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TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1997

7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Breakfast
Lobby Outside
Ballroom West - Hotel

"Coffee Talk" with Jody Kretzmann (optional)

9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Team Time
See List Below
Butler University
Calvin College
IUPUI (Service Learning/Voluntary Services)
IUPUI (Education/Nursing/Social Work)
Millikin University
Purdue University West Lafayette
Purdue University North Central
Rockford College
Valparaiso University

Suggested Team Task:
- Begin to Quantify Objectives (Planning Step #2)

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. Interactive Workshop
on Institutional Change
Ballroom West - Hotel
• Barbara Walvoord, Director, Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning
  University of Notre Dame

* Following this workshop, schedule times with consultants

1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Team Time (Pick up Box Lunch)
See 9:00 a.m. list
Suggested Team Tasks
- Complete Objectives (Planning Step #2)
- Analyze internal and external factors affecting the task (Planning Step #3)
- Determine Available Resources (Planning Step #4)
- Scheduled Time with Consultants
- Identify Critical Issue to be discussed at next session

Continuous Break Service Available in Conference Center and outside Ballroom

4:00 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. Sharing/Troubleshooting of Critical Issues
Ballroom West - Hotel

5:30 p.m.
Dinner on your own
Free Time/Team Time/Entertainment
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1997

7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.  Breakfast  
Lobby Outside  
Ballroom West - Hotel

Resource People Meeting  
Ballroom West - Hotel

9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.  Team Time  
See Tuesday 9 a.m. list

Suggest Team Task:
• Begin to identify and consider alternative approaches (Planning Step #5)
• Choose methods and develop tasks, with responsibilities and deadlines (Planning Step #6)
• Begin to develop an evaluation plan (Planning Step #7)
• Prepare 10 minute presentation

11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.  Lunch and Sharing of Resources  
Presidents Room - Hotel

12:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.  Team Presentations using Tuning Protocols  Ballroom West - Hotel
(10-15 minute presentations with protocol for feedback and development.)

2:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.  Evaluation of Institute and Closing  Ballroom West - Hotel

3:00 p.m.  Departure
AGENDA

UNIVERSITIES AS CITIZENS
SUMMER PLANNING INSTITUTE
June 16 - 18, 1997

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1997

10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. UAC Registration and Hotel Check-in

12:00 p.m. - 12:45 p.m. Lunch
Welcome Address by William Plater, Dean of the Faculties
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

12:45 p.m. - 1:00 p.m. Adjourn to first workshop

1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. Interactive Workshop on Assessment
Amy Driscoll, Director, Community/University Partnerships,
Portland State University

3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m. Break

3:15 p.m. - 5:15 p.m. Institute Overview/Team Introduction

5:15 p.m. - 6:00 p.m. Break (Check into hotel)

6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m. Dinner by Affinity Group
Bistro Lobby
(Second Floor Hotel Lobby)

7:00 p.m. - 7:45 p.m. Keynote Speaker
John "Jody" Kretzmann
Asset-Based Community Development Institute
Northwestern University

7:45 p.m. - 8:15 p.m. Questions and Answers

8:15 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Team Meetings
Suggested Team Task:
• Outline plan of action for rest of team time
• Clarify the task (Planning Step #1)
INSTITUTE FACULTY BIOS

JOANN CAMPBELL
JoAnn Campbell is the Indiana University Community Service Associate at the Center on Philanthropy, where she coordinates the integration of community service and academic study on all eight campuses. She is a member of the Universities as Citizens project planning committee and has been actively involved in the planning and implementation of the Universities as Citizens colloquiums and Summer Planning Institute. JoAnn completed a master’s degree at Penn State and a doctorate at the University of Texas at Austin in English, with a specialization in rhetoric and composition. She taught undergraduates in the English Department at IU Bloomington before coming to the Center on Philanthropy last summer.

AMY DRISCOLL
Dr. Driscoll is Director of Community/University Partnerships at Portland State University where she supports faculty efforts to connect the academic content of their courses with community service. In that role, she works with faculty to extend their teaching repertoires, to try new instructional approaches, and to assess the impact on students and community. She is a Professor of Education and her text Universal Teaching Strategies is in its second edition and used all over the country. Her work on assessment has been published in the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning and the Journal of Public Service & Outreach, and presented at AAHE and discipline related conferences. Dr. Driscoll will present a two hour interactive workshop on the assessment of campus/community projects.

KATE GILL KRESSLEY
Kate Gill Kressley directs the Civic Engagement Project through Marian College’s Office of Mission Effectiveness. This effort, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, attempts to integrate theory and practices of effective citizenship with Marian College’s deep institutional tradition of mentoring and service. This project is exploring how young people are, or could be, engaged in public work with adult citizens as partners and how those ways contribute to overall youth, civic and community development. Kate has worked in Indiana and nationally in areas of parent/school/community partnerships, civic engagement and public work, leadership development, strategic planning, collaboration and systems change, and evaluation. She has worked in higher education and in state and local education and not-for-profit organizations for over 25 years.
JO ANN INTILI

Dr. Jo Ann K. Intili has provided training and technical assistance since 1981, when she designed and delivered a variety of workshops targeted for middle managers and office staff in both non-profit and private organizations. More recently, as a part of Project STAR, Dr. Intili has been providing training and technical assistance in evaluation to Learn and Service programs and Senior Corps Program Directors. In addition to this work, she has specialized in research design and evaluation. As part of this emphasis, in the period from 1985 through the present, she has worked with California’s Department of Education on the need for and capacity available to address adult education needs. She has evaluated the impact of workplace and family literacy on the clients they served. She has worked on assessing needs for legal and other services in Florida, Texas, and California. She has a Ph.D. from Stanford University.

JOYCE JOHNSTONE

Joyce Johnstone is chair of the Education Department at Marian College, a post she has held for eighteen years. She has been active in teacher education issues, serving as state president of the Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education for two terms, and president of the Indiana Association of Teacher Educators for one term. She has also served on numerous committees and task forces at the national and state level. She serves as a member of the Board of Examiners for the Indiana Professional Standards Board. Her interest in parent engagement have led to several grants and projects in this area, and she has led efforts at her college to integrate service learning into the curriculum, especially around the theme of understanding the role of parents. She was an Indiana Campus Compact Faculty Fellow during the 1995-96 year and is a member of the Indiana Campus Compact Advisory Board.

JOHN (JODY) KRETZMANN

Dr. Kretzmann is Co-Director, with John McKnight, of the Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) Institute. He also is the co-author of Building Communities From the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community’s Assets. Dr. Kretzmann has worked to develop community oriented public policy at the national, state, and local levels. In Chicago, he served as chair of the Neighborhood Planning Committee for Mayor Harold Washington, and was an active policy consultant through Washington’s four and a half years in office. He serves on a wide range of civic and community boards, and as a trustee of the Wieboldt Foundation. Dr. Kretzmann will speak on issues related to supporting community-based efforts to rediscover local capacities and to mobilize citizens’ resources to solve problems.

CATHERINE LUDLUM

Cathy Ludlum is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Indiana University East where she incorporates service learning into three of her courses. Cathy was a member of the first class of Indiana Campus Compact Faculty Fellows and went on to serve as the Senior Fellow during the 1996-97 school year. She is one of four partners involved in a successful Service Learning Coordinator project that links two colleges and two community based organizations in Richmond, Indiana in an effort to enhance service learning. In addition, Cathy serves on the Executive Committee of Indiana Campus Compact’s Advisory Board and recently completed a year tenure as the Coordinator of IU East’s Office of Service Learning -- an office which she helped to found. Cathy received her Ph.D. in Philosophy from Northwestern University.

THERESA LUDWIG

Theresa Ludwig has served as the Service Learning Director at Earlham College for the past five years. During her tenure at Earlham, the program has developed to include several new service initiatives. In her role as director, she serves as advisor to student initiated service efforts and works collaboratively with the student staff to match students and their interests and skills to the needs of the community. She works proactively with nonprofit organizations and schools to develop service learning placements and with faculty members to integrate service learning into the curriculum. She also directs the Bonner Scholars Program, a four year community service scholarship and serves as a member to the Indiana Campus Compact Advisory Board. Theresa also is actively involved in several local community organizations as a board member and volunteer. She has a BS in Communication and Psychology from the University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point and is pursuing her MA in Philanthropic Studies at Indiana University.
RANDALL OSBORNE

Randall Osborne received his undergraduate degree in psychology from Indiana University in Bloomington in 1985. He received his Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the University of Texas at Austin in December 1989. Randall's areas of research include the self-concept and self-esteem development and enhancement, factors that promote recovery from biased first impressions, and the relationship between personality variables and social information processing. Randall has written a textbook titled Self: An Eclectic Approach that has just been published by Allyn & Bacon. Randall is interested in building partnerships between the campus and the community and has developed several service learning based courses at the IU East campus. Randall is currently an Indiana Campus Compact Faculty Fellow and is finishing a two year term as President of the Mental Health Association in Wayne County.

LISA MCGETTIGAN CHAMBERS

Lisa McGettigan Chambers is the Director of the Michigan Campus Compact (MCC) which is based in East Lansing, Michigan. Lisa received her BS in Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. She earned a Masters degree in Educational Psychology with a College Student Development emphasis at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in Lincoln, Nebraska. Before coming to MCC, Lisa worked at Kent State University as the coordinator for leadership development in the Student Activities Office. While writing her masters thesis on the evaluation of an Emerging Leader Class, that she helped to create and teach Lisa began to make the connection of service learning to student leadership development. This interest continued and expanded as she worked with student leaders at Kent State and St. Norbert College. Lisa is interested in service as it relates both within and outside the classroom to students' growth and development.

NANCY HARTMAN SCOTT

Nancy Hartman Scott is Director of Mentoring & Service Learning at Marian College in Indianapolis. She works with faculty, staff, and students to promote service learning through workshops, grants, and course revisions. Nancy has a background working in community-based organizations and is particularly interested in promoting symbiotic relationships between the academy and the community-based organization. She has organized comprehensive introductory workshops for faculty interested in integrating service learning into their courses. These workshops are open to community representatives interested in finding out more about the academic side of service learning. Nancy has Specialist and Master’s degrees in Education.

SHAWN SWEENEY

Shawn Sweeney is currently the Executive Director of Illinois Campus Compact for Community Service. Shawn also has served as a Team Leader with AmeriCorps*National Civilian Community Corps in Maryland, and as both a VISTA volunteer and Special Projects Coordinator with the Pennsylvania Institute for Environmental and Community Service Learning in Pennsylvania. She has coordinated, and presented at various service and education related conferences and workshops in Illinois, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Massachusetts, and New York, as well as participating in an environmental service learning project in Novgorod, Russia. Shawn brings her experience as a participant and coordinator of service programs at the K-12, Higher Education and Corps level.

AUDREY TODD

Before assuming her responsibilities as the Executive Assistant to the President of Manchester College, Dr. Audrey Todd was Assistant Dean of Student Development and Director of Multicultural Affairs. In addition she maintains a role as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology. Dr. Todd earned her B.A. degree in Psychology from the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, VA in 1985 and her Ph.D. in 1992 from Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS. Her dissertation was titled An Assessment of African American Student’s Perceptions of Factors that Foster or Impede Their Academic Progress on a Predominately White Campus. This was a comprehensive examination of African American students’ perception of their experiences and selected aspects of the campus environment at a predominantly white land-grant institution. Audrey is a member of the Indiana Campus Compact Advisory Board.
BARBARA WALVOORD

Dr. Walvoord is the Director of The Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Notre Dame. She also is a Concurrent Professor of English. Dr. Walvoord has been the Director of five faculty development programs, each of which received national awards and/or recognition. Dr. Walvoord’s recent publications include *In the Long Run: A Study of Faculty in Three Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Programs* (1997) and the award-winning video, *Making Large Classes Interactive* (1995). Dr. Walvoord will present a three hour interactive workshop on institutional change and community engagement.

PETER YOUNG

Peter Young received a bachelor’s degree from Central Michigan University in 1993 with a major in Interpersonal and Public Communication and a minor in social Work and a master’s degree in Student Personnel Administration in Higher Education from Ball State University in 1995. Currently, working as the associate director of Leadership and Service Programs at Ball State, Peter is responsible for advising Student Voluntary Services, recruiting and working with local community service agencies for service program development and collaborating with academic departments to implement service learning components in the curriculum. Peter serves as the chairperson of the Indiana Campus Compact Executive Committee of the Advisory Board, a member of the Delaware County Coalition of Human Services and the Points of Light Foundation. He co-founded the east central Indiana Association for Volunteer Administration. Peter serves as a member of Delaware County Big Brothers-Big Sisters board of directors.
Universities as Citizens  
Summer Planning Institute  
Team Abstracts  

Butler University  
Indianapolis, IN  
The key issues that our team will address during the Institute are central to our mission and continued growth in the areas of community-based learning and citizenship in today’s society: (1) We will first grapple with what the term “scholarship of engagement” could mean within our campus culture; (2) We will develop a practical and assessable plan of action for future development of our emerging Center for Citizenship and Community as it relates to student, faculty and staff involvement in the “scholarship of engagement;” (3) We will chart milestones that have already been made in this area e.g. extending the community-based learning components of our curriculum and the Center for Citizenship and Community Lectures Series; (4) We will build upon the current campus culture to develop a new aspect of an existing course and/or an entirely new course that will engage students and faculty in a new type of learning environment based within the community.

Calvin College  
Grand Rapids, MI  
Calvin College provides strong institutional support through its Service-Learning Center for more than 1000 students, 30 courses and 75 community organizations involved in service learning each semester. However, it does not have an institutional plan for partnering with the local community for community development. The focus of the Calvin team is to develop a plan for creating consensus for a campus wide vision for community partnership. This will include dialogue with community-based organizations, building “grass-roots” support among students and faculty and incorporating this vision within Calvin’s five-year strategic plan.

IUPUI Schools of Education, Nursing, and Social Work  
Indianapolis, IN  
IUPUI Schools of Education, Nursing, and Social Work have come together to form a partnership with public schools in the UNWA neighborhood. The purpose of this partnership is to build the infrastructure for interprofessional collaboration among the Schools, and to link teaching/research/service activities with the expressed needs of the UNWA community and its five IPS schools. One of the proposed outcomes of this project is service learning activities for students in the three schools. These service learning activities will support the model of full service schools.

IUPUI Office of Service Learning  
Indianapolis, IN  
The IUPUI team will address how we can improve the quality and quantity of existing programs within the Office of Service Learning and the Office of Student Voluntary Community Service, add new programs to their portfolios, and develop an agenda for the proposed Center for Public Service and Leadership that will focus on improving community connections and integrating community engagement within teaching, research, and service activities.
Millikin University  Decatur, IL

The key issues for this planning institute center around setting standards and outcomes for implementing, and methods for evaluating service learning integrated into the academic focus of all 26 sections of the new introductory University Seminar and into the co-curricular focus of the 3-5 day “First Week” orientation preceding the beginning of classes for all 520 incoming first year students. One year goals include the Summer 1997 planning, the Fall 1997 implementation and the Spring 1998 evaluation and revision of service learning in University Seminar and First Week.

Purdue University North Central  Westville, IN

The Purdue University North Central Campus Compact team will use the opportunities presented by the Summer Planning Institute to establish the foundations on which to construct a viable, efficient program of campus and community engagement. Our first and primary task will be to establish an infrastructure of personnel, offices, and tasks with which to organize and facilitate the variety of efforts associated with the Universities as Citizens concept. The Summer Institute presents our university with a unique and welcome opportunity to establish mechanisms of coordination and creation with which to enhance our interaction with the surrounding communities.

Purdue University  West Lafayette, IN

A team representing several key groups on campus will formulate a plan for a cross-disciplinary “Committee for Citizenship Education through Service Learning and Community Engagement” (CCESLCE) and prepare guidelines for such a committee. The CCESLCE, modeled on the successful Committee for the Education of Teaching Assistants, will explore and move forward the institutionalization of a scholarship of engagement at large, research-oriented universities such as Purdue - by raising awareness, pooling information and ideas, and by benchmarking. This indirect and gradualist approach to furthering the scholarship of engagement should be very acceptable at Purdue University, and offers the best path to long-term success.

Rockford College  Rockford, IL

Rockford College will support a program designed to establish more explicitly the spirit of service on our campus by creating special community-based learning activities for all in-coming freshmen by increasing the number of community-based learning opportunities for students throughout our academic programs and by strengthening our collaboration with community organizations. More specifically, we hope to acquire the tools needed to: 1) Develop improved methods of assessment for our current community-based learning program; 2) Revise our current community-based learning sequence for freshman; 3) Develop an action plan for our Community-based Learning Advisory Board.

Our proposal outlines the key issues we would address to strengthen our pursuit of continuing the development of community-based learning at Rockford College.

