars, particularly Oregon State University, the Reward Team developed the following definition for Ohio State:

> Teaching, research, and outreach are not considered scholarship in and of themselves. These efforts become an effort for demonstrating scholarship when they create something that did not exist before, they are validated by peers, and they communicate and exemplify one or more of these forms of scholarship.

While pursuing their second goal (regular faculty evaluation, development, and renewal), Pate said, they found that few or no performance standards were in place and that faculty were not effectively reviewed on an annual basis. In addition to failing to provide faculty members with a clear set of expectations, this made the evaluation process more difficult.

To help solve this problem, Pate said, "everyone had to write a position description last year, and they will be reviewed annually. These descriptions are an agreed-upon set of expectations between a faculty member and a chair and are included in the dossier.

"We also felt that annual reviews must be meaningful and should focus on substance, outcomes, impacts, and, most of all, quality of activities. We found that the department chairs needed to get training on how to conduct these performance evaluations to make them more meaningful. And they do that now with positive results."

The Reward Team found its third goal particularly challenging, said Pate. "How do you measure quality and impact and state it in a way that's unambiguous? It's very difficult to translate all these ideas into something meaningful and understandable for a junior faculty member coming up for tenure."

Another challenge was this: Is the issue of post-tenure review acceptable to faculty? After a largely unsuccessful first attempt, the team created a system of faculty development that Pate feels has been invaluable in her own departmental experience.

"Every five years, a faculty member gives a presentation to the department," said Pate. "It is not a research presentation but a program presentation. There is then constructive and critical feedback by those in the department to the faculty member's goals for the next five years. The system offers an incentive, in that faculty can apply for funding to help them redirect themselves."

Since the initial work of the Reward Team, Pate has seen things change at Ohio State. "I do believe people are evaluated differently now," concluded Pate, although the work continues.

The Wisconsin Idea

The Wisconsin Idea, developed at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, brought a unique perspective to the group, since this work was really a precursor to much of the work presented over the course of the conference.

"Our work was finished in 1995," said **Dr. Ann Hoyt,** professor of consumer sciences in the School of Human Ecology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and consumer cooperative state specialist for the University of Wisconsin-Extension. "We drew extensively on the work of Oregon State University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Michigan State University to develop our guidelines."

Hoyt explained that the University of Wisconsin-Madison was forced into this early discussion of outreach scholarship due to a board of regents decision in the mid-1980s. At that time, the extension staff were integrated into the resident campuses, where they immediately fell under the same evaluations standards as the resident faculty at this primary research institution.

In addition, in the late 1980s the provost created a council to consider how the university would increase outreach visibility, impact, and participation.

Hoyt said it soon became clear that the Madison faculty would not engage in additional outreach activities unless they were rewarded for it. This was the motivation for the formation of the Provost's Council on Outreach.

Hoyt chaired the subcommittee on faculty rewards, which prepared guidelines for evaluating outreach excellence. In 1995, the subcommittee published *Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea: A Guide to Documenting and Evaluating Excellence in Outreach Scholarship.*

Hoyt said, "Basically the Wisconsin Idea states that outreach scholarship is a distinct form of teaching, research, and service, and these are the basic components in the university's search for knowledge."

In developing the Wisconsin Idea, the committee began with the following assumptions:

- The role of outreach scholarship varies among departments and faculty appointments.
- All faculty members will be expected to articulate their outreach agendas.
- Every tenure case should include evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments in the context of the Wisconsin Idea.
- Evaluation of outreach scholarship should be dependent on department mission and independent of source of funding.

A key element in the Wisconsin Idea was the committee's definition of quality outreach scholarship. Hoyt said they determined the following:

- There needed to be evidence that the scholarship resulted in significant outcomes and that there was beneficial impact from the application of knowledge to real-world needs, problems, issues, aspirations, or concerns.
- Quality outreach scholarship needed to be tied to the university and department mission and policies.
- Quality outreach scholarship needed to bridge gaps between theory and real-world needs, issues, or concerns.
- Scholarship needed to communicate problems, needs, and aspirations of the people of Wisconsin to the university community.

Since publication of the report, Hoyt has seen the outcomes resulting from the Wisconsin Idea. She noted the following outcomes on the positive side:

- All faculty members have received copies of *Commitment to the Wisconsin Idea.*
- Candidates and departments are using the guidelines to guide junior faculty and prepare tenure dossiers, especially for integrated appointments.
- Divisional committees have included outreach-friendly language in their guidelines.
- Integrated faculty members successfully achieve tenure and promotion.
- Consideration for merit increases is more equitable, because those evaluating have a better understanding of the scholarship.

