Since the early 2000s, engaged scholars have been part of a generational shift in higher education, inheriting a legacy and rich history informed by the contemporary civic engagement movement that emerged in the late 1970s. Understanding this inheritance is foundational to current efforts to shape engaged scholarship and change higher education institutions in ways that support engaged scholars and serve a larger public, democratic purpose. Lessons can be learned from this movement’s past. Examining its trajectory also points to common ideals that continue to draw people together. Like all movements, the civic engagement movement has been sustained by support networks, the vast majority of which have been established in the past two decades (Hartley, 2011; Hollander & Hartley, 2000). Perhaps more importantly, movements are sustained by a clear understanding of what they hope to achieve and what they are moving against (Della Porta & Diani, 2006). For example, the civil rights movement not only sought to create a world of racial understanding and equality but also opposed bigotry and the laws that upheld a system of segregation. In the same way, a desire to promote civic agency and to foster participatory democracy has animated the civic engagement movement. Its ideals have constituted a sustained critique of the notion of the university as an ivory tower and schooling as an exercise in depositing knowledge into the minds of passively receptive students (Freire, 1994). Recognizing these common purposes and adopting new tactics to achieve them in a changing world constitute the foundation of any successful, sustained movement.
A Metahistory of the Civic Engagement Movement

Cold War Science

The individuals and institutions that shaped the civic engagement movement were working within a larger history seeking to redefine colleges and universities as social, political, economic, and moral institutions. Cold War science and the infusion of federal funding that fueled the military, industrial, and university complex fundamentally shaped higher education in the United States. Vannevar Bush’s *Science, the Endless Frontier* (1945) framed an epistemological and methodological case both for the primacy of pure science as the standard for research and for basic research to reside at the top of a hierarchy of knowledge production and dissemination, with applied research and knowledge then flowing from the university outward to society (Stokes, 1997). *Science, the Endless Frontier* laid the groundwork for creation of the National Science Foundation (NSF), and postwar appropriations for the NSF began to reshape research universities—a trend propelled by Sputnik and a deepening national crisis defined by the Cold War and fought with scientific advances (Leslie, 1993).

In short, the civic engagement movement inherited what Schön (1995) referred to as an institutional epistemology of “technical rationality” (p. 27) that privileged basic research and an epistemological architecture that fragmented knowledge into increasingly narrow specializations. This fragmentation was mirrored institutionally in siloed departments, a splintering that began at the turn of the 20th century with the rise of academic disciplines (Benson, Harkavy, & Hartley, 2005). Increased fragmentation and academic work that privileged interests of disciplinary knowledge over knowledge to serve the public good gave rise to a growing chorus of critiques about the university as out of touch, unable to address pressing social issues whose complexity required transdisciplinary approaches.

The Cognitive Sciences and Learning

One of the problems with the institutional epistemology and architecture was that it largely ignored student learning and development. By the mid-1980s, an endless stream of reports emerged on the failure of undergraduate education—for instance, *Involvement in Learning* (1984), *Integrity in the College Curriculum* (1985), *To Secure Our Blessings* (1986), and *Transforming the State Role in Undergraduate Education* (1986; Cross, 1993, p. 288). Campuses that were constructed around a cult of objectivity and positivism that separated students’ cognitive development from their socioemotional development (i.e., divisions of academic affairs and student affairs) were, according to critics, fundamentally dehumanizing and undermined educational ideals.
Coincident with the rise of the civic engagement movement was a period of significant advances in the cognitive sciences and in developmental psychology that reinforced experiential learning theory and practice. By the late 1980s and early 1990s, research had clearly demonstrated both how people learn and how the structures and practices of colleges and universities were not designed for optimal student learning. This period is littered with national reports that brought the research forward to reveal that the pedagogical architecture of lecture halls and what Freire called a “banking” model of education (1994)—depositing information into empty-headed students—was not the way to produce learning. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule’s *Women’s Ways of Knowing* (1986), Chickering and Gamson’s “Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” (1987), Barr and Tagg’s “From Teaching to Learning” (1995), Peter Ewell’s “Organizing for Learning” (1997), and many other seminal pieces were widely read and discussed.

While drawing upon a long history of educational theorists who championed active learning—Dewey, Lewin, Kolb, and others—all these reports arrived at the same conclusion: Learning happens when students’ affective and cognitive development is seen as integrated, when their knowledge and experiences are validated, when they are engaged actively and collaboratively in the learning process, when they have opportunities for direct experience, and when they reflect on their experiences and on who they are as learners. In the most widely cited article published in the influential magazine *Change*, Barr and Tagg wrote that in a “learning-centered” environment, the “purpose is not to transfer knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learners that make discoveries and solve problems” (1995, p. 15). The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) grew out of developments in the cognitive sciences and the quest for improving undergraduate education. Piloted in 1999 and first administered in 2000, the NSSE was a means for campuses to understand whether students perceived that they were engaged in learning and that they were participating in active and collaborative learning processes as part of their educational experience. From the beginning, service-learning emerged as a high-impact practice that fostered deep learning. The 2002 annual NSSE report found that “complementary learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom augment the academic program,” and activities such as community service “provide students with opportunities to synthesize, integrate, and apply their knowledge. Such experiences make learning more meaningful and, ultimately, more useful because what students know becomes a part of who they are” (Edgerton, et al., 2002, p. 11).
The University and Society

