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For Democracy’s Future:
Education Reclaims Our Civic Mission

White House meeting, hosted by the Secretary of Education and other Obama Administration officials

January 10, 2012
• Release of *A Crucible Moment: Civic Learning and Democracy’s Future – A National Call to Action*, from the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement at AACU and commissioned by the Department of Education

• Release of the Department of Education report, *Advancing Civic Learning and Engagement in Democracy: A Road Map and Call to Action*

• The inauguration of the *American Commonwealth Partnership* (ACP) aimed at envisioning and creating 21st Century Democracy Colleges in which, as Undersecretary Martha Kanter said, we approach “education as a civic and moral imperative as well as an economic imperative.” The ACP, as Harry Boyte explained it, will work with campuses to make a commitment to move “from scattered civic activity to deep civic identity.”
American Commonwealth Partnership (ACP)

Broad coalition with 5 key priority areas:

- Deepen civic identity, values, and vision
- Advance Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement
- Build and Strengthen Campus-Community Connections
- Expand Public Scholarship and Research
- Provide Evidence
• http://www.ed.gov/civic-learning
• http://www.aacu.org/civic_learning/crucible/
• http://democracyu.wordpress.com/
A CRUCIBLE MOMENT
College Learning & Democracy's Future

"TO SERVE A LARGER PURPOSE"
ENGAGEMENT FOR DEMOCRACY AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION
EDITED BY JOHN SALTMARSH AND MATTHEW MARTLEY
Redefining higher education for the 21st century

Located squarely between the neoliberal, market driven, highly privatized university and the need for universities to more effectively address social issues and improve the human condition are the issues of community engagement, public scholarship, and university-community partnerships.
What do we mean by Democratic Engagement?

Democratic engagement is grounded in relationships that are based on the democratic values of task-sharing and lay-participation (collaboration reciprocity, and co-creation between academics and non-academics) and is accomplished through facilitating the creation of a wider public culture of democracy.
Isn’t all engagement democratic?

*Engagement* “requires going beyond the expert model that often gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration...calls on faculty to move beyond ‘outreach,’ ...asks scholars to go beyond ‘service,’ with its overtones of noblesse oblige. What it emphasizes is genuine *collaboration*: that the learning and teaching be multidirectional and the expertise shared. It represents a basic reconceptualization of...community-based work.”

O’Meara and Rice, Faculty Priorities Reconsidered (2005).
Why not just call it “civic engagement?”

“...presents the risk that the term can say everything and nothing at the same time. Additionally, the lack of a clear definition can leave some campuses and their leaders with the impression that they are ‘doing engagement,’ when in fact they are not.”

Stepping Up as Stewards of Place (2002)
Civic Engagement in Peer-Reviewer Articles
“Civic engagement is ready for the dustbin...like other buzzwords, civic engagement means so many things to so many people that it clarifies almost nothing.”

Ben Berger (2009)
Why does it matter that we frame our work around democratic engagement?

Implications for

1. Partnerships
2. Faculty and Staff Practice
3. Institutional culture and change
Questions catalyzing the *Kettering Colloquium (2008)*:

- **Why has the civic engagement movement in higher education stalled and what are the strategies needed to further advance institutional transformation aimed at generating democratic, community-based knowledge and action?**

- **Is the civic engagement as it is practiced on campuses changing higher education or is higher education changing the way that civic engagement is being practiced?**

- **What would need to happen for civic engagement as it is practiced in higher education to be more democratic?**
DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT WHITE PAPER

By John Saltmarsh, Matt Hartley, and Patti Clayton

“...whether this educative process is carried on in a predominantly democratic or non-democratic way becomes therefore a question of transcendent importance not only for education itself but for its final effect upon all the interests and activities of a society that is committed to the democratic way of life.”


