

# University-Community Colaborations for the Twenty-First Century

*Outreach Scholarship for  
Youth and Families*

Edited by  
Richard M. Lerner  
Lou Anna K. Simon

---

**University-Community  
Collaborations for  
the Twenty-First Century**

---

Michigan State University Series on Children, Youth, and Families  
(Vol. 4)  
Garland Reference Library of Social Science  
(Vol. 1119)

---

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY SERIES ON  
CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

John Paul McKinney, *Senior Editor*

Lawrence B. Schiamberg, *Advisory Editor*

Amy B. Slonim and Linda Spence, *Associate Editors*

---

*Child Maltreatment and Optimal Caregiving in Social Contexts*  
by Diana Baumrind

*Adolescent Parenthood and Education*  
Exploring Alternative Programs  
by Mary Pilat

*Adolescents, Cultures, and Conflicts*  
Growing Up in Contemporary Europe  
by Jari-Erik Nurmi

*University-Community Collaborations for the Twenty-First Century*  
Outreach Scholarship for Youth and Families  
edited by Richard M. Lerner and Lou Anna K. Simon

---

# **University-Community Collaborations for the Twenty-First Century**

*Outreach Scholarship for  
Youth and Families*

---

**edited by**

**Richard M. Lerner**

**Lou Anna K. Simon**

---

First published by Garland Publishing, Inc.

This edition published 2013 by Routledge

Routledge  
Taylor & Francis Group  
711 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10017

Routledge  
Taylor & Francis Group  
2 Park Square, Milton Park  
Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

Copyright © 1998 by Richard M. Lerner and Lou Anna K. Simon  
All rights reserved

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century : outreach scholarship for youth and families / edited by Richard M. Lerner, Lou Anna K. Simon.

p. cm. — (Michigan State University series on children, youth, and families ; vol. 4) (Garland reference library of social science ; vol. 1119)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8153-2445-6 (alk. paper)

1. Community and college—United States. 2. Education, Higher—Social aspects—United States. I. Lerner, Richard M. II. Simon, Lou Anna Kimsey. III. Series: Michigan State University series on children, youth, and families ; v. 4. IV. Series: Garland reference library of social science ; v. 1119.

LC238.U547 1998

378.1'03'0973—dc21

97-30385

CIP

---

# Contents

---

<b>Series Preface</b>	ix
-----------------------	----

Lawrence B. Schiamberg

---

<b>Foreword: Creating the New Outreach University</b>	xiii
---	------

C. Peter Magrath

---

<b>Preface</b>	xxi
----------------	-----

---

## **Section I: Creating Community-Collaborative Universities**

A View of the Issues

Chapter 1

<b>The New American Outreach University</b>	3
---	---

Challenges and Options

Richard M. Lerner and Lou Anna K. Simon

Chapter 2

<b>The Land-Grant Idea and the Evolving Outreach University</b>	25
---	----

James T. Bonnen

---

## **Section II: Creating Outreach Universities**

Contemporary Efforts

Chapter 3

<b>Marshaling the Forces of the Land-Grant University to Promote Human Development</b>	73
--	----

Graham B. Spanier and Mary Beth Crowe

Chapter 4

<b>Toward a New Century of Service</b>	91
--	----

Community Collaborative Programs at Kent State University

Carol A. Cartwright

---

Chapter 5	
<b>Community Collaboration Programs at Goucher College</b>	
A Commitment to Connect	109
Judy Jolley Mohraz and Carol Weinberg	
Chapter 6	
<b>Outreach for the Twenty-First Century</b>	
The Virginia Tech Approach	127
Peggy S. Meszaros	
Chapter 7	
<b>Building University System Collaboration</b>	
The Florida Inter-University Center for Child, Family and Community Studies	139
Lionel J. Beaulieu, Ann K. Mullis, and Ronald L. Mullis	
Chapter 8	
<b>Educating the Applied Developmental Psychologist for University-Community Partnerships</b>	
The Fordham Model	157
Ann Higgins-D'Alessandro, Celia B. Fisher, and Mimi G. Hamilton	
Chapter 9	
<b>The Children, Youth, and Family Consortium</b>	
A University of Minnesota/Community Partnership	185
Martha Farrell Erickson and Richard A. Weinberg	
Chapter 10	
<b>Challenges of University-Community Outreach to Traditional Research Universities</b>	
The University of Pittsburgh Office of Child Development Experience	203
Robert B. McCall, Christina J. Groark, Mark S. Strauss, and Carl N. Johnson	
Chapter 11	
<b>Making University and Community Collaborations Work</b>	231
Christine M. Todd, Aaron T. Ebata, and Robert Hughes, Jr.	

## Chapter 12

**Toward a Scholarship of Relevance**

- Lessons from a Land-Grant University 255  
Stephen A. Small and Karen Bogenschneider

## Chapter 13

**Organizational Innovation and the Creation  
of the New American University**

- The University of Pennsylvania's Center for Community  
Partnerships as a Case Study in Progress 275  
Ira Harkavy

## Chapter 14

**The Young Spartan Program**

- A Bridge between the Ivory Tower and the Community 289  
Joanne G. Keith, Daniel F. Perkins, Joy C. Greer,  
Karen McKnight Casey, and Theresa M. Ferrari

## Chapter 15

**Promoting the Health of Maryland's Adolescents**

- The Center for Adolescent Health at the  
Johns Hopkins University 315  
Cheryl S. Alexander and Madlyn C. Morreale

## Chapter 16

**Changing the Culture of the University  
to Engage in Outreach Scholarship**

- 335  
Mary Brabeck et al.

---

**Section III: Perspectives from Community Stakeholders**

## Chapter 17

**Boldness for Our Times**

- Mobilizing University Expertise to Meet Youth Needs 367  
Russell G. Mawby

## Chapter 18

**Furthering Community Youth Development**

- 389  
Richard J. Sauer



## Chapter 19

**The Common Pursuits of Modern Philanthropy  
and the Proposed Outreach University**

Enhancing Research and Education

397

Lonnie R. Sherrod

## Chapter 20

**The Fermilab Program for Science and  
Mathematics Education of Youth**

419

Marjorie G. Bardeen and Leon M. Lederman

## Chapter 21

**"One Foot in the Library and One Foot in the Street"**

Strategies for Investing in University-

Community Collaboration

435

Jane Quinn

## Chapter 22

**Partnership in Action**

The Governor's Clergy Summit in the City of Detroit

451

John Engler and Connie Binsfeld

---

**Section IV: Conclusions**

## Chapter 23

**Directions for the American Outreach University  
in the Twenty-First Century**

463

Richard M. Lerner and Lou Anna K. Simon

---

**Contributors**

483

---

**Name Index**

505

---

**Subject Index**

507

---

## Series Preface

### Outreach Scholarship for Children, Youth, and Families

---

The publication of Richard M. Lerner and Lou Anna K. Simon's volume, *University-Community Collaborations for the Twenty-First Century: Outreach Scholarship for Youth and Families*, signals the continued prominence and success of the Michigan State University Series on Children, Youth, and Families. The authors' scholarly work, accompanied by the insightful foreword by Peter Magrath, is a prime example of the creative emphasis on cutting-edge scholarship which the MSU Series represents—a focus on issues of social policy, program design and delivery, and evaluation—which addresses the needs of a diversity of children, youth, families, and communities. In particular, this book promises to be a seminal and landmark volume in rethinking the role of the American university in fostering, enhancing, and building university-community partnerships in the service of children, youth, and families.

Furthermore, the Lerner/Simon volume is a clear illustration of the goals of the Institute for Children, Youth, and Families (ICYF). It serves as an example of the relationship of outreach scholarship to essential issues of policy and program development which, in turn, has the potential for enhancing the lives of children, youth, and families in the diverse communities which the Institute serves. Likewise, the publication of this challenging and most impressive volume provides evidence that the MSU Series, initiated by ICYF and well served by the commitment and intellectual leadership of Senior Editor John Paul McKinney with the able guidance of Marie Ellen Larcada of Garland Publishing, serves as a compendium of scholarly work reflecting the very best scholarship aimed at enhancing the life experiences of a diversity of children, youth, and families. As such, both the Lerner/Simon volume and the MSU Series demonstrate the importance and feasibility of the mission of ICYF in integrating research and outreach.

The mission of the Institute for Children, Youth, and Families at MSU is based on a vision of the nature of a land-grant university as an academic institution with a responsibility for addressing the welfare of children, youth, and families in communities. More specifically, the mission of ICYF is shaped by an ecological perspective that places the life-span development of human beings in the context of the significant settings of human experience, including community, family, work, and peer networks (Lerner et al., 1994; Schiamberg, 1985, 1988). Historically, the ecological perspective has both been associated with, and a guiding frame for, colleges of home economics or, as they are more recently termed, colleges of human development, human ecology, or family and consumer sciences (Miller & Lerner, 1994). Using the ecology of human development as a conceptual framework, the Institute for Children, Youth, and Families continues to develop programs that integrate the critical notion of development in context with the attempt, indeed the necessity, of creating connections between such scholarship and social policy, program design, delivery, and evaluation.

The MSU Series is a unique collection of books, designed to provide a vehicle for the publication and transmission of research/outreach efforts characterized by the collaborative relationship (and potential relationship) between university expertise and the community. Lerner and Simon's book represents the careful and visionary thinking of authors who have worked, first hand, with university-community partnerships and collaborations which reflect both successful and "best practice" efforts in the service of enhancing the life prospects of children, youth, and families in community settings. As universities begin to respond to continuing social pressures to apply their resources to address a variety of critical social problems, there is a compelling need for such careful scholarship and for best practice in helping universities and communities to frame joint programs addressing the needs of the diverse groups of children and families that both serve. The Michigan State University Series on Children, Youth, and Families is, itself, an example of the outreach scholarship which reflects the contextual and practical policy focus of the ICYF research program. The MSU Series publishes reference and professional books, including monographs and edited volumes, which appeal to a wide audience in communities as well as in universities, including such constituencies as scholars, practitioners, service deliverers, child and family advocates, business leaders, and policymakers. As illustrated by the superb scholarly effort of Lerner and Simon, the MSU Series has substantial import and appeal to

these constituencies primarily because of its focus on the integration of research and outreach and, as well, an emphasis on collaborative relationships between universities and communities.