However, she added, the resident faculty is still not expected to do outreach scholarship, and there is little expectation that junior faculty will engage in public service.

"We have a long way to go in this regard," as well as with the new discussions regarding evaluation in terms of the changing university, particularly when new hires cross interdisciplinary lines, said Hoyt.

Undoubtedly many questions remain regarding the role of all faculty in outreach/engagement, research, scholarship, and, ultimately, tenure.

In conclusion, Alter said, "There are many challenges with regard to this issue. One critical challenge is for us to continue to engage in conversation about scholarship and to engage it fully, visibly, systemically, vigorously. This is what we are about in the university, in the academy. I think the fundamental challenge is to make sure we're having this discussion on an ongoing basis."

"Building and Sustaining University and Community Partnerships: A Community Perspective"

By Pam Farr, President of The Cabot Advisory Group LLC and retired Senior Vice President of Marriott International, Inc.

In ancient Athens, everyone was expected to participate in civic life and take an interest in government and learning. They had a word for business people who did not involve themselves in public life. The word was idiot. *And so not wanting to be branded an idiot, I stand before this impressive group as a business person who is prepared to share some insights, case studies, and observations about how we can build coalitions to serve our communities and make the planet a better place. I will guide you through some of the key issues we face, my predictions for the future, and some very practical tips that I have gleaned from my corporate days of forging outreach and community-based programs with colleges and universities. I will also point out some potential pitfalls to avoid.*

Let us begin with the end in mind—achieving a successful example of outreach scholarship. Let us further take a cause that is at the top of the mind in the world today—freedom. Let us marry them with the conference theme—outreach scholarship.

The Freedom Foundation was established in 1991 as successor to the foundation started in 1953 by the Gannett Company. The Gannett Corporation publishes *USA Today* and other newspapers and owns TV stations in major markets nationwide.

The Freedom Forum is a nonpartisan, international foundation dedicated to free speech and free press with a focus on these priorities: First Amendment issues, diversity in America's newsrooms, and the museum of news called the Newseum, located in Arlington, Virginia.

Pam Farr, President, The Cabot Advisory Group LLC

Recently, the Freedom Foundation sponsored the first-ever presidential debates in Zambia, Africa, in its efforts to support a democratic election. The debate was broadcast on television and radio and translated into ninety-eight tribal languages. A similar presidential debate was held in 2000 in Ghana, Africa. I know, because my business partner, **Madelyn Jennings,** former senior vice president of human resources for Gannett and current member of the executive committee of the Freedom Forum, was there. In preparing for this speech, I chatted with Madelyn about the important relationships that the Freedom Forum has forged with several academic institutions in order to fulfill their mission of freedom. These relationships include the following:

- The Freedom Forum and Vanderbilt University have established a First Amendment Center. The center sponsors many forums dealing with freedom issues. Together, Vanderbilt and the Freedom Forum are building a Diversity Institute to advance the prospects of getting more minority individuals into the newsrooms.
- The Freedom Forum is underwriting programs at the University of South Dakota that encourage Native Americans to enter the field of journalism.
- The Freedom Forum also sponsors festivals to raise student awareness of freedom of speech. These festivals have taken place on a number of campuses, including Penn State, the University of North Carolina, and Arizona State University.
- Each year, the Freedom Forum sponsors twelve international journalists for semester-long visits to U.S. universities.
- Finally, the Freedom Forum provides stipends for University of North Carolina doctoral candidates who want to teach journalism.

What is illustrative about all of these partnerships is that they represent the key ingredients that I believe are critical to the success of outreach and community-based partnerships:

- pressing need
- well-defined community
- coalition of interested parties
- effective leaders

- a work plan
- secure funding
- accountability for results

Many of these elements have also been articulated by the Kellogg Commission in its report titled *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*—a must read for all of us. I will address them in detail as we look a bit more closely at the Freedom Forum case study.