Background and Context

Participants at a recent Wingspread conference on civic engagement in higher education (Bukardt et al. 2004) concluded that while the movement has created some change, it has also plateaued and requires a more comprehensive effort to ensure lasting commitment and institutional capacity. For the participants at Wingspread, and for others involved in civic engagement in higher education, the time has come for “calling the question” of whether engagement will be viewed as a core value of the university of the 21st century – as centrally important to the civic mission of higher education and to generating and transmitting new knowledge (Bjarnason et al., 2003, p. 139). This example (at least as it is in a university with greater collaboration and democracy) illustrates the power of democratic processes and purposes – “democratic engagement” – in transforming higher education.
To Serve a Larger Purpose: Education for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education
Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M. eds. (2011)
Temple University Press
Our work has attempted to do two things:

• provide a framework of democratic engagement as a way to focus attention on the purposes and processes of engagement practices and the implications of democratic engagement for changing institutions; and

• link engagement practice to institutional change, examining the kinds of engagement practices that perpetuate/reinforce the status quo and the kinds of engagement practices that compel change.
Technocratic

- Engagement in this sense reflects the dominant academic culture of higher education, often characterized as “scientific,” “rationalized,” “objectified,” or “technocratic,” meaning that the approach to public problems is predominantly shaped by specialized expertise “applied” externally “to” or “on” the community, providing “solutions” to what has been determined to be the community’s “needs.”
Democratic

• The norms of a culture of democratic education are determined by values such as inclusiveness, participation, task sharing and reciprocity in public problem solving, and an equality of respect for the knowledge and experience that everyone contributes to education and community building. These democratic processes and purposes reorient civic engagement to what we are calling “democratic engagement.”
# Comparing Civic Engagement Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Civic Engagement (Focus on Activity and Place)</th>
<th>Democratic Civic Engagement (Focus on Purpose and Process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relationships</strong></td>
<td>- Partnerships and mutuality</td>
<td>- Reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deficit-based understanding of community</td>
<td>- Asset-based understanding of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic work done <em>for</em> the public</td>
<td>- Academic work done <em>with</em> the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge production/research</strong></td>
<td>- Applied</td>
<td>- Inclusive, collaborative, problem-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unidirectional flow of knowledge</td>
<td>- Multi-directional flow of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>- Positivist/scientific/technocratic</td>
<td>- Relational, localized, contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Distinction between knowledge producers and knowledge consumers</td>
<td>- Co-creation of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Primacy of academic knowledge</td>
<td>- Shared authority for knowledge creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- University as the center of public problem-solving</td>
<td>- University as a part of an ecosystem of knowledge production addressing public problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Dimension</strong></td>
<td>- Apolitical engagement</td>
<td>- Facilitating an inclusive, collaborative, and deliberative democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td>- Knowledge generation and dissemination through community involvement</td>
<td>- Community change that results from the co-creation of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Order Change</td>
<td>Second-Order Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what is done - to make what already exists more efficient and more effective.</td>
<td>Aim is to alter the fundamental ways in which organizations are put together. These changes reflect major dissatisfaction with present arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not disturb the basic organizational features, or substantially alter the ways in which faculty and students perform their roles. Those who propose first-order changes believe that the existing goals and structure are both adequate and desirable.</td>
<td>Second-order changes introduce new goals, structures, and roles that transform familiar ways of doing things into new ways of solving persistent problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require changes that alter the culture of the institution, those which require major shifts in an institution’s culture—the common set of beliefs and values that creates a shared interpretation and understanding of events and actions.</td>
<td>Is associated with transformational change, defined as change that (1) alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products; (2) is deep and pervasive, affecting the whole institution; (3) is intentional; and (4) occurs over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focuses on institution-wide patterns of perceiving, thinking, and feeling; shared understandings; collective assumptions; and common interpretive frameworks are the ingredients of this ‘invisible glue’ called institutional culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six propositions that offer possibilities for constructive action