The unique role and perspective of both ICYF and the MSU Series can be further appreciated in light of the ongoing trends for both university accountability and social contribution. In particular, the various university stakeholders, including business, government, and community leadership, are increasingly urging universities to use their research and scholarly resources to address problems of social, political, and technological relevance (Boyer, 1990; Votruba, 1992). Thus, communities are seeking a greater involvement in outreach on the part of their universities. Both ICYF and Michigan State University are committed to integrating outreach into the full fabric of university responsibility (Provost's Committee on University Outreach, 1993).

The volume by Lerner and Simon represents an outstanding contribution to this emerging outreach/research focus. The MSU Series editors, including John Paul McKinney, Amy B. Slonim, Linda Spence, and Lawrence B. Schiamberg, as well as the staff editor of the Institute for Children, Youth, and Families at MSU, Linda Chapel Jackson, are proud and grateful to have this path-breaking book on the emerging issues and patterns of university partnerships with the diverse communities of America as part of the MSU Series.

Lawrence B. Schiamberg

Series Editor, MSU Series on Children, Youth, and Families

## References

- Boyer, E.L. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Lerner, R.M., Miller, J.R., Knott, J.H., Corey, K.E., Bynum, T.S., Hoopfer, L.C., McKinney, M.H., Abrams, L.A., Hula, R.C., & Terry, P.A. (1994). Integrating scholarship and outreach in human development research, policy, and service: A developmental contextual perspective. In D.L. Featherman, R.M. Lerner, & M. Perlmutter (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior*, Vol. 12 (pp. 249–273). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Miller, J.R., & Lerner, R.M. (1994). Integrating research and outreach: Developmental contextualism and the human ecological perspective. *Home Economics Forum*, 7, 21–28.
- Provost's Committee on University Outreach. (1993). *University outreach at Michigan State University: Extending knowledge to serve society*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Schiamberg, L.B. (1985). *Human development* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- . (1988). *Child and adolescent development* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Votruba, J.C. (1992). Promoting the extension of knowledge in service to society. *Metropolitan Universities*, 3 (3), 72–80.

**This page intentionally left blank**

---

# Foreword

## Creating the New Outreach University

---

Richard M. Lerner and Lou Anna K. Simon have assembled—and contributed to—an important book. It is far more than a series of isolated, interesting case studies on how colleges and universities must adapt themselves to serve society's interest in the new century just ahead. There are case studies in this book, but in its totality and the sweep of its conceptual and descriptive essays, *University-Community Collaborations for the Twenty-First Century* presents a lively demonstration of some of the most critical issues facing our society—and how colleges and universities can help meet these needs.

Put another way, this book provides both a theoretical and a practical primer, with rich illustrations, on how colleges and universities must become even more society-serving. The message is implicitly and explicitly clear: our colleges and universities, wonderful as they are, must change and reform themselves so as to serve the needs of contemporary America. We are a nation of great accomplishments and potential, but we are also riven with huge problems in our communities: alcohol and drug abuse, crime, inadequate schooling, families (or, perhaps more accurately, non-families), and the reality and growing threat of a lost, wasted generation of youth—which, in turn, has massive implications for the economic competitiveness of the United States.

America's colleges and universities are still, as those of us who have labored within them love to say, "the envy of the world." The American research university has been incredibly successful in helping to identify and solve countless problems through its research in agriculture, medicine, and the sciences. Just as important, America's colleges and universities have performed excellently in helping to educate millions of Americans every year with the insights and skills essential to being effective human beings in a complex, technological world. A fair question then might be,

“Why should our colleges and universities change?” The answer is simple: because the world has changed.

A little history is instructive. Half a century ago, World War II ended and American higher education quickly confronted three monumental challenges. First, education-hungry war veterans populated our colleges and universities—and these institutions responded effectively. Second, the long and hard Cold War began and our universities were called upon to develop a world-class research capability heavily geared to our nation’s security—and these institutions responded effectively. And third, tens of millions of Americans, especially minorities and women and people of modest means, yearned for the tools provided by higher education—and colleges and universities responded effectively.

This is a great success story, one in which America’s public colleges and universities played the leading role. But that was then, and this is now. Now America faces new and even more monumental challenges. The Cold War is over, but the world is still an unsafe place, and international economic competitiveness is critical to our nation’s security.

Moreover, we confront difficult, riveting, domestic challenges: a troubled health and welfare security system, a seemingly uncontrollable crime and corrections problem, a large population of men, women, and children, many of them minorities, who are economically and socially disenfranchised, and an elementary and secondary school system that in too many cases fails our society. And all of these challenges compete against a national consensus that public deficits and government spending must be curbed.

What does this mean for America’s colleges and universities? The answer is, a great deal—in effect a monumental challenge at least as critical as that of the Cold War era. Because universities are indispensable generators of intellectual and economic creativity, they are essential to America’s social and economic well-being in the century before us, just as two- and four-year colleges are also vital contributors to the talent pool of our society in their work of educating students who, ideally, become lifelong learners.

But to meet this challenge successfully, our universities, especially, must adapt and change. Yesterday’s good works are inadequate for tomorrow’s needs. We must recognize the new realities of diminished public resources while facing our shortcomings forthrightly. Clearly, these include our need to use faculty time more productively, our obligation to pay more attention to undergraduate students and to become full-time collaborators with public schools, and our duty to link research discover-

ies and educational insights with our states and communities in partnerships that strengthen our economy and society. And we dare not be afraid to use the new technologies—most of them spawned in our universities—to improve how we teach, learn, and communicate in a world not defined by campus boundaries or restricted by towers built of ivory.

This challenge, the challenge of adapting to change and, indeed, leading it, is really the thesis—the prescription—of this volume’s description of the rich possibilities inherent in the new outreach university. This is a university, whether public or private, collaborating with community and liberal-arts colleges of all kinds, not only in their important traditional missions of educating students on campuses and producing life-saving research, but a university focused on community partnerships and collaborations that address the crisis afflicting much too much of America’s youth. The exciting truth is that the kinds of practical educational-outreach programs called for by the contributors of this volume can be done. They are not just theory, but models that are being put in place—even though there are not enough of them to meet our society’s needs.

The fulfillment of this challenge to meet the need for new outreach universities, building on their rich historic traditions, is one of the central challenges facing our universities. William C. Richardson, the president of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, who has himself led major research universities, has stated the issue correctly and precisely:

*One of the critical challenges for higher education is to redirect our knowledge and our resources in the service of rural communities and urban neighborhoods. In fact, it may be these investments that prove the true test and value of our research and outreach programs. Can we, for example, make a difference in the lives of people where they live, in the towns and communities of America? Can we build the capacity of people to play a central role in finding their own solutions? And, can we impact public policy that creates both economic and social opportunities for people to improve their quality of life? (Richardson, 1996)*

Richardson, in a speech to university presidents, goes on to quote Dr. Donald Schön, Ford Professor Emeritus at MIT, who suggests that we should stop thinking about “practice” (outreach, if you will) as simply a kind of laboratory setting for the application of knowledge. Instead, Schön makes the fundamental point that practice leads also to the generation of knowledge; as he puts it, “we should ask not only how practitioners can better apply the results of academic research, but what kinds of knowing



are already embedded in competent practice” (Schön, 1995). For those who care, as all of us should, about the future of research universities and their need for adequate funding, here is the solution. By doing what is needed, our universities will not only generate a climate of political support that will help with their funding needs, but they will also be generating insights and new knowledge from their outreach practices, from their literal “doings,” which in turn stimulate and nourish the critical research function.

The essays in this book illustrate this point dramatically, even as they provide excellent descriptive models of ongoing outreach programs, whether at Penn State, Kent State, Virginia Tech, or smaller colleges such as Goucher. There are conventional and strong academic prejudices about university-community outreach programs, and they are well described in the chapter about the University of Pittsburgh experience with its Office of Child Development. And yet the point is that the programs of that university have not only proven their value both to the community and to the university, but that undoubtedly they have informed the engaged faculty with new academic insights and understandings with regard to the complex challenges involving children, youth, and families in our modern society.

Indeed, the issue of research and scholarly relevance, so vital to our universities, is well explained and cogently argued by Stephen A. Small and Karen Bogenschneider in chapter 12, describing models of scholarship and relevance at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. The outreach youth and family programs of the University of Wisconsin clearly demonstrate that scholarship can be relevant in outreach work. Moreover, these projects lead to genuine results—actual implementation in communities—where they can make a difference in people’s lives. But beyond this, this chapter provides compelling evidence that the scholarship of relevance and practice can meet the high scholarly expectations of academia. As the authors note, “each of the outreach projects cited in this paper and many described throughout this book have been published in refereed journals or presented at scholarly meetings.”

Unfortunately, as the authors and contributors to this volume full well know, it’s difficult to sell the idea of revitalizing America’s universities so that outreach activities become as mainstream and valued within the academy as is currently true for the research function and the traditional ways of teaching students. As the contributors to the chapter on “Changing the Culture of the University to Engage in Outreach Scholarship” write in concluding their chapter:

*Our institutional mission and values provide a context essential for our ongoing commitment to the work. However, we know that it will take a cultural sea change to accomplish our goals. Time will tell if our sustained efforts will be integrated into the broader fabric of Boston College and become, as Fullan and Steigelbauer wrote . . . “a new way of life, not just another project.”*

The academic culture and faculty-reward system is one of the key underlying issues that must be addressed and modified if outreach is to become a truly mainstream part of our colleges and universities. All of us who deal with these issues and work for change recognize that this is one of the toughest, but not insuperable, challenges we face. To again quote Bill Richardson in his speech to university presidents, he argues that the “research-as-king mindset has shaped the academic culture and hierarchy of most American universities.” He goes on to suggest that we must change the status quo on this issue if we are to meet the true challenges faced by higher education. There is of course no magic formula, but there is a need for a rebalancing of university efforts involving the teaching and learning of undergraduate and other students, the role of research, and the application of research in many forms—including outreach needed and relevant to our nation’s communities.