During this period, analysts were asking questions about the role of the university in society. As Ernest Boyer wrote in his groundbreaking 1996 essay “The Scholarship of Engagement,” the university had failed in addressing the country’s most significant social, civic, and ethical issues. Something had to change in order to create “a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and creatively with each other” (p. 20). The “special climate” that recognized knowledge assets and expertise outside of academia meant that academics would need to rethink the core processes of generating and disseminating knowledge. The engagement he envisioned would make room for a different way to generate knowledge, which was needed in order for the university to “to serve a larger purpose” (p. 13). It required a renewed way of thinking about “knowledge and scholarship,” a phrase that served as the title of a 1994 article by Lynton in which he explored two key ideas: the flow of knowledge and an “ecosystem” of knowledge. Interrogating the flow of knowledge, Lynton noted that “the current primacy of research in the academic value system” fostered a “persistent misconception of a unidirectional flow of knowledge, from the locus of research to the place of application, from scholar to practitioner, teacher to student, expert to client” (p. 9). Such a “linear view of knowledge flow,” he added, “inevitably creates a hierarchy of values according to which research is the most important, and all other knowledge-based activities are derivative and secondary.” “In short,” he wrote, “the domain of knowledge has no one-way streets.” This logic of a multidirectional flow led Lynton to conceptualize knowledge as an “ecosystem,” in which it “is everywhere fed back, constantly enhanced. We need to think of knowledge in an ecological fashion, recognizing the complex, multifaceted and multiply connected system” and to recognize that “knowledge moves through this system in many directions” (pp. 10-11).

The notion of focusing knowledge generation on addressing critical social issues was manifested in the rise of action research, teacher research, and practitioner inquiry. Federal agencies also provided large amounts of funding to universities for these studies. The National Institutes for Health and the Centers for Disease Control recognized the importance of collaborative research in partnership with affected communities. The National Science Foundation (NSF) focused attention on “broader impacts,” “the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes” (National Science Board, 2011, p. 2). While the NSF considered broader impacts beginning in the 1960s, not until 1997 did this focus become a separate and distinct criterion, and only in 2007 did the NSF further clarify the criteria to emphasize transformative research (National...
Science Foundation, 2014). The NSF considered five questions in assessing the broader impacts criteria:

How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society? (National Science Board, 2011, p. 4)

At the core of the goal of broader impacts were another set of questions: “What is the nature of the system within which scientific knowledge is transformed into public policy or social action?”; “What interactions characterize this system?”; and “What skill sets and partnerships do scientists need to develop in order to optimize the transformation of their science into actionable and useful knowledge?” (National Science Foundation, 2013).

**Civic Disengagement**

Central to the rise of the civic engagement movement was the need to reclaim what Boyer called higher education’s “civic mandate” (1990, p. 16), particularly as the campus foment of the sixties gave way to a disquieting calm that was interpreted widely as student apathy and self-absorption. The focus on higher education’s civic mission and the concern with student political disengagement were two sides of the same civic engagement coin. American culture during the 1970s had fostered what the social historian Christopher Lasch (1979) called “a culture of narcissism,” a state of affairs that Tom Wolfe popularly described as “the ‘Me’ decade” (1976). By 1985 sociologist Robert Bellah and his colleagues argued in the bestseller *Habits of the Heart* that although individualism was a distinguishing characteristic of American social thought and behavior, it had “grown cancerous” (p. xlvii). Faculty experienced an undercurrent of discontent, expressed in the popularity of writers like Page Smith (1990) and Parker Palmer (1992). In 1985 Frank Newman, while at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, wrote in *Higher Education and the American Resurgence* that “the most critical demand is to restore to higher education its original purpose of preparing graduates for a life of involved and committed citizenship” (p. xiv).

Newman and other higher education leaders over the next decades were concerned with the future of American democracy as study after study
revealed that 18- to 24-year-olds expressed little interest in participating in mainstream politics. Trend data from “The American Freshman,” a key survey of college students conducted annually by the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), showed a sharp decline in student political engagement. The percentage of freshmen who considered “keeping up to date with political affairs” to be an “essential or very important” objective dropped from 60 percent in 1966 to 45.2 percent in 1980. (The percentage eventually reached a low of 28.1 percent in 2000 [Pryor et al., 2007].) In 2000, campus presidents who joined the national coalition Campus Compact issued the 

Presidents’ Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education, stating, “We share a special concern about the disengagement of college students from democratic participation. A chorus of studies reveals that students are not connected to the larger purposes and aspirations of the American democracy. Voter turnout is low. Feelings that political participation will not make any difference are high. Added to this, there is a profound sense of cynicism and lack of trust in the political process” (p. 1).

At the same time, a fierce national debate sprang up in the country around how campuses ought to respond to the political disaffection of America’s youth. For many, students who volunteered for community service were performing good deeds but were not acting politically, and campuses that promoted service were not promoting the knowledge, skills, and values needed for active political participation in a democracy. The politics of service surfaced amid President George H. W. Bush’s support for the National Community Services Act of 1990: “I am particularly pleased that [this act] will promote an ethic of community service. . . . Government cannot rebuild a family or reclaim a sense of neighborhood, and no bureaucratic program will ever solve the pressing human problems that can be addressed by a vast galaxy of people working voluntarily in their own backyards” (quoted in Kahne and Westheimer, 1996, p. 596). However, as Kahne and Westheimer also noted, “Bush was advancing voluntary community service as an alternative to government programs. . . . While requiring students to ‘serve America’ (the rhetoric of the federal legislation) might produce George Bush’s ‘thousand points of light,’ it might also promote a thousand points of the status quo” (p. 596).