Valparaiso University  Valparaiso, IN

Valparaiso University’s commitment to service learning is manifest in administrative support, faculty leadership, involvement in Indiana Campus Compact, and continual growth in initiatives on campus including a major University-wide workshop being planned for May which aims at expanding curricular offerings and integrating existing student volunteer activities with course offerings. We wish to participate in the Universities as Citizens Institute to assess our progress on the action plan devised a year ago and to develop strategies to: a) institutionalize service learning; b) encourage faculty research using service learning; and c) expand service learning opportunities for students.
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Participant List

Mark Adler
Student
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Butler University
4600 Sunset Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46040
(P) 1-800-368-6852
madler@butler.edu

Marilyn Asteriadi
Associate Professor of Nursing
Purdue University North Central
LSF 66A
Westville, IN 46391
(P) 219-785-5246
(F) 219-785-5495
mja@purduenc.edu

George Averitt
Community Representative &
Guest Lecturer
Purdue University North Central
Tech 186
Westville, IN 46391
(P) 19-785-5263
(F) 19-785-5528

Richard Balkema
Professor of Political Science
Valparaiso University
Huegli 306
Valparaiso, IN 46383
(P) 219-464-5262
(F) 219-464-5311
rbalkema@exodus.valpo.edu

Julie Beggs
Assistant Director of Campus
Activities/Coordinator of
Volunteerism & Service Learning
Butler University
4600 Sunset Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46040
(P) 1-800-368-6852
beggs@butler.edu

Anne Belcher
Assistant Professor
IUPUI
School of Nursing
1111 Middle Drive
#1465
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(P) 317-274-750
(F) 317-274-1378
abelcher@wpo.iupui.edu

Mac Bellner
Project Associate
Indiana Campus Compact
c/o University Place Conference
Center
850 W. Michigan, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(P) 317-274-6500
(F) 317-274-6510
mbellner@iupui.edu

Rhonda Berg
Director, Service Learning Center
Calvin College
3201 Burton Street SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
(P) 616-957-6271
(F) 616-957-8551
berg@calvin.edu

Claudia Beversluis
Acting Dean
Calvin College
Department of Psychology
3201 Burton Street SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
(P) 616-957-6271
(F) 616-957-8551
cbeversl@calvin.edu

Mike Boyer
Director of the YMCA
YMCA
200 Y Blvd.
Rockford, IL 61104
(P) 815-987-2252

Nancy Bragg
Director of Service Learning
Millikin University
118 W. Main
Decatur, IL 62522
(P) 217-362-6463
(F) 217-362-6407
nbragg@mail.millikin.edu

Robert Bringle
Professor of Psychology & Director of
the Office of Service Learning
IUPUI
402 North Blackford Street
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(P) 317-274-6753
(F) 317-274-6947
rbringle@iupui.edu

Rufus Cadigan
Faculty Coordinator for Community-
Based Learning
Rockford College
5050 East State Street
Rockford, IL 61108
(P) 815-226-4108
(F) 815-226-4119

JoAnn Campbell
Community Service Associate
IUPUI
Center on Philanthropy
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(P) 317-227-4200
(F) 317-684-8900
jocampbe@indiana.edu

Patricia Carlisle
Director of Student Support Services
Purdue University North Central
LSF 104B
Westville, IN 46391
(P) 219-783-5312
(F) 219-783-5544
pac@purduenc.edu

Robert Chalmers
Associate Dean for Professional
Programs
Purdue University
Pharmacy Practice
RHPH
West Lafayette, IN 47906
(P) 765-494-1382
(F) 765-494-7880
chalmers@pharmacy.purdue.edu

Paul Contino
Associate Professor of Humanities in
Christ College
Valparaiso University
Mueller 120
Valparaiso, IN 46383
(P) 219-464-5023
(F) 219-464-5159
pcontino@exodus.valpo.edu

Gayle Cox
Professor
IUPUI
School of Social Work
902 W. New York St., ES 4138
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(P) 317-274-6709
(F) 317-274-8630
Kendall Lankford  
Associate Director  
Indiana Campus Compact  
University Place Conference Center  
300 W. Michigan, Suite 200  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
(P) 317-274-6500  
(F) 317-274-6510  
klankfor@iupui.edu

Kate Laskowitz  
Associate Professor  
Organizational Leadership and Supervision  
Purdue University  
KNOY  
West Lafayette, IN 47907  
(P) 765-494-5615  
(F) 765-496-2519  
klassowitz@tech.purdue.edu

Greg Lindsey  
Professor  
IUPUI  
School of Public & Environmental Affairs  
BS 4068  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
(P) 317-274-8704  
(F) 317-274-5153  
glindsey@speanet.iupui.edu

Michelle Loyd-Paige  
Professor  
Calvin College  
Department Sociology & Social Work  
3201 Burton Street SE  
Grand Rapids, MI 49546  
(P) 616-957-6239  
(F) 616-957-8551  
lopa@calvin.edu

Gary Lubbert  
Assistant Professor of Business  
Rockford College  
5050 East State Street  
Rockford, IL 61108  
(P) 815-226-4093  
(F) 815-226-4119

Theresa Ludwig  
Director, Service Learning Program  
Earlham College  
National Road West  
Richmond, IN 47374  
(P) 765-983-1317  
(F) 765-983-1234  
thwite@earlham.edu

Lisa McGettigan  
Director  
Michigan Campus Compact  
Michigan State University  
29 Kellogg Center  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1022  
(P) 517-353-9393  
(F) 517-355-3302  
mcc1989@aol.com

Anna Melodia  
Vice Chancellor Undergraduate Education  
IUPUI  
Administration Bldg. 112B  
Indianapolis, IN 46202  
(P) 317-274-8990  
(F) 317-274-4016  
melodia@iupui.edu

Kathleen Mullen  
Professor of English  
Valparaiso University  
Huegli Hall 324  
Valparaiso, IN 46383  
(P) 219-464-5247  
(F) 219-464-5511  
kmullen@exodus.valpo.edu

Ray O’Connor  
Assistant Professor of Psychology  
Valparaiso University  
Dickmeyer Hall 218  
Valparaiso, IN 46383  
(P) 219-464-5497  
(F) 219-464-6878  
orocnnon@exodus.valpo.edu

Rose Olson  
Graduate Research Assistant  
Purdue University  
Pharmacy Practice  
RHSPH  
West Lafayette, IN 47907  
(P) 765-496-2908  
(F) 765-496-0802  
orolsonmo@pharmacy.purdue.edu

John Pomery  
Professor of Economics  
Purdue University  
1310 Kranert Bldg.  
West Lafayette, IN 47907  
(P) 765-494-4515  
(F) 765-496-1778  
pomeryj@mgmt.purdue.edu

Charles Pressler  
Professor  
Purdue University North Central  
Schwartz 201  
Hwy, 421  
Westville, IN 46391  
(P) 219-785-5474  
(F) 219-785-5526  
chuckp@purduecc.edu

Minetta Richardson  
Principal  
Elder Watson Diggs Elementary School  
1002 W. 25th Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46208  
(P) 317-226-4242

Steve Roberson  
Associate Dean  
Butler University  
Jordan College of Fine Arts  
4600 Sunset Avenue  
Indianapolis, IN 46208  
(P) 1-800-368-6852  
roberston@butler.edu

Linda Rowden  
Project Coordinator/Partners in Education  
Millikin University  
1184 W. Main  
Decatur, IL 62522  
(P) 217-424-6251  
(F) 217-362-6407  
piedned@aol.com

Linda Schinke-Llano  
Director of University Teaching & Learning Programs  
Millikin University  
1184 W. Main  
Decatur, IL 62522  
(P) 217-424-6251  
(F) 217-362-6407  
lillano@mail.millikin.edu

Nancy Scott  
Director of Mentoring & Service Learning  
Marian College  
3200 Cold Spring Road  
Indianapolis, IN 46222  
(P) 317-955-6131  
(F) 317-955-6448  
nscott@marian.edu
TUNING PROTOCOL

A Tuning Protocol is a formalized way to get feedback on work in progress. As with music, this is a rehearsal where the tuning of the "instrument" is vital to the quality of the "music".

The Process:

1. **Groups Formed**

   Three groups are formed comprised of three Universities as Citizens campus teams. The Resource Person assigned to each team will serve as the facilitator for that team's Tuning Protocol. The Resource Person is responsible for time-keeping and making sure that feedback is directly related to the work at hand.

2. **Presentation** *(10 minutes)*

   The first team has 10 minutes to present their work in progress to the other two teams of "Tuners". No interruptions or questions are allowed, just listening and note taking by the Tuners. Presenters may ask for specific feedback or may leave it open.

3. **Clarifying Questions** *(3 minutes max.)*

   The Tuners may ask clarifying questions after the presentation, but no discussion is allowed.

4. **Warm Feedback** *(5 minutes max.)*

   Tuners share positive reactions to the presentation. Presenters may only listen and take notes while Tuners talk.

5. **Cool Feedback** *(5 minutes max.)*

   Tuners ask questions to clarify confusion, gaps, concerns, etc. Presenters may only listen and take notes while Tuners talk.

6. **Presenters Response** *(5 minutes max.)*

   Presenters respond to those comments and questions which they choose to respond to. Tuners are silent.

7. **Debriefing** *(3 minutes max.)*

   Anyone can talk about the process of tuning the presentation. What frustrations or positive reactions were experienced?

8. **Continuation of Process for Next Teams** *(30 minutes each)*

9. **Final Debriefing** *(5 minutes max.)*
TYPICAL PLANNING STEPS

1. **Define the task** -- specify what is to be accomplished and by when; a problem to be solved, a project or task to be organized, etc.

2. **Quantify objectives** -- specify measurable outcomes, and criteria by which success will be measured.

3. **Analyze internal and external factors affecting the task** -- organizational strengths and weaknesses; available capacity; community resources and support; other "environmental" factors; resources.

4. **Determine available resources** -- members, staff, community residents, other volunteers, funds, equipment and supplies.

5. **Identify and consider alternative approaches** -- various ways in which the task might be completed.

6. **Choose methods and develop task, with responsibilities and deadlines** -- what are the steps, who is responsible, and by what date must each be completed.

7. **Develop an evaluation plan** -- determine how progress will be monitored and results evaluated.

SOURCE: From *Starting Strong: A Guide to Pre-Service Training* by MOSAICA for AmeriCorps
FACTORS THAT AFFECT PLANNING

Parameters for the task:

- Objectives -- desired results
- Deadline
- Resources available (people, money, equipment, and materials)
- Required processes or methods

The external environment:

- Community resources and support
- Socioeconomic factors
- "Political" climate
- Relationships with other organizations

The internal environment:

- Organizational capacity and skills
- Organizational weaknesses

SOURCE: From Starting Strong: A Guide to Pre-Service Training by MOSAICA for AmeriCorps
ACTION PLAN
SAMPLE OUTLINE

I. Introduction/Summary
II. Advisory Committee Member List
III. Rationale (Tie to mission of campus)
IV. Timeline
V. Goals/Objectives (see below)
VI. Responsible Agent

Most action plans include some of the elements in their goals and objectives section:

- Program evaluation
- Faculty development
- Curricular development
- Resource development
- Analysis of potential obstacles
- Target community agencies/issues
- Student constituencies
- Community service links on campus (liaison office)
DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN

SOME GUIDING QUESTIONS

Over the past several years, Campus Compact has held national and regional planning institutes for campuses interested in integrating service learning into the curriculum. A requirement of these institutes was the preparation and submission of action plans. Lessons learned in developing these action plans were used to generate the following set of critical questions. These questions can be used to help guide your planning efforts.

**Mission of institution/other commitment**
- What is the mission of the institution and how does our work align with it?
- Is there an opportunity to strengthen responsiveness to the mission or remedy an imbalance?
- Has the President made statements in this regard?
- What is the political climate?
- In terms of our campus, how can we explain our project so that definition issues do not hamper our gaining support for this project?
- How is what we are proposing different from what is now occurring or has occurred in the past but at the same time, is just what we need to do now -- an obvious next step to respond to many of the challenges we face?

**Reference groups**
- Who does our campus looks to for new ideas?
- Who is the competition?
- Are they ahead?
- Could we move out in front?

**State of Affairs**
- What is the current state of affairs regarding the activities that influence our project?
- Where are the strengths and weaknesses?
- Where is the money?
- Where does it come from?
- What is the first major step we need to take?

**Campus Communities and Constituencies**
- Who (in terms of individuals, offices, committees and task forces, etc.) are potential partners?
- Who may be eager to hear about our work?
  - Alumni
  - Public and community relations
  - Campus ministry
  - Faculty Development
  - Centers for Teaching and Learning
  - Multicultural and diversity initiatives
  - Administrative offices, such as purchasing and personnel, recreation, training and other resources in terms of community development
  - Others?
Campus Communities and Constituencies (continued)
- Given the different interests of these constituencies, how should our project be "pitched"?
- Can partners and supporters be enrolled from these areas on a task force or advisory group?
- Where would we like our efforts housed?
- What is a good launching pad?
- What are the implications of our 'launch' site?

Local Community and Constituencies
- Who are potential partners in our local community?
- Who may be eager to hear about our work?
  - Mayor's Office
  - Volunteer Network
  - United Way
  - Neighborhood Associations
  - Schools and Parent/Teacher Organizations
  - Others?
- What resources do these constituencies and others offer that are not available on campus?
- Given the different interests of these constituencies, how should our project be "pitched"?
- Can partners and supporters be enrolled from these areas on a task force or advisory group?

Engaging Key Stakeholders
- How can stakeholders be identified?
- What mechanisms will be used to get key stakeholders on board and to support them?
- Who are the leaders that might get involved?
- Who are likely torch-bearers?
- How do we keep everyone informed and on-board?
  - newsletters
  - regular meetings
  - home page
  - press releases in campus publications

Other Trends/Innovations
- What other innovations/topics are important on campus?
- How can we make the connection between these innovations and our project?

Resources
- What do we need to do our work?
- What are possible sources of fund?
Briefly restate the desired results and strategies (with revisions as needed):

Complete the following action implementation plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions to Be Taken</th>
<th>Who is Responsible</th>
<th>By When</th>
<th>With What Accountability</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions to Be Taken</th>
<th>Who is Responsible</th>
<th>By When</th>
<th>With What Accountability</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note what information will be shared with whom and who is responsible for doing so. Add this to the communications plan—Document 2D.

Total Cost:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>TIMETABLE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE/DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.A. Recruit Faculty Director</td>
<td>inform faculty about campus action plan</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>Director hired Feb. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>define tasks of faculty director</td>
<td>WP/JH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>Job description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negotiate with dean for terms of employment</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>create an application form &amp; process</td>
<td>WP/ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintain list of interested faculty</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to date mailing list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>announce appointment in campus paper</td>
<td>JH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B. Hire Assistant Director</td>
<td>define task of assistant director</td>
<td>WP/ET/KR/ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 1993</td>
<td>AD hired Nov. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publicize job in area newspaper</td>
<td>WP/NB</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>establish interview committee</td>
<td>ET/KR/ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negotiate terms of employment</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determine administrative support line</td>
<td>JH/ WP/BB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.A. Establish an Advisory Committee</td>
<td>invite participation from faculty</td>
<td>CCT</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identify community members</td>
<td>CCT</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identify 2 student members</td>
<td>JH/MW/CCT</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draft letter of interest</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draft letter of appointment</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

ACTION PLAN FOR
COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICE-LEARNING

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY
SPRING 1996

I. Introduction

This document proposes an action plan to expand and further integrate community-based service-learning into the academic curriculum of Valparaiso University.

A. Rationale
B. Timeline
C. Goals and Objectives for
   1. Local community organizations
   2. Students
   3. Teaching faculty and support staff
   4. Valparaiso University as an institution
D. Specific activities for these constituencies

II. Rationale

Valparaiso University has already taken significant steps toward integrating community-based service-learning into its curriculum:

A. Established an administrative base
B. Received state-funded incentive grants to develop courses
C. Established ongoing courses in two Colleges
D. Developed the International Service major
E. Supported faculty and staff in attending regional and national conferences
F. Placed in its Catalog notice of service-learning courses

But in order to meet its Mission Statement commitment: “To prepare students for service to the world and to the Church,” Valparaiso must expand and further integrate the community-based service-learning initiative into its curriculum.

III. Timeline

The projected timeline of this plan is five years, from Fall 1996 through Spring 2001.

IV. Goals

While significant institutional support for this plan is already in place, realizing a program of academic excellence and significant community service will require work toward these further goals:

A. Respond to the real needs of local agencies by attentive consultation with their representatives
B. Involve students in the planning as well as performance of service-learning projects
C. Increase current levels of faculty support and participation
D. Expand institutional support for the endeavor

V. Objectives and Actions for Local Community Agencies

In order to respond to the real needs of local community agencies, we propose the following steps.

A. Plan preliminary activities
   1. Survey current university-community partnerships
   2. Solicit advice from local agency representatives to plan and develop further work
   3. Enlarge survey to discover other possible partnerships
   4. Make necessary contacts in this group

B. Increase community awareness
   1. Gain press and media coverage of project
   2. Publish a newsletter from the Volunteer Service and Service-Learning Center
   3. Make contact with United Way Agency and Town and Gown Committee
   4. Develop a brochure to distribute among local agencies
   5. Invite agency heads to consult with those of other agencies which enjoy rewarding service-learning connections

C. Acquire community resources
   1. Develop a list of agencies willing to sponsor service-learners
   2. Complete a community needs assessment survey
   3. Develop a manual of protocol relating to community-based service-learning

D. Recognize community agencies and leaders
   1. Create public occasions to honor community agencies and leaders
   2. Involve the Town and Gown committee in recognizing participants
   3. Expand the service-learning brochure to recognize new agencies as they join
   4. Offer an appropriate three-credit course at Valparaiso University to reward a key member of those agencies who participate in the project, either free or at substantially reduced cost

E. Conduct ongoing research with agencies
   1. Assign students to keep a portfolio of work completed for the agency
   2. Assign students to write a final reflective essay over their activities
   3. Use these materials to help redevelop courses and activities, in consultation with the agency head
   4. Have students create a research network for community agencies, both about their services and about service-learning opportunities
   5. Create with the help of agencies a University research initiative to promote students’ “active citizenship”

VI. Objectives and Steps to Promote Student Development

In order to promote student involvement both in classroom and in service-learning settings, we propose the following steps:

A. Plan preliminary activities
   1. Assess student attitudes toward service and service-learning
   2. Meet with previous participants to develop publicity
B. Increase awareness among students
1. Invite student participation in on-campus meetings promoting service-learning
2. Make available opportunities for students to attend regional and national conferences
3. Appoint student members to Administrative Committee membership
4. Disseminate information on service-learning courses/opportunities in
   a. University Bulletin
   b. Semester class schedules
   c. WVUR
   d. The Torch
   e. Departmental pre-registration
   f. Freshman orientation
   g. Bulletin boards of the Volunteer Service and Service-learning Center
   h. Residential Assistant work
   i. Alumni clubs and recruiting work
   j. Admissions literature
5. Create cocurricular transcripts

C. Acquire resources for student participation
1. Give service-learning scholarships
2. Allocate the required five percent of work-study funding to service-learning projects
3. Invite alumni sponsorship of specific projects related to their fields

D. Recognize student service-learning achievements
1. Sponsor an end-of-year reception for service-learners
2. Designate outstanding work in service-learning by graduation recognition/awards and transcript notation
3. Award a service-learning mentor or fellow stipend
4. Appoint experienced service-learners to the Advisory Council

E. Conduct ongoing research related to students' “active citizenship”
1. Track designated courses for enrollment
2. Track participants for
   a. Follow-up courses
   b. Follow-up volunteer activities
   c. Post-graduation civic involvement
3. Develop student profiles to measure such effects as
   a. Self-esteem
   b. Academic improvement
   c. Academic appreciation
   d. Focus and directedness
   e. Choice of vocation

VII. Objectives and Steps for Faculty and Staff Involvement

In order to promote involvement of teaching faculty and support staff in community-based service-learning, we propose the following steps.