It is because of this commitment to significant change and adaptation, and the opportunity for our colleges and universities to lead and direct change—as opposed to being driven haphazardly by the new environment confronting higher education in this post–Cold War era—that the Kellogg Foundation has stepped in. It supported the establishment of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, intended to provide direction and leadership in dealing with some of the most critical challenges before higher education. The Commission has already concluded that these challenges revolve primarily around the student experience and can be placed at the heart of institutional concerns; addressed the question of access to our nation’s colleges and universities as a priority, despite financial and political pressures; advocated the creation of a learning society that encourages learning throughout life; advocated the reform of the campus culture so that excellence is redefined through the new agenda of social needs that are so obvious; and—especially relevant to the thesis of this book—promoted the idea of “engaged institutions,” those that go beyond traditional extension programs in order to become more productively involved with our communities.

No book, and certainly no single commission of university presidents,

can presume to identify all of the issues and challenges before us, much less to solve them in some kind of a neat package. But this volume clearly identifies one of the most critical agendas before the house of American higher education: how our colleges and universities can reach out to communities and encourage communities to “reach in” to them, so that old collaborations can be strengthened and new ones developed and nurtured for the sake of addressing our nation’s future—its youth. There are so many excellent essays and chapters in this book that one hesitates to single any one out; they are all on the right message of university-community involvement and the land-grant mission of serving public needs.

But it is not inappropriate to cite the essay on “Boldness for Our Times,” written by the chairman emeritus of the Kellogg Foundation, Russell G. Mawby, for its insistence that our universities must, far more than they have and in new and imaginative ways, engage with education. This means not only the vital sector of K–12 education, but equally that which addresses the developmental process of youngsters from pre-birth through adolescence and into young adulthood. Mawby’s thesis is that universities have to, in an integrated fashion, address and collaborate with communities in order to address the needs of the family and the local community and its schools. As he writes in his concluding paragraphs, our society urgently needs outreach scholarship that links the intellectual resources of institutions of higher education with communities and their needs, and he goes on to make this essential point:

*... the multiplicity of problems confronting and confounding America’s youth ... provides the venue for this enhanced outreach initiative, building on higher education’s oldest tradition of public service. America simply must do a better job of preparing its coming generations for the responsibilities they will assume and the lives they will lead. The richness of the intellectual resources of higher education must be mobilized to this end.*

One of the dangers facing American higher education is the erosion of public understanding and support, joined to an ideology that regards higher education as primarily serving private and selfish interests. In fact, our colleges and universities are primarily and overwhelmingly in public service. Their work of educating students, undertaking research, and fostering its application is essentially a public good, not a private benefit. The historic record demonstrates that higher education, while appropriately benefiting individuals, has fundamentally been a benefit—indeed a criti-

cal resource—serving the public good. If the colleges and universities of America consider and take to heart the insights, and then implement the practices, from this volume put together by Richard M. Lerner and Lou Anna K. Simon, both our society and its universities will be richly rewarded.

C. Peter Magrath

President

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

## References

- Richardson, W. C. (1996, January). Coming in from the Cold War: A peace time mission for higher education. Speech presented at the Kellogg Commission.
- Schön, D. A. (1995, November/December). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change*, 27–34.

**This page intentionally left blank**

---

# Preface

---

America's youth and families face an historically unprecedented set of problems, involving health and health care, economic opportunity and employment, educational and school failures, poverty, physical and social ecological deterioration, crime, inadequate social-service systems, and a set of behavioral risks (e.g., drug and alcohol use and abuse, violence, and unsafe sex) that engage increasingly broader segments of our citizenry. At the same time, America's universities are being challenged to become directly involved in addressing these problems. They are being pressed to reorient their missions to conduct teaching, research, and service in manners that help the communities beset by these problems address them—in ways defined by these communities as meaningful and useful. This reorientation involves the conduct of outreach scholarship and the creation of outreach universities.

Simply, then, universities are being challenged to work, in partnerships with communities, to use their abilities to generate, transmit, preserve, and apply knowledge in ways that improve the life chances of the individuals and families of the communities with which they are involved. This volume illustrates how these challenges are being met productively and successfully. It brings university administrators and faculty leaders from state, land-grant, and private colleges and universities together with leaders from several sectors of the community, from nongovernmental organizations, from state government, and from foundations supporting youth and family programming in order to: (1) present their views about issues pertinent to the problems facing America's universities and communities; and, most important, (2) to describe their actions aimed at creating community-collaborative, outreach universities. These are institutions that, in partnership with communities, integrate research, teaching, and service in order to effectively address the vital community and national concerns we have noted.

We believe that this volume gives unique voice to the solutions that universities and communities are currently forging for these problems. The chapters in this book make clear that there remain several important issues to address in order to continue to pursue these efforts; these issues involve both the university (for example, changing the system by which faculty are rewarded, so that community collaboration is both encouraged and sustained) and the community (overcoming, for example, the perhaps deserved skepticism that exists about the commitment of universities to work, as full partners, with communities). In addition, there exist issues that pertain to the collaborative system created by university and community partnerships, including issues involving placing the sustainability of the collaboration and the empowerment of citizens above concerns for the independent benefits to the partners. Nevertheless, the chapters attest to the fact that successful community-university collaborations can be developed and maintained; they also underscore the view that, if the programs described in this book are used as sample cases or models of what might be accomplished, there is reason for great optimism about the role that universities—as community-collaborative institutions—can play in promoting the positive development of our nation's youth and families.

There are numerous people we wish to thank for their collegiality and collaboration during the preparation of this book. Most of all, we wish to thank all the contributors to this volume. As the authors of the chapters of this book, these colleagues brought life and force to our vision of the potential that the creation of outreach universities has for enhancing opportunities for America's youth and families. We want to thank especially Dr. C. Peter Magrath, President, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, for encouraging the efforts of all contributors to the volume and for writing an insightful and supportive foreword.

Linda Chapel Jackson, Editor at the Institute for Children, Youth, and Families at Michigan State University, and her assistant, Adrienne E. Wile, provided expert professional editorial contributions to the entire volume. Their commitment and productivity are greatly appreciated. We also wish to express our gratitude to Dr. Lawrence B. Schiamberg, Senior Editor of the MSU Series on Children, Youth, and Families, for his sponsorship of the volume and for his helpful scholarly advice throughout the process of the book's development. We are grateful as well to the staff of Garland Publishing for their expert guidance throughout the production process.

Finally, we want to express our deep and abiding affection for our respective families—to whom this book is dedicated. It is their love and

support that continue to motivate us to merge our professional abilities and our personal values in order to advance the institutions we most cherish—family, community, and university—in manners that enhance the lives of all citizens of our nation.

Richard M. Lerner

Lou Anna K. Simon



**This page intentionally left blank**

---

## **Section I**

---

### **Creating Community- Collaborative Universities**

*A View of the Issues*

**This page intentionally left blank**

---

# Chapter 1

## The New American Outreach University

### Challenges and Options

Richard M. Lerner

Boston College

Lou Anna K. Simon

Michigan State University

---

*Too many of our faculty, in all of our disciplines, are far too insulated, too isolated, and in fact and perception seen as indifferent to worlds other than their own. . . . Our traditional faculty culture, which is built around every faculty person as an entrepreneur, a free thinker, and a free doer, has much to commend itself. But it also has much to condemn itself when that individual freedom is divorced from social reality and the needs and aspirations of America's citizens and voters. (C. Peter Magrath, President, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1993, p. 4).*

America, and the communities that comprise it, face a set of problems of historically unprecedented scope and severity. Issues of economic development, environmental quality, health and health-care delivery, and—ultimately—of people, of children, youth, and families, challenge the current resources and future viability of our nation.

Indeed, across the communities of our nation, children and adolescents are dying—from violence; from drug and alcohol use and abuse; from unsafe sex; from poor nutrition; and from the sequelae of persistent and pervasive poverty (Dryfoos, 1990; Hamburg, 1992; Hernandez, 1993; Huston, 1991; Lerner, 1993a, 1993b, 1995; McKinney, Abrams, Terry, & Lerner, 1994; Schorr, 1988; Wilson, 1987). And, if our youth are not dying, their life chances are being squandered—by school failure, underachievement, and dropout; by crime; by teenage pregnancy and parenting; by lack of job preparedness; by prolonged welfare dependency; by challenges to their health (e.g., lack of immunizations, inadequate screening for disabilities, insufficient prenatal care, and lack of sufficient infant and childhood medical services); and by the feelings of despair and hopelessness that pervade the lives of children whose parents have lived in poverty and who see themselves as having little opportunity to do better, that is, to

have a life marked by societal respect, achievement, and opportunity (Dryfoos, 1990; Huston, 1991; Huston, McLoyd, & Coll, 1994).

Numerous sectors of society have worked, and continue to work, to address these issues. However, although the sum total of these efforts affords a "comprehensive" approach, the whole has been less than the sum of its parts. Current efforts often involve different agencies and organizations competing for "turf," or "ownership" of a problem, and duplicating services that are delivered independent of input from program recipients; such an orientation to service provision is quite typically coupled with a deficit view of communities, families, and individuals and, as a consequence, few instances exist of community-wide, integrative collaboration. As such, most existing efforts do not build on community assets and do not create the capacity for communities to sustain effective programs.

A vision for such community empowerment exists, however. This vision seeks to create caring communities through broad, multi-institutional and citizen collaborations, and acts to envision, implement, and evaluate community-based programs; to engage policy; and to build a new generation of community leaders (e.g., see Dryfoos, 1990, 1994; Hamburg, 1992; Lerner, 1995; Lerner, Ostrom, & Freel, 1995, 1997; Ostrom, Lerner, & Freel, 1995; Schorr, 1988; Weiss & Greene, 1992).