**Social Justice and Change**

Raising the question of whether the purpose of the civic engagement movement was to change American higher education was one thing, but asking whether its purpose was to change American society was another thing entirely. This was the larger politics of the movement that Kahne and Westheimer (1996) were raising. At bottom, the question was whether the civic
engagement movement was a movement for social justice, and if so, what were the implications for higher education? How one’s identity as an engaged scholar intersected with the larger history of American higher education and its role in advancing social justice had implications for how one is positioned in relation to the college or university as an institution.

As a movement sharing demands for social justice in the 1960s, the civic engagement movement overlapped and intersected with a movement for diversity and inclusion in higher education, a movement with deep roots in the struggles for civil rights (Vogelgesang, 2004). While both movements sought legitimacy within the academy, by the 1990s tensions emerged as the civic engagement movement realized greater acceptance through an emphasis on depoliticized pedagogy, curriculum, and student learning. Those in the civic engagement movement often seemed oblivious to the potential synergy of their work with the work of diversity and inclusion on campuses and in local communities (Battistoni, 1995). In the first short history of the “community service movement in American higher education” (Liu, 1996), issues of diversity work on campus or how the efforts at advancing service-learning and community service might advance social justice in a diverse democracy are not mentioned. As structures supporting community service and service-learning emerged on campuses in the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s—at the same time that campuses had established or were establishing multicultural centers and ethnic studies departments—there was “a strong tendency to separate and compartmentalize these two efforts on college campuses” (Vogelgesang, 2004, p. 34). The two movements struggled to find greater connection on campuses even as they used different frameworks and languages to describe their work; as Beckham noted in the late 1990s, “supporters of each reform movement tend to discount the complexities of the other” (1999, p. 5).

Beckham, the first African American dean of the college at Wesleyan University and a program officer at the Ford Foundation leading campus diversity initiatives during the 1990s, also noted, “We face another obstacle to collaboration” that had to do with a “certain lack of fit . . . especially having to do with the ways in which” some scholars “describe the past and the future” (1999, p. 6). Beckham surfaced a difficult reality about the work of scholars who identified their scholarship as “engaged” or “activist” and who viewed the university as an institution of oppression that fueled wider social injustices. For many of these scholars, often from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups and women, their goal was to direct their intellectual and institutional resources to addressing social injustices in local communities. They did not position themselves as part of the civic engagement movement, partly because they did not see their work as reforming institutions of
higher education. Theirs was a historical relationship to institutions of higher education that Moten and Harney captured when they claimed that “the only possible relationship” of the “subversive intellectual” to “the university today is criminal one . . . to sneak into the university and steal what one can” (2004, p. 101). Resistance to a stakeholder relationship came from the concern that the university would appropriate and corrupt these scholars’ social justice work, following the academy’s past record of exclusion, oppression, and injustice. Thus, there was an orientation that distanced activist scholars from service-learning efforts and wider claims toward an engaged campus because such efforts could appear to serve as cover for the ways in which the university was part of a wider social culture of injustice and, thus, part of the problem. The politics of activist scholarship invoked collaboration with those in local communities but resisted the politics of scholars being collaborators with the university.

This historical and political undercurrent ran deep. Beckham named it as a historical divide between aspirational and historical democracy. He wrote that those in the civic engagement movement aspired to strengthening “the civic mission of the research university,” and that they “discern something in history that should be ‘recovered’” (1999, p. 6). According to Beckham, these scholars viewed the civic mission of higher education as “something that once existed, but which has been lost” (p. 6), something that required retrieval. For many others, whose scholarly work was defined by a social justice agenda, “The rhetoric of civic renewal can sound dangerous, threatening to smooth over the gross injustices of the past . . . for America’s minority populations” (p. 7).

Amid the often unacknowledged repercussions of a divided history, Beckham and others were striving to find a way for advocates of campus diversity and those advancing the civic engagement movement to find common ground. By the 2000s, people in the civic engagement movement were forced to account for the complexities of diversity. Students were increasingly diverse in every way, as were the graduate students and the young faculty entering the professoriate. Moreover, many of the communities with which urban campuses in particular were partnering were predominantly historically underserved communities of color.

By the mid-2000s, efforts to connect service-learning programs to college readiness in the K–12 schools had arisen, particularly for underserved students in underperforming schools. Often, however, that access did not mean access to the campus that sent the college students into the schools, and it had few implications for changing campus culture. By the late 2000s, greater connection between the two movements, greater accounting of their complexities, and the associated need for organizational change on campus
led to the emergence of structural connections. For example, a number of campuses combined offices of diversity and inclusion with offices of civic engagement, recognizing the inherently intertwined nature of the work (Sturm, Eatman, Saltmarsh, & Bush, 2011) (also, see chapter 15).