A. Plan preliminary activities
1. Expand the Volunteer Service and Service-learning Advisory Board to include broader faculty representation
2. Create a Service-learning Administrative Group composed of “maniacal” faculty
3. Present updates on service-learning to Committee on Learning and Teaching

B. Increase awareness among faculty and staff
1. Give a series of Brown Bag lunches to recruit new participants
2. Disseminate information on the electronic Faculty Bulletin Board
3. Develop a compact workshop to prepare current faculty to participate in the project
4. Invite incoming faculty to summer sessions on the potential of service-learning in their teaching, providing modest stipends
5. Sponsor an end-of-session workshop directed at service-learning successes and ongoing problems
6. Establish a mentoring relationship between experienced and new faculty

C. Acquire resources for faculty participation
1. Increase library holdings in service-learning philosophy and practice
2. Encourage service-learning faculty to apply for grants from
   a. CELT
   b. Campus Compact
   c. Knight Foundation
3. Designate a faculty member committed to service-learning as a grants facilitator
4. Pursue possible Alumni Association interest in supporting service-learning projects in their professional expertise

D. Recognize faculty and staff commitment to service-learning
1. Honor faculty and staff at a year-end reception
2. Work toward establishing a Service-learning Professorship
3. Valorize faculty service-learning contributions on the “community service” section of yearly Activity Reports
4. Take faculty participation in service-learning more seriously through increasing merit raises for such activities
5. Link faculty participation to tenure and promotion decisions

E. Conduct ongoing research into faculty and staff development through service-learning
1. Develop faculty profiles to measure such effects as
   a. Self-esteem
   b. Job satisfaction
   c. Student satisfaction with faculty
   d. Long-term commitment to the project
   e. Pedagogical effectiveness
   f. Research production
2. Track disciplines and courses in which faculty offer service-learning components
3. Develop a faculty network through which information on specific formats for service-learning components can be exchanged
4. Track publications by faculty on service-learning
5. Develop a bibliography on faculty development through service-learning

VIII. Objectives and Steps for Institutional Development

To invigorate Valparaiso University’s institutional commitment to service-learning, we propose the following steps.
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A. Plan preliminary steps
1. Highlight service-learning opportunities in Admissions literature
2. Focus attention on such opportunities in the University Bulletin
3. Designate service-learning courses in the Course Schedule
4. Include service-learning matters on the agenda on the Town-Gown committee
5. Require a service-learning course in the General Education block

B. Increase awareness of existing institutional commitment through
1. President Harre’s leadership role in Indiana Campus Compact
2. Professor Richard Balkema’s statewide and campus leadership role on the Service-learning Advisory Board
3. Professor Jon Pahl’s statewide and campus leadership role as Campus Compact Fellow
4. Dean Jan Bays’ campus leadership role as Director of Service-Learning
5. Courses offered by
   a. Professor Richard Balkema (Political Science)
   b. Professor Sandra Kowalski (Nursing)
   c. Professor Betty-Anne Leeseberg-Lange (Theatre)
   d. Professor Munira Merchant (Social Work)
   e. Professor Kathleen Mullen (English)
   f. Professor Jon Pahl (Theology)
   g. Professor John Steven Paul (Theatre)
   h. Professor Lori Petties (Social Work)

C. Acquire resources to increase VU’s institutional commitment
1. Investigate grant opportunities from
   a. Partners in Service-Learning
   b. Indiana Campus Compact
   c. The Lilly Foundation
   d. The Office of Institutional Advancement (Alumni giving)
   e. The Guild
   f. The Chapel in its Social Concerns Ministry
   g. Campus Greek organizations
   h. Other campus organizations concerned with social service
   i. The Carnegie Foundation
2. Investigate service grants to students
3. Use existing funds from Union Board to bring speakers on Volunteer and Service-learning to campus
4. Apply for grants from CELT, CWR, and TRC
5. Investigate state grants to community agencies which might incorporate service-learning

D. Expand institutional commitment to service-learning
1. Establish a scholarship, perhaps connected to Church/Ministry vocations, for significant participation in service-learning
2. Centralize and locate the position of Director of Volunteer Service and Service-learning Center
3. Budget for support materials, library resources, attendance at conferences, recognition of community and university participants in the project
4. Connect work in this area to Promotion, Tenure, and Salary determinations
5. Appoint service-learning advocates to positions on CELT, CWR
6. Establish a Professorship in Service-learning

E. Conduct ongoing research
1. Promote networking with comparison schools to determine ongoing value of
service-learning
2. Involve key personnel in the national conversation about service-learning
3. Study effect of service-learning on attitudes toward “active citizenship”
4. Emphasize service-learning in admissions literature and study the effect of this move on recruitment and retention
5. Examine effect of service-learning on Church/ministry/social service vocations

IX. Advisory Committee

This report was prepared by the following persons, who attended the Regional Conference on Service-learning at Indiana University, Bloomington, on February 22, 23, 24, 1996.

Mr. Greg Ferguson
Director, Christian Community Action

Dean Jan Bays
Interim Associate Dean for Service-learning and Greek Affairs

Professor Richard Balkema
Member, Indiana Campus Compact Advisory Board

Professor Jon Pahl
Fellow, Indiana Campus Compact

Professor Kathleen Mullen
Department of English

Professor Lissa Yogan
Department of Sociology
WHY CHANGE EFFORTS FAIL

• THEY ALLOW FOR TOO MUCH COMPLACENCY

• THEY FAIL TO CREATE A SUFFICIENTLY POWERFUL GUIDING COALITION

• THEY UNDERESTIMATE THE POWER OF VISION

• THEY UNDERCOMMUNICATE THE VISION BY A FACTOR OF 10 (OR 100 OR EVEN 1,000)

• THEY PERMIT OBSTACLES TO BLOCK THE VISION

• THEY FAIL TO CREATE SHORT TERM WINS

• THEY DECLARE VICTORY TOO SOON

• THEY NEGLECT TO ANCHOR CHANGES FIRMLY IN INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

THE EIGHT STEP PROCESS
OF CREATING MAJOR CHANGE

1. ESTABLISHING A SENSE OF URGENCY
   - Examining the market and competitive realities
   - Identifying and discussing crises, potential crises, or major opportunities

2. CREATING THE GUIDING COALITION
   - Putting together a group with enough power to lead the change
   - Getting the group to work together like a team

3. DEVELOPING A VISION AND STRATEGY
   - Creating a vision to help direct the change effort
   - Developing strategies for achieving that vision

4. COMMUNICATING THE CHANGE VISION
   - Using every vehicle possible to constantly communicate the new vision and strategies
   - Having the guiding coalition role model the behavior expected of employees

5. EMPOWERING BROAD-BASED ACTION
   - Getting rid of obstacles
   - Changing systems or structures that undermine the change vision
   - Encouraging risk taking and nontraditional ideas, activities, and actions

6. GENERATING SHORT-TERM WINS
   - Planning for visible improvements in performance, or "wins"
   - Creating those wins
   - Visibly recognizing and rewarding people who made the wins possible

7. CONSOLIDATING GAINS AND PRODUCING MORE CHANGE
   - Using increased credibility to change all systems, structures, and policies that don't fit together and don't fit the transformation vision
   - Hiring, promoting, and developing people who can implement the change vision
   - Reinvigorating the process with new projects, themes, and change agents

8. ANCHORING NEW APPROACHES IN THE CULTURE
   - Creating better performance through customer- and productivity-oriented behavior, more and better leadership, and more effective management
   - Articulating the connections between new behaviors and organizational success
   - Developing means to ensure leadership development and succession

THE CHANGE PROCESS: NOTES FROM FACING THE FUTURE

CHANGE STRATEGY

Take all four of the following approaches:

RATIONAL
Develop, present, and discuss information based on theory, research, and generally accepted evidence

SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL
Focus on opinion leaders and social networks by which people are influenced

PSYCHOLOGICAL
Deal honestly with people's fears and anxieties

POLITICAL
Build coalitions around people's interest and utilize the institution's leadership and governance structure

THE CHANGE PROCESS

I. Develop a Working Consensus on the Urgent Need to Restructure

A. Create Powerful Initiating/Coordinating Group
   - Seek out those people who understand the need to act, encourage them to join the effort and have them urge colleagues to come forward
   - Collect and present widely the good data and research that are disconcerting regarding the future and indicate the need to restructure

B. Communicate the Sense of Urgency Based on External and Internal Economic and Social Realities
   - People must be aware of the leadership's perception of a need for change
   - Not everyone will join and not significant accommodations should be made to them

II. Building a Working Consensus Around a Vision of the Future

A. Create a Vision -- A Powerful, Overall Set of Directions

   Ask two basic interrelated questions:
   - If we were going to create this university today given what we know and given the technology available, what would it look like?
   - Given the likely economic and social realities of the next decades, and what we presently know, how can we create a university -- especially at the undergraduate level -- that
     a) enhances student learning and student access;
     b) reduces university experiences and student costs to attend;
     c) makes faculty work life a positive experience; and
     d) meets the needs of the larger society?
B. Role of the Vision

- Focuses on clearly differentiating how the university currently operates from how, in broad terms we would like it to operate if we could recreate it
- Enables people
  a) to think holistically about what they are undertaking
  b) to make choices among options along the way
  c) to defend against the desire of individuals to return to the "here"

III. Working With Those Committed to Change

A. Key Insight #1

We must allow the process to evolve and must continually make the case for the changes by communicating through campus opinion leaders to a broader and broader audience

B. Key Insight #2

It is common to let those who are in opposition determine the agenda of a change process, thereby forcing compromises that undermine the overall direction. Do not attempt to win acceptance from a governance too early in the process.

IV. Phased Implementation Plan

A. Guided by a Powerful Central Coordinating Group

B. Create Implementation Teams
   - Cut across traditional faculty and administrative lines
   - Build in early victories

C. Establish Demonstration Projects
   - Test out new ideas

D. Create a Clear, General Time Line

V. Five Tools for Success

A. Internal Expertise Should Be Used as Much as Possible

B. Risk-takers Should Be Supported

C. Link with Other Institutions Going Through the Change Process

D. Invest in Faculty Development

E. Invest in Technology
The Change Process in Restructuring Universities

BY ALAN E. GUSKIN

There is a growing public acceptance that colleges and universities are not cost-effective, that our tuitions are too high, and that academic institutions must therefore restructure their operations, much as has happened in other sectors of American society. Within the higher education community itself, there is a new awareness of our inability to understand how to do more with less, especially in the delivery of education. What we know is how to do more with more and less with less. Yet, doing more with less is what we must do. While it may be surprising to some, today more than 200 colleges and universities are involved in programs to discuss the need for restructuring. Many are involved in Pew Roundtables both individually and in networks of institutions: the Council of Independent Colleges is involved in a 25-college network, also Pew funded, focused on restructuring faculty roles and rewards; the American Council on Education has developed a Kellogg-funded network of more than 20 colleges and universities dealing with the restructuring process. These projects include large and small, public and private colleges and universities.

Alan E. Guskin has been Chancellor of the five-campus Antioch University since July 1994, following a major restructuring of the university administration. Prior to that he served as President of Antioch University (1985-1994) and of Antioch College (1987-1994). From 1975 to 1985 he was Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Parkside. He has continued to teach and write throughout his career as a Chancellor and President and currently holds the faculty position of Distinguished University Professor.
In a recent issue of the Pew Roundtable’s Policy Perspectives, the authors assert that successful restructuring requires a partnership and shared purpose between faculty and administrators in which universities are more responsive to students and societal needs while maintaining the commitment to academic freedom and the unencumbered pursuit of knowledge.

Securing a more productive engagement between faculty and administrators begins with a tough discussion of what changes are needed and why. The impulse to deny the problem must be overcome, and the willingness to work together established as a precondition of purposeful action.

Their proposed change strategy, like that followed by the Roundtables and the other networks, is one of open dialogue between key players on a campus. To the extent there is an overall change strategy, the assumption seems to be that restructuring will occur and people will—or should—change because of the dire consequences of not changing; the idea seems to be that people will put aside their fears, anxieties, and prior beliefs and join the venture in a whole-hearted manner.

But asserting a need to change is one thing, producing it is another. I share the hope that change can occur through a rational, discussion-based project. But do not assume such an outcome, because discussion alone rarely produces significant change in an organization. The approach advocated here—and in much of the wider literature on organizational change—assumes a more dynamic, interpersonal, and political change process. This approach views the more rational, discussion-based process common to the Roundtables as one part—mainly the beginning—of a more elaborate strategic restructuring change effort.

In brief, the dynamic, strategic, political approach presented here accepts that there is a bright and dark side to human nature and how people behave in organizations, including colleges and universities; that people have real fears and anxieties about the future that take time to overcome; that some people like change and innovation and thrive on it, while others do not; that many people resist change for reasonable reasons and that others will resist change temporarily as they await examples of how others have made a leap they can follow. Further, this article assumes that restructuring requires not only a partnership between faculty and administrators (and often trustees), but also a deep concern for student learning and the educational outcomes necessary for a person to be an effective member of the future society.

The basic conceptions developed here emerge from my own experiences as well as the literature on organizational change efforts. The inspiration to write this article emerged from the questions and concerns I encountered throughout the country in talking about my two earlier Change articles (July/August and September/October 1994) with faculty members and administrators at over a dozen universities and colleges and at six national meetings. It has become evident to me that even when institutional and faculty leaders are committed to making significant changes or to restructuring, many do not understand the process of change necessary to achieve their goals and, therefore, either are immobilized or make unnecessary errors.

How can and does change occur? We know what it means to undertake incremental change; what does it mean to enter into an institutional restructuring process? How will we deal with people who resist changing? What is the role of faculty and administrators in actually producing the change? How can we begin if the provost or president is non-committal regarding the need to change? How do we know that the processes we undertake will work and make a difference?

The Key Is Starting

The key to changing a university or college is to start the process. There are many reasons to resist restructuring our institutions—not the least of which are the difficulty and pain. But there are societal forces at work that will eventually lead us to make systemic changes in our institutions, whether we like it or not. I believe there is enough creativity and skill in almost every college and university to successfully produce a restructured institution, if we commit ourselves to begin.

The challenge is summed up by Marjorie Kelly in her article in the July/August 1993 issue of Business Ethics, “Taming the Demons of Change.” She writes:

Transformation of any sort—whether human or chemical or corporate—is a perilous passage at best, calling for a radical letting go and an openness to the unknown. It’s hard to imagine anything more frightening. And it’s hard to find a more likely route to progress—for in letting go of the old form, we create the space for a new form that will work even better. It comes down simply to this: that we can’t advance as long as we’re holding tight to what no longer works.

And we have to break the mold before a new form can emerge.

This exhortation to start sounds like a strange beginning to an article on change strategies for restructuring universities, yet I believe it is a core issue. We are too good at analyzing all the difficult issues involved in doing something—anything—and thereby immobilizing ourselves. If we look holistically at the world around us and allow our intuitive skills to roam a little, it will soon enough become obvious that we cannot continue to practice our academic profession with dignity and integrity without fundamental change.
The longer we analyze the current ways of operating the further we tend off that awesome day when we will have to change something. Analysis thus becomes a defensive maneuver to avoid making fundamental change.

How many times have we seen plans rejected because we’ve analyzed in depth their problems, only to be left with the status quo, which everyone agrees is less desirable than any of the rejected alternatives? At two institutions in which I’ve served, I’ve personally been associated with planning for changes in academic calendars that almost everyone agreed were not working well. Yet the proposed new calendars—each of which was much better than the existing one—were debated endlessly, their weaknesses highlighted, their potential benefits diminished. In one case, a faculty survey found 80 percent agreeing that the existing calendar was a hindrance to the academic program and student retention. Yet, it took three different planning groups over a four-year period to finally develop an acceptable plan, which then was passed by the faculty by only two votes!

In beginning the restructuring process, we must not ask ourselves what the detailed final outcome will look like; it is impossible to state with clarity what our restructured institution will look like 10 years from now. By starting the process and focusing on a number of basic goals, we can use the creativity and wisdom of people in our institution to develop—with the context of the institution’s heritage—a vision of the future.

**Some Basic Issues**

Restructuring a college or university—or a school within a university—is a complex and difficult undertaking. If it were not so important to do so for the future education of our citizens and for people’s quality of life inside and outside our institutions, I would not advise it. But do it we must.

To understand what’s involved in such an effort, I’ll first raise and discuss a number of basic issues; then I’ll review steps in the change process itself. My “basic issues” include an understanding of why people resist change, the essential role of leaders, the difference between structural and incremental change, and the impact of size and complexity on a restructuring effort.

**Why People Resist Change**

Many people will resist change, any change, and the more significant the change, the greater the resistance. For many, probably most, change is difficult, painful, and an uncertain leap into an unknown future.

James O’Toole explores this issue in depth in his recent book, *Leading Change*, in which he concludes that there are a number of reasons why people resist change, even when it is in their interest:

[First], resistance to change occurs when a would-be leader challenges the comfort of the group, the members’ satisfaction with the established level of their power, prestige, privileges, position, and satisfaction with who they are, what they believe, what they cherish.

Individuals are what they believe, and groups are their cultures: hence to require a group to change its shared beliefs is to threaten its very existence. 

Peaceful change thus requires acquiescence in upsetting the dominant world view; in effect, the collective eating of crow by those who have the power to resist change.

[Second], in almost all instances, the majority of haves [people who have the power] resist the call to reform, not so much because they fear change, but because they bristle at having the will of others imposed on them....Thus a major factor in our resistance to change is the desire not to have the will of others forced on us.

It is not difficult to draw higher education parallels to O’Toole’s analysis, especially when dealing with restructuring the faculty role in student learning or the academic calendar. In university life, those in power—the “haves”—are clearly the faculty and academic leadership. The cultural norms and belief system regarding student learning are built around an academic calendar: faculty are expected to teach courses to groups of students in classes usually offered a few times a week during a 12-to-16-week semester or 10-to-12-week quarter. And, in doing so, faculty teach their discipline as learned in graduate school and thereafter.

This belief system is shared by those in formal leadership positions—almost all of whom were once faculty members—as well as by full-time faculty members throughout the institution. Changing this belief system will be difficult, not only because it represents a consensus on the campus and throughout almost all higher education, but because the overwhelming majority of faculty members and administrators find it hard to imagine viable alternatives. Moreover, academic leaders and faculty are particularly sensitive to anyone imposing their will on them—from the outside or inside.

The discomfort of those in leadership positions regarding the restructuring of the university is as great or greater than that of the faculty: administrators believe in or accept the validity of the present system; they have become leaders by being able to manage successfully the present systems that will have to be overturned; and they have learned to be successful at creating change that occurs incrementally. Further, for many, the level of collaboration and the breakdown of some of the hierarchy that would be necessary to achieve a restructured university may undermine their conception of their role as leader.

Yet, I am not pessimistic about the future. Traveling around the country talking about these issues, I have been struck by the pain—and good sense—of many faculty members and administrators at numerous institutions. A number of years of little or no salary increases combined with the non-replacement of departing colleagues have been sobering: more students to teach, more courses to prepare, and a slow erosion of the faculty salary base. Faculty may be fiercely individualistic and, like everyone else, focused on their traditions, but they are very smart. And, most recognize that their future does not look good.

**But Who Shall Lead the Change?**

Over and over again, I have heard faculty moan hopelessly that their provost or president (as well as many of their colleagues) is not interested in making any
significant changes. Frustrated, upset, and sensing that things have to change, many faculty have bought into the notion—surprisingly common throughout higher education—that leaders alone are primarily responsible for leading change and fixing the problems. Isn’t that the reason they earn the “big bucks”?

University administrators share this same understanding, but their experience—positive and negative—in producing small, incremental changes makes them leery of major structural change. They know that they need to act like leaders to deal with the expectations of the faculty and their board, so they look out at the faculty and exhort them to change.

The argument is that since most of the financial resources in universities are in personnel and related costs, and since most personnel costs are in the academic area, then what is needed is to reduce the number of faculty members and get those remaining to be more productive. However, since the only way to make faculty members more productive in the present educational model is to have them teach more students and courses, faculty naturally resist as best they can.

And, here we stand: administrators exhorting the faculty to make incremental changes that won’t really meet the institution’s needs; and faculty members resisting the exhortations but slowly losing ground as they are left with fewer colleagues and less money. The conflict and anxiety increase.

The problems we are facing are not the result of inappropriate resistance by faculty or administrators; rather, they are systemic in nature. People in colleges and universities—faculty, administrators, students, and even trustees—act the way they do because the institutional systems of American higher education have supported and rewarded their present behaviors. In addition, creating alternative systems of rewards for faculty and students, or alternative uses of faculty time, or different approaches to facilitating student learning, have been overtly or covertly discouraged at all institutional levels by the organizational structures and systems.

My perspective in this article, and in my previous ones, is to encourage faculty and administrative leaders to face the future directly by being proactive in creating necessary changes in the most effective and least painful ways—rather than only reacting to the pressures from external agencies. Embedded in these writings is my belief that changes forced by a state legislature or severe financial realities will cause serious ruptures internally and could undermine an institution’s sense of academic integrity and autonomy.