Gannett Corporation is in the business of newspapers/media. It is their industry. They funded the foundation years ago through a wise utilization of Gannett stock, which has handsomely appreciated over the years and ensures a source of funding for the Freedom Forum and its philanthropy. The foundation does not take donations. It has a board of directors and an executive committee of committed, highly competent, and extraordinarily dedicated individuals who believe in the philosophy and value freedom of speech. At the point of formation of the foundation, Gannett executives recognized that they could give back to the communities in which they do business, and they aspired, in the broader geopolitical framework, to make the world a better place through freedom of speech.

Further, the Freedom Forum founders understood that freedom of speech has "one song, but many voices." Diversity in newsrooms and television studios begins with a diverse workforce. The foundation recognized that it must build outreach into academic and political institutions to make their mission a reality. And, lastly, the foundation made a commitment to measure results and hold institutions accountable for continuing outcomes, not just efforts and good intentions. This example is the springboard for my remarks about outreach.

In the academic world, you use the term *outreach scholarship.* In the business world, we often use the words *social responsibility* to reflect our efforts to achieve goals in a manner that exceeds the ethical, legal, operational, charitable, and community expectations of constituents, shareholders, and employees. Social responsibility does not require the attainment of *all* goals. However, it is usually associated with the following:

- good faith efforts
- doing what's right
- acknowledging our shortcomings
- and commitment to continuous improvement

If we were to catalog *activities* that typically fall under the corporate social responsibility (CSR) umbrella, we would find the following:

- philanthropy/giving
- employee volunteer programs
- college/university outreach
- community projects
- equal opportunity/diversity management
- safety/security of employees/customers
- legal compliance
- fiduciary responsibilities to stakeholders/shareholders/investors

Constituents or segments of targeted populations that come under consideration when fashioning outreach and social responsibility programs are the following:

- students
- alumni
- applicants
- future applicants
- professors
- administrators
- staff
- board
- community
- key contributors to fund-raising

That being said, after twenty years in the corporate world serving on teams that built socially responsible and community-based efforts, I offer here a framework that I believe *makes sense*—to borrow a phrase from the Kellogg Foundation. **W. K. Kellogg** founded the Kellogg Foundation in the 1930s, reportedly retaining only a fraction of his fortune for his own use. He articulated a simple but profound principle for use of the foundation monies and its projects—that they "make sense."

If I were to build the pillars or elements for outreach scholarship that "make sense," they would be as follows:

- principles that guide decision making
- values and beliefs that are consistent with the charter and history of the institution
- missions and strategies that are articulated and understandable
- a resource plan
- effective leadership

As we examine each of these elements, I will try to emulate our scientists, who believe that if you ask the right questions up front, you will unlock the solutions downstream:

I. Principles

First, a principle is a rule of conduct or action, a fundamental truth or doctrine. As outreach program designers and champions of social engagement, we must ask: What do we stand for? Why? What is our aim or focus? What are the rules of engagement as we proceed? What do we hold as fundamental to our efforts?

II. Values/Beliefs

What do we truly believe is right/wrong? What do we value as worth our effort? What is outside or inside our scope or reach? Where are we willing to invest our time, money, and effort?

III. Mission/Strategy

A vision is usually conceived as an aspiration that may be just beyond our grasp but still points us to the true north of the effort. A mission statement expresses intent. Outreach leaders must answer questions about both vision and intent: What are we committed to achieve? How will we operationalize this strategy through activities, goals, and accountabilities?

IV. Resource Plan

The demand for programs/services will always outstrip the supply of resources—human, capital, and technological. Funding is perhaps the greatest concern in creating a resource plan, but in my opinion, FOCUS must precede

FUNDING. It is critical to focus our efforts. Rather than creating a "meteor shower" of activities and initiatives, I strongly urge academic institutions and corporations to focus their efforts and leverage their resources over a sustained period of time. I have worked on task forces and advisory boards from which I have come away with a circuit overload of well-intentioned people without clear mission, strategy, plans, and focus. It is a bit like designing an out-of-control theme park—too many rides, too much music, too many eateries, and too many lights. We have to get a grip!

We also have to guard against well-intentioned "crusader rabbits" that fight for a focused cause but are clueless about the realities of legal, financial, and resource realities. In my younger days, I may have been such a crusader rabbit myself—until I became a business executive and grew wiser with years and experience. We need a balance of viewpoints or lenses to look through to achieve great outcomes in outreach scholarship. In other words, we might have some great crusader rabbits, but they had better be teamed with strong finance, legal, political, and donor rabbits in order to get things done. Goals should be turned into realities, not just more meetings or lofty, unattainable, unsustainable goals! In my experience, if the focus of the outreach is razor-sharp and the strategies are in place along with an action plan, there is a much better chance for funding.