Universities have a critical role to play in such collaborations. They can act as agents of technical assistance, knowledge development, demonstration, training, and dissemination. However, to make such contributions, universities must change from their currently perceived (and, in several respects, actual) status as enclaves for ethereal elitism (Bonnen, 1986, 1992; Lerner, 1996) and become agents in community engagement and empowerment. To produce this change, a revised view of the scholarly functions of universities is needed, one that creates "outreach universities," that is, universities that generate, transmit, preserve, or apply knowledge to address societal problems, as these problems are defined in concert with community collaborators. To reach such collaborative definitions, a "co-learning" model, that is, a model involving a merger of expertise in communities with expertise in universities, must be developed.

Illustrations exist of productive university-based initiatives consistent with the promotion of such community-collaborative outreach scholarship. A key purpose of this volume is to present these examples of "systems change," that is, of alterations in the way universities function in and with the communities they serve and of the issues of academic restructuring that need to be addressed in order to enhance and sustain outreach schol-

arship pertinent to the youth and families of these communities. In turn, perspectives from key community stakeholders—from foundations, from nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and from governmental bodies also involved in promoting the positive and healthy development of our nation's youth, families, and communities—are included in order to underscore the need for, and significance of, these university systems changes.

The presentation of these university and community illustrations is predicated on the belief that if the university and the society served by its efforts are to survive and prosper into the next century, collaborations that build and maintain such programs will have to be supported. However, and despite the productivity of the examples of outreach presented in this book, it is still the case that such initiatives are not modal in American society. Accordingly, it is important to understand the academic and societal context within which these systems changes are occurring. This context both promotes the need for such changes and, as well, constrains the possibility that they will occur.

### **The Context for Creating Outreach Universities:**

#### **Academic and Community Opportunities and Constraints**

The American university has been dominated by an emphasis on the development of the disciplines (Bok, 1992; Bonnen, 1986, 1992; Boyer, 1990; Votruba, 1992). American universities have been modeled after the nineteenth-century German university—wherein community-disengaged, independently working scholars pursued “ethereal” knowledge, that is, knowledge that was not contingent on the extant sociocultural context pertinent at a given historical moment (Lynton & Elman, 1987). Historically, the more decontextualized the knowledge, the higher its value (Bonnen, 1986, 1992).

Contemporary intellectual and societal forces are challenging this value. University scholars—whether they are in the role of teacher, researcher, and/or administrator—are currently engaged in discussions about the existence or validity of decontextualized knowledge, and about the legitimacy of the disciplinary and sociocultural isolation associated with such knowledge.

These issues have been discussed in fields as seemingly disparate as:

- the physical sciences—involving concepts such as quantum mechanics (Zukav, 1979), chaos (Gleick, 1987), and dissipative systems and entropy (Prigogine, 1978);

- evolutionary biology—involving concepts such as exaptation (Gould & Vrba, 1982), self-selection (Lewontin & Levins, 1978), and behavioral neophenotypes (Gottlieb, 1992);
- the social and behavioral sciences—involving concepts such as individual-environment dialectics (Riegel, 1975, 1976); the ecology of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1979; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998); developmental systems (Ford & Lerner, 1992; Lerner, 1997; Sameroff, 1983; Thelen & Smith, 1998) and contextualism (Lerner, 1986, 1991, 1992, 1995); the home economics/human ecology vision of integrative (community-collaborative, multidisciplinary, and multiprofessional) scholarship (Lerner & Miller, 1993; Lerner et al., 1994; Lerner, Miller, & Ostrom, 1995; Miller & Lerner, 1994); and applied developmental science (Fisher et al., 1993; Lerner & Fisher, 1994).

Together, these concepts have fostered a challenge to prior conceptions of the nature of the world. The idea that all knowledge is related to its context has promoted a change in the typical “philosophy of being” (the ontology) within the academy; that is, a focus on “relationism” has helped advance the view that all existence is contingent—on the specifics of the physical and social cultural conditions that exist at a particular moment of history (Pepper, 1942). As a consequence, changes in epistemology have been associated with this revision in ontology: Contingent knowledge can only be understood if relationships are studied (Schön, 1995). Accordingly, any instance of knowledge (e.g., the core knowledge of a given discipline) must be integrated with knowledge of the context surrounding it, *and of the relation* between knowledge and context. Part of this context is the community. As such, one key implication of these philosophical changes for outreach scholarship is that the university scholar’s knowledge must be integrated with the knowledge that exists in the communities within which universities are embedded.

### **From Multidisciplinary Knowledge to Community-Collaborative Universities**

The philosophical ideas associated with the emerging interest in relational knowledge result in an increased emphasis among scholars on integrating knowledge across multiple dimensions (i.e., across multiple disciplines and multiple professions). As such, the interest in relationism and integration constitute a set of internal pressures within the academy for multidisciplinary

scholarship. Moreover, these contemporary intellectual emphases converge with external pressures on the academy that, in effect, provide a corresponding press for integrative, multidisciplinary knowledge. That is, coupled with pressures stemming from academic philosophical and scholarly revisions, external pressure is being placed on the academy to use its knowledge to address the problems of the community. Thus, the relationism being promoted by academic/scholarly changes converges with a relationism fostered by interest in the community to have universities apply their knowledge to community problems—as the community defines these problems.

Therefore, since these community problems—involving issues of employment and economic development, of health and health services, of environmental quality, of crime, of a severely challenged educational system, of poverty, and ultimately of the quality of life of individuals, families, and communities—are not arrayed in insulated disciplinary compartments, this appeal constitutes a press for multidisciplinary knowledge that is integrated with the needs of the community (Lerner et al., 1997; Miller & Lerner, 1994). Thus, these pressures involve calls for universities to be accountable for helping address, in a sustained manner, the social and cultural problems of the diverse proximal and distal communities in which they are embedded.

Such efforts by universities are not distinct from traditional activities pursued by, in particular, land-grant institutions. Indeed, the pressure by the community for the university to use its knowledge to address community-defined problems, that is, the demand for outreach scholarship (Lerner, 1995; Lerner et al., 1994; Miller & Lerner, 1994), pertinent to the quality of life of youth and families, is a demand consistent with one of the three foundational foci of land-grant institutions (Bonnen, 1986, 1992). That is, a concern with improving people's lives has been, along with concerns for providing access to information and for promoting economic development, a core focus of the land-grant mission. However, the pressures for sustained university contributions to the enhancement of the lives of individuals and families are not placed today only on land-grant institutions. All state universities, and indeed all institutions of higher learning, in both the public and private arenas, receive such pressures—and this is why this range of public and private institutions is represented in this volume.

Moreover, these pressures—rather than being able to be interpreted as a brief discontinuity in expectations maintained about universities—promise to be of such scope that institutions of higher education will have to develop a long-term strategy for response, one that will require not the



compartmentalization (or, in some cases, marginalization) of such responses within one section or unit of the university (e.g., cooperative extension); rather, such responses will require action across the entire fabric of the university. The implementation of such responses will necessitate changes in the academic system that extend well into the next century and will involve major revisions in the mission and structure of the American university. Indeed, as Magrath has observed:

*First and foremost our universities, all of them, both those that are technically land-grant and those that are not technically land-grant, are in the people-serving business. That is why they exist, and indeed all of them really are in the spirit of the land-grant tradition of serving society and being responsive to social needs in collaborative partnerships with our community and its legitimate interests. . . . But above all else public service means that all of our universities, from the most prestigious research-intensive universities to those that are smaller and may be more focused, have a fundamental, irreducible, obligation to recognize that we serve not our interest, but our state and national interests as defined, not just by us clever professionals, though we have contributions to make; but as defined by the people who pay taxes and who provide the tuition, and who make contributions that enable us to be blessed with fulfilling and well-paying jobs that gives us much. It is therefore not only appropriate, but morally right, that much be expected of us. (Magrath, 1993, pp. 5–6)*

In sum, then, converging intellectual and societal pressures are acting as an important impetus for the emergence of a university system wherein knowledge integration—across disciplines, across professions, and across the borders that may divide the university from the diverse communities it serves—may become both intellectually and ethically normative. That is, we believe that contemporary societal pressures serve to reinforce the direction of change involved in the above-noted philosophical issues: Both sets of pressures will require universities to integrate their abilities to generate, transmit, preserve, and apply knowledge (Boyer, 1990) with the needs of the community.

Of course, American universities and the pressing social issues facing the nation have always been interrelated (Bonnen, 1986, 1992; Boyer, 1994). Leaders of our nation's institutions of higher education and of the nation itself have traditionally linked academic scholarship and the "practical" needs of America. Indeed, Boyer (1994) describes the history of the links between higher educational teaching and research and service to the

nation, a history that involved both private and public institutions, and which began during the colonial period, extended through the American Revolution and the 1862 and 1890 Morrill acts, and included the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Indeed, as Boyer (1994) notes, the very title of this latter act illustrates the essential link between higher education and a very vital societal issue: the security of our nation.

Nevertheless, today in America this historical association between the scholarship of our universities and the problems of our nation has weakened. From outside of the university there is, as Boyer observes, a general belief that:

*The overall efforts of the academy are not considered to be at the vital center of the nation's work. And [there] is the growing feeling in this country that higher education is a private benefit, not a public good. (emphasis in original) (Boyer, 1994: p. 48)*

Although there is controversy within the academy about the necessity of any association between the scholarly agenda of the professorate and the critical issues facing our nation, it is our view that the pressures on universities by the diverse communities of our nation will foster increased reliance on an integrative vision for the future of American universities, for example, as found in the view of scholarship embodied in the perspective labeled "applied developmental science" (Fisher et al., 1993; Lerner & Fisher, 1994), or the home economics/human ecology and development perspective forwarded by Miller and Lerner (1994) and by Lerner, Ostrom, and Freel (1997). Such integrative views promote collaborative approaches to working across units, disciplines, and professions, and with communities.