On other hand, I believe internally induced change will be less traumatic and, if effective, can maintain our integrity, autonomy, and dignity. Further, except in very rare circumstances of extreme urgency, I believe internally induced changes in the academic area will not be effective if imposed on faculty by the administration or trustees. Even though strong administrative leadership is important, the entire structural change process must be based on a sense of colleagueship between and among faculty, administrators, and trustees.

**Importance of Leadership**

The overall commitment of an institution’s senior leadership team, or the chief executive or head of the unit being restructured, is an important element in achieving a successful restructuring effort. While such commitment is required in any successful change effort, it is more essential in the restructuring process because of the global nature of the change being implemented and the time it will take to be successful. Strong leadership commitment will be needed to maintain the focus of key players over a lengthy period of time, and to convince those resisting that the change is highly likely, thereby encouraging some to make the leap earlier rather than later. This strong commitment is also important in protecting and encouraging those deeply involved in the risky business of experimenting with and making the change.

Since resistance can occur at any level, commitment of the university leader or unit leader is essential in overcoming the inevitable foot-dragging or outright resistance of a member of the leadership group. In any restructuring effort, all senior administrators must either buy in or leave, and only the senior leader can make that happen. If one member of the senior leadership group is unchecked in his or her resistance, there is a significantly increased likelihood that the restructuring process will be resisted by the faculty members or administrators who are the most uncomfortable with the proposed changes. The senior administrator, in effect, confirms their discomfort.

Such resistance of senior and middle-level administrative leaders is to be expected, given the fear that jobs will be lost and that years of effort will be restructured out of existence. There are good reasons for making the change, but it can be an overwhelming feeling...
for those who have devoted a career to the old systems. In my July/August 1994 Change article on administrative restructuring, I indicate that in my own institution I had to force the resignation of a senior university vice president in order to assure the successful continuation of our restructuring process. Once that occurred, everyone understood the depth of my commitment and intention to persist over the long run.

Besides maintaining focus and overcoming administrative resistance, leaders often develop, or facilitate the development of, the vision that supports a restructuring process. They are also critical players on the restructuring coordinating team, especially since they are responsible for communicating to everyone a sense of urgency regarding the need for institutional change.

All this raises a critical issue concerning the length of terms for college and university leaders. Since restructuring an institution will take a minimum of four to five years, and more likely five to seven years, the revolving-door presidencies we see today can indeed undermine a restructuring process. This change in presidential leadership is further accentuated by the tendency of chief academic officers to serve five years or less.

This lack of leadership stability becomes particularly acute when we realize that most new presidents have never served in that role before and over 75 percent of them are chosen from outside the institution. These new leaders will need a year or two to learn their job and understand the subtleties of the institution. Hence, if a restructuring process is initiated, and if the president leaves in four to six years, it is likely that he or she will do so in the middle of the restructuring process. Given the stresses and struggles of any restructuring process, changes in leadership could well deal a significant blow to the success of the entire project.

While institutional leaders can be encouraged to stay longer, it is my observation that most successful presidents leave because of their difficult relationships with faculty and boards; the latter is especially true—and increasingly so—in the public sector. If institutions are to be successful in facing the future, then governing boards and faculty leaders will have to form healthier and more productive relationships with their institutional leaders, and to focus on enabling the president to be an effective institutional leader rather than viewing her or him as a hired hand or public figure to be attacked when mistakes are made.

**When Leaders Don't Lead: Managing Leaders**

But, does this mean that without a wonderful, courageous leader all is lost? If this is so, are we concluding that because of the limited availability of such leaders, significant university restructuring will be rare?

In discussing the need for restructuring at a number of universities, I was often met with dedicated faculty and administrators who said with sadness that they were willing to enter into such a process but that their academic leaders and/or president were noncommittal. What could they do? I implored them not to give up, pointing out that the university is more their future than anyone else’s, and that they had to develop strategies to induce their senior administrators to become leaders. The urgency of the next decade requires them to do so.

My observations over the last two decades have led me to conclude that while it is important for leaders to lead, it is also important for leaders to be managed. Universities are unique organizations where leadership is and must be shared: it is the very nature of our educational institutions that selected faculty and students are expected to provide leadership at the top of the organization along with administrators, especially regarding the education of students.

By managing institutional leaders, I am not implying colluding against, controlling, or sabotaging them. Rather, managing leaders should be in the service of the larger institutional interests. Managing a leader takes sensitivity: it requires working with the leader rather than against him or her; it requires a sophisticated understanding of how organizations operate, how institutional decisions are made, how power is exercised in a university, and how chief executives and chief academic officers think.

We know that no leader is capable of leading by herself or himself. And no leader has the institutional base or experience to lead without the helpful guidance of those who desire her or him to be successful. While managing leaders sounds like an oxymoron, good, experienced presidents and provosts know how desirable it is to be managed by their senior administrators and others—including supportive faculty leaders—within the context of the president’s and provost’s leadership.

Underlying the actions involved in managing a college or university president or provost is my assumption that these chief administrators are most effective when they lead others in collaborative ways, that they need to have the best judgments of those they lead—collectively and individually—and that they must not be isolated or encouraged to work alone, no matter what their proclivities. A smart and effective president or provost will relish being managed, for it will enable him or her to provide leadership on the important issues that must be faced.

Just as we discover when we attempt to build political support in our communities for something we deeply believe in, we must accept that educational as well as political leaders are captives of pressure groups as much as or more than their own personal interests. A well-meaning community leader, therefore, will be responsive to pressures that enable him to be an effective leader in the service of community interests. In a similar vein, we need to believe that a noncommittal, well-meaning university president or provost can be persuaded by faculty and other administrative leaders to lead a restructuring effort for the benefit of their institutions’ future health.

What is needed is a set of incentives
that pressure the president or provost to act. This means that committed faculty members and administrators quietly build significant support among key faculty and administrative colleagues who are respected by the leadership, based on the assumption that the president or provost would act appropriately if he or she knew such support existed.

The strategy is that the leader can be persuaded to take on the restructuring effort as a major part of his or her own agenda, based on the leader's judgment of the data presented, the institutional need, and the support the leader will have for acting.

The key perspective for faculty and other administrators to have in managing university leaders—and in being led by them—is that of wanting to provide the president and/or provost with the means and opportunity to lead rather than being upset and complaining that the leader is not leading. Replacing senior administrators who do not lead with someone else is no guarantee that real leadership will occur. I believe that, in most cases, a benign university president or provost can be helped to become an effective leader of a restructuring effort if the community pushes or cajoles him or her in that direction.

Managing leaders as well as being led by them should be seen as the legitimate and healthy functioning of a college or university by both faculty members and administrators. Such collaboration would bode well for implementing a restructuring process. The alternative—viewing a university as a basically hierarchical or authoritarian institution—is contrary to the interests and desires of faculty, and in the long run is not effective in any change effort requiring faculty to undergo significant restructuring of their work.

Restructuring vs. Incremental Change

Universities continually change one or another element in the academic program, in the way administrative units are organized, in the addition of a student service, and so on. Except in rare circumstances, the change—whether an addition or subtraction—is intended to be limited to the particular area involved, leaving untouched the basic underlying processes by which students learn and faculty teach, as well as the organization of the university itself.

Even when new computer systems are incorporated, the manner in which service is provided is rarely changed; rather, the service is provided faster, or new services are added. While many of these changes are helpful in providing more effective services and satisfying more people, the institution's underlying structures and processes remain the same. This is true even when organizational units—such as a department or school—are cut or rearranged, because the basic educational and administrative processes involved remain unchanged. Hence, these are called incremental changes.

Restructuring a university refers to changing basic underlying processes by which services are delivered, whether of an educational or an administrative nature. For example, restructuring the academic area or the role of faculty members refers to changing the way faculty work and students learn as well as changing the academic calendar and formats that determine the way students and faculty interact. Using computer technology in restructuring an administrative area means that the service will be delivered in new ways, usually involving people who work together in closer contact with those being served, and whose work is organized around the technological capacities of the computer.

In my previous Change articles on restructuring the administration (July/August 1994) and the work of faculty (September/October 1994), I proposed some ways to accomplish these changes in the administrative and academic areas.

Restructuring assumes that the underlying change occurs broadly throughout the unit being restructured. It assumes that all parts of a unit or organization are systematically interrelated, so that a change in one element will impact all the other parts of the unit or organization. Restructuring as a change process in higher education is very similar to what Hammer has called "reengineering" in the corporate sector.

Because incremental change does not noticeably affect the basic underlying processes of an institution or the underlying belief systems, it is often accepted after some discussion; it is also easy to conceive of because it is consistent with how people have practiced their professions. But incremental changes do not deal with the type of structural changes necessary for a future of reduced resources, increased availability of and demand for powerful technologies, and the demand that a college or university be accountable to student learning outcomes.

William Massy and Robert Zemke, in a recent EDUCOM white paper, "Using Information Technology to Enhance Academic Productivity," highlight the implications of restructuring in their discussion of how information technology can be used to achieve "more with less productivity enhancement." This enhancement requires that technology replace some activities now being performed by faculty, teaching assistants, and student personnel. With labor accounting for 70 percent or more of current operating costs, there is simply no other way. Faculty will have to reengineer teaching and learning processes to substitute capital for labor on a selective basis. Failing to make such substitutions will return institutions to the more-with-more scenario.

Intelligent substitution will require much more attention to the processes by which teaching and learning actually take place. Faculty will have to invest time and energy in learning about what they do and why they do it, and then open themselves up to the possibility of doing things differently. Departments will have to understand teaching costs at the level of specific activities, not simply broad functional terms.

Size and Complexity Are Important

Sometimes a college or university may be too big to restructure as one whole, so that the appropriate unit for restructuring effort is not the whole university but a school or college. While the entire institution, or major part, may ultimately be restructured, in such circumstances it is important to work with the individual unit or to unbundle the larger institution into smaller, manageable structures in which the student's entire education can take place.

Doing this will enable the restructuring of educational and administrative processes to occur. For example, it may be necessary to unbundle graduate education and all the faculty involved from graduate education. As was experimented with in the late 1960s, it may be necessary to reduce...
the undergraduate educational unit size even further, possibly creating colleges within colleges.

The key issue is that the student's entire education—or a significant part of it—takes place within that unit, and that faculty are directly tied to that unit so that their work can be restructured without the interference of colleagues not involved in the restructuring effort. It would be undesirable to have faculty members who are committed to new forms of teaching and learning in a newly restructured unit tied to a departmental structure that serves other goals—like traditional undergraduate education models or graduate education. In effect, one cannot ask faculty members to make the necessary changes in their work and to be judged by the reward systems of colleagues doing very different work.

In such restructuring efforts, there will be a good deal of criticism that the smaller size will lead to an increase in costs, since the centralized larger units are more efficient. While some services, such as libraries, can be more efficient and cost less when handled centrally—especially with the use of new electronic technologies—I believe that student learning and most administrative services are not among them.

The complexity of large universities creates inefficiencies and costs that can be avoided in restructured, less complex units in which people take greater responsibility for their actions and work is divided by function and not structures—for example, units serving the student's non-learning needs as an integrated whole rather than having the student deal with a myriad of offices built around the convenience of administrative units and institutional politics. The radical changes in computer technology offer much support for decentralized, autonomous activities following acceptable standards at reduced time and cost. The business literature is filled with such examples; so, too, is my experience.

The reduced complexity of smaller units leads to the possibility that faculty colleagues will be more supportive of experimentation. Also, this less complex environment could enable faculty work to be tied more closely to the effectiveness and productivity of the educational unit and thereby to financial, career, and psychological rewards.

In addition, smaller, less complex educational units provide an important environment for testing out new ideas as the restructuration process evolves. Since not all ideas work, it is wise to test them out in a smaller setting where adjustments can be made quickly with minimal costs. Wholesale implementation of new restructured processes should not be undertaken until these have been tested and shown to be beneficial. Therefore, these smaller environments become an important part of the phasing in of new restructured activities.

Finally, smaller and less complex educational units would increase the focus on the student as learner and the faculty member as facilitator of learning, and decrease the focus on those academic and administrative bureaucratic elements in large, complex units that create distance between faculty member and student, increase student dependency, and are costly in both human and financial terms.

The Change Process

In the previous section, we focused on some of the key underlying issues involved in restructuring: the nature of resistance to change, the important role of leaders, the distinction between restructuration and incremental change, and the impact of size and complexity. But some of the most significant issues remain; namely, the components of an effective change process to restructure a college or university.

Jack Lindquist, one of the most insightful writers and leaders of organizational change in higher education, who unfortunately died prematurely in 1991, sums up four basic approaches to changing attitudes and behavior in universities:

Some believe that humans are essentially rational, so reason and evidence should do the trick....

Others find that humans are social creatures, so that awareness, interest, trial, and eventual adoption occur through a process of social interaction and persuasion in which opinion leaders and reference groups are influences, perhaps as important as the rational soundness of the change message itself....

Still others believe that the main obstacles to change are not impressive messages nor social influences. Psychological barriers are the problem....

Yet another group maintains we are political animals at base, busy protecting and strengthening our vested interests.

As Lindquist points out, effective organizational change in higher education—especially the restructuring process we are dealing with—requires working in all four areas: the rational, social-interactional, psychological, and political. In doing so, we must use a change strategy that deals with developing, presenting, and discussing information based on theory, research, and generally accepted evidence, that focuses on opinion leaders and social networks by which people are influenced that deals honestly with people's fears and anxieties, and that builds coalition around people's interests, and utilizes the institution's leadership and governance structures.

Restructuring the administrative or academic area of a college or university is a major undertaking that will take at least four to five years. My own experience has been in the restructuring of a university administration and in major incremental change efforts in the academic areas of three institutions. While significant and difficult, these academic change efforts did not involve the type of restructuring I have proposed in my previous article on restructuring the role of faculty.

At present, while a growing number of institutions are beginning to discuss seriously the need to restructure and are beginning to invest heavily in classroom computer technology—
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many of them quite creatively—I am not aware of any institution that has undertaken the restructuring of faculty work and the educational process. In fact, in discussions with individuals involved in the largest Roundtable restructuring efforts, I found considerable concern about the lack of any good existing models. But I am convinced many institutions will undergo the restructuring process in the next five to 10 years. And it is highly likely that any such restructuring of faculty work will follow a process similar to that of the administrative area and other major change efforts.

First, any restructuring effort will require the development of a working consensus on the urgent need to restructure. By a working consensus, I am referring to a consensus among the major administrative and faculty leaders of a college or university as well as many of the major opinion leaders on the faculty and the board of trustees.

Second, such a restructuring effort requires a working consensus around a vision of the institution’s future. Third, while key academic and administrative leaders are critical in creating this sense of urgency and vision, there are others throughout the institution—both faculty and administrators—who will want to be involved from the outset. The leadership of the college or university should seek out those people who are supportive of the change effort and work with them.

Fourth, the restructuring process takes a considerable amount of time to fully implement. The restructured institution does not emerge whole at one time; rather, it is implemented in a series of phases that evolve over time. These revolutionary changes require evolutionary processes.

Building a Working Consensus

Creating an institutionwide sense of urgency can be very hard work for those who sense the importance of starting the restructuring process. The reasons for the difficulty are many and only partly relate to a general resistance to any change. While many people sense something is amiss in higher education, they tend to blame others and/or look to them to change the conditions: for governments to grant more money, for administrators to somehow fix the problem, for faculty to be more productive, for more students to enroll or pay higher tuition, and so on.

It seems that both faculty and administrators have bought into a perspective common to people who work in large, central, planning-oriented organization and governmental bureaucracies: namely, that somehow their work deserves support because they are doing it, irrespective of successful institutional performance or external needs. Activity becomes the norm, and if there are problems, then one should do more activity—more committee meetings, more fund-raising, more teaching—without fully understanding how it relates to helping the institution become more effective.

I believe this “activity” perspective occurs because the outcomes of present teaching and educational processes are, for the most part, unexamined—a perspective that is reinforced by the sanctity of the classroom and the autonomy and individualism of the faculty. As a result, it is extremely difficult for faculty members (or administrators) to make a clear connection between their work and institutional financial and academic performance.

Similarly, since incremental change is commonly understood and practiced when there are serious financial problems, many incremental changes are initiated based on assumptions that the decreases in financial support are temporary and good times will return in a year or two. Universities continue to cut departments, make significant cuts in all non-faculty positions or expenses, or make across-the-board faculty cuts to deal with their financial problems, even though a careful analysis of the impact will show that these measures solve the problem only temporarily, while in the long term sharply undercutting the quality of faculty work life and reducing the access and quality of the education offered.

Developing a working consensus around the urgency to start the restructuring process requires that leaders in the faculty and administration create a powerful initiating coordinating group that develops the institutional strategy for starting, and has the capability to fully implement the restructuring effort over time. Among the group’s first acts is to seek out those people who understand the need to act, to encourage them to join in the effort, and to have them urge their colleagues to come forward. This consensus-building process will lead others to respond.

At the same time, it is important for the initiating/coordinate group to collect and present widely the good data and research that are disconcerting regarding the future and indicate the need to restructure. Such information can be a powerful prompt for initiating discussion about the need for internal change on a campus. Smart faculty and administrative leaders know how to use research and data to start the conversations that need to occur. In fact, the 200 colleges and universities involved in Pew Roundtables and the other discussion strategies are involved in using the literature, research and data—as well as local pain—to initiate this first step in the change process.

The institution’s leaders must spend a good deal of time communicating their sense of urgency based on external and internal economic and social realities. People throughout the institution must be aware of the leadership’s perception of the need to change and commitment to act. And they should know that many other influential people are joining the process.

At the same time, leaders of the restructuring process must understand that many faculty and administrators will not want to join the effort at the beginning, nor need they—and no significant accommodations should be made to them. It must be remembered that people join change effort at a number of different stages; few remain resisters to the end.
The process, then, for creating a working consensus to face the urgent need to restructure a university requires articulate and strong institutional leadership: the participation and commitment of many of the key faculty, administrators, and trustee opinion leaders; a collaboration between these leaders in a coordinating/initiating group; continuing communication wherever possible about the urgent need to restructure based on the economic, social, and educational realities of the present and future; an appeal to supporters within the institution who agree with the sense of urgency; and the creation of an institutional context in which it is assumed that the restructuring process is essential for the future of the institution and has already begun.

**Building a Working Consensus Around a Vision of the Future**

While the beginning of the change process starts with an urgent need to face the future of the university, building the future requires a leap of faith. And institutional leaders must show that they have faith that a viable future will evolve.

As I have stated earlier, it is essential at this point that the key administrative and faculty players not get bogged down in detailed analyses of the likely outcomes of the transformational process, a style of inquiry and problem-solving process common to those of us in higher education. Too much analysis into a future we cannot possibly predict in detail will lead to an unnecessary waste of time, unending debates, and discouragement.

As we embark on planning the future, a powerful, overall set of directions is needed—a vision of the general outcomes of the restructuring process. This can be accomplished with enough detail and some excitement by asking two basic interrelated questions:

1. If we were going to create this university today given what we know and given the technology available, what would it look like?
2. Given the likely economic and social realities of the next decades, and what we presently know, how can we create a university—especially at the undergraduate level—that (a) enhances student learning and student access; (b) reduces university expenses and student costs to attend; (c) makes faculty work life a positive experience; and (d) meets the needs of the larger society?

Answering these broad questions in a general way creates the "there" that we are headed toward—a vision of a desired future. It focuses the restructuring effort by clearly differentiating how the university presently operates from how, in broad terms, we would like it to operate if we could re-create it.