V. Leadership

Leaders can envision future states that do not yet exist. They have the ability to influence and inspire people to follow them to that proverbial "new city on the hill," even though the journey will mean change, discomfort, and disruption of the current state. Tap outreach leaders who have proven track records, impeccable ethics, and charisma to lead the charge to that new city on the hill.

Case Studies

Before I move to that future city on the hill, I would like to underscore the notion of FOCUS by using two more case examples from the corporate world. First, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, established by **David Packard,** one of the co-founders of the Hewlett-Packard Corporation. According to **Pete Peterson,** the former senior vice president for human resources of Hewlett-Packard and retired member of the foundation's board of directors, the foundation had several focus areas, including the following:

- funding the purchase of open land in California to preserve it from developers
- funding labs and buildings to support advances in science and engineering
- funding management consultancy for nonprofit organizations to improve efficiency and effectiveness
- funding and promoting family planning and reproductive health in developing nations that suffer from a lack of reproductive health services for women

In this case, rather than using the scattergun approach, the foundation focused or beamed its efforts on these selected areas and sustained their efforts over a period of years.

Another example that is very familiar to me is the Marriott Family Foundation for the Employment of People with Disabilities. The **J. W. Marriott Family** created the foundation from its family wealth to encourage the recruitment, training, and employment of people with disabilities. The foundation created what is now known as the Bridges Program, a model program that has been replicated in many cities in the United States. The Bridges Program aims to *bridge* the world of school to the world of work for high school students. To fulfill this goal, the foundation funds job coaches; conducts outreach to vocational rehabilitation offices, colleges, and universities that train human resource and vocational rehabilitation professionals; and forges alliances with local school administrators to identify students for the program.

As a corporation, Marriott has appeared repeatedly in *Fortune Magazine*'s list of the Best Companies to Work For, and it is one of the largest employers of people with disabilities. The foundation also works with other employers in major cities to create job-training sites and encourage hiring of people with disabilities.

Year after year, the focus and effort have been sustained. Thousands of lives have been changed, and communities have been enriched by people with disabilities getting jobs, earning wages, buying goods, raising families, and becoming mainstreamed in society—truly living out their hopes and dreams.

I know that they are achieving their goals, because my son, who was born with spina bifida that paralyzed his lower legs, was recommended by his high school for the Marriott Bridges Program. At the time, the school-based counselors did not know that I was one of the original architects of the Bridges Program. It was only after the application process began that this came to light, and the Bridges people inquired about the applicant with the same last name. My son, John, met the criteria on his own, and I am very proud to say that he obtained an internship at a radio station. Now this field has become his passion. He is enrolled in community college and wants to major in radio broadcasting/communications.

As a family, the Marriotts are committed to this cause. They put their time, effort, and money into the foundation. It has been aligned with their personal values. It has earned them the reputation of being good corporate citizens. And it has served as an example to others who will take up causes, build solutions, and make a difference in the future.

Future Outreach Models

As I reflect on these examples, I believe that the future will be characterized by the following major factors:

- velocity
- intensity
- complexity
- humanity
- diversity
- generosity

I believe that the future will bring about the convergence of several of these characteristics, and this will bode well for outreach scholarship. The world is truly turning into a global village. The economy is a world economy based on interdependency, and it is becoming increasingly borderless. The speed and velocity of information flow and the extremely powerful emotions generated out of the world's complex social and political relationships create compelling forces, with major calls to action. The diversity of humanity spawns diversity of thought, speech, action, and lifestyle. The flash points between our differences become evident daily. The saddest of these has been the September 11 disaster. But I am an optimist. I believe that order comes from chaos and that a new world order may be emerging. I see generosity and social responsibility as becoming antidotes to a cynical world in order to preserve the dignity of humankind.

Now where, exactly, do I predict that the convergence of generosity, diversity, humanity, and outreach scholarship will occur?

