

# UC Berkeley

## Research and Occasional Papers Series

### Title

Report: Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity: Institutional Trends and Initiatives at the University of California

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3cc3w7bx>

### Author

Proceedings of University of California Symposium held June 10, 2005

### Publication Date

2005-06-10



# Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity

Institutional Trends and Initiatives at the University of California

December 2005

Proceedings of a Universitywide Symposium Held June 10, 2005

Organized by:

The Student Experience in the Research University-21st Century Project (CSHE-Berkeley)  
UC Office of the President - Academic Affairs  
University of California Academic Senate

Sponsored by:

UC Office of the President - Academic Affairs  
Center for Studies in Higher Education  
California Campus Compact, with a grant from Learn and Serve America Higher Education

**CSHE** | Center for Studies  
in Higher Education

University of California, Berkeley  
South Hall Annex, #4650  
Berkeley, CA 94720-4650  
Voice: 510.642.5040  
Fax: 510.643.6845  
<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>

# Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	4
<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Institutional Civic Engagement: Research, Purpose, and Strategies</b>	7
Panel Introduction	7
<i>M.R.C. Greenwood</i>	
Scholarship and Mission in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century: The Role of Engagement	7
<i>Barbara A. Holland</i>	
Operationalizing Engagement: Scholarship at Research Universities	10
<i>Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr.</i>	
Response	12
<i>Meredith Minkler</i>	
<b>What We Know about Student and Faculty Civic Engagement: Best Practices, National Trends, and UC Data</b>	14
Panel Introduction	14
<i>Tom Ehrlich</i>	
Civic Engagement Beliefs and Practices among College Graduates and Faculty	14
<i>Lori Vogelgesang</i>	
How UC Students Vary in Their Levels of Interest in and Involvement with Public and Community Life – A Sample of UCUES Data	17
<i>Gregg Thomson and Richard Flacks</i>	
Response	18
<i>Andy Furco</i>	
Response	19
<i>Joe Kiskis</i>	
<b>Civic Engagement, the Undergraduate Academic Experience, and Policy Implications: Results from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey and the SERU21 Project</b>	20
Panel Introduction	20
<i>Jodi Anderson</i>	
Explaining Variation in University of California Students' Civic Awareness and Participation	20
<i>Richard Flacks</i>	
Thinking Globally and/or Acting Locally? Community Service and Civic Engagement Orientations of Berkeley Undergraduates	22
<i>Gregg Thomson</i>	
Response	24
<i>Michael T. Brown</i>	
Response	25
<i>Jeff Wright</i>	

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

<b>Civic Engagement and the Curriculum: Opportunities Defined</b>	26
Panel Introduction	26
<i>Mike Schudson</i>	
Civic Engagement in Sociology: The ENLACE Undergraduate Research and Mentorship Program at UCSB	26
<i>Denise A. Segura</i>	
Response	28
<i>Jennifer Lilla</i>	
Response	29
<i>Cliff Brunk</i>	
<b>Closing Remarks</b>	30
<i>Kathy Komar</i>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	32
Symposium Program Steering Committee	32
List of Participants	32

## Acknowledgements

The Symposium Steering Committee – co-chairs Jodi Anderson (UCLA) and John Douglass (CSHE, UC Berkeley), along with Cliff Brunk (Chair, Academic Council, UC Academic Senate), Julius Zelmanowitz (UCOP Office of Academic Initiatives), and Dennis Galligani (UCOP Student Academic Services) – would like to express its gratitude to the UC Office of the President for generously supporting the 2005 Civic and Academic Engagement Symposium.

In addition, the symposium would not have been possible without the financial and strategic support provided by the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) at UC Berkeley; the California Campus Compact ([www.campuscompact.org](http://www.campuscompact.org)), with a grant from Learn and Serve America; and the UCwide Office of the Academic Senate. Our thanks to CSHE staff, notably Nathalie Lajarige, for logistical support. Kathleen Beasley and Jenny L. White provided content and editorial support for this and a compendium report on the proceedings of the UCwide symposium.

Finally, we thank Berkeley Chancellor Birgeneau for offering a warm welcome to symposium participants, University of California President Robert Dynes for generously providing opening remarks, and former University of California Provost and Senior Vice President MRC Greenwood for her support and participation.

An electronic version of this document, along with a report on recommendations by the Strategy Group on Civic and Academic Engagement, *Promoting Civic Engagement at the University of California*, is available at: <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/events/civicacademic/>.

## Introduction

Civic engagement is moving to the forefront of higher education discussions as universities seek ways not only to intensify students' learning experiences but also to forge stronger links with the communities they are meant to serve. Within the University of California system, there are already multiple examples of service-learning, university-community partnerships, and volunteer initiatives.

In June 2005, faculty, academic staff, and student representatives from across the University of California system gathered at a symposium held on the Berkeley campus to discuss and analyze the important interface of civic and academic engagement, and to explore ways to further expand civic engagement as a core component in the University of California's teaching, research, and public service mission. This document provides a summary of the proceedings for that symposium. A compendium report by the Strategic Group on Civic and Academic Engagement, *Promoting Civic Engagement at the University of California*, is available at: <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/events/civicaacademic/>.

The University of California is the largest single research university system in the United States, enrolling some 200,000 students in 2005, and is projected for significant enrollment growth over the next fifteen years. UC is striving to better understand the undergraduate experience and, in turn, to seek methods to improve the learning environment for students. This includes the recent development of the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) through the Center for Studies in Higher Education, and the formation of a new General Education Commission.

University of California President Robert Dynes and Berkeley Chancellor Robert Birgeneau provided the symposium's opening remarks, and UC Provost and Senior Vice President MRC Greenwood chaired the first session. The daylong event was attended by nearly 100 representatives from all ten UC campuses (see Appendix A for a listing of the participants and program committee) and had four major goals:

- To share national perspectives on how research universities are developing and supporting academic environments that integrate civic engagement;
- To present national and UC-specific data on student civic and academic engagement;
- To discuss reports and white papers that address current UC best practices in community-based learning and research; and
- To lay the groundwork for a systemwide approach to civic engagement.

The remarks of speakers at the beginning of the symposium emphasized the important and positive role of civic engagement in higher education. Chancellor Birgeneau noted that studies have shown that students who participate in community service during their time in college are more likely to finish college, enroll in graduate school, socialize across ethnic and racial lines, and remain involved in community activism or volunteerism later in life.

Chancellor Birgeneau observed that at Berkeley, 11,000 out of 33,000 students are involved in the community in some way, and about 90 courses at the campus have a service-learning component. Of those students who volunteer through CalCorps, 75 percent are Cal Grant recipients. The significance of this statistic is twofold: students who come from a disadvantaged background themselves are the most likely to be engaged in community service; at the same

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

time, the university has both the opportunity and challenge to make more-privileged students understand their obligations.

In his welcoming remarks, UC President Robert Dynes spoke about the importance of maximizing UC's contributions to California by identifying and addressing the state's needs. As he has traveled throughout the state since becoming UC President, he said he has come to recognize the impact that UC has on the daily lives of citizens, whether through health care delivery in clinics and hospitals, academic assistance in K-12 schools, nutrition programs for families in inner cities, products for the state's important agricultural industry, or new technology for disaster control.

Despite the many contributions he already sees, President Dynes said he believes the university has the potential to be far more effective as a powerful influence on how California manages its future. He has launched a long-range planning process for UC that will envision what the university should be doing by 2025, when the state will have 50 million people. The symposium's focus on the role of civic engagement fits well into that larger conversation about the future of the university and how UC can best and most effectively serve California.

**The Symposium Panels**

To explore national research on civic engagement, the status of civic engagement at UC today, and the opportunities for the future, the symposium offered the following four panel discussions:

- Institutional Civic Engagement: Research, Purpose, and Strategies;
- What We Know about Student and Faculty Civic Engagement: Best Practices, National Trends, and UC Data;
- Civic Engagement, the Undergraduate Academic Experience, and Policy Implications: Results from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey and the SERU21 Project; and
- Civic Engagement and the Curriculum: Opportunities Defined.

The following report documents the symposium proceedings, summarizing the presentations and providing key highlights made by speakers.

*(Comments made by individuals are paraphrased and/or synthesized, and therefore should not be regarded as direct quotes attributable to presenters or other participants.)*

# Institutional Civic Engagement: Research, Purpose, and Strategies

## Panel Introduction

### **M.R.C. Greenwood, UC Office of the President**

Universities have a special responsibility to engage the public that they serve. One challenge they face is a growing public frustration with their unresponsiveness. Universities are seen as out of touch with the problems that burden society. Research universities have the disciplines and expertise, but they are not widely recognized for bringing these resources to bear on relevant problems. While there are many programs that are focused on engagement, a coherent approach appears to be lacking. In this panel, presenters will explore what makes institutional civic engagement successful, what barriers exist, and what can be done to overcome obstacles.

### **Scholarship and Mission in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Role of Engagement** **Barbara A. Holland, Indiana University**

The role of engagement can be placed within the context of the evolving shifts in the nature of research institutions. These shifts are being driven by technological, intellectual, financial, and accountability pressures that are creating fundamental changes in the external and internal conceptions of excellence in higher education and the nature of scholarly work.