While seeking to promote deeper partnerships between colleges and universities and their communities and to effect positive social change, the civic engagement movement did not necessarily embrace social justice as a chief aim or adopt political activism as a means for challenging the status quo. It failed to encourage what Barber called “strong democracy” (1984). Boyte joined Barber in critiquing apolitical conceptions of service because it met students’ needs for “personal relevance and a sense of membership in a community [but they] . . . usually disavow[ed] concern with larger policy questions, seeing service as an alternative to politics” (1991, p. 76; emphasis in original). In the early 1980s, with the formation of the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL), and again in the early 2000s, beginning with the Wingspread summit on student civic engagement, students called for campus leaders to recognize student altruism and provide opportunities to express it. In 2001, when a group of 33 undergraduates representing 27 colleges and universities came together at Wingspread, they challenged the critics as well as their institutions. The students waded into a simmering debate about the varieties of community service experiences (e.g., charity versus justice projects), and “argued that community service is a form of alternative politics, not an alternative to politics” (Long, 2002, p. vi). Participants at Wingspread argued that campuses needed to structure educational opportunities to connect individual acts of service to a broader framework of systematic social change, leading, potentially, to institutional transformation as campuses, government, and public policy become more responsive, public-spirited, and citizen-centered. These two themes—student political engagement and the role of the campus in preparing citizens—were woven together by the vexing problem of higher education’s role in preparing students as citizens in a democracy.

**Neoliberalism**

Alongside the problematic institutional epistemology, architecture, and pervasiveness of passive pedagogies arose neoliberalism, a political ideology that not only shaped the political economy of the United States but also took hold in the political economy of colleges and universities. The last decades of the 20th century witnessed both the rise of the neoliberal, market-driven, highly privatized university and the demand for universities to more effectively address critical social issues, many of which were impervious to market solutions. The central goal of neoliberalism is to transfer numerous public
functions, assets, and roles to the private sector. . . . It seeks to eliminate any notion of the broader public good, including institutions such as schools and public universities” (Rhoads & Szelényi, 2011, p. 13).

Neoliberalism’s effects were apparent in the state’s withdrawal from funding public universities, a result of abandoning the overarching notion of higher education as a public good (Bloom, Hartley, & Rosovsky, 2006). Instead, education became part of the commodification of everything, and its larger democratic and social goals were either discarded or redefined in market terms. Trend data from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA show a significant shift over time in the attitudes of incoming students regarding the purposes of higher education. In 1967, 85 percent of students indicated that “developing a meaningful philosophy of life” was an essential or very important objective of higher education. By 2003, however, that number had dropped to 39.3 percent. During the same time period, the percentage of students indicating that “being very well off financially” was a priority jumped from 42.2 percent to 73.8 percent (Pryor et al., 2007, pp. 31–33).

As colleges and universities adopted prevailing neoliberal principles, higher education became viewed as a private benefit, hence the effects of defunding public postsecondary education, rising tuition costs, increasing student debt, the proliferation of online for-profit providers, and the dominance of contingent-faculty labor. Philanthropy also shifted its funding strategies away from higher education. It is hard to know the degree to which the broader discourse of privatization influenced funding priorities, but the result was unambiguous. In the 1980s and 1990s, the major foundations—including the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment, Templeton, Pew Charitable Trusts, the Kellogg Foundation, and the Atlantic Philanthropies—collectively had poured tens of millions of dollars into improving undergraduate education and building capacity for public engagement. They were committed to higher education as a public good and invested their resources accordingly. By the early 2000s, however, each and every one of these foundations had deprioritized their funding of higher education as a place that educates citizens for a healthy democracy because the self-evident truth of the public good of colleges and universities had been surpassed by issues of access, affordability, and workforce preparation—issues predominantly framed as access to the private benefit of higher education. From a philanthropic perspective, higher education as a place of teaching and learning to cultivate the intellect, promote ethical growth, and develop interpersonal competence and professional preparation of students as citizens was largely abandoned.

“The logics of neoliberalism” included “relentless attachment to privatization and the destruction of an ethical and relational public” (Simpson, 192),
undermining the civic commitments of the movement. The civic engagement movement was often on the defensive, reasserting the democratic purposes of higher education, countering the reductionist trends sweeping across the landscape of higher education, and attempting to counteract neoliberalism’s effects on the university. “For critics of the neoliberal model . . . universities became places of civic engagement,” with the result that “one answer to the abuses of neoliberalism became the engaged university, and one strategy was service learning” (Jones & Shefner, 2014, p. 11).

A New Generation of Scholars

Enormous demographic shifts in the United States coincided with the emergence of civic engagement movement. Greater numbers of women, people of color, and low-income individuals began pursuing higher education, groups that traditionally had either not sought postsecondary degrees or had been excluded from the academy. These changes in the student population were mirrored, albeit more slowly, in the faculty. For many within the academy, the success of these underrepresented and underserved students became the litmus test for whether issues of access, equity, and social justice were embodied in the civic mission and democratic purpose of higher education. As campuses were slow to change, affirmative action aimed to increase access for historically excluded groups. Neoliberal reaction led to the decimation of affirmative action, but many campuses embraced the educational value of diversity as core to their mission and struggled to adapt to the new demographics—if not for higher ideals, than out of enlightened self-interest in attracting an increasingly diverse applicant pool.

For underrepresented faculty pursuing academic careers, the university was often a hostile place. The institution may have opened the door, but once inside, faculty found a narrow environment unaccepting of many ways of knowing and different habits of being. The university’s institutional epistemology was not hospitable to emerging forms of scholarship (or the scholars who used them), often referred to as collaborative or public scholarship, that originated in a rich and complex intersection of feminist, postmodern, postcolonial, and critical race theories, and employed a broad array of disciplinary approaches, schools of thought, and methodological practices. The presence of these scholars, their confrontation with the academy, and their determination to create a different kind of university would have deep and pervasive implications for higher education—across the curriculum, through teaching and learning practices, in research and scholarship, and in determining the ultimate relevance of the university to the wider society.