Obviously, this is a pragmatic change effort and not all our aspirations for the future can be realized. But focusing on a vision of the future enables people to think holistically about what they are undertaking, to make choices among options along the way, and to defend against the desire of individuals to return to the "here" as the ever-present difficulties emerge in the restructuring process.

John Kotter in a recent article in the *Harvard Business Review* on "Leading Change: Why Transformations Fail," writes:

> Without a sensible vision, a transformation effort can easily dissolve into a list of confusing and incompatible projects that can take an organization in the wrong direction or nowhere...

In failed transformations, you often find plenty of directives and programs, but no vision.... A useful rule of thumb: if you can't communicate the vision to someone in five minutes or less and get a reaction that signifies both understanding and interest, you are not yet done with this phase of the transformation process.

Creating a working consensus on the vision follows the same basic process as the development of a sense of urgency. In fact, the two processes should overlap a good deal, as the sense of urgency leads to asking the basic questions and developing an image of the future, which then reinforces the viability of acting on the sense of urgency. Institutional leaders and opinion leaders must seek out others throughout the institution to join the effort, but there should be no sacrifice of the vision in order to include resistors. It is essential to work with those who want to make the changes and assume that almost all the others will eventually participate as they see their interests affected.

At the same time, it is important to make sure that the vision is broad, thereby permitting a great deal of flexibility in creating the future. This will allow different members of the academic community to see how their interests can be taken into account in the implementation process. In fact, alternative models of work may be employed as faculty members and administrators take seriously a focus on student learning and reduced expenses.

The key issue will be maintaining a clear focus on the vision and broad directions as the change process evolves. This means that the restructuring implementation process will involve continuing relations between the central coordinating initiating group—that is, the "holder" of the vision and broad directions—and implementation teams that create the concrete meaning of this vision and its direction in the key educational and administrative areas of the institution. There is a great deal of room for creativity, but there can be no compromise with the overall vision and directions.

**Working With Those Committed to Change**

As emphasized above, it is essential that the leadership of the restructuring process focus on those who support the change effort rather than worrying about those who do not. It is common in higher education to let those who are in opposition determine the agenda of a change process, thereby forcing commitment that undermine the overall direction. This most often occurs because institutional leaders attempt to win acceptance from a governance group too early in the process, resulting in the need to co-opt the resistors to get their acquiescence or votes. I believe that a decision by the governance structures to move forward should occur relatively late in the process, when there is a general understanding of the need to change, there is a vision of the restructured institution, and there are many who support the effort.

The literature on the adoption of innovations, especially the work of Everett Rogers, indicates that relatively clear stages can be observed in the way people accept major changes in how they work and use the newest techniques and materials. Some people—the innovators—like to be involved in change activities and will be the first to adopt such innovations; others—the early adopters—need to see the innovations...
lead, but they are right behind; still others will follow at a later point as the need becomes clearer and they see others’ success. Then, there are the lag-gards who may resist to the very end, but they tend to be a small minority.

The key insight in this for university restructuring is that we must allow the process to evolve and must continually make the case for the changes by communicating through campus opinion leaders to a broader and broader audience. Further, as we seek to develop ideas for implementing the vision, we should involve greater and greater numbers of people in planning groups. An effective restructuring process requires that an institution’s leadership initiate the change effort, yet it requires a broad collaborative effort for successful implementation. This broad collaboration occurs through implementation teams established to realize the vision.

Strategic patience and perseverance are essential ingredients of any major transformation effort. To quote James Collins and Jerry Porras from their recent book on successful businesses, Built to Last, “Luck favors the persistent.” This is a secret ingredient in gathering support for the restructuring effort—to persist until the restructured university comes into being.

**Phased Implementation Process**

The restructured institution should not and cannot come into being at one time; as stated earlier, these revolutionary changes are implemented by an evolutionary process.

The restructuring process must be guided by a powerful central coordinating group responsible for implementing the vision, which includes the revolutionary changes. In order to accomplish this, the central group needs to create a number of implementation teams to work on specific parts of the restructuring effort; these teams reflect the evolutionary nature of the restructuring process. Examples of such implementation teams may include those responsible for:

1. the assessment of student learning outcomes;
2. integrating all student services into “one-stop shopping”;
3. seeking out partnerships with other colleges and universities to reduce costs and increase learning opportunities;
4. establishing faculty development training programs around the use of technology and new faculty roles, such as mentoring and small-group discussion skills;
5. creating demonstration projects that use technology to reduce faculty workload and enhance student learning;
6. developing new faculty roles; and
7. developing alternative academic calendar structures.

These teams will cut across traditional faculty and administrative lines, thereby taking the restructuring process deep into the institution and bringing many new people into the effort.

As previously stated, the primary function of the central coordinating group is maintaining the focus on the overall vision and strategy as more and more people and implementation teams participate; this will prove essential to the overall success of the restructuring effort. The central group also focuses on dealing with the political realities of the institution. Because this group contains the key administrative and faculty leaders, it has the capability to allocate scarce fiscal and human resources, to form implementation teams that build coalitions across campus, and to monitor the work of these teams. Further, because this central group maintains the calendar of the change effort, it can make the necessary adjustments to deal with unforeseen difficulties.

An important element in the implementation process is creating early victories. Because the restructuring process will take at least four to five years to complete, it is important that people feel a sense of accomplishment along the way. Waiting to the end to feel some sense of success may be discouraging for too many and increase their resistance out of frustration or anxiety about the long-term outcome. But, as Kotter maintains, “Creating short-term wins is different from hoping for short-term wins. The latter is passive, the former active.”

In developing the implementation teams, care should be given to seeking such early victories. In the examples presented above, it is possible to envision that “one-stop shopping” for students can occur early in the process. So, too, can establishing a faculty development process to help faculty with new skills, creating demonstration projects using new technologies, and some partnering with other institutions. On the other hand, creating new faculty roles, and inventing alternative academic calendars might well take a long time to achieve. Each institution will have a wide array of issues to deal with in a restructuring effort; focusing on some early victories will help create the context for future success.

It is important to establish demonstration projects to test out new ideas. Such projects can be fairly sizable, such as a group of faculty and students forming a small college within a college, or can be small, such as a few faculty testing out new ways to use technology to restructure the role of faculty members. These test sites will also determine whether those new ideas are worthy of broader dissemination within the institution.

Most colleges and universities are fortunate in having faculty members who are already experimenting with new methods of delivering educational services. It is important that these individuals be given the necessary support and independence to pursue these innovations.

Implementing small and large demonstration projects—some of which are successful—can create models of success. Knowing and seeing that their colleagues have successfully implemented new educational or administrative processes encourages those who are interested in the change effort but can’t figure out what it looks like or what they can do.

The reality of any restructuring pro-
Process is that since we are dealing with the basic underlying processes, structures, and belief systems of the institution, the change cannot occur quickly; people just can’t alter their belief systems overnight—nor should they. Hence, while difficult to develop, there is a need for a clear, general time line for the introduction of changes that are being planned. Adjustments in the schedule will, no doubt, be made at one time or another as new ideas and plans emerge or as difficulties occur, but these must be made with great care.

People need to know when important changes in their work will be required, so that they can have some sense of control over their lives. Predictability and consistency are important elements in enabling people to adapt their work lives to new practices.

Finally, while there are other elements of the implementation process, it is important to highlight five tools for success:

1. **Internal expertise should be used as much as possible.** This approach will give more credibility to the change process, will reduce the number of mistakes and difficulties incurred as consultants learn about the institution, will avoid external consultants using “cookie-cutter” approaches to the institution, and will enable the faculty and administrators to have colleagues who will remain with them over the long haul. While some external support may prove helpful, an assessment of internal resources is essential. It is my impression that there is much more faculty and administrative expertise at most colleges and universities than is recognized.

2. **Risk-takers should be supported.** Those faculty members and administrators who are the innovators and early adopters should be supported in their efforts, as an indication to others of the seriousness of the restructuring efforts and to show the risk-takers that the institution supports their activities.

3. **Link with other institutions going through the change process.** Restructuring a college or university is a difficult undertaking, and it is especially nice to know that others are struggling in the same way; the mutual support and commiseration gained in this way cannot be over-estimated. Such networking may overcome the tendency of faculty and administrators in a particular institution to believe that their problems are unique and the result of their lack of ability or the special nature of their own institution. By sharing experiences one institution may be helped to avoid sticky problems already solved by others. Further, faculty and administrators love to talk with colleagues and they may find it easier to share problems with those outside their institution than those inside, as well as to accept help from outsiders.

4. **Investing in faculty development will be necessary.** The changes being asked of faculty members in restructuring their work lives will be extraordinary and will require them to function in ways they never conceived of and for which they were not trained. Significant support for faculty development will be necessary. By providing these dollars— especially in difficult times—the university indicates its commitment to the changes as well as respect for the difficulties that faculty are undertaking.

5. **Investment in technology will be needed.** New technologies will play a key role in the restructuring process and universities must be willing to invest in them. This does not mean a university must have all the bells and whistles of the most recent technological developments, but it does mean that the technology needed to restructure the work of administrators and faculty will be available.

**Facing the Future**

Restructuring will be one of the major activities of many or most of the universities in the country over the next 10 years. The process by which these transformations take place will not be easy and will not be quick. As the planning and implementation process unfolds, many tough decisions will have to be made, some wrong turns will have to be redirected. Technology will not work as expected, difficult people and situations will have to be overcome, and adjustments made in the timetable. And, people will grieve the loss of the past—people, structures, and processes—as they enter into the future, whether leaping or crawling.

As Kotter concludes his article on transformational change efforts:

In reality, even successful change efforts are messy and full of surprises. But just as a relatively simple vision is needed to guide people through a major change, so a vision of the change process can reduce the error rate. And fewer errors can spell the difference between success and failure.

As I have discussed in my two previous articles, powerful pressures will force major changes in how our colleges and universities are organized. The major issue for those of us in higher education to face is whether we—faculty, administrators, and trustees—are going to lead these change efforts or be forced into them by external agencies and groups.

We must face the future. If it weren’t necessary we shouldn’t and wouldn’t do it.
art and science. But of even more concern to him is the adoption of corporate management, production, and marketing strategies by universities. He worries about the "growing political and business-oriented marketing of the mind" and is still convinced "that general education and its concerns are the center of every university worth its corn or its saltwater.

Finally, David Mathews provides yet another way of thinking about and defining public scholarship. He draws on scholars such as Thomas Bender and Robert Putnam to explore what public scholarship might mean. Communication, especially deliberative dialogue, is essential to public life, a theme echoed by Alejandro Sanz de Santamaría. Public scholars are "defined, in part, by how they go about producing knowledge, by the kinds of questions they raise, and most of all, by the richness of their concept of public life." He further asserts, "they can be identified by the way they stand in relation to the public. Public scholars stand with other citizens."

We invite you to join in examining the questions posed in these essays, and to join in exploring what public life might be if academics and administrators were to rethink their professional orientations. Echoing David Mathews, let us hear from you.

DIVIDED NO MORE
A Movement Approach to Educational Reform
By Parker J. Palmer

As I travel the country talking with faculty about the reform of teaching and learning, I meet many people who care about the subject and who have compelling visions for change. But after we have talked a while, our conversations take an almost inevitable turn. "These are wonderful ideas," someone will say, "but every last one of them will be defeated by the conditions of academic life."

That claim is usually followed by a litany of impediments to institutional reform: Teaching has low status in the academy, tenure decisions favor those who publish, scarce dollars will always go to research (or to administration, or to bricks and mortar), etc. No matter how hopeful our previous conversation has been, these reminders of institutional gridlock create a mood of resignation, even despair — and the game feels lost before play has begun.

The constancy of this experience has forced me to think more carefully about how change really happens. I have found myself revisiting an old but helpful distinction between an organizational approach and a movement approach to change. Both organizations and movements are valuable, worthy of leadership, and channels for change — and a healthy society will encourage symbiosis between the two (indeed, reform-minded administrators often welcome movement energies). But when an organizational mentality is imposed on a problem that requires movement sensibilities, the result is often despair. I believe that some of us are making precisely that mistake when it comes to the reform of teaching and learning.

The organizational approach to change is premised on the notion that bureaucracies — their rules, roles, and relationships — define the limits of social reality within which change must happen. Organizations are essentially arrangements of power, so this approach to change asks: "How can the power contained within the boxes of this organization be rearranged or redirected to
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achieve the desired goal?” That is a good question — except when it assumes that bureaucracies are the only game in town.

This approach pits entrenched patterns of corporate power against fragile images of change harbored by a minority of individuals, and the match is inherently unfair. Constrained by this model, people with a vision for change may devote themselves to persuading powerholders to see things their way, which drains energy away from the vision and breeds resentment among the visionaries when “permission” is not granted. When organizations seem less interested in change than in preservation (which is, after all, their job), would-be reformers are likely to give up if the organizational approach is the only one they know.

But our obsession with the organizational model may suggest something more sinister than mere ignorance of another way. We sometimes get perverse satisfaction from insisting that organizations offer the only path to change. Then, when the path is blocked, we can indulge the luxury of resentment rather than seek an alternative avenue of reform — and we can blame it all on external forces rather than take responsibility upon ourselves.

There is a part of human nature that would rather remain hopeless than take the risk of new life. It is not uncommon for academics to be driven by this “death wish,” even (and perhaps especially) the most idealistic among us. The most vigorous resistance to the movement model may come from reformers who have been defeated on one front and are too weary to open another. Sometimes it is easier to live with the comfort of despair than with the challenge of knowing that change can happen despite the inertia of organizations.

The Movement Way
But there is another avenue toward change: The way of the movement. I began to understand movements when I saw the simple fact that nothing would ever have changed if reformers had allowed themselves to be done in by organizational resistance. Many of us experience such resistance as checkmate to our hopes for change. But for a movement, resistance is merely the place where things begin. The movement mentality, far from being defeated by organizational resistance, takes energy from opposition. Opposition validates the audacious idea that change must come.

The black liberation movement and the women’s movement would have died aborning if racist and sexist organizations had been allowed to define the rules of engagement. But for some blacks, and for some women, that resistance affirmed and energized the struggle. In both movements, advocates of change found sources of countervailing power outside the organizational structures, and they nurtured that power in ways that eventually gave them immense leverage on organizations.

The genius of movements is paradoxical: They abandon the logic of organizations in order to gather the power necessary to rewrite the logic of organizations. Both the black movement and the women’s movement grew outside of organizational boundaries — but both returned to change the law, and the law of the land. I believe that the reform of teaching and learning will happen only if we who care about it learn to live this paradox.

What is the logic of a movement? How does a movement unfold and progress? I see four definable stages in the movements I have studied — stages that do not unfold as neatly as this list suggests, but often overlap and circle back on each other:

- Isolated individuals decide to stop leading “divided lives.”
- These people discover each other and form groups for mutual support.
- Empowered by community, they learn to translate “private problems” into public issues.
- Alternative rewards emerge to sustain the movement’s vision, which may force the conventional reward system to change.

I want to explore these stages here, but not simply in remembrance of things past. By understanding the stages of a movement, some of us may see more clearly that we are engaged in a movement today, that we hold real power in our hands — a form of power that has driven real change in recent times. Knowing our power, perhaps we will have less need or desire to succumb to the sweet despair of believing that organizational gridlock must have the last word.

Choosing Integrity
The first stage in a movement can be described with some precision, I think. It happens when isolated individuals make an inner
choice to stop leading “divided lives.” Most of us know from experience what a divided life is. Inwardly we feel one sort of imperative for our lives, but outwardly we respond to quite another. This is the human condition, of course: our inner and outer worlds will never be in perfect harmony. But there are extremes of dividedness that become intolerable, and when the tension snaps inside of this person, then that person, and then another, a movement may be under way.

The decision to stop leading a divided life, made by enough people over a period of time, may eventually have political impact. But at the outset, it is a deeply personal decision, taken for the sake of personal integrity and wholeness. I call it the “Rosa Parks decision” in honor of the woman who decided, one hot Alabama day in 1955, that she finally would sit at the front of the bus.

Rosa Parks’ decision was neither random nor taken in isolation. She served as secretary for the local NAACP, had studied social change at the Highlander Folk School, and was aware of others’ hopes to organize a bus boycott. But her motive that day in Montgomery was not to spark the modern civil rights movement. Years later, she explained her decision with a simple but powerful image of personal wholeness: “I sat down because my feet were tired.”

I suspect we can say even more: Rosa Parks sat at the front of the bus because her soul was tired of the vast, demoralizing gap between knowing herself as fully human and collaborating with a system that denied her humanity. The decision to stop leading a divided life is less a strategy for altering other people’s values than an uprising of the elemental need for one’s own values to come to the fore. The power of a movement lies less in attacking some enemy’s untruth than in naming and claiming a truth of one’s own.

There is immense energy for change in such inward decisions as they leap from one person to another and outward to the society. With these decisions, individuals may sit in motion a process that creates change from the inside out. There is an irony here. We often think of movements as “confrontational,” as hammering away at social structures until the sinners inside repent — and we contrast them (often invidiously) with the “slow, steady, faithful” process of working for change from within the organization. In truth, people who adopt an organizational approach to problems often become obsessed with their unyielding “enemies,” while people who adopt a movement approach must begin by changing themselves.

I met teachers around the country who are choosing integrity in ways reminiscent of Rosa Parks. These faculty have realized that even if teaching is a back-of-the-bus thing for their institutions, it is a front-of-the-bus thing for them. They have realized that a passion for teaching was what animated their decision to enter the academy, and they do not want to lose the primal energy of their professional lives. They have realized that they care deeply about the lives of their students, and they do not want to abandon the young. They have realized that teaching is an enterprise in which they have a heavy investment of personal identity and meaning — and they have decided to reinvest their lives, even if they do not receive dividends from their colleges or from their colleagues.

For these teachers, the decision is really quite simple: Caring about teaching and about students brings them health as persons, and to collaborate in a denial of that fact is to collaborate in a diminishment of their own lives. They refuse any longer to act outwardly in contradiction to something they know inwardly to be true — that teaching, and teaching well, is a source of identity for them. They understand that this refusal may evoke the wrath of the gods of the professions, who are often threatened when we reach for personal wholeness. But still, they persist.

What drives such a decision, with all its risks? The difference between a person who stays at the back of the bus and “sits on it” and one who finally decides to sit up front is probably lost in the mystery of human courage. But courage is stimulated by the simple insight that my oppression is not simply the result of mindless external forces; it comes also from the fact that I collaborate with these forces, giving assent to the very thing that is crushing my spirit. With this realization comes anger, and in anger is the energy that drives some people to say: “Enough. My feet are tired. Here I sit.”

These people have seized the personal insight from which all movements begin: No punishment can possibly be more severe than the punishment that comes from conspiring in the denial of one’s own integrity.
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But the personal decision to stop leading a divided life is a frail reed. All around us, dividedness is presented as the sensible, even responsible, way to live. So the second stage in a movement happens when people who have been making these decisions start to discover each other and enter into relations of mutual encouragement and support. These groups, which are characteristic of every movement I know about, perform the crucial function of helping the Rosa Parks of the world know that even though they are out of step, they are not crazy. Together we learn that behaving normally is sometimes nuts but seeking integrity is always sane.