The traditional role of universities has been to generate and transmit knowledge through three functions: research, teaching, and service.

However, the emerging role of universities is to generate a learning society through discovery, learning, and engagement. Increasingly, universities will be part of a network of learning – a fluid and changing network of different sources of expertise.

Part of the reason for this global shift in the research culture is a new transdisciplinary approach to issues and the extensive social distribution of knowledge. Knowledge and data are now so diffuse that researchers are required to work interactively. In its original mode, research was pure, disciplinary, homogeneous, expert-led, supply-driven, hierarchical, peer-reviewed, and almost exclusively university-based. In this new mode, research is applied, problem-centered,

Moderator **M.R.C. Greenwood** is the former Provost and Senior Vice President for academic affairs for the 10-campus University of California system. She previously served with distinction as chancellor of UC Santa Cruz, a position she held from July 1996 to March 2004.

Presenter **Barbara A. Holland** is the Director of the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, funded by the Learn and Serve America program of the Corporation for National and Community Service. She also is a Senior Scholar in the Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. Her research agenda looks at factors and strategies related to organizational change in higher education with a focus on institutionalization and assessment of civic engagement programs. She has published more than 30 works on these topics, including co-authorship of *Assessment of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement* (2001), a widely used model for assessing engagement programs.

Presenter **Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr.** is Associate Vice Chancellor of Community Partnerships, Professor of Political Science, and Founding Director of the Center for Communications and Community at the University of California, Los Angeles. He has also taught at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Grinnell College, and the University of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. Most recently, he has taught with former Vice President Al Gore at Columbia University, Fisk University, and Middle Tennessee State University.

Respondent **Meredith Minkler** is Professor of Health and Social Behavior and Director of the Program at the School of Public Health, UC Berkeley. She has close to 30 years' experience in working with underserved communities on community-identified issues through community building, community organizing, and community-based participatory research. Her current research includes documenting the impacts of community-based participatory research on public policy, empowerment intervention studies with youth and the elderly, and national studies of health disparities in older Americans.



**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

transdisciplinary, heterogeneous, hybrid, demand-driven, entrepreneurial, and network-embedded.

This transdisciplinary research shares many of the same characteristics of more traditional research. Practitioners adhere to the norms of the scientific method, but they use different cognitive and social strategies. Existing knowledge is used, but the theoretical framework is creative, evolving, and cannot be reduced to its distinct disciplinary parts. The research team typically includes diverse perspectives on both the question that is being addressed and the possible applications for the research that is produced.

In addition, research groups tend to be temporary and dissolve as the problems are solved or redefined, although communications persist over time through the use of technology. The results are diffused instantly through the network of participants, thus merging production and diffusion. Subsequent diffusion occurs as practitioners enter successive problem contexts. Practitioners may not return to the discipline for validation – and the quality of research is judged by less traditional criteria, including efficiency and usefulness.

The NRC Workshop on Advancing Knowledge and the Knowledge Economy (2005) put it this way: knowledge is becoming “the product of networked entities, often differently situated yet motivated to find new solutions to specific problems, needs and circumstances. Enabled by technology, knowledge moves quickly through these networks – across firms, institutions, borders and distances.”

Engaged scholarship also exhibits many of these traits; it is a specific conception of faculty work that connects the intellectual assets of the institution (i.e., faculty expertise) to public issues, such as community, social, cultural, human, and economic development. Learning partnerships between campus and community acknowledge the expertise and knowledge each sector brings to the exploration of critical public issues.

<p><b>Engaged Scholarship:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is collaborative and participatory.</li> <li>• Draws on many sources of distributed knowledge.</li> <li>• Is based on partnerships.</li> <li>• Is shaped by multiple perspectives and expectations.</li> <li>• Deals with difficult, intractable and evolving questions; these complex issues may constantly shift.</li> <li>• Is long term, in both effort and impact, often with episodic bursts of progress.</li> <li>• Requires diverse strategies and approaches.</li> <li>• Crosses disciplinary lines – a challenge for institutions organized around disciplines.</li> </ul>
--

The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement defines engaged scholarship as capturing “...scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service. It engages faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. In this definition, community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good.” Through engaged forms of teaching and research, faculty apply their academic expertise to public purposes as a way of contributing to the fulfillment of the core mission of the institution.

As a mode of teaching and research, it integrates discovery and learning. It is not an add-on or extra activity, but is infused within teaching and research. The scholarship of engagement recognizes diverse faculty interests, and it can be valued and rewarded institutionally. By renewing a sense of what a university can do to have an impact, engaged scholarship gives

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

scholarly work a public purpose. It is not simply a new view of “service,” but is an expression of service through the form of scholarly work.

This emerging mode of scholarship has an impact on the academic culture. The integrated and diverse approaches to scholarship build new research capacity, particularly through collaboration with external sources of knowledge and the expectation of an evolving scholarly agenda. It creates multiple career pathways for faculty in different career stages. It provides for a balance between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

One of the stumbling blocks to the spread of this new mode of scholarship is the confusion around the rhetoric of engagement. Is this simply a way of putting volunteerism in the classroom? What is the difference between service-learning, community-based learning, academic service-learning, and co-curricular service? between Civic engagement, community engagement, and civic education? between the scholarship of engagement, community-based research, participatory-action research, and campus-community partnerships? These terms are often used interchangeably, particularly as new methods emerge.

How does service-learning fit into the concept of engaged scholarship? Service-learning is a pedagogical approach; it is academic and integrated into the curriculum. It focuses on student learning through action that benefits the community, but it is mutually rewarding because it can be transformational for students as well, connecting them with their role in a democratic society.

The concepts of engaged scholarship and service-learning are having an impact on institutions across the nation. Engagement is diversifying the academy and scholarly roles are becoming more integrated. Campuses’ reward and incentive structures are changing to recognize the value of engaged scholarship. Because of the global interest, engagement is becoming a widely recognized core element of academic excellence and prestige. Perhaps most importantly in today’s environment of accountability, engagement is reviving an awareness of the expectation that higher education serve the “public good.”

Like all innovations, engaged scholarship and service-learning have had to go through the various stages of acceptance. Gibbons describes the process in this way: typically, intellectual innovations are first described as misguided by those whose ideas are dominant, then are ignored, and eventually are adopted by the original adversaries as their own concept. The elite institutions are now awakening to the potential gains derived through engaged scholarship. Regional accreditation processes are beginning to take it into account. Federal interests, often in the form of grant requirements, are centering on collaborative research and the community impact of research. There is persistent pressure on institutions to provide evidence of their positive impact. The concepts of engaged scholarship and service-learning have even been introduced into popular classification and ranking systems (e.g., Carnegie and U.S. News and World Report). There is also a strong

**Effective service-learning:**

- Increases retention, particularly among first-generation college students.
- Increases diversity of local enrollment. Enhances achievement of core learning goals and has an effect on progress to degree.
- Makes learning more relevant to students, helping them clarify their talents and interests at an early stage of their academic career; it often impacts choice of major selection and eventual career.
- Develops students’ social, civic, and leadership skills.
- Strengthens undergraduate research skills and capabilities.
- Encourages students to be productive participants in the community by connecting them to their surroundings.

## Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity

student demand for engaged learning, reflected in the fact that more than 400,000 are involved in service-learning today.

The spread of engaged scholarship is not without challenges, however, particularly for research universities. Those institutions that are already successful have a strong investment in traditional modes of scholarship. Typically, these institutions take a conservative view of innovations, finding ways to re-socialize new ideas to resemble current work. Other factors – their large size, their tendency to be compartmentalized and discipline-dominated – make change a slow process. Furthermore, since the leading models for engagement tend to not be their peer institutions, the stimulus for change has not been as forceful.

Nonetheless, there are research institutions moving in this direction. The University of Michigan has endowed a center for engagement, focusing on student service-learning and partnerships and producing a refereed journal of scholarly work. Living/learning, honors, and other cohort curricular modules are focused on civic learning issues. The campus has linked engagement to the issues of diversity, access, and student success. Michigan has also provided a home for the Kellogg Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good, which has sponsored a national conversation on the role of higher education.

Michigan is not alone. The Committee on Interinstitutional Cooperation (Big 10 universities) has defined civic engagement and is working on developing benchmarks and strategies. They define *engagement* as the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; to enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; to prepare educated, engaged citizens; to strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; to address critical societal issues; and to contribute to the “public good.” In addition, programs that engage students and faculty in research on community-identified needs are under way at Duke, Brown, Georgetown, Princeton, Cornell, Harvard, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and others.

Despite these signs of progress, it is fair to say that there is room at the top for a research university to step forward and take a leadership role. The University of California has the opportunity to be that leader. There are challenges, of course: the system’s large size and dispersed campuses; a siloed culture of disciplines; and the need for faculty to embrace the concept and embed it in their research and teaching curriculum. However, the benefits are immense and well documented, including attracting funding for research and enhancing the university’s reputation as a great place to learn and be a faculty member.