Focusing on these significant trends in American higher education, the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) added questions to their
faculty survey in 2004–2005 aimed at assessing faculty involvement in civic engagement in their scholarship and teaching and their perceptions of the institutional environment. One of the questions centered on whether, in the previous two years, the faculty member “collaborated with the local community in teaching/research.” In the 2013–2014 survey, the response to this question from faculty at all undergraduate campuses was 48.8 percent (Eagan et al., 2014). At public campuses, it was 50.4 percent; among tenure-track faculty, 51.1 percent; among women faculty, 52.4 percent; and among Hispanic faculty, 55.2 percent. For all institutional types, faculty ranks, race/ethnicity groups, and both sexes, the data indicate increases in the percentage of faculty identifying community engagement in their teaching and research since the question was first asked a decade earlier (see Table 2.1).

As one data point contributing to an understanding of emerging faculty work during the development of the civic engagement movement, the HERI faculty survey allows us to gain perspective on a new generation of faculty. As the faculty became increasingly diverse, as evidence from the cognitive sciences revealed the importance of experience in student learning, as there was greater understanding of the kinds of knowledge needed to address social issues in communities (despite and perhaps because of the intransigence of neoliberalism), a generation of engaged faculty emerged within the academy. This next generation of engaged scholars is both a product of the civic engagement movement and a foreshadowing of its future.

Next-Generation Engaged Scholars and the Rise of the Public Engagement Knowledge Regime

Part of the inheritance of the next generation of engaged scholars is a history of the civic engagement movement that empowers them to claim agency in creating what can be identified as an emerging “public engagement knowledge/learning regime.” Slaughter and Rhoades, in their 2004 book *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy*, make the case that throughout the 20th century, there were two competing “knowledge/learning regimes” operating within higher education, both coexisting within the dominant institutional cultures of higher education.

The language of “regimes” is significant; it is a language of power, privilege, and politics. It constructs an understanding of knowledge generation and of teaching and learning that is inherently political—with consequences for equity and justice in a democracy. Regime language can evoke unease and discomfort, suggesting a conflict within an academy that prefers not to have issues of power and politics enter into the heady atmosphere of freedom of thought.
### TABLE 2.1.
**Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, Faculty Survey; Changes in Faculty Reports in Response to the Following Question:** “During the past two years, have you collaborated with the local community in teaching/research?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Baccalaureate Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On tenure track, but not tenured</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on tenure track, but institution has tenure system</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution has no tenure system</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races/ethnicities</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on responses from 16,112 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty at 269 four-year colleges and universities.
and detached objectivity. Such language makes visible the kind of struggle Schön discussed when he wrote of the “battle of epistemologies” on campus (1995, p. 34). The language of regimes, and competing regimes, also suggests regime change that challenges the legitimacy and prestige of the status quo.

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) refer to one regime as the “public good regime”; the other, the “academic capitalism regime” (pp. 28–29). The academic capitalism knowledge/learning regime “values privatization and profit taking in which institutions, inventor faculty, and corporations have claims that come before those of the public,” and holds that “knowledge is constructed as a private good, valued for creating streams of high-technology products that generate profits as they flow through global markets” (p. 29). In contrast, the public good knowledge/learning regime is “characterized by valuing knowledge as a public good to which the citizenry has claims”; its “cornerstone . . . was basic science that led to the discovery of new knowledge within academic disciplines, serendipitously leading to public benefits” (p. 28). According to the authors’ historical narrative of higher education, the public good regime prevailed early in the 1900s, but by the end of the 20th century the academic capitalism regime had driven out the public good regime. Thus, in the early 21st century, academic capitalism was in ascendancy if not dominance, and the public good was under siege.

A history of the community engagement movement reveals that among and through the next generation of engagement scholars in the current moment, an emergent public engagement knowledge/learning regime is competing for ascendancy. It is a regime that is fundamentally different from the public good regime and the academic capitalism regime, a regime that does not perpetuate the existing institutional structures and cultures—in other words, a knowledge/learning regime that necessitates institutional change and transformation.

The public good regime reflects the dominant academic culture of higher education, often characterized as “scientific,” “rationalized,” and “objectified,” meaning that the approach to public problems is predominantly shaped by specialized expertise “applied” externally “to” or “on” the community, providing “solutions” to what has been determined to be the community’s “needs.” In the public good regime, the public service function of the university is defined by an activity (e.g., research or service) that happens in a place (a community) whereby knowledge flows from the university to the community, the university is the center of problem-solving, and the university produces knowledge that the community consumes—all done with the self-proclaimed justification of providing public benefits.

The goal of the public good regime is for academics who create knowledge to move it beyond the ivory tower. In the public engagement regime, the
goal is for academics to move beyond the ivory tower to create knowledge. Unlike the public good regime, the public engagement regime comprises core academic norms determined by values such as inclusiveness, participation, task sharing, and reciprocity in public problem-solving, and an equality of respect for the knowledge and experience that everyone contributes to education, knowledge generation, and community building. Within the public engagement regime, academic work is done with the public; there is shared authority for knowledge generation and cocreation of knowledge and problem-solving that values relational, localized, contextual knowledge. In the public engagement regime, the university is part of an ecosystem of knowledge production addressing public problem-solving, with the purpose of advancing an inclusive, collaborative, and deliberative democracy.