Indeed, the problems facing our nation as we move to the twenty-first century, and, as such, the problems within which universities find themselves embedded, are so profound that such integrative visions must be developed and sustained. It is important, then, to consider the pressures for integration now facing American universities and the social and cultural problems that have led to these pressures.

### **Sociocultural Pressures and Youth and Family Problems Confronting American Universities**

The remainder of this decade will be a period of profound challenge for American universities. To address adequately the focal pressure to improve the quality of life of America's youth and families, universities will have to

respond to an historically unprecedented set of problems confronting the people of our nation's communities.

For example, consider just some of the high-risk behaviors that, as noted above, pervade the lives of America's youth: drug and alcohol use; crimes, often of a violent nature; school failure and dropout; and unsafe sex and teenage pregnancy and parenting. In America, there are approximately 28 million children and adolescents between the ages of 10 and 17 years. About 50% of these youth engage in *two or more* of the above-noted categories of risk behaviors (Dryfoos, 1990). Moreover, 10% of our nation's youth engage in *all* of the four categories of risk behaviors (Dryfoos, 1990).

These data regarding the prevalence of risk behaviors indicate that the current status of American youth is exceedingly problematic. Indeed, these data suggest that nothing short of a "generational time bomb" (Lerner, 1993a, 1995) is confronting American society. With so many of our nation's youth beset with so many instances of behavioral risk, America is on the verge of shortly losing much of its next generation, that is, the human capital upon which the future of our nation relies (Hamburg, 1992; Lerner, 1993a, 1993b, 1995). Moreover, poverty exacerbates the risk behaviors of youth and, in fact, Schorr (1988) notes that poverty is the single best predictor of "rotten outcomes" of youth development. Quite unfortunately, then, poverty is a growing problem for America's youth and families (Huston, 1991; Lerner, 1993a, 1995). By the end of the 1980s approximately 20% of America's children and adolescents were poor (Huston, 1991; Huston, 1994; Simons, Finlay, & Yang, 1991). Moreover, data in the 1992 *Kids Count Data Book* indicate that across the 1980s the percentage of youth living in poverty in the United States increased by 22%. Indeed, this national trend was present in forty states, and continues to increase across the nation (Huston, 1991). Furthermore, of the 12 million American children under the age of three years, 25% live in poor families (Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1994). In addition, whereas the number of children under age six years decreased by 10% between 1971 and 1991, the number of poor children in this age group *increased by 60%* (Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1994).

As a means to summarize the costs—not only to youth but to all of America—of pervasive youth and family poverty, as well as of the risk behaviors associated with it, we may note Hamburg's view that:

*Not only are many more children growing up in poverty than was the case a decade or two ago, but many more are mired in persistent, intractable poverty*

*with no realistic hope of escape. They are profoundly lacking in constructively oriented social-support networks to promote their education and health. They have very few models of competence. They are bereft of visible economic opportunity. The fate of these young people is not merely a tragedy for them, but for the entire nation: A growing fraction of our potential work force consists of seriously disadvantaged people who will have little if any prospect of acquiring the necessary competence to revitalize the economy. If we cannot bring ourselves to feel compassion for these young people on a personal level, we must at least recognize that our economy and our society will suffer along with them. Their loss is our loss. (Hamburg, 1992, p.10)*

In sum, then, given the number of youth and families that today are at such profound levels of risk, we are faced as a society with a crisis so broad that the entire fabric of American society is in serious jeopardy (Lerner, 1995; Simons, Finlay, & Yang, 1991). With so many of our nation's communities facing the likelihood of losing much of their next generation to one or more of the several high-risk behaviors increasingly present among our nation's youth, all of our children, whether or not they themselves engage in given risk behaviors, nevertheless in effect live in risk—of experiencing the adverse economic and employment conditions associated with living in a nation that is increasingly globally uncompetitive, has a diminished pool of future leaders, offers lowered standards of living, requires lower expectations about life chances and, in fact, provides fewer and fewer opportunities for healthy and wholesome development (Lerner, 1993a).

Put simply, America is wasting its most precious resource: the human capital represented by its youth (Hamburg, 1992; Lerner, 1993a, 1993b, 1995; Lerner & Miller, 1993). And this destruction of human capital is a problem that cuts across race, ethnicity, gender, and rural or urban environments (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1992, 1993; Simons, Finlay, & Yang, 1991). Accordingly, all of us, all Americans, and certainly all of our children and adolescents, are now and for the foreseeable future confronted by this crisis of youth and family development. The breadth of the problems affecting our nation's youth and families requires that we see the issues we face as pertaining to all of us, and not to only a segment or a subgroup of America. All of our nation's institutions—and certainly its universities—must participate in finding solutions to (in bringing knowledge to bear on) these issues critical to the quality of life in our nation. The responses to this historically unparalleled challenge will influence not only the structure of

much of higher education in the twenty-first century, but will determine whether these, and possibly all public and private universities are viable institutions into the next century. Indeed, as Sheldon Hackney noted, in his May 21, 1991 commencement address at the University of Pennsylvania:

*... as the university has become more important to society, it is losing the special place it once held in the scheme of things. Knowledge has become much more central to society and to the economy, yet universities are increasingly pictured as just another snout at the public trough.*

Thus, research universities, whether public or private, are being asked to address pressing societal problems and are being held accountable for their performance in these areas.

After several decades in which the nation has made a massive commitment of resources to public research universities, the mood has changed. The public, government, and governing boards are beginning to question the *raison d'être* of the public research universities. As a result of this point of view, the Pew Higher Education Research Program (1991) has predicted:

*... an end to the public perception of the collegiate campus as a place of sanctuary, a place where values other than the purely financial might prevail, where commitment to the freedom of expression and truly unfettered inquiry guarantees a standard of conduct exceeding that observed by the population at large. The message is that whatever their claims to a special calling, these institutions are no different, no better, no longer exempt from public scrutiny and caricature. . . . The practical consequence is that institutions of higher education can expect less of the public purse and more of public intervention.*

To maintain or to increase funding, the public and private donors must perceive that the agenda of these institutions is pertinent to the needs of the diverse proximate and distal governmental, business, and "grass roots" communities within which universities are embedded, and upon which universities rely for their financial and political support. If such pertinence is not demonstrable, then support will be eroded, if not completely withdrawn (Bok, 1992).

We believe, then, that all American universities will be asked increasingly to provide knowledge that is relevant to the needs of the youth and families of the communities within which they are embedded. Such relevance is the mandate of the American land-grant university; and at this

time in the history of our nation, the necessity for land-grant universities and, as well, state universities and public and private colleges, to provide leadership for such relevance is inescapable (Magrath, 1993).

Furthermore, it seems clear that relevance will be defined and evaluated from the vantage point of these communities and not from the perspective of the universities themselves (Bok, 1992; Boyer, 1994). It would be sheer folly to “hunker down and ride out the storm.” As the Pew Higher Education Research Program notes in response to the question “Why not hold our breath and wait out the next turn?”:

*Our answer is simple: This time, those who hold their breath are likely to turn blue before higher education again feels secure in its claim to public support and trust. Already there has been a steady and marked decline in the proportion of financial support that state legislatures provide their colleges and universities. Indeed, legislatures began according higher education a smaller share of their budgets more than a decade ago, well before the financial crunch that dramatically reduced the size of everyone's pie. States tend to increasingly regard higher education as a mature industry, and the monies they accord to colleges and universities have become a prime source of “flexible” funds capable of redirection without adverse political consequence. (Pew Higher Education Research Program, 1992)*

Thus, it is important that colleges and universities, led, we believe, by land-grant institutions, become “part of the solution” rather than “part of the problem” (Cleaver, 1967). The problems confronting communities require that the academy be open to input from, and available to be influenced by, communities and by the diverse youth and families within them. If universities are not accessible and responsive to the diverse communities within which they are embedded, the universities' contribution to solving community-defined problems will be, at best, haphazard. If universities do not pay attention to communities and provide avenues of communication, they will not be able to learn about the pressing issues of the day.

What is called for then, is nothing short of a cultural change in the role that universities play in contributing to the critical issues facing society (Boyer, 1990, 1994; Lynton & Elman, 1987). In Boyer's (1990) terminology, universities are being challenged to view their scholarship from a problem-focused rather than a discipline-based perspective. Problems such as pervasive and persistent poverty, economic development and competitiveness, health, environmental quality, and youth development do not

fall neatly into a single disciplinary category. Solutions to such problems require integrative scholarship (Brown, 1987).

Integrative scholarship will lead to closer collaborations between universities and the communities within which they are embedded. The creation of such community-collaborative relationships is the core intellectual issue around which discussion of changes in the American university system reside (Boyer, 1994; Lynton & Elman, 1987; Magrath, 1993). We believe that the needed reorientation can be achieved by synthesizing the missions of the university around the concept of "outreach."

### **Features of an Outreach University**

Recently, a provost-empaneled committee of faculty and administrators at Michigan State University completed a report on how the university might extend knowledge to serve society (Provost's Committee on University Outreach, 1993). The Committee emphasized that the key missions of the academy—teaching, research, and service—are all different manifestations of a scholar's core concern, that is, knowledge, and its generation, transmission, application, and preservation (Boyer, 1990). Outreach, the Committee emphasized, is a form of scholarship that involves one or more of the teaching, research, and service missions. That is, outreach involves the generation, transmission, application, or preservation of knowledge in manners consistent with university and unit views of these missions. However, these activities are carried out to directly benefit audiences external to the university—and are to be defined by these diverse community groups, in concert with universities. In other words, then, outreach is a cross-cutting activity; it involves all instances of the above-noted knowledge functions and, as such, can engage all facets of unit and university missions in a community-collaborative, co-learning approach to scholarship.