My bet is that it will fall into three broad categories:

- biotechnology focused on world health as an outcome of the human genome mapping projects
- ecology and environment, protecting the planet and its natural and human resources
- communications and consumer products, focusing on a wide range of lifestyle and personal-choice products and services

Imagining this convergence is not too much of a stretch when you read about the following examples:

- Biotechnology researchers are working to develop bacteria that can detect land mines.
- Plants are being modified to produce vaccines and other pharmaceuticals.
- While it conducts its business, Weyerhaeuser Company devotes its corporate giving efforts to reforestation and protecting wildlife.
- Glaxo Wellcome makes a pledge in its annual report to shareholders that the company will be responsible and efficient in the use of the Earth's resources in making its products, integrating environment, health, and safety into all aspects of its business.
- MacroChem Corporation announced that early trials of a gel designed to improve sexual function show that the new consumer product is safe for men. Does this product represent crass commercialism, or does it take a broader view that human sexuality is one of the most fundamental aspects of humanity and should be pursued in an effort to make lives more meaningful?

My point in all these examples is that colleges/universities will continue to provide knowledge, research, and expertise to address society's changing needs. If we align these assets with corporate know-how and the individuals and institutions that fund these alliances, we have a powerhouse combination.

In the spirit of this collaboration I would like to tell you about a new foundation, which I think, in many ways, points to the future. The Stargazer Foundation takes its name and inspiration from the popular TV show Star Trek. It has created StargazerNET *(www.stargazernet.net),* which uses the World Wide Web as a virtual meeting place to support not-for-profit educational and social objectives. Its mission is to enable the sharing of knowledge, experience, and information throughout the world at no cost. I like to think of it as a huge knowledge aggregator, connecting the dots that represent parties from around the world who are interested in making the planet a better place. The StargazerNET advisory board reads like the Who's Who of the galaxy! This is a glimpse of the future.

In his best-selling book titled *Stewardship: Choosing Service over Self-Interest,* **Peter Block** observed, "Stewardship encompasses concerns of the spirit, but it also must pass the test of the marketplace. It must be practical and economic." As you create new opportunities in outreach scholarship, remember that your institution will stand at the intersection of the spirit, the community, and the marketplace—and YOU can help reconcile these interests if you are truly wise.

Outreach Scholarship 2001 Program Committee Members

Talat Azhar
Senior Marketing Associate, Outreach Marketing Research, The Pennsylvania State University

Brenda Bernatowicz
Regional Director, Cooperative Extension, The Pennsylvania State University

Karen Bruns *
Director, OSU CARES, The Ohio State University

Beth Byers
Staff Assistant, Conferences and Institutes, The Pennsylvania State University

Jeri Childers *
Acting Director, Outreach Office of Program Development, The Pennsylvania State University

Lisa Clapper
Marketing Associate, Outreach Marketing, The Pennsylvania State University

Michael Dann *
Senior Program Developer, Outreach Office of Program Development, The Pennsylvania State University

Chris Dufour *
Senior Conference Planner, Conferences and Institutes, The Pennsylvania State University

Jeanine Emigh
Staff Assistant, Outreach Office of Program Development, The Pennsylvania State University

Tammy Golden
Staff Assistant, Conferences and Institutes, The Pennsylvania State University

Tracy Gross
Computer Support Specialist, Outreach Office of Information Systems, The Pennsylvania State University

Tracey D. Huston
Director, Outreach Communications, The Pennsylvania State University

Denise Kowalski
Program Assistant, Conferences and Institutes, The Pennsylvania State University

Michael Martin *
Special Assistant to the Vice President, Outreach and Cooperative Extension, The Pennsylvania State University

Jeanne Williams
Program Assistant, Outreach Office of Program Development, The Pennsylvania State University

Greg Wise *
Secretary of the Faculty/Academic Staff, Assistant to the Provost, Office of the Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Extension

Donna Yorukoglu
Information and Training Specialist, Outreach Office of Information Systems, The Pennsylvania State University

* **National Planning Committee**

Penn State Editorial Staff

Tracey D. Huston
Monograph Executive Editor and Director of Outreach Communications, Office of Outreach Communications

Deborah A. Benedetti
Writer/Editor, Office of Outreach Communications

Celena E. Kusch
Writer/Editor, Office of Outreach Communications

Karen Tuohey Wing
Writer/Editor, Office of Outreach Communications

Barbara Sherry
Staff Assistant, Office of Outreach Communications

Dick Ackley
Photographer, Penn State Image Resource Center

Dave Shelly
Photographer, Penn State Image Resource Center

Curt Krebs
Photographer, Penn State Image Resource Center

Brian J. Mizikar
Graphic Designer, Outreach Marketing