For next-generation engagement scholars, public engagement raises the relationship of knowledge to power, privilege, politics, and self-interest. In Etienne’s 2012 book *Pushing Back the Gates*, a study of university-community engagement, he maintains that successful engagement requires three ingredients: long-term, sustained, leadership; substantial infrastructure; and a widespread sense of self-interest. This element of self-interest shapes next-generation engagement; the institution and those who enact the institution’s mission share a core understanding that the campus’s well-being is connected to the local community’s well-being. In the academic capitalism regime, self-interest was market share or shareholder interest. In the public good regime, self-interest is often translated into the faculty’s research and prestige interests. Only in the public engagement knowledge regime is there a more authentic sense of self-interest. That is, it is in the best interest of the campus’s knowledge, learning, and democracy-building mission to be engaged deeply in the education, health, housing, employment, and overall well-being of the local community.

As the backbone of the public engagement knowledge regime, next-generation scholars are seeking campuses where they can thrive as engaged scholars. If they find that the institution is a barrier to their engagement, they seek regime change. The public good regime does not require that the university do anything differently. All that is needed is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what exists, without disturbing the basic organizational features or substantially altering the ways in which faculty and students perform their roles. There is no need for major shifts in institutional culture. As one scholar of literary studies, who identifies himself as a public good scholar, has written, the existing “structure will do quite nicely as a home, thank you, though it ever so badly needs paint, perhaps an addition or two, and a bit of landscaping” (Tères, 2011, p. 34). All that is needed, in this positioning of higher education’s relation to the public good, “are innovative efforts to bring
the knowledge, expertise, and protocols of careful, critical thinking developed over generations within the academy to bear on the experiences and problems of our fellow citizens who make up the general public” (p. 45). Next-generation scholars seek cultural norms that support public engagement and therefore enact agency by bringing about transformational changes in policies and structures. These changes can require major shifts in an institution’s culture that are deep and pervasive, altering underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products. The history of the civic engagement movement in American higher education suggests that fundamental culture change in the academy is needed, not merely a new coat of paint.

While the history of the civic engagement movement in American higher education indicates a rich and robust emergence, countervailing forces surround it. Thus, the outcome of the current “movement” around publicly engaged scholarship and institutional public engagement of colleges and universities is not certain. This auspicious historical moment might be described in this way: Located squarely between the neoliberal, market-driven, highly privatized university and the need for universities to more effectively address social issues and improve the human condition are the issues of community engagement, publicly engaged scholarship, and university-community partnerships. This is the crux of the “crucible moment” that the Association of American Colleges and Universities identified (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012), and what David Scobey terms the “Copernican moment” (2012). It is nothing less than the moment for next-generation engaged scholars to create the future of higher education.
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A BRIEF HISTORY OF A MOVEMENT

Civic Engagement and American Higher Education

Matthew Hartley and John Saltmarsh

Next-generation engagement scholars and their scholarship are part of a broad, rich, and complex history of American higher education. What follows is a concise overview of the last 30 years as seen through the lens of the civic mission of higher education. In particular, it features the emergence of a civic engagement movement that has reinvigorated and advanced the democratic purposes of higher education. As contributors to this movement, we have been part of its history and offer our perspective as a way of understanding the past in order to empower those who now shape—and those who will shape—the future of civic engagement and the future of higher education.

Part of this history represents a contest over language. In any attempt to effect momentous change, words and meanings matter. The term civic engagement is fraught with contested meaning. The civic in civic engagement, as we use it in this chapter, is shaped by the history of a movement seeking to reclaim the importance of political and democratic participation as a cornerstone of what being a citizen means and as a central purpose of higher education. The engagement in civic engagement underscores the critical importance of authentic reciprocity in partnerships between those working at colleges and universities and those in the wider community. Engagement-as-reciprocity sees nonacademic knowledge as not only legitimate but also necessary in the generation of new knowledge aimed at solving public problems. It positions experts without academic credentials as peers in the generation of new knowledge (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). At its heart, the civic engagement movement has sought to reclaim the core democratic purpose.
of higher education and to direct its core activities—teaching and learning, and knowledge generation—toward addressing the pressing issues that face society locally, nationally, and globally.

The civic engagement movement has been shaped by certain activities, strategies, and efforts focused on specific constituencies at different points in time. In the 1980s the movement was defined largely as a “community service movement” (Liu, 1996); in the 1990s, as a “service-learning movement” (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999; Zlotkowski, 1995); and more recently as a civic engagement movement encompassing community service and pedagogical practices as well as larger issues of organizational change that operationalize the qualities and values of engagement in relationships between higher education and communities aimed at building a public culture of democracy. As with any movement, the civic engagement movement comprises particular issues, controversies, and characteristics that demarcate distinct periods within the larger movement. We explore four distinct periods of the movement beginning in 1984 and ending in 2012.


Discontent drives movements, and the early 1980s were troubled times for American higher education. The U.S. economy was weak, and a projected demographic decline in college students led some experts to predict that as many as one-third of colleges and universities might face merger or closure (Keller, 1983). Many institutions responded with an increasingly market-centered approach, and what the “customers” wanted were jobs. In 1971, half of all students (49 percent) indicated they were attending college “to be able to make more money”; by 1991, that proportion had climbed to three-quarters (74.7 percent) (Astin, 1998). Preprofessional majors outpaced traditional liberal arts majors on many campuses (Breneman, 1994). This shift in academic mission created significant problems at some institutions, producing faculty discontent (Chaffee, 1984; Hartley, 2002). In an interview in 1986, Ernest Boyer (1987) summarized the mood on numerous campuses he had visited: “We didn’t find dramatic examples of failure; rather, we found a loss of vision, of vitality, a sense of marking time” (as cited in Marchese, 1986, p. 10).