### **Operationalizing Engagement: Scholarship at Research Universities** **Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr., UCLA**

In 2002, the University of California, Los Angeles created the Center for Community Partnerships – a reflection of the high priority the campus has placed on engagement with its surrounding community. This was not the beginning of UCLA’s involvement in the community; the university has been engaged in the Los Angeles area for many years, though not in a systematic way. The goal of the Center is to be intentional about UCLA’s engagement, thinking about it in a systematic way and framing campus discourse about what it means to be involved in the surrounding community.

In embarking on its work, the Center considered different models. One common model is outreach. Outreach, however, is unidirectional by definition, and the Center believed it was important to have a much more dynamic exchange of information. Another model is through university extension programs. This is an important function that provides public service, but it

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

often is isolated from the central administration of a campus and is not part of the core academic program. A third model is public relations. This model focuses on a publicity blitz that talks a lot about what a university is doing, but typically it is not tied to the core academic imperative of an institution.

The fourth model is engagement with the community. The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities has said that universities “must move beyond conventional models associated with a university’s extension and outreach activities,” concluding that the “engaged” university is better situated to serve broad social purposes. The Commission defined engaged institutions as those “that have redesigned their teaching, research, extension and service functions to become more sympathetically and productively involved with their own communities.”

Taking guidance from this fourth model, the Center set out to reframe university-community partnerships to encourage bi-directionality in the exchange of information and to focus on the symbiotic relationship between the university and the community.

The Center also sought to redefine what partnership means – the preconditions for partnering, the challenges, the opportunities, and the necessary infrastructure. One important aspect of this process is to be very clear about the kinds of partnerships in which the university will engage. The community has to “win,” but the campus also has to “win.” When there is a partnership, the community needs are addressed and community capacity is built, but at the same time the partnership has to serve the university’s academic imperative of educating students and fostering research.

One of the Center’s goals has been to bring together the concept of engagement and the research or training impulse of the faculty in a way that allows faculty to see engagement as an integral part of what they normally do, rather than as an add-on or attachment. The Center wants to help faculty see Los Angeles as a wonderfully diverse laboratory for understanding phenomena, and therefore a good place to do research. It gives them a chance to test their beautiful theories against the ugly facts; it is a place where the neat machinations of theoretical observations come up against the messy reality of life, providing a feedback loop that can refine what is known and believed.

A key strength of the Center is support for community engagement from the highest echelon of the administration. At UCLA, many faculty members are already doing this kind of work, in an organic, bottom-up kind of approach. A top-down initiative to foster this at the 10,000-foot conceptual level is also critical. The academic leadership needs to talk about this work as an integral part of what a university does, as well as to provide recognition for initiatives already under way as a means of encouraging others in this direction. In this regard, having the Center located in the Chancellor’s office is symbolically and practically important.

From this foundation of support, the Center created UCLA in LA – an initiative that renews the university’s commitment to be an active, engaged, and valued partner in greater Los Angeles. This initiative reflects the belief that UCLA, as a public institution, has a special responsibility to use the university’s teaching, research, and service resources to make life better for those living in the Los Angeles region and beyond. The goals are:

- To create research-driven agendas that improve the quality of life for area residents;

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

- To forge links and transfer mechanisms between research and community issues and needs; and
- To sustain these efforts by infusing this mission into UCLA’s teaching, research, and service.

The Center has three areas of emphasis: Children, Youth and Families; Arts and Culture; and Economic Development. In its third year of operation, the Center has provided financial and technical support for 78 projects, selected from more than 400 applications, using \$2 million in funding raised from private donors.

Projects are evaluated using the following criteria:

- Does the project make sense on its face, in terms of value to the community and the campus?
- Is the relationship between the community and the campus articulated, with clear roles and responsibilities?
- Does the project have broad scope and the potential for deep impact?
- Is the outcome sustainable once the project is complete?
- Is the majority of the budget devoted to the product, i.e., supporting the actual research?

From the Center’s three years of operation, we can draw three conclusions. First, support at the top of the administration makes a difference in the success of civic engagement. Second, we have more opportunities in the future to insinuate engagement into the policies of the campus – for example, by including it in strategic plan reviews and by working more closely with the Academic Senate. And third, we need to consider how this initiative should develop in the future. We have funded a great many projects over a short period of time. But for the future, should we narrow our focus to three or four projects that can be extended and have a large impact? Or should we continue to provide support more broadly across a wide range of partnerships and disciplines? Those are the decisions facing UCLA today.

**UCLA in LA: Two Partnership Examples**

- The Seeds of Health and Community is a project that brings together the School of Medicine and a community group in East Los Angeles to examine the value and application of medicinal herbs.

In the first phase, a community garden was planted, using culturally appropriate rituals, as well as research into the knowledge, utilization, and attitudes of the immigrant community.

During a second phase, a curriculum is being developed to involve students from the nearby elementary school in the garden.

- Another example is a partnership between a community group and the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. The research has involved gathering data from four inner-city high schools about students’ experience with college counselors and their high school completion rates.

The data has been analyzed and used in an advocacy campaign to expand the availability of A-G courses.

**Response**

**Meredith Minkler, UC San Francisco**

As the first two speakers have discussed, the very mission of a research institution has to undergo transformative change in order to embrace civic engagement. Both speakers called for a radical rethinking of the nature of scholarship. Sometimes institutions are afflicted with academic hardening of the arteries; their research produces the kinds of answers they are comfortable dealing with because they ask the questions that will lead to those answers. As

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

both speakers pointed out, research universities need to expand their notion of colleagues well beyond the university – to include the community, the public, and other sectors.

There are a host of pressures moving us to rethink the nature of scholarly work. For those in fields like health, education, and planning, there is increasing pressure from the community to change the way we do business. Whether a question of day laborers, HIV, air pollution, or housing shortages, the complexity of so many of today's problems make them poorly suited to the discipline-specific research of the past and the sometimes disappointing interventions they have helped spawn. There has been a gigantic disjuncture between academic research and the real concerns of people in neighborhoods. Civic engagement places an emphasis on partnering with the community and taking actions that address their concerns.

The broader term now being used by government agencies and research funders is community-based participatory research. It has three elements at its core: participation, research, and action. One popular definition is that it is a systematic inquiry, with the participation of those affected by the issue, for the purpose of education.

None of this means that we leave our rigorous academic principles at the door. Engaged research is very concerned with validity and research rigor. The key is whether the research question itself is valid and reflects the real concerns of the community. This attribute is well reflected in the goals expressed in the UCLA initiative.

Both speakers talked about partnering beyond our own academic disciplines, a concept that is highly suspect to some; a colleague of mine has described it as unnatural acts between unconsenting adults. Nonetheless, many funders are calling for proposals in which partnerships are not just recommended, but mandated. Our research institutions need to catch up with what many have been telling us about the need to increase our relevance.

It is my privilege to head the only doctoral program in public health that is truly interdisciplinary. Almost all of the students have a community mentor as well as an academic advisor. They work with the community to come up with research projects that have outcomes that the community can use. This may not work with every discipline. But for increasing numbers of us, the call to increase our relevance is strong.

An important point brought out by Barbara Holland is that research universities need to broaden and deepen their approach to assessing scholarship. Unless privilege and tenure committees can come to grips with transdisciplinary work, research universities may fail to address some of the most pressing challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. If they do not figure out how to give more attention and prestige to this type of work, they risk having younger people, who see this as the new pathway to achieving a learning society, go elsewhere.

There are some excellent examples of the scholarship of engagement within the UC system, as Frank Gilliam has reminded us, but UC has a long way to go. It can fill the role of leader in this area, but to do so means rethinking the meaning of engagement in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

# What We Know about Student and Faculty Civic Engagement: Best Practices, National Trends, and UC Data

## Panel Introduction

### **Tom Ehrlich, Carnegie Foundation**

Three best practices stand out at universities that successfully use civic engagement as a core element of their programs. First, the most successful programs are at institutions which have a high degree of intentionality about their programs; a critical mass of faculty and staff are organized around engaging students from the moment they think about enrolling all the way through their graduation. Second, there are overlapping, reinforcing activities, not just in the curriculum but also in the co-curricular activities and the campus climate. And third, the programs focus not only on cognitive knowledge but also on developing students' civic skills, attitudes, and motivations.

These best practices are most often found at universities that are *not* research institutions, and there is much to learn from them as well as from programs already under way at the University of California. In this panel, we will hear an assessment of students and civic engagement here in California.

### **Civic Engagement Beliefs and Practices among College Graduates and Faculty**

#### **Lori Vogelgesang, UCLA**

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) – which is based in the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA – administers three student surveys annually. The Freshman Survey, started in 1966, looks at more than 300,000 students each year. There are two follow-up surveys, Your First College Year (YFCY) survey and the College Student Survey (CSS). The Institute also conducts a faculty survey every three years.

The data for this presentation come from a special 2004 follow-up survey of former students who were surveyed when they entered college in 1994 and again in 1998 – a cohort of about 20,000 students. Data also come from the 2004 Faculty Survey.