Accordingly, successful outreach is predicated on accountability and access. Universities can provide few benefits to external audiences if they are disconnected from these groups: Among the myriad issues upon which university faculty might focus their scholarship, only a subset, and perhaps a small one, might be important to the communities in which they are embedded. Thus, once again, universities will not be successfully accountable in addressing the needs of communities if there is no access by the community to the scholarly agendas of the academy, if there is not collaboration between university and community, if there is no co-learning. Accordingly, outreach, which integrates the knowledge, functions, and missions of the university, also involves the integration of

accountability and access into the core of the university.

Moreover, to promote and sustain a commitment to outreach into the breadth and depth of the university, other issues, core to the functioning of academic institutions, must be engaged integratively, that is, in a manner that promotes systems change. These issues include:

- restructuring of the tenure system;
- changing the faculty reward (review) system;
- addressing the pressures from funding sources;
- fostering outreach as a major feature of university and unit missions;
- fostering balance across the other functions of the university;
- promoting multidimensional excellence;
- framing outreach as a feature of institutional adaptive capacity (an issue integrally related to accountability);
- indexing and evaluating productivity;
- revisions in graduate education;
- undergraduate education and service learning.

Accordingly, an integrative approach to knowledge, and to academic system change in the service of fostering outreach, can lead universities to become institutions *for* the communities within which they exist, that is, institutions for the people they seek to both understand and systematically enhance. Such “outreach scholarship” can, then, be an effective means through which the knowledge functions of America’s universities (i.e., knowledge generation, transmission, application, and preservation) can meet the needs of communities and thus of our society (Boyer, 1990, 1994; Votruba, 1992). This approach to integrative research and outreach can help create—in actuality and in the perceptions of the public—an academy that is socially useful and relevant, an institution that, consistent with the land-grant mission (Enarson, 1989), truly employs knowledge to address the “practical” problems of life. Moreover, when this orientation is used as a frame for educating future generations of university faculty, then a means will be created for sustaining an “outreach university,” an institution wherein research, teaching, and community collaboration are synthesized.

### **Reorganizing Higher Education Institutions around the Concept of “Outreach”**

It is clear that internal economic challenges and societal pressures converge. Government, business, and “grass roots” constituents demand that



the resources society allocates to both "public" and "private" universities be spent on activities that are relevant to the needs of the constituents—as the constituents, and not the professorate, conceive of and define these needs (Boyer, 1990; Lynton & Elman, 1987). Accordingly, internal reorganization and external reorientation of American state and land-grant universities of the next century will be produced by a recognition that a revised approach to the knowledge functions of the academy will be required if scholarship is to be used to address key and pervasive problems confronting society.

As we have emphasized, integrative responses by American universities to the economic and societal pressures facing our nation may be especially important at this point in our history. Indeed, providing a frame for such integration may be a special contribution that state and land-grant universities can make to society. This role for such universities is brought to the fore because, as we have noted, the issues associated with the key youth and family problems confronting society cross domains of scholarship, involve the public, business, private, and political sectors of society, and occur in distinct ways in diverse community settings. Accordingly, to address these problems in ecologically valid ways, academics must join in both multidisciplinary and multiprofessional collaborations, associations that require knowledge of, and the participation by, the youth and families of the specific communities one is attempting both to understand and to serve (Lerner & Miller, 1993; Miller & Lerner, 1994).

One way of representing the import of the federal acts that created the combined teaching, research, and service missions of the land-grant system is to depict such an institution as the university *for* the people of the state. That is, the land-grant university's functions of knowledge generation (research), knowledge transmission (teaching), and knowledge utilization (outreach) exist to improve the lives of the people of its state *as they live in their communities*. Moreover, the vision of the tripartite, land-grant mission was that research, teaching, and service (or outreach) should be viewed as integrated, or synthetic, activities. Teaching about, or research conducted within, the ecologically valid settings within which children and families live their lives (that is, within their homes and within their communities), is predicated on an understanding of the needs, values, and interests of the specific people and particular community the land-grant institution is trying to serve.

Accordingly, when knowledge generation or transmission occurs in a context wherein the community values and sees "practical" significance

for these facets of knowledge, the application of this knowledge by the specific communities becomes more likely. At least three specific scholarly foci challenge the academy to move in directions that have not been traditional within institutions of higher education.

### **Implementing the Vision: Promoting Changes in American Universities and Colleges**

First, to obtain an adequate understanding of the problems of the youth and families of our communities, we should pursue multidisciplinary research efforts that focus on the richness and diversity of the people, settings, and potential of human life. Our research efforts should not only synthesize ideas and methods from multiple disciplines in an integrative manner, they should be conducted by and with youth and families of as wide a range of ethnic, racial, physical ability, family, community, and sociocultural backgrounds as possible. Only through an emphasis on such diversity can integrated knowledge be fully extended to the range of problems, and of possibilities, involving the people of our communities.

Second, it is clear that such scholarship will not succeed unless the youth and families from within these diverse settings are engaged cooperatively in the endeavor. Scholarship must be seen as relevant and important by the youth, families, and communities about whom we wish to learn; such research, then, should be seen as returning, or providing, something of value to these groups. Accordingly, techniques that give voice to the community need to be employed in order to activate this university-community collaboration and to remain accountable to the people it serves.

Finally, a third challenge brings us full circle to the issues confronting higher education in the 1990s; it involves the developmental systems view (Ford & Lerner, 1992; Thelen & Smith, 1998) that we, as scholars, are not disconnected from the people and society we study and serve. As parts of the same system it is entirely appropriate that we discuss—within the framework of our model of integration—what changes need to be developed in scholars and in scholarly institutions in order to best implement (or test) our vision of integrated knowledge.

One change involves having established scholars reorient their own work. In addition, leaders of graduate education programs should begin to train their students differently (Birkel, Lerner, & Smyer, 1989; Fisher et al., 1993). An appreciation of integrated knowledge, systematic change, context, and human relationships should be the cornerstone of graduate education. This is a central point stressed in the growing attention being

paid among scholarly societies and universities to the importance of training in applied developmental science for future scholars and professionals in fields associated with human development and education (Fisher et al., 1993). We should instill in these future "outreach scholars and professionals" a greater appreciation of the importance of knowledge integration, of community-collaboration, of human diversity and of the contextual variation that is both a product and a producer of it (Fisher, Jackson, & Villarruel, 1998; Lerner, 1982; Lerner & Busch-Rossnagel, 1981; Lerner & Miller, 1993; Miller & Lerner, 1994).

Furthermore, it is important to add that university tenure and promotion committees evaluating the new outreach scholar must be urged to begin to consider the relative value of multidisciplinary collaborative, and hence, multiauthored, publications, in comparison to within-discipline, single-authored products. We must also consider the nature of the reception given by university review committees to the sort of contextual and collaborative research we are furthering (Votruba, 1992, 1996). The issue to be debated here is whether we can train future cohorts of applied developmental scientists to engage productively in the multidisciplinary, multiprofessional, and community collaborations requisite for advancing integrated knowledge and then not reward and value them for successfully doing so (Votruba, 1992, 1996).

In essence, we must engage in a debate about changing the reward system within our universities. If we follow an integrative perspective that leads to the synthesis of science and service (e.g., Lerner, Ostrom, & Freel, 1997; Miller & Lerner, 1994), then it would seem that we must devise means to assign value to, and reward, an array of integrative, collaborative, multidisciplinary, and multiprofessional activities.

The key challenge for American colleges and universities as they move into the twenty-first century is to integrate knowledge across multiple academic disciplines *and* multiple professional activities, with the youth and families of the community. This integration must be achieved while providing access to the diverse communities served by the university and while remaining accountable for contributing to effective solutions to the problems identified through such access.

If we are to help foster such a university through pursuing the vision of integrative scholarship, we must act soon (Bok, 1992; Boyer, 1994). Our communities cannot wait for American universities to contribute in thorough, sustained, and effective ways to the problems they face. It may very well be that nothing less than the future of the academy and, more

important, the quality of life in our nation, is pending on the adequacy of our actions. Accordingly, discussions must be engaged, and action plans formulated, among the leaders of American universities and colleges.

### **The Plan of This Book**

The purpose of this book is to move this agenda forward—not merely by detailing the academic and institutional issues that must be confronted, since these have been well articulated in several important essays (e.g., Bok, 1992; Bonnen, 1986, 1992; Boyer, 1990, 1994; Lynton & Elman, 1987; Millard, 1991; Votruba, 1996; Walshok, 1995)—but by discussing the ways these issues are being integratively addressed by universities and by the communities within which they are embedded. That is, we seek to help further the creation of outreach universities by focusing this volume on current attempts at systems change, that is, on what is being done to work within the array of interrelated issues that confront leaders acting to create outreach universities. Thus, this book will not be an attempt to redefine the land-grant mission. Rather, the book will illustrate ways to achieve a foundational goal of universities, and particularly land-grant universities; that is, to improve the quality of life of the youth, families, and communities served by the university. This is achieved through outreach, community collaboration based on co-learning, a redefinition of research, and the synthesis of the (higher) educational enterprise with the social issues faced by the youth and families of our nation's communities.

In order for higher education institutions to provide leadership in the creation of such “outreach universities,” that is, universities wherein integrative, community-collaborative, multidisciplinary, and multiprofessional knowledge is normatively pursued and rewarded, this book will discuss also the several arenas of the academy that must undergo qualitative change. For example, as illustrated in several of the chapters in this volume, changes must occur in the roles of the disciplines, in systems of faculty rewards, in graduate and undergraduate education, in community access, in faculty and administrative unit accountability for excellence across the breadth of the university's mission, and in administrative vision and leadership. The organization and implementation of such changes involves both scholarly creativity, intellectual vision, and—frankly—administrative courage. The importance of these attributes for promoting systems change is represented across the sections of this book.

Section 1 has two chapters. In addition to the present, introductory chapter, the second chapter in this section discusses the history of the idea

of “knowledge-social application” synthesis. This concept is at the heart of the land-grant vision and, now, is at the core of both societal and academic pressures promoting university-community collaborations across the range of America’s universities.