1. Transformation change requires a broad-based consensus about purpose
2. The democratically engaged university entails co-creating a different kind of educational experience with its students
3. Leadership should model democratic values
4. Graduate education must be realigned to promote a larger public purpose
5. Evolving perspectives on knowledge generation must be validated
6. Institutions must provide resources for faculty professional development for democratic civic engagement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instructional Paradigm</strong></th>
<th><strong>Learning Paradigm</strong></th>
<th>“<strong>Collaborative Paradigm</strong>”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(The faculty determines the content and the way the content will be delivered.)</td>
<td>(The faculty creates a learning environment in which students learn through active and collaborative teaching and learning practices.)</td>
<td>(The faculty, students, and community partners collaboratively determine the content to be covered, the way in which the content is best learned, and are collectively responsible for learning.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide/deliver instruction</th>
<th>Produce learning</th>
<th>Co-produce learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer knowledge from faculty to students</td>
<td>Elicit student discovery and construction of knowledge</td>
<td>Collaboratively discover and construct knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering material</td>
<td>Specified learning results</td>
<td>Co-determine the learning outcomes and collaborate in the modes of instruction and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-course assessment</td>
<td>Pre/during/post assessment</td>
<td>Students and community partners collaborate in formative and summative assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are primarily lecturers</td>
<td>Faculty are primarily designers of learning methods and environments</td>
<td>Faculty in collaboration with students and community partners determine learning methods and create learning environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers classify and sort students</td>
<td>Teachers develop every students’ competencies and talents</td>
<td>Teachers and students and community partners together enhance students’ competencies and talents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Syracuse University is committed to longstanding traditions of scholarship as well as evolving perspectives on scholarship. Syracuse University recognizes that the role of academia is not static, and that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines change over time. The University will continue to support scholars in all of these traditions, including faculty who choose to participate in publicly engaged scholarship. Publicly engaged scholarship may involve partnerships of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, creative activity, and public knowledge; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address and help solve critical social problems; and contribute to the public good.”
Putting Democratic Engagement to Work on Campus

• A Dean of liberal arts college uses the Democratic Engagement White Paper for discussion at Dean’s Council meeting.

• The director of a community engagement center at a public urban university uses the White Paper for professional development for staff.

• The staff of a community engagement center at a private research university uses the White Paper to guide the revision of criteria for awarding funding to faculty for community engagement projects.
"I have just finished reading your article ... It resonates very well with my own thinking and is very relevant for our South African context. I am the Chairperson of the South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum (SAHECEF). For the next Board Meeting of this national organisation ... I am suggesting that the Board Members (representing 23 public universities and 1 private) read your article. I shall introduce it and then ask for discussion. I cannot agree more with your emphasis on the need for democratic process and purpose."
“What is most interesting to me about this thread is that it supports a claim in the Democratic Engagement White Paper: by continually focusing on the implementation of activities, we remove our attention from the bigger purpose and process that engagement seeks. In struggling with naming conventions and categorization, we turn our attention away from a larger issue: the normative epistemology of the academy is that we produce and disseminate knowledge and perform services “for” needy communities. The critical question is, How are communities included in the teaching and research activities of the academy so that we are truly producing knowledge and generating solutions “with” communities?”
Community Partner, Community Arts Organization

“I think your team’s 2009 Democratic Engagement white paper is the clearest I’ve read defining the engagement problem for higher education. It quickly translates to my field, which is a testament to its clarity. For example, the five barriers apply with equal force when I substitute *democratic arts* for *education*. I think this is significant for what it says about the condition of our democracy.”
“While several new studies and reports joined those we identified in the 2006 report in calling for a renewed vision of American higher education dedicated to preparation of an engaged citizenry, others raised serious questions about the movement’s effectiveness to date. Most noteworthy among these is the “Democratic Engagement White Paper,” published in February 2009 by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

Their conclusion that the “dominant epistemology of the academy runs counter to the civic engagement agenda” is valid but their assessment of the state of the movement as “fragmented and compartmentalized” is, in my view, unduly pessimistic.”

Discussion Questions

1. What would change in your engagement practice so that it would be more democratic?
2. Where is democratic engagement situated in relation to the core values of the campus?
3. What would need to change at your institution for democratic engagement to become central to its culture and practices?
4. Where does democratic engagement connect with other institutional priorities and innovative initiatives? Can you identify and describe examples of integration of these projects and goals with each other and into the fabric of the institution?
5. Where do you see momentum or openings to push for this kind of change? Who are potential allies? Where are the possibilities for collaboration? What might be strategic priorities for action?
Catalyst Paper

Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Public Engagement on Campus

Inviting your engagement

Posted by Susan Sturm at Oct 07, 2011 04:45 PM | Permalink

The authors of “Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Public Engagement in Higher Education” invite you to participate in an ongoing dialogue about integrating public scholarship and diversity.

We are eager to build on the momentum generated at the recent Imagining America Conference to make this issue a focus of attention and action. The authors of this “catalyst paper” came together out of a