Moderator **Tom Ehrlich** is a senior scholar at the Carnegie Foundation, where he co-directs the Political Engagement Project and the Foundation and Education Project. He also assists the Preparation for the Professions Program. Previously, he was co-director of the Foundation's study of Higher Education and the Development of Moral and Civic Responsibility. From 1995-2000, he was a Distinguished University Scholar at California State University and taught regularly at San Francisco State University in community service-learning courses.

Presenter **Lori Vogelgesang** is the Director of the Center for Service-Learning Research and Dissemination at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), UCLA. She currently directs the multi-year grant project, Understanding the Effects of Service-Learning: A Study of Students and Faculty. The student portion of the study examines the post-college impact of participating in service-learning during the undergraduate years. The faculty portion surveys faculty across the nation to understand their beliefs, work, and participation in service-learning and civic engagement pedagogies.

Presenter **Gregg E. Thomson** has been the Director of the Office of Student Research at UC Berkeley since 1990 and is a Co-Principal Investigator for the Student Experience in the Research University/21<sup>st</sup> Century (SERU21) project. Berkeley's Office of Student Research is recognized as a leader in the design and implementation of large-scale web-based surveys of university students. Thomson has also helped direct the development of the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES).

Presenter **Richard Flacks** is a Co-Principal Investigator for the SERU21 project. A Professor of Sociology at UC Santa Barbara, his research and writing on student culture and politics began in the early 1960s. In addition to books, his works include a number of widely-cited articles on student activism, student protest, and academic engagement. He is the chair of the UC Santa Barbara Committee on Admission, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools.

### Post-College Follow-up

The goal of the post-college survey is to understand how the college experience impacts post-college beliefs and behaviors. Not surprisingly, the most accurate predictor of a person's attitudes and beliefs after the college years are the attitudes, beliefs, and experiences of that person upon entering college. That means it is important to understand pre-existing attitudes and high school experiences, which are assessed by the Freshman Survey. Also taken into account are factors of institutional culture: its size and selectivity of admissions, the attitudes of faculty, etc.

The post-college follow-up survey is designed to assess a variety of outcomes 10 years after college entry. Community and civic engagement are measured by looking at the level of

volunteerism, participation in civic organizations, motivations for engagement, and commitment to community work. Other factors examined are graduate school participation, lifestyle choices, careers, political engagement, self-efficacy, and personal goals, values, and beliefs.

The post-college study includes 8,474 respondents who completed a survey in 2004, reflecting a 50 percent response rate. The results have been weighted to reflect a population of all students entering college in 1994 and graduating within six years.

Respondents were asked about their motivations for volunteering and being involved in their community. By far, the strongest response was "want to help" (82.5 percent indicated this was a "major reason" for their involvement), followed by a desire to "do something about an issue that matters" (55.3 percent). To "create a more equitable society" (14.5 percent) and to "change laws or policies" (6.9 percent) were considered a "major reason" far less often.

Respondents were also asked what level of impact various college involvements had on their lives after college. Studying abroad was cited by 56.5 percent (among those that participated in the experience) as having a "major impact" on their lives; friendships and peer interactions were cited as having a major impact by 54.2 percent and internships by 47.2 percent. Fewer respondents pointed to interaction with faculty (25.4 percent), coursework (23.3 percent), and community service/volunteer work (16.1 percent) as having major impacts on their later lives.

Conducting multiple surveys over time allows for an assessment of what happens to community engagement and personal goals during and after college. For the participants who entered college in 1994, there is a steady decline in volunteerism, from 80.3 percent who were involved when they entered college to 68.1 percent involved in 2004. The importance of influencing social values increases during the college years, but then diminishes in later years (40.7 percent

Respondent **Andy Furco** is Director of the Service-Learning Research and Development Center at UC Berkeley, where he serves on the Graduate School of Education faculty. His research focuses on the impacts, implementation, and institutionalization of school-sponsored service-learning and civic engagement initiatives. Since 1994, he has led more than two dozen research and evaluation studies on service-learning in K-12 education, teacher education, and higher education. His forthcoming book, *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education*, takes a look at the key dimensions that enable colleges and universities to advance and ultimately institutionalize service-learning.

Respondent **Joe Kiskis** is Professor of Physics at UC Davis, where he is Chair of the University Committee on Educational Policy. In the past, he has served as Vice Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate and Chair of the Davis Division Undergraduate Council. From 1999-2003, he co-led the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) re-accreditation effort at UC Davis.

#### Profile of 2004 Survey Respondents

- 55 percent were in a partnership or were married.
- 79.2 percent had no children.
- 31.9 percent hold a degree higher than a bachelor's degree.
- 37.2 percent were working toward a degree higher than a bachelor's degree.
- 83.5 percent were working full time.



**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

indicated that it was “very important/essential” on entry, 45.7 percent in 1998, and 38.0 percent in 2004). For the goal of influencing the political structure, 19.6 percent of students rated it as “very important/essential” upon entry, but this number falls to 16.1 percent in 1998, and then further drops to 14.1 percent in 2004. The goal of becoming a community leader also declines, from 34.9 percent to 31.9 percent and then to 15.5 percent over the three time points.

These statistics give a macro picture of the post-college life of the respondents. But the data can also be examined to see the impact of different college experiences. For example, for students who were enrolled in courses with a service-learning component, volunteerism is higher upon college enrollment than for students without that experience and, although it dips within the group by 2004, it remains higher in comparison to the non-service-learning students throughout the survey period. For those who studied abroad, volunteerism is higher than for other students, and it climbs sharply, both within the group and relative to the students who did not study abroad, by 2004.

**Faculty**

In the Faculty Survey for 2004, almost 38,000 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty members from more than 400 institutions were surveyed. The survey looked at their beliefs, values, teaching behaviors, and views of their institution. The data reported here are from weighted national norms of all universities and four-year institutions.

When asked about goals for students, faculty were in near universal agreement that to “develop ability to think critically” (99 percent) and to “help master knowledge in a discipline” (95 percent) were very important or essential. There is less agreement that to “prepare students for responsible citizenship” and to “develop moral character” were as important, with fewer than 60 percent of faculty members rating these as very important or essential. Thus, it is not surprising to see that efforts at educating for responsible citizenship are uneven across campuses.

Faculty were also asked to provide their perceptions of institutional priorities. More than 64 percent rated “to increase or maintain institutional prestige” as a high priority at their university, and 61 percent said “to pursue extramural funding” was a high priority. Data from universities, and from selective institutions in particular, indicate that these priorities are even higher at those institutions. About 40 percent indicated that “to create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities” was important to the institution, while close to 30 percent selected as high priorities “to help students learn how to bring about change in American society” and “to provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching/research.”

When asked about engaged scholarship practices, over 80 percent agreed that colleges have a responsibility to work with the local community. But only 44 percent have collaborated with the local community in their own research or teaching in the past two years, and only about 20 percent have taught a service-learning course in the past two years. As a side note, faculty at universities teach service-learning courses at comparable rates to other institutions, despite the perception that research universities have made less progress in this area.

It appears, then, that faculty believe it is important to work with the local community, but they do not see it as their personal job to be engaged in terms of scholarship. In some cases, they may not see a connection between what they do and the concept of engagement; they may perceive it rather as the job of outreach or extension.

## How UC Students Vary in Their Levels of Interest in and Involvement with Public and Community Life – A Sample of UCUES Data

**Gregg Thomson, UC Berkeley; and Richard Flacks, UC Santa Barbara**

The University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey – UCUES – is a web-based survey that is designed to reach all undergraduate students across the UC system. The survey is the result of a partnership between Gregg Thomson at UC Berkeley, Richard Flacks at UC Santa Barbara, and John Douglass at the Center for Studies in Higher Education. Because the data are linked to student ID numbers, it can be combined with other data that UC has on students to address a number of different research issues.

Although the survey is not specifically designed to assess civic engagement, there is a great deal of information that can be abstracted from the data collected in the Spring 2004 iteration, which collected responses from 40,000 students. This presentation provides a brief overview of some of the data, which will be looked at more in-depth in a later panel.

### What students say about their community and civic activity:

- 19 percent say that “giving something back to the community” is an “essential” goal of their college education.
- 50 percent of students report no participation this year in student organizations, such as student government, campus publications, or cultural groups. On the other hand, about 5 percent report they devote five or more hours a week to such activity.
- About 60 percent of students belong to at least one of the following (and about 20 percent belong to at least two): student government (7.7 percent), fraternity or sorority (10.8 percent), intercollegiate athletics (7.4 percent), other campus-based club (28.7 percent), off-campus club (16.8 percent), or internship (18.1 percent).
- About 35 percent say they worked this year as a community service volunteer. About 6 percent say they received course credit for such service.
- 14 percent of UC students enrolled in at least one service-learning course this year. About 20 percent of seniors had such a course this year.
- 8 percent are not registered to vote because they are not citizens, but another 16 percent who are eligible to do so are not registered to vote. Of those registered to vote, the majority are registered in the community where their parents live; 35 percent are registered in the community where the campus is located.
- About 50 percent say they are not well informed or not at all informed about national or international affairs. About 75 percent say they are not informed about campus and local community affairs.
- About 13 percent attended meetings or rallies related to “local, state, or national politics” with some frequency, while about two-thirds did not attend such events.
- About 9 percent engaged in protests or demonstrations this year, while 75 percent did not.
- In the 2003-4 academic year, about 6 percent participated in a political campaign; 84 percent did not.
- About 13 percent never or rarely conversed with friends about current events; 43 percent say they did this often.
- About one-third said they never or rarely had in-depth conversations with people whose political opinions were different from theirs. But one-third said they often have such conversations.

## Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity

### Student use of media:

- 7 percent say they read a newspaper every day; 21 percent read a paper at least several times a week.
- The campus newspaper is used by 40 percent; 13 percent read it daily.
- 30 percent use national TV news programs; 9 percent get news from these sources on a daily basis.
- 20 percent read weekly magazines.
- 13 percent use talk radio as a regular news source.
- 32 percent say they use the Internet every day for news and another 28 percent use the web several times a week.
  - Of students who use the Internet, about 80 percent rely on conventional news websites (Yahoo, CNN, Google, site of local newspaper, TV network).
  - About 15 percent use “sophisticated sites” (BBC, New York Times, Wall Street Journal, British newspapers, etc.).
  - 5 percent use foreign or international news sites (Le Monde, Haaretz, Al Jazeera, etc.).
  - 5 percent use left-wing “alternative” sites (Nation, Mother Jones, AlterNet, etc.).
  - 2 percent use right-wing sites (National Review, freepublic, frontpage).
  - Virtually no students said they used blogs as a news source.

### Self-identified political orientation:

- Students self-identified themselves in the following manner: far left, 6.1 percent; liberal, 41.3 percent; middle of the road, 37.9 percent; conservative, 13.9 percent; and far right, 0.8 percent. Males were underrepresented in the survey, which may skew the results.
- When students were asked about the strength of their political views, more than 60 percent have strong (47.7 percent) or very strong (15.7 percent) views, while 30 percent identified their views as weak and 6.7 percent as very weak.

### Seniors were asked to assess their own civic/political proficiency:

- 48 percent felt they had the capacity to be informed citizens (up from 16 percent when they started college).
- 60 percent said they had leadership skills (up from 30 percent when they started college).
- 62 percent felt they had the ability to express their views to others (up from 26 percent).

The goal of this presentation is not to provide an exhaustive review of what was found, but instead to give a general sense of what was asked in the most recent survey that may have relevance to civic engagement. This may stimulate questions about different data and links that can be explored.

### Response

#### *Andy Furco, UC Berkeley*

What is evident from the presentations is that civic engagement is occurring, but that it tends to be episodic in nature, with short-term, discrete activities that have a beginning and an end. The first point to take away from the discussions so far is that one of the critical keys to doing this type of work well is to have a systematic, comprehensive approach not necessarily to do more of what the universities are already doing or to do it differently, but to do it comprehensively and systematically to ensure there is a well-planned pathway of student experiences.

## Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity

This requires an assessment of what is already in place, strategic planning about what the goals are over the long term, measurement of the impact, and then institutionalization that ensures civic engagement is not a separate program but is embedded in the curriculum. The research data shows that civic engagement has only a minimal effect on students if it is not done in a comprehensive manner.

A second point is that the K-12 years are an important foundation for civic engagement. The research shows that the characteristics and experiences that students bring with them to college are critical, so finding ways to have students become engaged early is important – and that, once again, requires strategic planning and a comprehensive approach.

Third, any initiative around civic engagement would need to examine and determine what it means to be a good citizen. There are many different models of engagement: social capital, public works, charitable engagement, social justice, and more. Determining what type of model is critical in terms of arriving at the desired outcome.

Finally, it would be limiting to focus solely on civic outcomes. Instead, an engagement initiative should target a broad range of outcome areas: academic, civic, career development, moral development, and personal development. The research shows that the biggest impact on students' post-college lives is not in civic outcomes but in personal and social domains: building self-esteem, empowerment, motivation, personal engagement, and a sense of belonging.

### Response

#### *Joe Kiskis, UC Davis*

The presentations have provided two kinds of research. One is the collection of comprehensive and detailed data about what students are doing. The other is the correlation between civic experiences and outcomes, with some perspective on the values that are promoted. The latter raises the question of the proper role of a public university in the development of values for students – a question that is not being addressed today.

The data should be seen as heartening. Substantial numbers of students are already civically engaged, providing a solid base on which to build. One of the questions to be answered is whether this is something the university wants all students to experience. Is it an opportunity, an expectation, or a requirement?

Other questions involve the definitions for civic engagement, service-learning, and public service; some initial definitions have been provided but there clearly are distinctions and nuances that need to be examined. There is also the issue of whether academic credit will be given and, if so, what type: plain-vanilla units toward graduation, or toward some requirement, or toward requirements for a major.

If the university believes it is desirable to have more students involved and to have civic engagement integrated into the curriculum, then it would be desirable to link it to other objectives that the university has, such as critical thinking, depth of knowledge in major, and civic leadership. It is important that the civic experience be something that is capable of furthering these objectives. In addition, the experience should probably include reflection, analysis, and written assessment.

Framing the broader participation of students in civic engagement in terms of integration into the majors and addressing the issue of appropriate academic credit would make the most sense. Taking this approach would limit impact on time-to-degree, which has been a major concern.

# Civic Engagement, the Undergraduate Academic Experience, and Policy Implications: Results from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey and the SERU21 Project

## Panel Introduction

### *Jodi Anderson, UCLA*

In this panel, presenters will provide a more in-depth look at some of the data that have already been shared. Some questions that the data may help address include:

- How might this data be useful in helping the university understand the undergraduate experience?
- Does the university – meaning the institution, academics as well as administrators – have certain expectations about who should be engaged and what they should be learning from the experience?
- How could, or should, students be more engaged or engaged differently?

## Explaining Variation in University of California Students' Civic Awareness and Participation

### *Richard Flacks, UC Santa Barbara*

The following summarizes a sample of findings from UCUES. These are presented to stimulate questions about what UC might want to know about student engagement to help shape practice and policy. The findings are based on the Spring 2004 administration of UCUES. Nearly 42,000 students responded to the survey.

In measuring the dimensions of civic engagement, a factor analysis of a wide range of relevant items was used to generate the following scales:

- Political interest: a general index of students' interest in public affairs, based on self-evaluation of their level of political information, how much current events figure in their conversation, and newspaper usage.
- Political activism: an index based on students' self assessment of their proficiency (when entering college) in effectively expressing their views, in leadership, and in being an informed citizen.
- Community Involvement: an index based on students' self report of the amount of time they spend in community service and in extracurricular activity, how much they value community participation as a life goal, and their reported levels of information about campus and community affairs.

Moderator **Jodi Anderson** is a fourth-year Ph.D. student in Education at UCLA and is the 2004-05 Student Regent for the University of California. Her research interests center on organizational change and institutional civic engagement, as well as student engagement during and beyond the college years. While at UCLA, she has served as a teaching assistant in education courses and conducted course evaluation and research projects through the UCLA College of Letters and Science Office of Evaluation and Research.

Presenter **Richard Flacks** (see previous panel)

Presenter **Gregg Thomson** (see previous panel)

Respondent **Michael T. Brown** is a Professor of Counseling/Clinical/School Psychology in the Graduate School of Education at UC Santa Barbara and a Fellow in the American Psychological Association. He has published books, book chapters, and articles that contribute to understanding the cultural variables underlying the career and educational choice behavior of racial/ethnic minorities and women. He is the 2004-06 Chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools of UC's Academic Senate.

Respondent **Jeff Wright** is founding Dean of Engineering at UC Merced (since September 2001). He was formerly Associate Dean for Research, Professor of Civil Engineering, and Director of the Indiana Water Resources Research Center at Purdue University.

## **Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

Based on the analysis of the data, we can draw the following conclusions:

### **Student social backgrounds affect engagement.**

- Although White students are relatively high in “political interest,” they are low in community involvement compared with African American, Chicano/Latino, and Asian American students. Black and Chicano students are relatively high on political activism.
- Black and White students rate their political skill relatively high; Asian American students rate themselves relatively low.
- Students’ self-identified social class background relates strongly to these indices. Students at the high end of the class ladder rate themselves relatively high on political interest and skill. Students of working class and low-income background are relatively high on community involvement and activism.
- Students’ scores on SAT I are negatively related to community involvement at UCSB. Students’ “read” scores at admissions are strongly predictive of community involvement.

### **Civic engagement is positively related to various measures of academic engagement.**

- The amount of time students spend on study is positively related to community involvement. In general, students who study least are also least involved.
- Political interest is positively related to academic engagement. But political activism tends to be associated with academically disengaged behavior.