The second section of the book contains chapters describing the agendas of systems change being pursued—at land-grant universities, at state universities, and at selected large and small private institutions—to create and sustain outreach universities enhancing the lives of youth and families in America’s communities. The chapters in this section present the ongoing efforts of university and college presidents, provosts, deans, and faculty leaders to promote the systems changes requisite to meet this challenge.

The third part of the book includes chapters from sections of the community with which universities do (or at least should) collaborate and/or from organizations (foundations, governmental bodies) that have an interest in promoting such collaborations. Accordingly, these chapters are written by NGO leaders, foundation leaders, and leaders of governmental bodies.

The last section of the book contains a chapter that draws conclusions and addresses their implications. Here we derive common features of, and principles for, the systems changes illustrated in section 2 and discussed, as well, in section 3 of the book. We also identify the obstacles facing these agents of systems change. Last, we indicate the recommendations for further change, and for evaluation of the efficacy and outcomes of the change process, which we see as both reasonable and feasible. The chapter ends with a specification of academic and social policy changes that need to be pursued to implement our recommendations.

In sum, this volume includes the perspectives of the several sectors of society that must collaborate in the creation of outreach universities for America’s youth, families, and communities: university administrators and faculty leaders, NGO leaders, foundation officers, and government officials. By including and integrating these perspectives, we believe that this book gives voice to the ways in which issues of knowledge integration and community collaboration currently challenging American universities are being actively addressed in America. Across its chapters, then, our hope is that this book will promote a vision for the further development of initiatives in American higher education to create a university system predicated on the integration of cutting-edge scholarship with the needs and problems of the people of the community. In this way, then, this book may both enlighten our present and provide a productive path for our future.

## References

- Birkel, R., Lerner, R. M., & Smyer, M. A. (1989). Applied developmental psychology as an implementation of a life-span view of human development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 10*, 425–445.
- Bok, D. (1992). Reclaiming the public trust. *Change, 13*–19.
- Bonnen, J. T. (1986). A century of science in agriculture: Lessons for science policy. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 68*, 1065–1080.
- Bonnen, J. T. (1992). Changing roles of agricultural economists and their institutions. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 74*, 1260–1261.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. L. (1994, March 9). Creating the new American college [Point of View column]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (p. A48).
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*, 513–531.
- . (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Theoretical models of human development*. Volume 1 of the *Handbook of Child Psychology* (5th ed. pp. 993–1028), Editor-in-Chief: William Damon. New York: Wiley.
- Brown, N. A. (1987). *Youth development in the land-grant university* (McDowell Series Lecture). University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York. (1994, April). *Starting points: Meeting the needs of our youngest children*. Available from Carnegie Corporation of New York, PO Box 753, Waldorf, MD 20604.
- Center for the Study of Social Policy (1992). *1992 Kids Count data book: State profiles of child well-being*. Available from the Center for the Study of Social Policy, Suite 503, 1250 Eye Street NW, Washington DC 20005.
- . (1993). *1993 Kids Count data book: State profiles of child well-being*. Available from the Center for the Study of Social Policy, Suite 503, 1250 Eye Street NW, Washington DC 20005.
- Cleaver, E. (1967). *Soul on ice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dryfoos, J. G. (1990). *Adolescents at risk: Prevalence and prevention*. New York: Oxford University.
- . (1994). *Full service schools: A revolution in health and social services of children, youth and families*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Enarson, H. L. (1989). *Revitalizing the landgrant mission*. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Fisher, C. B., Jackson, J. F., & Villarruel, F. A. (1998). The study of African American and Latin American children and youth. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Theoretical models of human development*. Volume 1 of the *Handbook of Child Psychology* (5th ed. pp. 1145–1207), Editor-in-Chief: William Damon. New York: Wiley.
- Fisher, C. B., Murray, J. P., Dill, J. R., Hagen, J. W., Hogan, M. J., Lerner, R. M., Rebok, G. W., Sigel, I., Sostek, A. M., Smyer, M. A., Spencer, M. B., & Wilcox, B. (1993). The national conference on graduate education in the applications of developmental science across the life span. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 14*, 1–10.
- Ford, D. L., & Lerner, R. M. (1992). *Developmental systems theory: An integrative approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: Making a new science*. New York: Viking.
- Gottlieb, G. (1992). *Individual development and evolution: The genesis of novel behavior*. New York: Oxford.
- Gould, S., & Vrba, E. (1982). Exaptation: A missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology, 8*, 4–15.
- Hackney, S. (1991). *Commencement address*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Hamburg, D. A. (1992). *Today's children: Creating a future for a generation in crisis*. New York: Time Books.

- Hernandez, D. J. (1993). *America's children: Resources from family, government, and the economy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Huston, A. C. (1991). Children in poverty: Developmental and policy issues. In A. C. Huston (Ed.), *Children in poverty: Child development and public policy* (pp. 1–22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huston, A. C., McLoyd, V. C., & Garcia Coll, C. T. (1994). Children and poverty: Issues in contemporary research. *Child Development*, 65, 275–282.
- Lerner, R. M. (1982). Children and adolescents as producers of their own development. *Developmental Review*, 2, 342–370.
- . (1986). *Concepts and theories of human development* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- . (1991). Changing organism-context relations as the basic process of development: A developmental contextual perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 27–32.
- . (1992). *Final solutions: Biology, prejudice, and genocide*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
- . (1993a). Early adolescence: Toward an agenda for the integration of research, policy, and intervention. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Early adolescence: Perspectives on research, policy, and intervention* (pp. 1–13). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- . (1993b). Investment in youth: The role of home economics in enhancing the life chances of America's children. *AHEA Monograph Series*, 1, 5–34.
- . (1995). *America's youth in crisis: Challenges and options for programs and policies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- . (1996). Creating caring communities: Building university-community partnerships to enhance youth and family development. *Conversations*, 3 (1–2), pp. 8–12. [newsletter of the National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration]. Bronx, NY: Fordham University.
- . (1997). Theories of human development: Contemporary perspectives. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Theoretical models of human development*. Volume 1 of the *Handbook of Child Psychology* (5th ed. pp. 1–24), Editor-in-Chief: William Damon. New York: Wiley.
- Lerner, R. M., & Busch-Rossnagel, N. (1981). Individuals as producers of their development: Conceptual and empirical bases. In R. M. Lerner & N. A. Busch-Rossnagel (Eds.), *Individuals as producers of their development: A life-span perspective* (pp. 1–36). New York: Academic.
- Lerner, R. M., & Fisher, C. B. (1994). From applied developmental psychology to applied developmental science: Community coalitions and collaborative careers. In C. B. Fisher & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Applied developmental psychology* (pp. 505–522). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lerner, R. M., & Miller, J. R. (1993). Integrating human development research and intervention for America's children: The Michigan State University model. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 14, 347–364.
- Lerner, R. M., Miller, J. R., Knott, J. H., Corey, K. E., Bynum, T. S., Hooper, L. C., McKinney, M. H., Abrams, L. A., Hula, R. C., & Terry, P. A. (1994). Integrating scholarship and outreach in human development research, policy, and service: A developmental contextual perspective. In D. L. Featherman, R. M. Lerner, & M. Perlmutter (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 249–273). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lerner, R. M., Miller, J. R., & Ostrom, C. W. (1995, Spring). Integrative knowledge, accountability, access, and the American university of the twenty-first century: A family and consumer sciences vision of the future of higher education. *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM*, 8(1), 11–27.
- Lerner, R. M., Ostrom, C. W., & Freel, M. A. (1995). Promoting positive youth and community development through outreach scholarship: Comments on Zeldin and Peterson. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 10, 486–502.
- . (1997). Preventing health compromising behaviors among youth and promoting their positive development: A developmental-contextual perspective. In J. Schulenberg, J. L. Maggs, & K. Hurrelmann (Eds.), *Health risks and developmental transitions during adolescence* (pp. 498–521). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Lewontin, R. C., & Levins, R. (1978). Evolution. In *Encyclopedia Einaudi*, 5. Turin: Einaudi.
- Lynton, E. A., & Elman, S. E. (1987). *New priorities for the university: Meeting society's needs for applied knowledge and competent individuals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Magrath, C. P. (1993). *Comments to the Board on Home Economics on November 12, 1993*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- McKinney, M., Abrams, L. A., Terry, P. A., & Lerner, R. M. (1994). Child development research and the poor children of America: A call for a developmental contextual approach to research and outreach. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 23, 26–42.
- Millard, R. M. (1991). *Today's myths and tomorrow's realities: Overcoming obstacles to academic leadership in the 21st century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, J. R., & Lerner, R. M. (1994). Integrating research and outreach: Developmental contextualism and the human ecological perspective. *Home Economics Forum*, 7, 21–28.
- Ostrom, C. W., Lerner, R. M., & Freel, M. A. (1995). Building the capacity of youth and families through university-community collaborations: The development-in-context evaluation (DICE) model. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 10, 427–448.
- Pepper, S. C. (1942). *World hypotheses*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Pew Higher Education Research Program (1991). *Policy Perspectives*, 3 (4).
- Pew Higher Education Research Program (1992). *Policy Perspectives*, 4 (3).
- Prigogine, I. I. (1978). Time, structure, and fluctuation. *Science*, 201, 777–785.
- Provost's Committee on University Outreach (1993). *University outreach at Michigan State University: Extending knowledge to serve society: A report by the Provost's Committee on University Outreach*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Riegel, K. F. (1975). Toward a dialectical theory of development. *Human Development*, 18, 50–64.
- Riegel, K. F. (1976). The dialectics of human development. *American Psychologist*, 31, 689–700.
- Sameroff, A. J. (1983). Developmental systems: Contexts and evolution. In W. Kessen (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 1. History, theory, and methods*, 1 (pp. 237–294). New York: Wiley.
- Schön, D. A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change*, 27 (9), 27–34.
- Schorr, L. B. (1988). *Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage*. New York: Doubleday.
- Simons, J. M., Finlay, B., & Yang, A. (1991). *The adolescent and young adult fact book*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.
- Thelen, E., & Smith, L. B. (1998). Dynamic systems theories. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Theoretical models of human development*. Volume 1 of the *Handbook of Child Psychology* (5th ed. pp. 563–634), Editor-in-Chief: William Damon. New York: Wiley.
- Votruba, J. C. (1992). Promoting the extension of knowledge in service to society. *Metropolitan Universities*, 3 (3), 72–80.
- Votruba, J. C. (1996). Strengthening the university's alignment with society: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, 1 (1), 29–36.
- Walshok, M. L. (1995). *Knowledge without boundaries: What America's research universities can do for the economy, the workplace, and the community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weiss, H. B., & Greene, J. C. (1992). An empowerment partnership for family support and education programs and evaluations. *Family Science Review*, 5, 131–148.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Zukav, G. (1979). *The dancing Wu Li masters*. New York: Bantam.