Often, when I offer a workshop on the reform of teaching and learning, a professor will come to me privately and say: “I agree with you about these things — but I am the only one on this campus who feels that way.” Later in the day, two or three more faculty will take me aside and say the same thing. By evening I have spoken to eight or ten people who are committed to good teaching but are quite sure they are alone in these convictions on their campus.

While stage one is strong on many campuses, stage two is less well developed. Faculty who have decided to live “divided no more” are often unaware of each other’s existence — so weak are the communal structures of the academy, and so diffident are intellectuals about sharing “private” matters. It is difficult for faculty to seek each other out for mutual support. But it is clear from all great movements that mutual support is vital if the inner decision is to be sustained — and if the movement is to take its next crucial steps toward gathering power.

Where support groups do exist, they assume a simple form and function. Six or eight faculty from a variety of departments agree to meet on a regular but manageable schedule (say, once every two weeks) simply to talk about teaching. (The mix of departments is important because of the political vulnerability faculty often feel within their own guild halls.) They talk about what they teach, how they teach, what works and what doesn’t, and — most important of all — the joys and pains of being a teacher. The conversations are informal, confidential and, above all, candid. When you ask these people how they manage to add one more meeting to their crowded schedules, the answer often is: “This kind of meeting is not a burden, but a relief. It actually seems to save up my time.”

Some of these groups have evolved ground rules for conversation, and — on the evidence of other movements — such rules are vital if these groups are to flourish. Rules may be especially vital in the academy, where real conversation is often thwarted by a culture that invites posturing, intimidation, and keeping score. Ground rules cannot create new attitudes, but they can encourage new behavior.

For example, the ground rules may say that each person gets an opportunity to speak — but when the others respond, they may respond only with questions that will help the speaker clarify his or her inner truth. They may not criticize, give advice, offer pity, or say “tsk, tsk” when it turns out one has not read the latest book. The questions-only rule encourages real listening by banning one-upping, amateur psychoanalysis, quick “fixes,” and all the other ways we have of walling ourselves off from each other. Of course, people are always free to ask for help with the problems they face. But problem solving is not the primary purpose of these gatherings. Their purpose is to wrap the individual’s inner decision in a resolve that can only come from being heard by a supportive community.

At the moment, I suspect, more women than men are coming together on campus in support groups of this sort. The reason, I think, is simple: Women who care about teaching are involved in two movements at once — one in support of teaching, another in support of women in the academy — so they have double need of communal sustenance. Perhaps they have heard and heeded the admonition of Margaret Mead: “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.”

Going Public

The third stage of a movement has already been implied. As support groups develop, individuals learn to translate their private concerns into public issues, and they grow in their ability to give voice to these issues in public and compelling ways.

“As support groups develop, individuals learn to translate their private concerns into public issues, and they grow in their ability to give voice to these issues in public and compelling ways.”
But when women came together and began discovering the prevalence of their pain, they also began discerning its public roots. Then they moved from Freud to feminism.

The translation of private pain into public issues that occurs in support groups goes far beyond the analysis of issues; it also empowers people to take those issues into public places. It was in small groups (notably, in churches) that blacks were empowered to take their protest to the larger community — in songs and sermons and speeches, in pickets and in marches, in open letters and essays and books. Group support encourages people to risk the public exposure of insights that had earlier seemed far too fragile for that rough-and-tumble realm.

I am using the word “public” here in a way that is more classical than contemporary. The public realm I have in mind is not the realm of politics, which would return us to the manipulation of organizational power. Instead, to “go public” is to enter one’s convictions into the mix of communal discourse. It is to project one’s ideas so that others can hear them, respond to them, and be influenced by them — and so that one’s ideas can be tested and refined in the public crucible. The public, understood as a vehicle of discourse, is prepolitical. It is that primitive process of communal conversation, conflict, and consensus on which the health of institutionalized power depends.

Many would argue, of course, that our public process is itself in poor health and cannot be relied on for remedies. These critics claim that there is no longer a public forum for a movement to employ. But historically, it is precisely the energy of movements that has renewed the public realm; movements have the capacity to create the very public they depend on. However moribund the public may be, it is reinvigorated when people learn how to articulate their concerns in ways that allow — indeed, compel — a wider public to listen and respond.

Today, educational reform is becoming a focus of public discourse, and will become an even sharper focus if the movement grows. Many books have been written on the subject, and some — for better or for worse — have become best-sellers. Speakers roam the land planting seeds of change in workshops and convocations. New associations advance the cause of change in national and regional gatherings (and faculty who feel isolated on their own campuses seek them out as desert nomads seek oases). Well-established national associations have taken reform as an agenda.

Even more remarkable, the movement for educational reform has been joined by publics far beyond the walls of the academy. Parents, employers, legislators, and columnists are calling for more attention to teaching and learning, and their calls are insistent. Recently, a coalition of major accounting firms used the language of collaborative learning to press the agency that accredits business schools toward the reform of business education. At moments like that, one knows that “going public” can make a difference.

Because this activity does not always have direct political impact, some skeptics may call it “mere words.” But this criticism comes from an organizational mentality. By giving public voice to alternative values we can create something more fundamental than political change. We can create cultural change. When we secure a place in public discourse for ideas and images like “collaborative learning,” we are following those reformers who minted phrases like “affirmative action” and made them the coin of the realm. When the language of change becomes available in the common culture, people are better able to name their yearnings for change, to explore them with others, to claim membership in a great movement — and to overcome the disabling effects of feeling isolated and half-mad.

Alternative Rewards

As a movement passes through the first three stages, it develops ways of rewarding people for sustaining the movement itself. In part, these rewards are simply integral to the nature of each stage; they are the rewards that come from living one’s values, from belonging to a community, from finding a public voice. But in stage four, a more systematic pattern of alternative rewards emerges, and with it comes the capacity to challenge the dominance of existing organizations.

The power of organizations depends on their ability to reward people who abide by their norms — even the people who suffer from those norms. A racist society depends on a majority who are rewarded for keeping the minority “in its place” — and on a minority willing to stay there. But as members of either group discover rewards for alternative behavior, it becomes more difficult for racism to reign. An educational system that ignores human need in favor of a narrow version of professionalism depends on a reward system that keeps both faculty and students in their place.
But as soon as rewards for alternative behavior emerge for either group, it becomes more difficult for reform to be denied its day.

What are the alternative rewards offered by a growing movement? As a movement grows, the meaning one does not find in conventional work is found in the meaning of the movement. As a movement grows, the affirmation one does not receive from organizational colleagues is received from movement friends. As a movement grows, careers that no longer satisfy may be revisioned in forms and images that the movement has inspired. As a movement grows, the paid work one cannot find in conventional organizations may be found in the movement itself.

Ultimately, as a movement grows, conventional organizations are more and more likely to create spaces where movement-style work can be done. Forty years ago, anyone working openly for “equal opportunity” might have had a hard time getting paid work of any sort. Today, many organizations are required to pay someone to serve as their Equal Employment Opportunity officer. Similarly, black and feminist scholars whose insights have long been unwelcoming in the academy are not only employable today, but are often recruited with vigor.

In stage one, people who decide to live “divided no more” find the courage to face punishment by realizing that there is no punishment worse than conspiring in a denial of one’s own integrity. That axiom, inverted, shows how alternative rewards can create cracks in the conventional reward system and then grow in the cracks: People start realizing there is no reward greater than living in a way that honors one’s own integrity. Taken together, the two axioms trace a powerful vector of a movement’s growth—from rejecting conventional punishments to embracing alternative rewards.

These alternative rewards may seem frail and vulnerable when compared to the raises and promotions organizations are able to bestow on their loyalists. So they are. Integrity, as the cynics say, does not put bread on the table. But people who are drawn into a movement generally find that stockpiling bread is not the main issue for them. They have the bread they need and, given that, they learn the wisdom of another saying: “People do not live on bread alone.” We live, ultimately, on our integrity.

As we explore this fourth stage, where movements return to intersect with organizations, it is important to recall that a healthy society is one in which organizations and movements are related symbolically—as the case of black and feminist scholars will show. Without movements, such scholars would not be bringing new life to organizations; without organizations, such scholars would not have found ways to sustain careers.

But now that black and feminist scholars have found an academic niche, the need for the movement is not gone. Organizations often employ critics in order to contain them. By placing these scholars in air-tight departments, the academy may yet be able to keep them from breathing new life into the places where education is oxygen-starved. Indeed, the academic culture often inhibits black and feminist scholars themselves from teaching in ways that honor their own insights. The movement has succeeded, but the movement is still needed.

Of course, the educational reform movement is not fulfilled when the academy grants a toehold to nontraditional scholars, any more than the black liberation movement is fulfilled by a society that “allows” blacks to make a life on its margins. The movement will persist until the obvious is acknowledged: Teaching has as much right to full status in the academy as any other academic function—research, athletics, administration, lobbying, fundraising—and it may have even more right than some! Teaching simply belongs in the academy, and there is no need to defend that claim.

The defense, if any, must come from those who have promoted a concept of higher education so bizarre that it can ignore the question of how and why we teach and learn. We are at a moment in the history of education when the emptiness of that concept is clear—a moment when real progress on reform is possible. There is much to be done that I have not named here, from revising teaching as a legitimate form of scholarship (building on the superb work of the Carnegie Foundation) to developing more sophisticated strategies for change. But in the midst of those complexities, we must remember that all great movements start simply: A few people feel the pain of the divided life and resolve to live it no more. In that resolve is the power to live our moment to its full potential.

Postscript
Though the stages I have sketched here have historical warrant, they obviously comprise an “ideal type,” a schematic version of
how movements happen that is smoother and more hopeful in the
writing than in the living. Movements offer no guarantees of suc-
cess. But neither do organizations, nor life itself. What movements
do offer is a creative channel for energies that might otherwise be
extinguished. They offer us an alternative to the despairing cyni-
cism that is the constant snare of contemporary professional life.

Different people will find themselves at different stages of a
movement. Some will want to make a decision against dividedness,
some will need to join with others for support, some will have to
learn how to “go public,” and some will try to find alternative
rewards. Every stage has a contribution to make — not only to the
cause, but to the person.

At every stage of a movement there is both power to help
change happen and encouragement for disheartened souls.
Wherever we are on this journey, a step taken to renew our spirits
may turn out to be a step toward educational renewal — once we
understand the movement way.

THE PUBLIC
INTELLECTUAL AS
TRANSGRESSOR?
Addressing the Disconnection between Expert
and Civil Culture
By William M. Sullivan

The oddity of this topic lies not so much in what is stated as in the
context, a social as well as intellectual context, which gives it intel-
ligibility. The question I wish to address is why the notion of the
"public intellectual," a theme which Russell Jacoby and, most
recently, Robert Boynton, have brought to our attention, seems
nearly oxymoronic to many, why it seems to go against expecta-
tions, to transgress the usual use of language in the late twentieth-
century American culture.

"Public intellectual," as both Jacoby and Boynton argue, is in
one sense redundant. The very idea of an intellectual once conned,
from its origins in the Enlightenment, a learned concern for
the "republic of letters" as a major part of a public dialogue con-
cerned with the shaping of public opinion. It is only relatively
recently that "intellectual" has come to be applied to activities
focused on the more restricted circles of technically, usually aca-
demically, proficient experts.

Perhaps the best place to begin is by following Kenneth
Burke in trying to gain "perspective by incongruity." Consider this
judgment by Cicero, a source which also serves as a needed
reminder that the so-called "Western tradition" does not speak in a
simplistic, monotonic voice. We should, writes Cicero, beware of
taking the conception of the philosopher put forward by Plato in
his Republic as a sufficient characterization of the social responsi-
bilities which learning imposes. "For he (Plato) said that they
(philosophers) are immersed in the investigation of the truth and
that, disclaiming the very things for which most people vigorously
strive and even fight one another to the death, they count them as

This article is reprinted with permission of the author.
rom the vantage point of my vision, focused several years hence, I ask: To what extent, and in what ways, have universities been responsible for addressing society’s problems? This is what I see at the end of the first decade of the 2000’s.

In response to disgruntled voices from both inside and outside the academy challenging them throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s to move beyond their protected walls, universities have become deeply engaged in public issues. To tell the truth, universities were forced to take vigorous action in this direction to maintain public confidence and support. A very positive result, however, is that they have strengthened both their capacity and their willingness to engage the most pressing challenges then, and still, confronting our nation and its people—challenges related to successfully competing in a global economy, creating supportive climates for our youth, improving the quality of our schools, ensuring a sustainable environment, building strong communities, and coping with increasing ethnic and cultural diversity, to name a few.

Believe me, it took much more than rhetoric for universities to strengthen their involvement in societal issues. It took realigning the university in several fundamental ways. Making this change was not easy, particularly since so many forces in the universities supported the status quo. Nevertheless, substantive change was indeed accomplished. Here are several challenges that universities overcame as a result of their commitment to strengthen their social impact and sustain their social covenant.

James C. Votruba

First, universities rethought their core academic mission and its relationship to issues of public concern. At the time, most universities described their mission as involving teaching, research, and service with each treated as separate and conceptually distinct from the others. After much deliberation, some of it quite heated, universities agreed that, in fact, their fundamental mission is to promote learning accomplished through the discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge. These various forms of scholarship strengthen and inform each other and may take place in a variety of settings involving a variety of learners both on and off campus.

Keeping in mind the university’s fundamental mission to promote learning through various forms of scholarship, they further agreed that universities do not solve social problems nor should they be expected to do so. Rather, the responsibility of universities is to promote learning related to those problems so that those who are responsible for their resolution can make informed judgments. Promoting this learning, they posited, could best be accomplished through a variety of knowledge-based activities including applied research, technical assistance, demonstration projects, impact evaluation, policy analysis, as well as instructional offerings designed to deepen insights and promote understanding. This view of the university’s mission and its role in addressing social problems has, since the mid-2000’s, provided the foundation on which they have built a broad range of external partnerships with each partner contributing what it does best.
Second, universities rebalanced the faculty and unit-level incentive and reward system. Despite all the past institutional rhetoric to the contrary, the primary and sometimes sole criterion for faculty professional advancement at most universities had been traditional forms of research. Of course, research continues to be important. It is, as in the past, a defining characteristic of the university. However, the heavy focus on basic research between the 1960s through the 1990s allowed both undergraduate education and the extension and application of knowledge to become marginalized. When universities began to take seriously their role in addressing the challenges confronting society, they realized that they had to create conditions that supported and rewarded such work. As a result, criteria were developed to evaluate the quality of a faculty member's problem-focused scholarship. This work of a decade ago is now being reflected in salary, promotion, and tenure decisions. Incentives were also introduced to encourage unit-level engagement of social issues.

Third, universities bit the proverbial "bullet" in allocating institutional resources and now hold academic units accountable across the full breadth of the academic mission. With problem-focused scholarship a major institutional priority, obviously there needed to be human and financial resources to support it. University planning and budgeting processes were revised to create the expectation that each major academic unit would contribute to the full breadth of the academic mission, including the extension and application of knowledge to serve society. Today, units are able to negotiate the nature and extent of their contribution to each dimension of the academic mission but not whether they have a responsibility to engage each dimension. Finally, universities have accepted the hard reality that units will not make the extension and application of knowledge a high priority unless resource streams are available to support that activity and they will be held accountable for performance.

Fourth, universities subsequently strengthened their capacity to organize knowledge around problems as well as around disciplines. Even today, this is easy to advocate but much more difficult to achieve. Each discipline still tends to approach problems with its own theories, concepts, and language, which can become a formidable obstacle when trying to organize interdisciplinary problem-focused scholarship. Nevertheless, the majority of universities, committed to engaging effectively society's most complex problems, are continually creating opportunities and organizational structures that encourage collaboration across the disciplines.

Fifth, universities are doing a better job of preparing faculty to apply their scholarship in external settings. Working effectively in the public arena requires more than subject-area competence. It requires that faculty members understand how to engage in scholarship that is client centered and sensitive to context. Scholars must understand how to assess client needs, use language that the client understands, be sensitive to client culture and values, and promote interventions that build client capacity. It is essential that all recognize that the partnership between a faculty member and an external client must be built on the understanding that each has the capacity to be both teacher and learner. Developing these faculty skills has required new approaches in both graduate student training and faculty development across the professional lifespan. For example, along with teaching and research assistantships, universities have created graduate assistantships that offer opportunities to extend and apply knowledge in real world settings.

Finally, the university now has leaders at all levels who are committed to a full and active partnership with society. Universities hire presidents, provosts, deans, and chairs who have demonstrated their commitment to this work. Governing boards are carefully educated concerning both the potential and risks associated with the university's involvement in social issues. Senior faculty leaders are encouraged to extend their scholarship into the public arena and to become models and mentors for others. Ultimately, of course, the universities' valued contribution to issues of public concern has been made possible by the motivational force, skillful guidance, and consistent societal service path of leaders who possess vision, commitment, courage, and the strategic skills necessary to accomplish the institutional realignment process.

There were many forces that resisted realigning the university in ways that I have described. As you can well imagine, change of any sort was a threat to those who had a vested interest in the status quo. However, there were also forces that worked on behalf of realignment. They were represented by the voices of business leaders, small manufacturers, healthcare providers, farmers, teachers, social workers, government officials, community leaders, and citizens who demanded that the universities they had created and sustained become full partners in addressing the challenges that they were confronting.

The stakes were high. Universities had little time to lose in realigning to support the needs of contemporary society. American universities had historically received enormous public support because they were seen as central to advancing the public agenda. Reestablishing the university's social alignment in an era of unprecedented social dislocation and change engulfing the nation at the end of the millennium was a leadership challenge that universities ultimately took on with creativity and commitment.

By the late 1980's and early 1990's, universities such as Oregon State, Minnesota, Clemson, Wisconsin-Madison, and Michigan State had already embarked on major realignment efforts to strengthen their ties with society. Following the lead of these campuses, other pioneers began the realignment process, confirming that widespread repositioning and restructuring were possible and, indeed, invigorating. Today, most universities have embraced the new social covenant. Both society and universities see the benefit. The public has increased its support of universities because they are seen as indispensable partners in addressing society's most pressing challenges. Universities, basking in new prestige and public support, affirm that the risks associated with large-scale realignment were well worth the effort.

Note: This article is a revision of "Renewing the University's Social Covenant: The Leadership Challenge," which appeared in Focus (Volume 9, Number 1, May 1995), the newsletter of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation National Fellowship Program. Connie McKenna initiated discussion with Vothuba about envisioning the future and wrote the revised version with Jim's enthusiastic collaboration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Faculty Recruitment</th>
<th>Faculty Development</th>
<th>Institutional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Grants</strong></td>
<td>Scholarship of Engagement Mini Grant for faculty to connect their teaching research or service to community engagement. (Each state)</td>
<td>Faculty Fellows Grants for faculty leadership and modeling of the integration of teaching, research, and service through community engagement (Each state)</td>
<td>Universities as Citizens Development Grants for projects to strengthen the role of colleges and universities as institutional citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gatherings and Technical Assistance</strong></td>
<td>Campus-Based Workshop Training Individuals will attend this workshop to learn how to develop service learning workshops on their campuses (Collaborative)</td>
<td>Faculty Fellows Retreats Fellows will gather three times a year for training and mutual support (Each state)</td>
<td>Universities as Citizens Summer Planning Institutes for colleges and universities to plan initiatives to strengthen their role as institutional citizens (Collaborative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus-Based Workshop Series Attendees of the Campus-Based Workshop Training will conduct workshops on their campuses which will be advertised statewide (Each state)</td>
<td>Senior Faculty Fellows Meeting At the beginning and end of each grant year, the Senior Fellows from each state will gather for training, reflection, and evaluation (Collaborative)</td>
<td>Universities as Citizens Colloquiums One colloquium per semester with national speaker and time for discussion (Collaborative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Scholarships to individuals to present their work at conferences (Each state)</td>
<td>Faculty Fellows Workshop Series Conducted by Faculty Fellows on critical issues in service learning i.e. roles and responsibilities, action research, portfolio development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications</strong></td>
<td>Service Learning Workshop Curriculum Guide</td>
<td>Documenting the Scholarship of Engagement Faculty Fellows Curriculum Guide Special issue of the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning on Research and Assessment Service Learning: Methods of Assessment</td>
<td>Universities as Citizens Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Research Project on faculty motives and obstacles to community engagement</td>
<td>Research Project on faculty motives and obstacles to community engagement</td>
<td>Research Project on institutionalization of community engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIANA CAMPUS COMPACT
SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES
1996-97

PROGRAMS

Combining Community Service with Academic Study

- Awarded 17 course development grants (6 in general disciplines, 2 in the Science, Engineering, Architecture, Mathematics and Computer Science [SEAMS], and 9 in education).