### **Civic and academic engagement are complexly related to students’ ideological positions.**

- Students are preponderantly liberal; only 15 percent of the sample identify themselves as conservative or far right, while 48 percent call themselves liberal or far left. The 15 percent figure may somewhat underestimate the proportion of students who think of themselves as conservative because males are under-represented in the overall sample.
- The liberal preponderance is nevertheless clear. Less than one percent of students in the sample called themselves far right; more than seven times as many said they were “far left.”
- Class and race variation in students’ political views is significant but not very strong. For example, students who call themselves “wealthy” are more likely to be “far right” but also “far left.” Both the “far right” and “far left” are fairly heterogeneous with respect to class and ethnicity.
- “Far right” students are less likely to believe that they can express their political views on campus than any of the other ideological categories, and less likely to believe that students are respected regardless of their political beliefs. Students who identify as conservative but not far right are significantly less likely to agree with these perceptions.
- Students on the “far right” are more likely to be engaged in “religious and spiritual” activity compared with the rest of the student body.
- Students at both the left and right poles are more politically interested and active than students in between, but are somewhat less likely to be community involved.
- Students on the left tend to have higher GPAs than middle-of-the-road and conservative students.

This is not a complete or exhaustive report on this survey, but instead is an effort to sample some of the kinds of findings that can be drawn. Some of the findings support the data that others have produced that indicates an apparent relationship between community involvement and academic achievement. In addition, the findings point to the promise that community involvement has predictive value in the admissions process about how students will fare. One might see an argument for weighting civic engagement in the admissions process, just as SAT scores are now weighted so strongly.

## **Thinking Globally and/or Acting Locally? The Community Service and Civic Engagement Orientations of Berkeley Undergraduates**

**Gregg Thomson, UC Berkeley**

The inspiration for this research is the environmentalists' mantra: think globally, act locally. This reflects two civic engagement concerns: first, that University of California undergraduates have the opportunity to engage in local community service and, second, that students develop a global civic orientation – that is, become “citizens of the world.” The research question prompted by these concerns is: What is the relationship between a Community Service Orientation (CSO) and a Global Civic Orientation (GCO)? Further, how does examination of these two orientations advance our understanding of undergraduate civic engagement?

Professor Flacks has reported on the UCwide Spring 2004 UCUES results. In Spring 2005, only the Berkeley campus administered UCUES, with an overall response rate slightly greater than 50 percent.

The Berkeley Spring 2005 UCUES used a core-question-plus-module design – that is, all respondents completed a set of basic questions on the undergraduate experience and then one of the five specialized modules (academic engagement, civic engagement, student services, student development, and “wild card”).

A Community Service Orientation (CSO) index was constructed using a composite measure of past, present, and anticipated community service (including hours per week spent), and a measure of the importance placed on having opportunities for community service. These two measures have a 0.48 correlation. A Global Civic Orientation (GCO) index was constructed using three measures: a composite measure of frequency of use of Internet news sources, national television news, and a daily newspaper; importance of being well-informed about world issues; and frequency of discussion about current events or news with friends. Correlations among these three measures are 0.34, 0.36, and 0.42.

Analyses were run to assess the possibility of three relationships between CSO and GCO:

- A substantial **POSITIVE** correlation between CSO and GCO because **both are expressions of a more general civic engagement orientation**;
- A substantial **NEGATIVE** correlation between CSO and GCO because **the two are competing orientations or modes of civic expression**;
- Essentially **NO CORRELATION** between CSO and GCO because **the two reflect unrelated and different modes of civic expression**.

A positive relationship would suggest other measures correlate in the same direction with CSO and GCO; a negative relationship would suggest other measures correlate in the opposite direction with CSO and GCO; and no relationship would suggest that some measures correlate with CSO while others correlate with GCO.

### **Main Finding: The Community Service Orientation (CSO) and Global Civic Orientation (GCO) Appear to be Two Separate and Largely Independent Forms of Civic Engagement**

The overall correlation between CSO and GCO is an extremely modest +0.12. The magnitude of this correlation is consistent across and within a large number of student subgroups, e.g.,

## **Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

year in school, various demographic categories, and political subgroups. The significant exception is how family income moderates the CSO-GCO relationship: for low and especially middle-income students, the CSO-GCO correlation is stronger, while for high-income students the correlation is actually negative (-0.01).

To explore the typology of CSO and GCO, scores of below 5 and above 8 were used to define low and high scores on the 12-point CSO Index and scores of below 9 and above 13 were used to define the low and high scores on the 18-point GCO Index. This yielded the following: (A) Low-Low n=190; (B) Low CSO-High GCO n=145; (C) High CSO-Low GCO n=165; (D) High-High n=226.

The “four-corners” of the CSO-GCO distribution provides tangible illustration of how some background factors are related to the Community Service Orientation while others are related to the Global Civic Orientation:

- Women, underrepresented minority students, and students whose parents were not born in the United States are higher than their counterparts on CSO, while upper-classmen and white students are higher than their counterparts on GCO.
- By field of study, Political Science, Psychology, and Molecular & Cell Biology majors are high on CSO, while EECS, Mechanical Engineering, and Architecture majors are low.
- Political Science, English, Business Administration, and double majors are high in GCO, while Architecture, MCB, Mechanical Engineering, EECS, and Economics majors are low.

Looking at variations in civic engagement and political views of Berkeley undergraduates by using the CSO-GCO typology, the following can be noted:

- Self-reported gains in both interpersonal skills and leadership skills are correlated with both CSO and GCO.
- The two high GCO combinations are more likely to see themselves as liberal (or far left), but even more likely to report “strong” political beliefs regardless of political orientation.
- The two high GCO combinations are much more likely to view the country as headed in the wrong direction.
- The overall striking finding, however, is how the High-High combination stands out relative to the other three combinations on a wide range of items, including voting, being well informed about campus issues, choosing to enroll at Berkeley if starting over, and levels of satisfaction with both academic and social aspects of undergraduate life.

The above has implications for both further research and policy. For example, to foster civic engagement, is more than one strategy required? By harnessing the power of UCUES and linking the results to other data sources and studies, more can be learned about the development of civic engagement orientation and the outcome of service-learning and community service.



**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

**Response**

***Michael T. Brown, UC Santa Barbara***

Who should be admitted into our nation's colleges and universities, and how ought these decisions be made?

Such questions are of particular significance to our public colleges and universities, and even more so for those that are prestigious and highly selective. We of the University of California need to be conscious of what it means to be a public, albeit elite, university and intentional as well as strategic about achieving the mission of a public university.

Admissions decisions at UC are guided by a number of objectives, including enrolling students most likely to succeed and doing so in a manner fundamentally consistent with the most cherished values of our democracy: 1) reward achievements with opportunity, and 2) do so in a way that is fair and equitable, recognizing that all have not had the same preparatory resources and opportunities.

But in seeking out the students most likely to succeed, how will we define that success? This is where there is considerable educational policy value in the University of California's Undergraduate Experience Survey and the concepts of service-learning, civic engagement, and academic engagement.

In admitting students, a number of factors are employed, primarily high school grades and ACT or SAT test scores. Those factors are validated for use in part on the basis of their empirical relation to university success. Other factors are examined as measures of success after students are enrolled, such as first-year GPA.

But are first-year grade point performances and other similar indicators what we really mean by "university success"? What of the academic behaviors that produce these factors, such as academic engagement, or the behaviors and motivations associated with them, such as civic engagement?

The University offers a wide array of learning and achievement opportunities, all having some important relationships to after-college societal contributions and achievements, achievements at least as important as college freshman GPA. This is what the UCUES survey results indicate. If part of the University's responsibility is to prepare educated and engaged citizens, then these data indicate that the university must think beyond the traditional criteria of success (i.e., freshman GPAs). The university must begin to seriously consider criteria that include civic engagement and global/community service.

The data also show that different students pursue and are differentially prepared to pursue different facets of civic and social engagement. Such a reality argues for constructing, via admissions policies, a diverse class of students – students qualified by their varied backgrounds, preparations, and motivations for different achievements and contributions.

The University must look beyond grades and test scores in admitting students. Indeed, the University needs to return to the idea of "building a class" in admissions, thinking about all of the opportunities the university has to offer, and selecting the diverse student body most likely to involve themselves and succeed in these myriad opportunities. Finally, we must think intentionally and strategically about the many ways the University serves and can serve the greater good, and make sure that we embody these considerations in the University's admissions policies.

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

**Response**

***Jeff Wright, UC Merced***

At UC Merced, service-learning has been established as an integral part of the undergraduate education program. It provides a way of addressing a problem with engineering education in this country, namely low retention of students in the major. Nationally, about 50 percent remain in the major – and even at the best institutions, the figure is only about 70 percent.

A big contributing factor to low retention is that students become engineering majors because they want to build, design, and invent things. Then universities put them through two grueling years of math and science that is taught in isolation from what got them excited about the major in the first place. They don't see the relevance of what they are learning and they lose enthusiasm. Service-learning is designed to address this challenge.

A second critical issue is that the engineering major does not attract diverse students. Only about 10 percent are women, and less than 3 percent are from under-represented minorities. Service-learning also has a role in addressing this issue.

A third issue is that engineering students do not interact with students from other disciplines or experiment with other coursework. Engineering is focused on an extensive sequence of courses that must be taken, so students have no time to venture into other areas. This means they do not normally develop the capabilities to express their views or write well or work on teams. Service-learning helps in these areas as well.