**This page intentionally left blank**

---

## Chapter 2

# **The Land-Grant Idea and the Evolving Outreach University**

*James T. Bonnen*

*Michigan State University*

---

I used to believe that neither society nor university faculty understood the land-grant idea. But today I am convinced that it is worse than that. It is the university as an historical institution that is not understood—even by faculty. Remarkably, the reason is that academics, for all of their intellectual and analytic capacities, never reflect on it or study it—or few do. Rather, we faculty mostly take the university for granted and believe it has pretty much always had the same roles and functions, as when we entered it. In addition most faculty believe that it has only the “harmoniously integrated” roles that each of us plays within the university. In short, many of us behave as if the university was created in our “own image and likeness.”

In fact, different faculty play very different roles. Their beliefs are in stark contrast to the complex reality of diverse, often conflicting, roles actually being performed across a large university, the management of which is far more difficult than most faculty appreciate. Nor are these multiple roles a recent phenomenon. Many are in fact ancient.

The basic argument of this chapter has been made before but is not well understood by most academics: The university has survived for nearly a millennium by creating new roles and adapting its mix of roles to fundamental changes in the nature of society and its practical needs. Society is changing in radical ways again and we in the university are in a mode of adaptation that appears to be creating deeper involvement in society’s efforts to resolve its practical problems. Today’s evolving “outreach university” had its origin in a unique nineteenth-century American educational innovation, the land-grant college. The land-grant tradition introduced “service to society” as a function of U.S. higher education. However, we still have difficulty defining and agreeing on what outreach, extension, or service should involve as a legitimate university function. The existence of

such a variety of terms is indicative of our lack of consensus about the nature of this century-old function of the American university.

This chapter first addresses the historical development of the university and the accumulating roles in which the university has served society over the centuries. It then turns to the impact of science on the modern American university and its societal context, and to a review of the challenges facing U.S. universities today, including the rise of a knowledge-centered society. The last half of the chapter is devoted to a survey of the growing direct involvement of U.S. universities in addressing societal problems, an attempt to define this more direct involvement, which we call "university outreach," and finally an assessment of the risks and limitations of outreach as a major role of the university.

### **Evolution of the University and Its Social Roles**

The modern university has many roles. These have accumulated over the centuries, generally without dropping earlier ones. The university was a medieval creation of the eleventh and twelfth centuries (Rashdall, 1929; Rudy, 1984, pp. 14–26). Before it was anything else, the medieval university was a professional school that taught theology and provided the vocational training of priests—some of whom constituted the society's only educated elite (Deanesly & Bateson, 1926). Training in law and medicine developed in the Middle Ages as functions of the university (Mullinger, 1911). These schools conserved and transmitted knowledge for future generations. An organized liberal-arts curriculum (the trivium and quadrivium) developed as a formal preparation for law and especially medicine. All of these roles were responses to medieval societal needs for civil and ecclesiastical leadership, lawyers, and medical doctors (Rudy, 1984, p. 31; Mullinger, 1911, p. 751).

With the rise of the renaissance university in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, education of a lay elite for societal leadership first evolved as a significant role. Humanistic studies and scholarship developed very slowly, initially outside the university, driven by the growing revival of classical Greek and Roman learning, first in Renaissance Italy and then in Europe. However, the medieval roles remained the dominant university functions in the Renaissance. Thus, the renaissance university continued to be motivated by society's perceived practical needs. (Rudy, 1984, p. 40)

The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, rather than for God, or in the Renaissance, man's sake, did not become a major force in European scholarship until well into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Until this time, all scholarly study tended to be devoted to religion,

vocational, and other perceived practical needs of society.

The “Scientific Revolution” began a fundamental transformation of society and its institutions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While modern science as an enterprise runs back into the seventeenth century, it did not have a major presence in the university until the nineteenth century (Ashby, 1974, pp. 1–15). The university as a social organization resists and only slowly adopts new roles. The constraint of tradition on innovation explains much of the history of the university.

American higher education was established during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, borrowed from the British Oxford and Cambridge version of the liberal arts as conceived in the renaissance university (Newman, 1976). Initially these were church-sponsored colleges or seminaries for undergraduates. University graduate education and science research were introduced in the nineteenth century, an innovation modeled on the German university that evolved out of Wilhelm von Humbolt’s reforms of German higher education. This is the model for the modern research university, which in the U.S. was imposed on top of the undergraduate college. These two ideas of the university involve very different goals and values, and thus social roles that often conflict. Today some faculty are devoted to one, some to the other, some to both (Brubacher and Rudy, 1968, pp. 171–201).

It is difficult today to imagine the complexity of the conflict over the nature and purpose of the university that occurred during the early decades of this century. A confusing combat of beliefs and values drove a great diversity of views within the academy over the appropriate role of higher education in U.S. society (Veysey, 1965, pp. 439–444). Today we face a new configuration of equally complex conflicts and confusions, some new, but many ancient (Brubacher, 1977; Ashby, 1974, pp. 73–149).

### **The Land-Grant Idea**

But what of the land-grant university, its “service to society,” and origins? Some decades ago, I wondered, “What do senior faculty mean by their endless appeals to the land-grant mission or land-grant philosophy?” I never got a satisfactory answer. The definitions proved too general or did not encompass many things going on around me.

I came to the College of Agriculture at Michigan State University from graduate work at Duke and then Harvard and was the first member of my department who did not have a farm background. Baffled by my environment, I started reading histories of land-grant colleges and the au-

tobiographies and biographies of early pioneers such as Liberty Hyde Bailey and Isaac Roberts. What I learned surprised me. Contrary to the beliefs of many faculty:

1. The land-grant system of colleges did not spring into existence as a coherent idea or set of institutions in one decade or even one generation of leadership. The land-grant college evolved as an idea and then as an institution and a national system over the seven decades between 1850 and 1920. There was a lot of trial and much error, and it was not clear before the turn of this century whether the idea would be even a partial success (Roberts, 1946, p. 136).
2. The land-grant idea was not conceived solely for agriculture. It is not any specific set of organizations, such as the trilogy of the experiment station, the extension service, and on-campus or resident instruction. These were designed specifically to address agriculture.
3. The land-grant idea is not just access to higher education for those with limited resources. It is not just good science. It is not just science applied to practical problems. It is not just extension education for people of the state who have practical problems to solve. It was all of this and more.

So what is the land-grant idea? It is, indeed, an idea. *It is a set of beliefs about the social role of the university.* What then are the beliefs that have defined the social role of the land-grant university? And what gave rise to this set of beliefs?

The history of the last half of the nineteenth century shows that the land-grant university arose out of an industrializing society's increasingly complex problems and deficiencies (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968, pp. 64–66). There was a growing need for more highly trained professionals, especially in the new science-based fields necessary to address the requirements of an industrial society—in engineering, public health, agriculture, forestry, nursing, etc. Many of the professional schools of the modern university were needed but did not exist. Secondly, it arose out of an industrializing society's frustration with an unresponsive set of mostly private colleges providing a classical or “literary” education for a wealthy elite of less than 1% of the population. U.S. colleges of the day were generally church-sponsored, and higher education was viewed as a religious responsibility. With few exceptions these institutions were unwilling to sully their hands addressing society's common but real needs. This was not their role. Thirdly,

it arose out of middle-class concern for the “American dream” of unlimited opportunities that was being threatened by industrialization. This was creating great wealth for some, but also a large, disadvantaged working-class population of poor farmers and industrial workers with no prospect of access to the skills and practical education necessary for a better life. It was, they believed, creating a trapped underclass of potential peasants and workers. This concern was not only for equality of opportunity for a disadvantaged population, from which many in the middle class had come, but arose as well from their fear that democratic institutions and individual liberty, and thus survival of the middle class, were at stake in a society of growing economic inequality. (Morrill, 1961; Eddy, 1957, pp. 1–45; Brubacher & Rudy, 1968, pp. 64–66).

In partial response, a new kind of college or university was created: The land-grant university or college, the unique part of the nineteenth-century public university movement (Nevins, 1962). The Morrill Act of 1862 founded the land-grant colleges around an explicit commitment to education and service for the broader society. The land-grant university in its mature form was devoted to science and education in the service of society by:

1. Educating and training the professional cadres of an industrial, increasingly urban, society;
2. providing broad access to higher education, irrespective of wealth or social status;
3. working to improve the welfare and social status of the largest groups in society, who at that time were among the most disadvantaged—farmers and industrial workers, the latter called “mechanics” in the nineteenth century.

Justin Morrill, the congressional sponsor of the act establishing the land-grant university system, was primarily concerned for broader, more democratic access to higher education to strengthen political democracy.

*The Land-Grant colleges were founded on the idea that a higher and broader education should be placed in every State within reach of those whose destiny assigns them to, or who may have the courage to choose industrial vocations where the wealth of nations is produced. . . . It would be a mistake to suppose it was intended that every student should become either a farmer or a mechanic when the design comprehended not only instruction for those who may hold a plow or follow a trade, but such instruction as any person might*