During this same period, the political disaffection of young people emerged as a significant social concern. The media frequently compared the idealistic students of the sixties with the materialist and career-minded college students of the 1980s. In 1982 the American Association of Colleges1 and the Kettering Foundation cosponsored a special issue of Liberal
**Education** on the “civic purposes of liberal learning.” David Mathews, then president of Kettering, summed up the collective mood in the introductory article: “As I listen to the more perceptive among us diagnose the civic order, I find a common thread of disquiet that relates to the underpinnings of the civic enterprise—to our capacity to act together as a people” (Mathews, 1982). Amid this growing concern about civic fragmentation, public and community service emerged as a response.

**Public and Community Service**

One of the earliest efforts to kindle civic engagement began inauspiciously in January 1984 when a recent Harvard graduate, Wayne Meisel, initiated a “walk for action” starting at Colby College in Waterville, Maine, and ending in Washington, DC. Meisel believed that the characterization of college students as apathetic was wrongheaded. As he introduced himself on campuses, Meisel argued that rather than being apathetic, students were the victims of “a society that unknowingly and unintentionally fails to inspire, tap, and channel their resources.” Meisel encouraged “a lifelong commitment to community service, and . . . [promotion of] sensitive, thoughtful and effective citizenship and leadership.”

He was also careful about avoiding political activism. Recalling his time at Harvard, Meisel explained, “I saw a group of politically active knee-jerk liberals on the one hand and on the other hand there was a group of people who just wanted to head off to Wall Street to make money. I wanted to try to reach that big group of students in the middle, between the knee-jerks and the jerks.” On campus after campus, Meisel invited students to become leaders, and his message resonated. When his walk ended on May 29, 1984, having visited 67 campuses, Meisel had the beginnings of a network. He and his classmate Bobby Hackett founded the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL; Meisel & Hackett, 1986). Over the next five years, COOL staff members continued campus organizing. By 1989 the organization was working with student leaders at more than 450 institutions and hosting an annual meeting that drew thousands of students.

The idea of promoting public service was emerging elsewhere. In 1985 Frank Newman, the president of the Education Commission of the States, wrote the influential *Higher Education and the American Resurgence*, in which he argued, “If there is a crisis in education in the United States today, it is less that test scores have declined than it is that we have failed to provide the education for citizenship that is still the most significant responsibility of the nation’s schools and colleges” (p. 31). The report caught the attention of the presidents of Stanford, Georgetown, and Brown Universities. Together they formed Campus Compact, a coalition of presidents personally...
committed to promoting civic engagement. To their great surprise, 110 presidents joined their effort in the first year. At the inaugural meeting of the coalition on January 16, 1986, Newman argued that its purpose was to teach students to “see the larger issues as a citizen. [That] is the first task of the institution and . . . how to achieve that has to be at the head of the list” (Coalition of College Presidents for Civic Responsibility, 1986).

The question facing the nascent Campus Compact was how best to achieve that aim. The organization chose to advance “public service” through volunteerism: serving in soup kitchens, cleaning up trash in local parks, tutoring at local schools. A transcript of that first meeting offers a window into the group’s mind-set at the time. “I’d like to ask a question—and this is probably dangerous—how many in the room either give or think it would be alright to give some form of academic credit for service? [Some hands go up.] How many would be opposed? [Some hands go up.] And the rest are just in the middle waiting for leadership. It looks like a real minority.” Very few faculty members nationwide were experimenting with integrating community-based activities into their courses to enhance learning outcomes, otherwise known as service-learning. Not surprisingly, some of the presidents expressed concern over the propriety of “giving academic credit for service.” They saw service activities as worthy but could only imagine them as extracurricular activities. Unfortunately, the nature of these experiences fell short of providing the “education for citizenship” that Newman had advocated; many were short-term, and few offered students meaningful opportunities to reflect on the complex socioeconomic factors that caused the problem.

**Linking Service and the Curriculum**

In addition to Campus Compact, the National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE) also championed community-based activities. A number of faculty members and practitioners who were highly experienced in linking service and learning were among its relatively small membership (e.g., 600 in 1980). In the late 1980s, a group of faculty and staff with close ties to NSEE became concerned about Campus Compact’s emphasis on volunteerism. With its burgeoning membership of college and university presidents, Campus Compact had the capacity to influence significantly the national discourse about civic engagement. However, this small group worried that volunteerism would become the accepted standard for civic engagement and, as one of them put it, “[institutions] could get on the band-wagon for cheap.” They had a bolder agenda: the group wanted to see civic engagement incorporated into the core work of colleges and universities. They arranged a meeting with Campus Compact’s director, Susan Stroud, in 1986 to discuss concerns. As it turned out, a few members of the Campus Compact leadership had begun
to raise these issues as well. Subsequently, Stanford’s president Donald Kennedy and a staff member, Tim Stanton, and David Warren, president of Ohio Wesleyan, conducted a study examining links between service and faculty work, resulting in a seminal report written by Stanton (1990). That report had a significant influence on the debate over the academic rigor of community service and the curriculum. It also represented a decisive shift from volunteerism and “public service” to service-learning within both Campus Compact and the burgeoning civic engagement movement.