The programs now being designed at UC Merced will allow students coming into engineering to form teams to work together to solve real engineering problems for real clients. They won't just take a single course that has a term project that reflects service-learning. Each semester, they will earn course credit for participating on teams. More experienced seniors who are about to enter the workforce will work with freshmen completely new to the field.

The community partners that our students will work with will be not-for-profit organizations in the surrounding area that cannot afford engineering services. The teams will identify opportunities to bring engineering problem-solving to the issues these organizations are addressing. The teams will work with the organizations as clients, building and maintaining a relationship rather than simply accomplishing a solution to a single problem. As an example, last summer a team designed and created a machine that is useful for teaching physics to students in K-12 schools.

It is hoped that this will be attractive to other students from other majors, who can join the teams and work with the community. In addition, it is an opportunity for UC Merced to make a connection with the general public and help them understand that they have a stake in our success. UC Merced looks forward to being part of the civic engagement movement and helping UC continue to advance in this area.

## Civic Engagement and the Curriculum: Opportunities Defined

### Panel Introduction

**Mike Schudson, UC San Diego**

Three issues emerge from the discussion so far:

- Integration – A consistent theme is that civic engagement will not accomplish much unless it is integrated as part of the curriculum and major fields of study. It should be part of everyone's education; it should not be a separate add-on to what is already being done.
- Intentionality – Although many students say they have taken service-learning courses, and there are examples within the UC system of civic engagement being done well, it is clear that a self-conscious, organized approach is needed.
- Internationality – One of the fastest growing majors is international studies, and foreign language class enrollments have increased. Are these students demonstrating civic consciousness, and should recognition of globalization be included in the concept of civic engagement?

### **Civic Engagement in Sociology: The ENLACE Undergraduate Research and Mentorship Program at UCSB** **Denise A. Segura, UC Santa Barbara**

The UCUES study has found that 70-85 percent of seniors highly value the opportunity to be engaged with faculty research or classes that improve their understanding of national and world events, and in which they can conduct

Moderator **Michael Schudson** is Professor of Communication and Adjunct Professor of Sociology at UC San Diego. From 1996 to 2001, he served as co-director of the UCSD Civic Collaborative, a project to link UCSD faculty and students to the broader San Diego community. He is currently director of the campuswide "public service minor" administered through Thurgood Marshall College, one of the campus' six undergraduate colleges. Schudson's research concerns the history and sociology of American journalism and the history of civic participation in the US.

Presenter **Denise Segura** is Professor of Sociology at UC Santa Barbara, specializing in Chicana Feminist Studies, Latina/o education, and Chicana/Mexicana employment. She has been at UC Santa Barbara since 1987 and served as Director of the Center for Chicano Studies from 1994-1999. Currently she is engaged in collaborative research with Dr. Richard Duran (Education) on Chicano/Latino education that is funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for \$1.5 million, with matching funds from UCSB. She is Vice-Chair of the University Committee on Educational Policy.

Presenter **Jennifer Lilla** is a fifth-year Ph.D. student in Biomedical Sciences at UC San Francisco, and is currently President of the University of California Student Association, representing the 200,000 students of the University of California. She is a predoctoral fellow in the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program. She attended UC Berkeley as an undergraduate, majoring in Interdisciplinary Studies and minoring in French.

Presenter **Cliff Brunk** has been a faculty member in the Biology Department at UCLA since 1967. His research is in the area of molecular evolution, where he deals with the molecular mechanisms influencing the evolution of genomes. He teaches a general education course for non-majors, LS15, dealing with evolution, genetics, and the impact of humans on Earth; an upper division course in molecular evolution, EEB121; and various graduate courses and seminars.

research as a part of the class. The ENLACE Undergraduate Research and Mentorship Program in the Sociology Department at UC Santa Barbara gives them this opportunity.

Many of our students are interested in learning how to contribute to the public good and participate in social change to address some of the pressing issues of our society. One area in need of significant intervention and social change is the crisis in Latino education. Locally and

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

statewide, fewer than 60 percent of Latino students graduate from high school and over half (57 percent) of all Latinos 25 years and older do not have high school diplomas, compared to 11.3 percent of whites. Only 11 percent of Latinos have college diplomas compared to 29 percent of whites. About 14 percent of UC undergraduates are Latino, although more than half of the public school population is Latino.

Many Latino students who have made it to UC, as well as many non-Latino students at UC, want to do something about this situation. At UC Santa Barbara, I've been part of a team that secured a W.K. Kellogg Foundation four-year grant called "ENLACE" to develop a partnership between the university, local community colleges, K-12 schools, and Latino-focused community-based organizations in Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. The goal is to implement a set of pilot projects to strengthen the academic preparation and educational attachment of Latinos in elementary, middle, and high schools as well as college. This program had matching funds from the university.

The Undergraduate Research Mentorship Program is a four-quarter research and service experience in the local community. Each spring, between 25 and 30 university students take a field research class to gain basic skills and complete readings in education. After this class, they are assigned as mentors and researchers to local Latino students and their families. In the fall, they take Sociology 146, "Education and Empowerment," where they concurrently do mentorship, tutoring, and advocacy work with the students and families, document their work, and write up a research paper centered on a case study that they turn in at the end of the quarter.

Mentors learn to build on their own cultural backgrounds to develop meaningful relationships and strategies to serve as effective role models for local Latino students. This goal intersects with research on the importance of individualized attention and role models from the same (or similar) racial-ethnic, gender, and class backgrounds to positively impact the educational motivation and achievement of elementary and secondary school-age students. Concurrently, being a role model enhances the self-esteem of an individual and contributes positively to his/her investment in the nuances and responsibilities of this role and strengthens the academic engagement of Latinos in the university.

The following two quarters, the program follows a basic internship model in which the students work with the students and families and get a small stipend. They continue to document their work in the form of field notes, which they hand in weekly. They meet with the ENLACE staff and myself every three weeks to reflect on their experiences and receive support for their advocacy work and fieldwork.

The ENLACE Research and Mentorship Program affirms research that demonstrates the high value of community work or involvement for many minority students that, if linked to the educational curriculum, can decrease their alienation from the "chilly climate" of many college campuses as well as enhance their academic engagement. In fact, one of the major findings of ENLACE is how the mentors value the way this program helps connect them with "their" community.

This year's undergraduate researcher/mentors are working with local students (called ENLACE scholars) who are in the ninth grade. Since this is a longitudinal research study, most of these students have been with ENLACE since they were in the sixth grade. We began with forty sixth-graders; four years later we have 32 young scholars. Mentors help the students develop study skills and engage in academic planning and goal setting. They also help parents navigate the

## Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity

educational system while connecting them with community resources. Many mentors also interface with students and teachers in the classroom and assist with on-site after-school activities, all of which are documented in field notes. Other students and graduate students are working at the school sites with the ENLACE families, documenting weak and strong links in the educational pipeline in our local setting in order to uncover social processes potentially useful to developing strategies and policy for strengthening the academic pipeline.

During the four years ENLACE has been operating, 110 undergraduates have been involved. All of them who were seniors successfully graduated from the university, and most have gone on to either secure a teaching credential and/or pursue graduate study. UC Santa Barbara feels this program is a successful retention strategy but, most importantly, it enhances the pool of underrepresented students who will continue on to teacher education and other graduate and professional programs. Given that the Kellogg funding is now ending, the next challenge is to integrate this work into the regular curriculum.

### Response

#### *Jennifer Lilla, UC San Francisco*

My goal is to articulate some of the feelings that I share with other UC students and those in the audience today. There are a host of questions still evolving as the presentations are made. First, what is the goal of civic engagement? Is it to convince the public that the university is “good”? Is it to train students to be active citizens? Is it to use the university to be an agent of social change? Or is it to change conditions so that time spent in the community is no longer inversely proportional to academic achievement? Is it to integrate or harness what students are already doing? Or is it to encourage students who are not already involved to be actively engaged?

When the data was shown earlier that demonstrated that those from higher-income families tend to be less involved, many students simply nodded because we see it all around us. Many people who come from those backgrounds simply aren’t engaged. They are not as aware of the day-to-day realities that the rest of us face, although there are those who are aware of the privileges they have had and who know what the lack of quality education has done to a whole cohort of their peers.

If the university wishes to enter into a partnership with students, we have already advocated for outreach funding for student-initiated projects. If the goal is to dissolve the bubble that keeps the reality of community life at bay, the reality is that today’s students are much more tied to the outside world through work and family concerns and demands. Their community involvement is dictated to them; in light of the socio-economic realities they contend with, it is not a choice. Students see education as an opportunity to change the status quo. If they come from underprivileged backgrounds, they feel very strongly that they are here not just as individuals, but also as representatives of their communities. They are not looking to use their education as a platform to jump into a higher income, but as something they can bring back to the community and use to change the status quo.

Traditionally, academic achievement has been seen as a selfish goal; there has been very little reward for doing anything outside of the classroom or laboratory. Advocacy work as a student leader is not rewarded. There is an assumption that there will be time for leadership after a degree is earned. Many of us, however, want to feel connected to a larger community throughout our educational experience.