- Selected 10 new Faculty Fellows and one Senior Fellow (6 general disciplines, 3 SEAMS disciplines, and 2 education).

- The eight Service Learning Coordinators (SLC) partnerships continued. Hosted an SLC Summer Planning Institute on July 29-30, 1996 at Butler University. SLC partnerships developed year-long action plans and attended workshops on sustainability, fundraising, and partnership building.

- Published several articles on the Faculty Fellows project:
  


- Presented at several conferences on the Faculty Fellows Project.

Developing Students through Community Service

- Awarded 33 Community Service Mini-Grants during two rounds (25 in the fall and 9 in the spring).

- Organized transportation and lodging for 17 students, staff, and faculty to attend the 1997 National Conference on Student Community Service (the COOL Conference) on March 13-16, 1997 in Cleveland, Ohio.

- Organized a three workshop college student track at the 3rd Annual Partnership Conference, April 11, 1997.

- Selected the First Annual Richard J. Wood Student Community Commitment Award recipients - Fatima Hyder, Earlham College and Colleen Frazier, Indiana University East. Awards were presented by Richard J. Wood at the Third Annual Partnerships Conference Awards Banquet on April 10, 1997.

- Awarded 18 Side By Side grants (8 - 1st round, 10 - 2nd round). Side by Side grants are for community service projects designed and implemented by college students and youth in equal partnership.

Building a Sustainable Network

- Continued to develop the Advisory Board. Held four meetings (September, November, January, April). The Executive Committee continued to provide oversight of the Advisory Board and guidance to the Executive Director. Faculty Fellows and Community Service Mini grantees presented at the November and January meetings, respectively.

(over)
President Alan Harre of Valparaiso University began his term as Presidents’ Board chair on July 1, 1996. President Harre, President Parker Marden of Manchester College, President Daniel Felicetti of Marion College, President John Worthen of Ball State University, and President Edward Malloy of the University of Notre Dame, attended Campus Compact’s Presidents’ Leadership Colloquium prior to the ACE Conference in March.

Co-sponsored the **Third Annual Partnerships Conference: Community, Service, Learning in Indiana** on April 10-11, 1997. Co-sponsors were the Indiana Department of Education, Indiana Commission on Community Service, Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, Indiana Office of the Corporation for National Service, IUPUI Office of Service Learning, and Youth as Resources of Southwestern Indiana. Frank Newman presented the keynote speech at the Thursday evening awards banquet. Suellen Reed, Richard Wood, and Governor and Mrs. Frank O’Bannon presented statewide awards. The April 11th conference presented 21 workshops in seven tracks including fundraising, college students, and *Universities as Citizens*.

**Embedding Service Learning into Teacher Education (ESTE)**

- Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) received a grant from the Corporation for National Service’s Chief Executive Officer’s Fund for the Advancement of Service Learning. Indiana Campus Compact is the IDOE’s partner in implementing this project to infuse service learning into teacher education.
- Awarded 9 course development grants for faculty to develop service learning courses.
- Held a meeting of Deans of Schools of Education on February 7, 1997. This meeting was attended by nearly 30 representatives of 17 Schools of Education.
- Selected five schools to participate in the ESTE Summer Planning Institute (Ball State University, Indiana State University, Indiana University Northwest, Indiana University Southeast, and Purdue University).
- Will hold the ESTE Summer Planning Institute on July 13-17, 1997 at the Seasons Lodge in Brown County.
- Will award $10,000/each ESTE implementation grants to schools who attend the ESTE Summer Planning Institute and successfully develop a comprehensive action plan that aligns with the goals of the ESTE project.

**Universities as Citizens**

- Awarded a grant from PSI’s Cinergy Foundation to pilot the *Universities as Citizens* project.
- Held three *Universities as Citizens* colloquia on the campus of IUPUI. Alexander Astin, James Votruba, and Mary Walshok served as keynote speakers. Afternoon working sessions were held after each colloquium. In total, nearly 125 faculty, staff, students, administrators, community representatives attended the colloquia.
- Published proceedings of the Fall Colloquia and distributed nationally.
- Submitted a *Universities as Citizens* book prospectus to three publishers. Received letter of interest from Jossey-Bass and are currently in the second stage of negotiations.
- Planned and implemented a *Universities as Citizens* track at the **Third Annual Partnership Conference**.
- Will hold a *Universities as Citizens* Summer Planning Institute on June 16-18, 1997 at the University Place Conference Center. In addition to Indiana, colleges and universities from Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio have been invited to participate in this institute.
- Submitted a *Learn & Serve: Higher Education* grant proposal to the Corporation for National Service. If funded the program would continue the *Universities as Citizens* project with implementation grants, colloquia, publications, and research.
Michigan Campus Compact
AN OVERVIEW

31 Kellogg Center, East Lansing, MI 48824-1022
E-Mail: MCC1989@aol.com Phone: (517) 353-9393 Fax: (517) 355-3302

Michigan Campus Compact is affiliated with Michigan Nonprofit Association

Director: Lisa McGettigan

- The Michigan Campus Compact (MCC) is a coalition of Michigan’s university and college presidents whose purpose is to facilitate on their campuses a commitment to community service that will lead students to develop a life-long service ethic and will promote service learning in the curriculum.

- MCC promotes “educational citizenship” by helping campuses encourage service and service learning experiences which develop students’ sense of civic responsibility. Compact members believe that direct contact with social problems and efforts to solve them allows students to reflect critically on the world around them and encourages them to take an active role in their community. These experiences lay the foundation for a life-long ethic of public responsibility and community service.

- This ethic serves both the general community and the student. Skills gained in service experiences are applicable far beyond graduation from college. Through these efforts students develop skills such as: leadership, listening, problem-solving, team-building, collaboration, and self-discipline. Students learn initiative and responsibility. Direct involvement gives them a greater understanding of the issues facing our nation. It increases their commitment to solving problems and better prepares them for living in a multicultural society.

- Formed in 1989 as one of the nation’s first statewide campus compacts, MCC is composed of public and private, four-year and two-year institutions of higher education in Michigan. Through its membership, MCC is strengthening existing community service programs, encouraging the creation of new ones, promoting academic service learning, and advocating public policies that advance student community service while fostering cooperation between the public and private educational sectors.

Membership in the Michigan Campus Compact includes many benefits:

- Technical Assistance - MCC provides assistance in a variety of forms. Consultant Service - The MCC staff consults with each member institution about ways to strengthen or expand its community service program. Members receive at least one on-site visit a year from the director of MCC.

- Seminars/Workshops - MCC sponsors numerous workshops and conferences on important issues including mentoring, integrating service into the curriculum and leadership development. Every summer, the MCC Student Service Leadership Conference, held at Camp Minwanca, engages over 100 students from across Michigan in developing annual action plans for community service efforts on their respective campuses. A Faculty/Administrator Institute is held annually for faculty and administrators from member institutions. Its purpose is to discuss methods of infusing service into the curriculum and means of creating institutional support for those faculty that do service learning.
Student Leadership Development - Students from member institutions have the opportunity to participate in SCAN (Student Community Action Network). SCAN is an action-oriented, student-focused task force composed of two students from each member institution, established to insure that student voices in Michigan are heard. SCAN provides a forum for students statewide to network, collaborate, and disseminate information. Monthly meetings also contain an educational component led by students. SCAN sponsored the first Student Service Learning Winter Workshop in January 1996.

Grants - As funding is available, MCC awards Venture Grants to individuals or groups from member institutions to encourage the development of innovative public and community service projects. Projects may be initiated by students, faculty or staff. Funded projects may include direct service activities, research and evaluation, curriculum initiatives, leadership training and the testing of model programs. From 1989 - 1995, through financial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, MCC has funded 130 Venture Grants totaling $400,000.

Opportunities for Networking and the Development of Leadership Skills - Committee meetings, seminars, and workshops are scheduled throughout the year to facilitate the discussion of ideas. MCC manages a list serve for faculty, staff, and student groups among MCC member institutions.

Resource Library - MCC’s Resource Library functions as a statewide clearinghouse, providing resource materials from a variety of sources to its member institutions. A resource bibliography details academic, technical, and practical information available in the office. MCC also distributes materials from the national Campus Compact and other affiliates such as Youth Service America. In addition, MCC will publish two quarterly newsletters and informational pamphlets in the near future as well as summaries of funded projects and an annual report.

Student Community Service Awards - MCC annually recognizes students in Michigan Campus Compact member institutions at the Annual Recognition Ceremony for their outstanding contributions to community service in their communities.

Faculty/Staff Community Service Learning Awards - The Faculty/Staff Community Service Learning Award recognizes outstanding faculty/staff who promote student involvement in community service or service learning.

The Michigan Campus Compact endeavors to use the collective expertise and experience of its participant campuses in establishing a common base of knowledge from which to build a more effective community service network. It seeks to initiate new projects and to enhance those already in existence. It works to generate new ideas, to build consensus on issues, to assist collaborative efforts, to foster public awareness, to encourage greater communication and to provide new program incentives, all with the larger objective of encouraging life-long commitment to community service.
Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service is a national coalition of 547 college and university presidents committed to helping students develop the values and skills of citizenship through participation in public and community service. It is the only national higher education organization whose primary purpose is to support academically based public and community service.

Campus Compact assists its member campuses through a network of 21 state Compact offices and its centers for community colleges and historically black colleges and universities (hosted by Maricopa Community Colleges and Spelman College, respectively). Member campuses are bonded together as a coalition, actively supporting presidents, faculty, staff and students to reach into the community to build partnerships and to improve the social and economic well-being of our American communities.

**Campus Compact Projects**
Since 1985 Campus Compact has
- provided seed grants, information referrals, and consultation to member campuses to strengthen campus-based service programs;
- helped shape federal, state, and local policy;
- organized institutes and developed resource materials to support and expand the role of faculty in service initiatives through the Project on Integrating Service and Academic Study;
- developed the Campus Partners in Learning mentoring initiative to pair college students with middle school students in long term, developmental relationships;
- promoted national awareness of the educational and societal benefits of community service through its media efforts; and
- offered the annual Howard R. Swearer Student Humanitarian Awards to recognize outstanding student community service and the Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service Learning to honor faculty support of integrating service into the curriculum.

**Membership**
To join Campus Compact, the college or university president signs a letter of commitment to the principles of the Compact, names five staff liaisons on his or her campus, and submits a membership fee based on full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment. In states where state compacts exist, presidents join through that state office.

**For more information, contact**
Campus Compact, Box 1975, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, 401-863-1119.

*Campus Compact is a project of the Education Commission of the States.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFERENCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FURTHER INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points of Light Foundation</td>
<td>June 29 - July 2, 1997</td>
<td>New York City, NY</td>
<td>202-223-5001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 National Community Service Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Campus Compact Fall Conference</td>
<td>October 3 - 5, 1997</td>
<td>Denison University, Granville, OH</td>
<td>Ohio Campus Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>614-376-4834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEE 1997 National Conference</td>
<td>October 22 - 25, 1997</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>National Society for Experiential Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(National Society for Experiential Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3509 Haworth Drive, Suite 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27609-7229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Away</td>
<td>November 7 - 9, 1997</td>
<td>University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>615-343-0385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fourth National Conference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:BRAKAWAY@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu">BRAKAWAY@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Campuses and Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.vanderbilt.edu/breakaway">http://www.vanderbilt.edu/breakaway</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Dropout Prevention Network Conference</td>
<td>November 9 - 11, 1997</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>616-929-0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind the Mask: A Child Worth Saving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAHE Faculty Roles and Rewards Conference</td>
<td>January 29 - February 1, 1998</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaheffrr@aahe.org">aaheffrr@aahe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAHE National Conference on Higher Education</td>
<td>March 21 - 24, 1998</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmanes@aahe.org">mmanes@aahe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:oneworld98@aol.com">oneworld98@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nylc.org">http://www.nylc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAHE National Conference on Assessment</td>
<td>June 13 - 17, 1998 (tentative)</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mdormenech@aahe.org">mdormenech@aahe.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 20, 1997

Dear Colleague:

Indiana Campus Compact is pleased to announce the third year of the Learn and Serve Faculty Fellows program. This unique opportunity provides support for faculty to integrate community engagement and service learning into all aspects of their professional development (teaching, research, and service).

Enclosed please find a request for proposals (RFP) for the program. Through a statewide competition, nine Learn and Serve Faculty Fellows will be selected. Two of the Fellows will be chosen specifically from among the Science, Engineering, Architectural, Mathematics, and Computer Science (SEAMS) disciplines and two will be selected from schools of education. The remaining five Fellows will be chosen from among all disciplines.

We invite proposals from faculty in collaboration with community based organizations for projects that connect faculty professional life to the communities in which they live. The RFP contains information about the program, application process, and timeline. The deadline for receipt of proposals is Friday, September 26, 1997.

The length of the fellowship will be 10 months with the term beginning October 1, 1997 and ending July 31, 1998. Each Fellow will be awarded $4,000. This award will consist of a) $3,600 to buy release time (e.g. salary for part-time replacement), to compensate Fellow for time spent on program, and/or expenses related to the Fellows program (e.g. in-state travel or expenses related to service to community based organization) and b) $400 for travel to a national conference. In addition, each Fellow will be responsible for a $1,000 departmental match.

Funding for this project is made available through the Corporation for National Service, Campus Compact, and a partnership with the Indiana Department of Education.

If you are interested in reading more about the Faculty Fellows program, please call Indiana Campus Compact to request a draft of an article about the program that will be published in the Fall 1997 issue of the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.

Please circulate the RFP to any faculty that might be interested. If you have any questions, contact the Indiana Campus Compact office at (317) 274-6500.

Richard Gomes  
Executive Director

Dr. Randall Osborne  
1997-98 Senior Faculty Fellow

Brian Hiltunen  
Project Director
INDIANA CAMPUS COMPACT
LEARN AND SERVE FACULTY FELLOWS PROGRAM
1997-98 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Introduction

The Learn and Serve Faculty Fellows program is designed to establish a new model for faculty professional development. This model is premised on the idea that community service provides an excellent means by which the three components of faculty professional development (teaching, research, and service) can support and strengthen each other.

In the first two years of the program, sixteen Faculty Fellows representing twelve different disciplines from nine different campuses were selected. Faculty Fellows successfully integrated community service into all aspects of their professional development. For example, one Faculty Fellow taught an ethics course that involved students providing service to Aids Task Force Richmond. The faculty member provided professional service to the task force by designing a series of AIDS HIV education workshops for public school teachers and other educators. The faculty member connected her service to research on citizenship and moral discourse.

In an effort to build a strong and productive social and intellectual community, the Faculty Fellows were linked through retreats, a listserv, conference calls, group projects, and Indiana Campus Compact events. This effort to promote community among the Faculty Fellows is viewed as central to the success of the program.

Program Description

In the 1997-98 academic year, Indiana Campus Compact will award nine Learn and Serve Faculty Fellowships. These scholars will be chosen through a competitive, statewide process outlined below. Two of the Fellows will be chosen exclusively from the Science, Engineering, Architectural, Mathematics, and Computer Science (SEAMS) disciplines and two more will be chosen from schools of education. The remaining five will be selected from among all disciplines.

All nine Faculty Fellows will be involved in an effort to infuse community service into teaching, research and service. First, each Faculty Fellow will be required to perform service for a community organization. This community service will be related to the Fellow’s academic discipline or the Fellow’s expertise as an educator. Second, Faculty Fellows will design a research, scholarly, or artistic creation relating to the service performed with the community organization or to the practice of service learning. Third, each Faculty Fellow will offer a service learning course within the grant year (October 1, 1997 - July 31, 1998). By engaging faculty members in service learning pedagogy, service based research, and community service, the Faculty Fellows program will provide the participating institutions with spokespeople capable of demonstrating that service learning is not ancillary but integral to faculty teaching, research, and service. Indiana Campus Compact believes that this will increase the quality of service learning; increase the weight given to service learning when promotion, tenure, and merit increase evaluations are made; and legitimize service learning as a pedagogy by increasing the number of service learning courses.

To provide leadership and guidance to the Faculty Fellows, a faculty member from among the last year’s Faculty Fellows’ class has been chosen to serve as a Senior Fellow. The Senior Fellow will aid in the design and evaluation of the program by assisting with planning and leading of three Faculty Fellows retreats; mentoring Faculty Fellows; modeling research by designing and commencing a research project that relates to service; chairing the Faculty Fellows selection committee; and sitting on the project evaluation team.

Indiana Campus Compact is committed to supporting faculty after their year as a Faculty Fellow by offering them opportunities to come together at retreats, including them on a listserv, and engaging them with other Indiana Campus Compact activities.

Funds for this project are made possible through the Corporation for National Service under the Learn and Serve America: Higher Education program area. The Corporation for National Service seeks to support efforts to make service an integral part of the education and life experiences of students in the nation’s colleges and universities. It
is primarily interested in supporting campus-based service-learning programs that directly and demonstrably benefit both the community and the students who serve, meeting unmet educational, public safety, human and environmental needs. Additional funds have been made available through a grant from Campus Compact and a partnership with the Indiana Department of Education.

**Faculty Fellow Responsibilities:**

1) **Service:** Provide research, scholarship, and/or expertise to meet a community organization's stated need. The service provided will be one that will have otherwise had to have been purchased by the community organization. For example, facilitating a strategic planning process, developing a marketing strategy, or doing a needs analysis.

2) **Research:** Design a research, scholarly, or artistic project within their discipline that relates either to the service performed (see #1) or to the practice of service learning.

3) **Teaching:** Offer a service learning course within the grant year (October 1, 1997 - July 31, 1998).

4) Provide encouragement, advice, and support to faculty members resulting in the creation of service learning courses.

5) Participate in 3 retreats (1 one-day and 2 two-day retreats). **Please note that the first retreat is scheduled for October 24-25, 1997.**

6) Facilitate at least one faculty service learning workshop at their institution.

7) Participate on a Faculty Fellows electronic mail discussion list.

8) Attend at least one national conference on service learning or attend a disciplinary conference where you will be making a presentation on service learning.

9) Participate in a Faculty Fellows group project.

10) Develop a portfolio of work accomplished as a Fellow.