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

If we are going to move toward a scholarship of engagement, then faculty are not the only ones who need to be valued and rewarded for that effort. That's not possible unless the external pressures, like the high cost of education, are removed. Students who are already working 10, 15, or 20 hours a week still want to be involved, and that should be rewarded.

None of this can happen unless there is a significant cultural change. The culture needs to not just reward but also embrace the ways students are engaged outside as well as in the classroom.

**Response*****Cliff Brunk, UCLA***

As a professor of biology at UCLA for 40 years, I teach general education courses as well as cell and molecular biology. I have not been as successful in integrating civic involvement as one of my colleagues has. In the late 1970s, Dr. Roger Bohman took over two general education courses with huge enrollments, one on cancer and the other on AIDS. We estimate that he has taught 50,000 students in the last two decades. He is an example of integrating civic involvement from the bottom up.

These courses primarily teach the biology of the diseases to non-majors. Early on, my colleague would invite HIV-positive individuals into the class. But when the class has 400 students, this still keeps the students fairly distant from the experience. So he developed a community service component that requires each student to spend six hours in the field. A number of non-profit organizations have lined up to have his students participate in their activities.

One example is Project Angel Food. Students spend a full day preparing food and delivering it to homebound AIDS victims. Six hours does not do a lot to build empathy by itself. Students learn the biology of the disease in class, so this is the hook that gets them interested. The civic engagement that brings them in contact with real people, ministering to them in a very real if limited way, then gives the students a much more meaningful experience than they would have had in the classroom alone.

This is an example of one individual incorporating civic engagement in his course, a bottoms-up approach rather than the systemic approach we have been talking about today. It is tremendously advantageous for students, and demonstrates the value of having the educational process more fully involve the community, as well as the classroom.

## Closing Remarks

### ***Kathy Komar, UCLA***

One striking aspect of these discussions is the range of directions from which the civic engagement agenda is coming: colleagues, students, administrators. The university in recent years has been in danger of moving further and further away from the perception of it as a public institution. This is an opportunity to say that we are a public institution in the best possible way – by engaging the many capacities that we have on campus for the benefit of the community.

**Kathy Komar** is Professor of Comparative Literature at UC Los Angeles, where she won the Distinguished Teaching Award in 1989. She was elected Chair of the Academic Senate at UCLA for 2004-05, and was elected President of the American Comparative Literature Association for the 2005-07 term. She has published on a variety of topics in American and German literature from Romanticism to the present.

We need to determine what those capacities are, with the help of input from both the community and students. One thing that is clear is that we have a lot of capacity that we are not using optimally. Many of the people here today are already engaged in this type of work, but we need to figure out ways to get more faculty and administrators involved. One of the first things that could be done is to have the Academic Senate sponsor an event that would highlight the community work already going on and share the successes with others.

Once people are more aware of what is already going on and the opportunities, the next step would be to find ways – in these budget-constrained times – to help them shape programs. We need to find resources to coordinate these efforts so that faculty do not have the added burden of administering an infrastructure that can connect this initiative with the community.

At UC Santa Cruz, the Academic Senate there is putting together a yearlong, universitywide issues course to engage students involved in campus organizations in a discussion of ways the university can help solve real-world problems. They are creating a structured space that is flexible and that allows students to work on issues alongside the faculty and administration. This is fantastic, and we need to find more ways to partner not only with communities but also with student-initiated efforts.

At UCLA, the chancellor has had a task force on experiential learning and community service. One result has been the recognition that there is research in this area – literature, best practices, and a history – that can be examined. These can guide how we infuse this into the curriculum, what professional development is needed, what an institutional framework should look like, and what academic standards need to be created.

There are distinctions between the terms that have been used today, and those need to be looked at. We need to have a common definition because there are critical differences between many of the terms. For example, community service doesn't generally involve an educational objective, while service-learning specifically does. If we are going to talk about curricular changes, then it is better to focus on service-learning.

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity**

One of the things that is energizing about this discussion is that this is something that we can embark on together – students, faculty, and the administration – that would make people feel less helpless in the face of the many challenges we are facing today. We can bring our expertise into the community and make a difference in areas that are among the most diverse and difficult in the nation. We can all work together to continue the momentum from today's presentations.



## Appendix A

**All-UC Symposium  
Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity:  
Institutional Trends and Initiatives at the University of California**

---

**Townsend Center, UC Berkeley  
Friday, June 10, 2005**

---

### ***Symposium Steering Committee***

Co-Chair: Jodi Anderson, UCLA Student and UC Regent  
Co-Chair: John Douglass, Senior Research Fellow, CSHE, UC Berkeley  
Cliff Brunk, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President, Student Academic Services, UCOP  
Julius Zelmanowitz, UCOP Office of Academic Initiatives

### ***List of Participants***

#### **UC Berkeley**

Alice Agogino, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Maryanne Berry, Student  
Robert Birgeneau, Chancellor  
Kyra Caspary, Office of Student Research  
Fred Collignon, Professor/Chair of the Faculty, Service-Learning Committee  
Patricia Cross, Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Education  
Barbara Davis, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education  
Colin Delmore, Graduate Student  
John Douglass, Senior Research Fellow, Center for Studies in Higher Education  
Andrew Furco, Director/Assistant Adjunct Professor, Service-Learning Research  
Saul Geiser, Research Associate, Center for Studies in Higher Education  
Tessa Graham, Student  
I. Michael Heyman, Chancellor Emeritus, UCB; and Professor Emeritus, Law  
Robert Holub, Dean, Undergraduate Division  
Caroline Kane, Chair, Academic Preparation and Development Committee  
C. Judson King, Director, Center for Studies in Higher Education  
Robert Knapp, Chair, Academic Senate  
Monica Lopez, School of Social Welfare  
Christina Maslach, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Affairs  
Meredith Minkler, Professor, School of Public Health  
Genaro Padilla, Vice Chancellor, Undergraduate Affairs  
David Stern, Professor, Graduate School of Education  
Gregg Thomson, Director, Office of Student Research  
Megan Voorhees, Director, Cal Corps Public Service Center

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity****UC Davis**

Joseph Kiskis, Professor, Physics  
 Daniel Simmons, Chair, Academic Senate  
 Fred Wood, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Studies

**UC Irvine**

Kenneth Janda, Chair-elect, Academic Senate  
 Carlos Feliciano, Student  
 Julia Lupton, Professor, English and Comparative Literature

**UC Los Angeles**

Jodi Anderson, Student, UC Regent  
 Alexander Astin, Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies  
 Helen Astin, Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies  
 Kathy O'Byrne, Director, Center for Community Learning  
 Leo Estrada, Professor, Urban Planning  
 Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr., Associate Vice Chancellor, Community Partnerships  
 Kathleen Komar, Chair, Academic Senate  
 Margaret Leal-Sotelo, Assistant Director, Center for Community Partnerships  
 Maria Ledesma, Student, Regent Designate  
 Reynoldo Macias, Professor, Chicano Studies  
 Lori Vogelgesang, Researcher, Higher Education Research Institute

**UC Merced**

Valerie Leppert, Director of Engineering Service-Learning, Associate Professor, School of Engineering  
 Jeff Wright, Dean, School of Engineering  
 Crystal Wuebker, Student

**UC Riverside**

Andrew Grosovsky, Professor, Cell Biology and Neuroscience  
 Manuela Martins-Green, Chair, Academic Senate  
 Yolanda Moses, Special Assistant, Office of the Chancellor, Excellence and Diversity

**UC San Diego**

Mark Appelbaum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Undergraduate Education  
 Amy Binder, Professor, Sociology  
 Ross Frank, Associate Professor, Ethnic Studies  
 April Linton, Assistant Professor, Sociology  
 Keith Pezzoli, Lecturer, Urban Studies and Planning  
 Michael Schudson, Professor, Communication  
 Chris Sweeten, Student  
 Gabriele Wienhausen, Provost, Sixth College

**UC San Francisco**

Jennifer Lilla, President, UC Student Association  
 Naomi Wortis, Director of Community Programs, Assistant Clinical Professor, Community Medicine

**Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity****UC Santa Barbara**

Michael T. Brown, Professor, Education  
Richard Duran, Professor, Education  
Richard Flacks, Professor, Sociology  
Denise Segura, Professor, Sociology

**UC Santa Cruz**

William Ladusaw, Professor, Linguistics  
Mary Beth Pudup, Professor, Community Studies  
Nicole Teutschel, Student Coordinator  
Larry Trujillo, Director, Community Studies  
Matt Waxman, Student  
Patricia Zavella, Professor, Latin American and Latino Studies

**UCOP**

Clifford Brunk, Vice Chair, UC Academic Senate  
Robert Dynes, President  
Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President, Student Academic Services  
M.R.C. Greenwood, Senior Vice President & Provost  
Clint Haden, Director, Student Affairs and Services  
Linda Williams, Associate President  
Linda Goff, Executive Faculty Assistant to the Provost

**Others**

Barbara Holland, Director, National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (NSLC)  
Elaine Ikeda, Executive Director, California Campus Compact  
Tom Ehrlich, Senior Scholar, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching  
Rogéair Purnell, Program Officer, The James Irvine Foundation  
Craig Hayward, Mendocino Community College