**Application Contents**

All proposals must be typewritten and contain the following:

- **Title Page (form attached)** Must be signed by university official who has authority to accept faculty grants

- **Abstract:** Briefly describe the content of the proposal (double spaced not to exceed one page)

- **Proposal Narrative:** (length - four to six double spaced pages) The proposal narrative should:

  - Describe how service will be integrated into your course(s);
  - Identify a community organization with which you will work toward meeting a community need. Include a description of the need(s) addressed by the agency, and an indication of the types of service you will contribute (this should be service that you perform not service associated with a course you teach);
  - Describe the disciplinary research or creative activity that you will be engaged in as a Faculty Fellow. Show how community service or service learning will be incorporated;
  - Describe the strategies you will use in recruiting other faculty members to develop service learning courses;
  - Describe how service learning fits into your philosophy of professional development;
  - Describe how you will continue to model the integration of community service in your teaching, research, and service past the Fellowship year

- **Letters of Support:**

  - Include a letter from the appropriate person at the community agency where you will be performing your service indicating the agency's willingness to work with you in developing a service plan.
  - Provide letters of support from your chair and dean. The letter from your chair should contain a commitment to the $1,000 departmental match.
Completed Objective Forms

Include completed participant, community, and institutional impact objective forms. (See attached appendices for forms) These should be based on the teaching, research, and service to be done as a Faculty Fellow. Complete up to three worksheets (one per objective) for each of the three areas of impact (community, participant, institutional). The application should contain no more than nine worksheets (See attached appendices for sample objective worksheets).

*Please note that participant impact refers exclusively to college students.

Budget and Budget Narrative: A detailed budget should be included showing how funds are to be expended. The award and match are described in the Fellowship Terms section.

Selection Criteria

Proposals will be reviewed according to the following:

- Quality of the plan to integrate community service into teaching, research, and service.
- Strength of participant, community, and institutional objectives.
- Capacity to deliver outcomes.
- Quality of the relationships between individual faculty and community based organization.
- Institutional commitment to service learning.
- Evidence that the candidate will continue to model the integration of community service into teaching, research, and service past the grant period.
- Commitment to act as resource to other faculty at the candidate’s institution.
- Potential for improving and advancing service learning practice and research, disciplinary research related to community service, and faculty/community collaboration.

Fellowship Terms:

The length of the fellowship will be 10 months with the term beginning October 1, 1997 and ending July 31, 1998. Each Fellow will be awarded $4,000. This award will consist of a) $3,600 to buy release time (e.g. salary for part-time replacement) to compensate Fellow for time spent on program, and/or expenses related to the Fellows program (e.g. in-state travel) and b) $400 for travel to a national conference. In addition, each Fellow will be responsible for a $1,000 match. This match should come from institutional funds (e.g. departmental budget). The match could include indirect cost and costs related to Fellows program including: support staff, research expenses, travel, research assistant, and office supplies.

Eligibility:

Faculty from Indiana Campus Compact member campuses are eligible to apply. Faculty from all disciplines and professional schools are encouraged to apply. Current Faculty Fellows and alumni may apply, however, preference will be given to new applicants with quality proposals.

Timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 1997</td>
<td>Faculty Fellows Proposals Due To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana Campus Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c/o University Place Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>850 West Michigan, Suite 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN 46202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(No Faxed Proposals Will Be Accepted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29, 1997</td>
<td>Faculty Fellows Proposals Reviewed and Fellows Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 1997</td>
<td>Faculty Fellows Notified of Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 24-25, 1997</td>
<td>First Program Retreat (to be held in Indianapolis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reporting Requirements:**

Faculty Fellows will be responsible for:
- tracking progress and providing evaluation to Indiana Campus Compact.
- completing all Corporation for National Service and Indiana Campus Compact evaluation forms.
- completing monthly programmatic reports.
- submitting a portfolio of work as a Faculty Fellow.
- submitting quarterly fiscal reports (These reports will be completed by the appropriate fiscal agent at each Fellow’s institution).

**Indiana Campus Compact:**

Indiana Campus Compact is a statewide consortium of 25 public and private college and university campuses that sustains and strengthens an institutional commitment to community service and the development of a lifelong service ethic. Based upon our mission and commitment to service learning, Indiana Campus Compact’s goals are to: 1) improve the quality of teaching and learning, 2) support the development of Indiana communities, 3) promote increased civic responsibility, 4) prepare students for service to society, and 5) promote presidential and student leadership.

**For More Information:**

Contact Brian Hiltunen, Project Director, Indiana Campus Compact, (317) 274-6500.
Applicant (Name and Title): ____________________
Department:_____________________________________________________
College/University:______________________________________________
Address:________________________________________________________
Telephone: ______________ Fax: ______________ E-mail: ____________
(if applicable)
Name of Collaborating Community Organization(s): ____________________________
Brief Description of Proposal: _________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Authorized Fiscal Agent Signature(s): ________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

PROPOSALS MUST BE RECEIVED IN THE INDIANA CAMPUS
COMPACT OFFICE BY SEPTEMBER 26, 1997. SEND APPLICATIONS
TO:

Indiana Campus Compact
c/o University Place Conference Center
850 W. Michigan, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46202

For more information, contact Brian Hiltunen, Project Director, at (317) 274-6500.
Objectives Worksheet

Using copies of this blank worksheet, provide up to three objectives in each of the three impact areas: community, participant, and institution. Use a separate worksheet for each objective. For each objective, check the relevant impact area, and answer all five questions. For specific instructions and examples, contact your program officer.

This objective is related to:

☐ Community impact  ☐ Participant impact  ☑ Institutional impact

1. What work will be done? What activities will the program undertake?

2. What is the expected result of the work or activities described above?

3. How will you measure the impact of your activities or quality of your work?

4. By what standard will you gauge success?

5. How many individuals will benefit?

Objective statement:
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- Community impact
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Objective statement:
Objectives Worksheet

Using copies of this blank worksheet, provide up to three objectives in each of the three impact areas: community, participant, and institution. Use a separate worksheet for each objective. For each objective, check the relevant impact area, and answer all five questions. For specific instructions and examples, contact your program officer.
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2. What is the expected result of the work or activities described above?

3. How will you measure the impact of your activities or quality of your work?

4. By what standard will you gauge success?

5. How many individuals will benefit?

Objective statement:
Every program that receives Learn and Serve America: Higher Education funding must monitor and evaluate program success based on objectives that the program and Learn and Serve staffs have agreed upon. This document contains a set of guidelines that Corporation staff will use to assess the quality of the program objectives and related evaluation activities.

There are several elements we expect in the monitoring and evaluation components of your Learn and Serve America program:

- A mission statement
- A set of annual objectives-related data
- A plan for continuous program improvement
- A system for collecting additional descriptive and demographic data required by the Corporation

**MISSION STATEMENT**

The mission statement is the broadest, least specific statement of what a program hopes to accomplish. Some mission statements may be relatively concrete:

[The program] will institutionalize service-learning by modifying campus policies, conducting faculty development workshops on service-learning, and funding service-learning initiatives with institutional dollars.

Others may be more visionary, providing a less immediate sense of the work a program will do:

[The program] will institutionalize service-learning through campus policies and practices.

For a mission statement, either is acceptable. We view mission statements as expressions of hope and not necessarily as definitions of outcomes to be achieved.

**ANNUAL OBJECTIVES**

The Corporation is committed to measuring the success, or lack of success, of funded programs. An annual objective is a statement of what your program believes will be the result of a year of effort, a statement about what will change.

It is possible to measure several types of change. Change could be defined in terms of the process of operating a program. Generally speaking, objectives addressing the process of operating a program are called *process* objectives. Here are two examples:
To recruit 20 participants within six weeks of beginning operation.
To hold bi-weekly reflection meetings with all participants.

These objectives address *how* work will get done, not *what* work will get done. The ultimate goal of a program is unlikely to be the placement of its participants or the holding of meetings, although those are important processes in creating a quality program.

In contrast to process objectives are *outcome* objectives. Outcome objectives focus on the *end products* of a program. For example:

- To increase school attendance through a mentoring program.

Of course, a spectrum of "outcomes" exist. Setting up a mentoring program leads to a decrease in drop-out rates which leads to increases in graduation rates which leads to better job histories, and so on. The trick is to establish objectives as far along the spectrum away from processes and towards outcomes as possible, given the constraint of measurability in a single year.

Components of an Objective

For an objective to be useful, it must be specific enough to allow decision makers to determine what, if any, change occurs as the result of a program's efforts; for example, the following objective:

- To improve the reading skills of at-risk youth through tutoring.

This objective describes a service activity and a desirable outcome, but provides no indication of how the "improvement" will be measured or what "reading skills" the program expects to improve. An improved objective would describe both the desired change and a means of determining whether the change occurred:

- To improve the reading skills of at-risk youth through tutoring, as measured by performance on the school district's reading comprehension test, to be administered before and after the program.

We now know what change is desired (better reading skills) and how the change will be measured (a comprehension test), but we still lack an important detail. How big of a change in reading comprehension does the program hope to achieve? That is, would you be satisfied if the average increase in test scores was one percent? Regardless of the answer to this question, the problem is apparent. Programs and Corporation staff need to have a common standard for measuring whether an objective was achieved. Thus, we need a third revision of our objective:
• To improve the reading skills of at-risk youth through tutoring, as measured by an average increase of five percent on the school district’s reading comprehension test, to be administered before and after the program.

With this objective, your program staff and the Corporation have a common expectation of “how” achievement will be measured and “how big” an achievement to expect. Setting the “how big” component of an objective requires careful consideration and expert knowledge of your service area. Programs that set overly ambitious standards may fail to meet their objectives even if they are providing high-quality services. Programs that set very low standards for success may appear incapable of achieving substantial goals, and therefore, will be unlikely to receive Corporation support.

Only one element of our objective is missing. How many service recipients will there be? Will the program tutor 4 students or 40? Thus, we need one last revision for the objective to define clearly how success will be measured:

• To improve the reading skills of 25 at-risk youth through tutoring, as measured by an average increase of five percent on the school district’s reading comprehension test, to be administered before and after the program.

To summarize, each objective should include a description of:

• The work to be done (a product or service to be provided)
• A result of the work
• A means of measuring the quality or success of the work
• A standard of quality or success the program hopes to meet
• The number of service recipients

Identifying the five components in an objective is easier in some cases than in others. In product-oriented programs, for example, the work to be done and the result of the work may seem almost indistinguishable (building houses, high-quality houses built). Nevertheless, it should be possible to identify each component, even if some are inferred rather than explicit in your written objectives. Corporation staff will review your objectives to determine that all five components can be readily identified. To the extent that the components are missing or poorly specified, you should be prepared to revise your objectives to make them complete. Some examples may help to clarify how the components might be combined to create an objective:

Example 1:

---

1As a general rule of thumb, each objective statement should contain only one result.
To improve the mathematics skills of at least 25 students through peer tutoring. Students’ tutoring needs will be determined by a diagnostic test at the beginning of the program. Students will master at least 75% of their skills that require remediation, as determined by retesting.

1. The work to be done is tutoring.
2. The result to be achieved is improvement in mathematics skills.
3. The measure of quality a pre-test, post-test comparison.
4. The standard of success is “mastery” of 75% of the skills tutored.
5. Twenty-five students benefit from the service.

The nature of the diagnostic test and the meaning of the word “mastery” are not specified, so we would want to hear more about those elements from program staff. In general, however, the program has included in this objective all the essential elements necessary to permit a concrete discussion of program achievements.

Example 2:

- Protect our Environment members will engage in lead abatement activities in 25 public housing units during our initial year of operation, resulting in a reduced incidence of lead poisoning among residents.

1. The work to be done is lead abatement.
2. The result to be achieved is a reduced incidence of lead poisoning.
3. The measure of quality is not described.
4. The standard of success is not described.
5. The number of people to benefit from the activity is not specific.

Corporation staff would want to discuss with this program’s staff the absence of components 3 and 4, and the specifics of component 5. The program operators may feel that, for this activity, components 3 and 4 and the specifics of 5 are unnecessary. Because Corporation staff are not environmental experts, we would look forward to obtaining the professional judgments of both the program’s staff and other environmentists to determine if there are standards of quality for such an activity. Our concern is for the quality of the objectives, not the quantity of them.

Objectives and the Three Impacts

Learn and Serve America: Higher Education programs should provide up to three objectives in each of the following areas:

- community impact,
- participant impact, and
- institutional impact.
Community impact objectives must be detailed and result-oriented. While processes are important, they must lead directly to demonstrable results. Generally, the activity (the first component of an objective) will address the process, while the result (the second component of an objective) will address the intended outcome. For example, the activity of a community impact objective might focus on training elementary school students to mediate conflict in their classrooms. While training the students is critical, it is important that the skills and knowledge gained in the training result in some kind of change. In this instance, the activity (i.e., training) is the process; the hoped for result may be a reduction in violence.

Participant impact objectives should also be framed to evaluate end-results, not processes; they should describe the measurable changes that your program plans to produce in participants. For example, the activity of a participant impact objective might focus on bi-weekly policy seminars to examine the root causes of homelessness. The result might be an improved ability to articulate constructive policy alternatives.

Institutional impact objectives follow the same pattern as community and participant objectives. For example, the activity an institutional impact objective might be to hold 3 faculty seminars on service-learning, with 30 faculty participating. The result might be 6 faculty revise 6 existing courses to incorporate service-learning.

**REALISM**

Objectives must be crafted with great care, because they will be used to infer whether your program’s goals were met. Over-ambitious or unrealistic goals can produce a negative evaluation, even if the program had worthwhile accomplishments. Apply your professional experience to the objectives. Is a 50% increase in comprehension skills achievable given the amount of tutoring to be provided and the expertise of the tutors? Can neighborhood block watches produce a 35% decrease in street crimes?

In contrast, trivial or complacent goals may raise questions about your ability to “get things done,” and will ultimately limit your potential for demonstrating accomplishments. Should a program with 50 participants be expected to accomplish more than “canvas 100 residences door-to-door to distribute information on recycling.”?

**RELEVANCE**

To be meaningful, objectives should be linked directly to the activities of the program. Consider your objectives carefully to determine whether you have set objectives that will give your program an opportunity to demonstrate success. Objectives that are set too broadly, too narrowly, or off topic will hamper your effort to show results.
For example, imagine a public safety program that proposes to provide escort services to senior citizens in a neighborhood victimized by street crimes. The program proposes to demonstrate success by producing a 10% reduction in street crime in their community. There is real danger that their objective is too broad. A change in crime statistics could be affected by many forces that were not related to the activities of a senior citizen escort program. Only if the statistics employed were restricted to a specific set of crimes and collected from within the program service area could we expect that the program's activities be reflected in any statistical change in the incidence of crime.

Another program proposes to establish a neighborhood recycling center. They set as an objective recovering 8,000 pounds of recyclable materials in a year. This objective is probably too narrow. Even if their goal is achieved, it gives little indication of the impact of the program. Is 8,000 pounds a large amount or a small amount? How have service recipients been affected? Is the community meaningfully different? If collecting 8,000 pounds of recyclables will produce a meaningful change for some service beneficiary, there should be a measurable way of demonstrating it. A measure of that change should be incorporated into the objective.

Finally, consider a program that proposes to improve students' reading ability and plans to use number of library visits by each student as the method of measuring their success. While an increase in the number of library visits would undoubtedly be a good thing, it will not help us infer whether reading skills were improved. It is difficult to attribute improved reading ability to the number of library visits conducted. A better measure may be the ability to read and comprehend a newspaper article.
Objectives Worksheet

Using copies of this blank worksheet, provide up to three objectives in each of the three impact areas: community, participant, and institution. Use a separate worksheet for each objective. For each objective, check the relevant impact area, and answer all five questions. For specific instructions and examples, contact your program officer.

This objective is related to:

- Community impact
- Participant impact
- Institutional impact

1. What work will be done? What activities will the program undertake?

   Develop and offer a service learning workshop for division chairs and other supervisors.

2. What is the expected result of the work or activities described above?

   Greater understanding of service learning at the supervisory level, leading to increased likelihood of service learning being favorably considered in faculty reviews.

3. How will you measure the impact of your activities or quality of your work?

   Pre- & post-surveys

4. By what standard will you gauge success?

   At least 5 out of 7 academic supervisors (we're a very small campus!) will indicate on the post-survey greater understanding of and support for service learning.

5. How many individuals will benefit?

   5 - 7 administrators + those faculty they supervise who do service learning (currently approximately 15--20% of full-time faculty).

Objective statement: I will develop and offer a service learning workshop for division chairs and other supervisors resulting in greater understanding of service learning at the supervisory level, which will lead to increased likelihood of service learning being favorably considered in faculty reviews as measured by pre- & post-surveys. At least 5 out of 7 academic supervisors will indicate on the post-survey greater understanding of and support for service learning, which will benefit themselves and those faculty they supervise who do service learning.
Objectives Worksheet

Using copies of this blank worksheet, provide up to three objectives in each of the three impact areas: community, participant, and institution. Use a separate worksheet for each objective. For each objective, check the relevant impact area, and answer all five questions. For specific instructions and examples, contact your program officer.

This objective is related to:

- Community impact
- Participant impact
- Institutional impact

1. What work will be done? What activities will the program undertake?

Participants will assist in the delivery of programming designed to further the stated mission of one of four selected community organizations.

2. What is the expected result of the work or activities described above?

Organizations will be better able to achieve their mission as a result of an enhanced ability to offer programs.

3. How will you measure the impact of your activities or quality of your work?

By means of a service evaluation completed by directors of the organizations.

4. By what standard will you gauge success?

All four CBOs will indicate that the project met their objectives.

5. How many individuals will benefit?

100

Objective statement: Participants will assist in the delivery of programming designed to further the stated mission of one of four selected community organizations, increasing the organizations' ability to achieve their mission as a result of an enhanced ability to offer programs, as measured by a service evaluation completed by the directors of all four organizations indicating that the project met their objectives.
Objectives Worksheet

Using copies of this blank worksheet, provide up to three objectives in each of the three impact areas: community, participant, and institution. Use a separate worksheet for each objective. For each objective, check the relevant impact area, and answer all five questions. For specific instructions and examples, contact your program officer.

This objective is related to:

☐ Community impact  ☐ Participant impact  ☐ Institutional impact

1. What work will be done? What activities will the program undertake?

   Students in ethics classes will engage in varied activities with populations often subject to stereotypes, such as African American, lower income, persons with AIDS, elderly

2. What is the expected result of the work or activities described above?

   Enhanced understanding of impact and ethical relevance of attitudes (not just actions)

3. How will you measure the impact of your activities or quality of your work?

   Pre- & post-essay on the topic: "I believe that a person's Attitudes have nothing/ a little/ a great deal (circle one) to do with whether that person is ethical. I think this because..."

4. By what standard will you gauge success?

   Post-essays will display increased complexity of reasoning and more concrete, reality-based arguments

5. How many individuals will benefit?

   40

Objective statement: Students in my ethics class will engage in varied activities with populations often subject to stereotypes, such as African American, lower income, persons with AIDS, the elderly, leading to enhanced understanding of the impact and ethical relevance of attitudes (not just actions) as determined by a pre- & post-essay on the topic: "I believe that a person's attitudes have nothing/a little/a great deal (circle one) to do with whether that person is ethical. I think this because..." Post-essays will display increased complexity of reasoning and more concrete, reality-based arguments.
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