A number of efforts aimed at demonstrating the efficacy of service-learning and its academic rigor occurred in the late 1980s into the 1990s. In May 1989 a Wingspread meeting brought together a group of experienced scholars and practitioners to develop a set of principles for service-learning. Ellen Porter Honnet and Susan J. Poulsen captured these principles and published them as the highly influential “Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning” (1989). The principles argued that service-learning was a highly effective and legitimate teaching strategy: it allowed students to grasp the complexity of real-world problems and to develop skills in collective problem solving, it deemphasized personal charitable acts (community service) and helped students understand the root causes of social problems, and it ought to be conducted in a spirit of reciprocal partnership with the community.

The authors also underscored the civic purposes of the pedagogy. The statement’s preamble claims, “We are a nation founded on active citizenship and participation in community life. We have always believed that individuals can and should serve.” Within a few years, however, this expressly civic emphasis would be challenged.

In 1990 Jane Kendell published a three-volume set titled Combining Service and Learning. It proved to be one of the most important early resources for the growing number of faculty members constructing service-learning courses. The volumes offered practical advice as well as readings that raised important questions about community involvement.

That same year, Ernest Boyer contributed to a growing civic discourse in the academy through Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), offering a broadened conception of faculty work. Boyer recognized the value of the “scholarship of discovery”—traditional forms of research that produce disciplinary peer-reviewed articles. However, he saw its dominance as highly problematic.
“Beyond the campus, America’s social and economic crises are growing—troubled schools, budget deficits, pollution, urban decay, and neglected children. . . . Can we define scholarship in ways that respond more adequately to the urgent new realities both within the academy and beyond?” (p. 3). Before long, Boyer argued, “What is needed [for higher education] is not just more programs, but a larger purpose, a larger sense of mission, a larger clarity of direction in the nation’s life” (1996, p. 20). By 1996 Boyer would shift his thinking about the application of academic knowledge to “the scholarship of engagement,” a more complex view of the dynamic two-way relationship between campuses and communities for public problem solving (see also Saltmarsh, 2011). Boyer advocated recognizing and rewarding the application of scholarly expertise “to pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems” (1996, p. 14). The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) took up Boyer’s message and launched an annual Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards in 1991, convening administrators and faculty members from hundreds of colleges in order to reconceptualize the work of the professoriate. A number of the state-based Campus Compacts also launched initiatives throughout the 1990s aimed at promoting service-learning and encouraging community-based research. Many institutions sought to advance institutional change efforts around Boyer’s ideas (O’Meara and Rice, 2005).  

In 1991 Campus Compact’s director, Susan Stroud, secured a major Ford Foundation grant to promote service-learning through its Integrating Service with Academic Study (ISAS) initiative. ISAS funded 130 service-learning workshops nationwide. It also generated a renewed sense of purpose for Campus Compact’s leadership. ISAS’s director, Sandra Enos, recalled, “I almost felt like one of the apostles taking this gospel out and trying to convert [people].” By 1996 ISAS had worked extensively with over 160 campuses through its summer institutes and other programs (Liu, 1996).  

Service-learning’s fortunes rose dramatically in 1993 when President Bill Clinton established the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS). The Learn and Serve America Higher Education (LASHE) program within CNCS became a major funding source for service-learning initiatives, which CNCS actively sought to promote. A 1999 RAND report indicated that LASHE had awarded $100 million to approximately 100 institutions of higher learning from 1995 to 1997 and had emphasized subgranting to over 500 campuses (Gray et al., 1999). Additional federal funding came from the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of University Partnerships. From 1994 to 2002 this office ran a program called Community Outreach Partnerships Centers (COPC) that aimed “to create enduring partnerships between academic institutions and communities in order to build capacity for more effective responses to the needs and problems of distressed
neighborhoods and to enhance the research and teaching capacity of participating colleges and universities” (Vidal et al., 2002, p. 4). The COPC program invested approximately $45 million in more than 100 colleges, universities, and community colleges to support community engagement (p. i).

This funding, along with significant philanthropic support, fueled the growth of a distinguishing feature of this period: the creation of campus infrastructure to support the institutionalization of service-learning. While there were a handful of offices, centers, and institutes on campuses by the late 1980s, hundreds existed by the late 1990s. Nearly every campus that was advancing service-learning as a curricular strategy had supporting infrastructure to assist faculty in course revision, pedagogical preparation, and partnering with local communities. If campuses were going to institutionalize service-learning, they would need what Walshok called “new kinds of institutional mechanisms” (1995, p. 275) to do so. Over the course of the 1990s, the Campus Compact annual member survey showed a marked increase in the number of member campuses that had created infrastructure for supporting civic engagement. The survey also indicated a shift in reporting structure. In the early 1990s, offices or centers typically reported to student affairs; by the end of the decade, the trend was to report to academic affairs, signifying the shift from community service to service-learning. By 1998, models of the structure, staffing, functions, and funding of service-learning on campuses of every institution type had been compiled in a widely read book, Successful Service Learning Programs (Zlotkowski, 1998).

The expansion of service-learning throughout the 1990s is partly reflected in Campus Compact’s growth. The organization had 202 members in 1989; within five years, its membership more than doubled to 520. Establishing state-based Campus Compacts drove this growth significantly. State Compacts fostered networks of geographically proximate institutions that could share ideas and resources and compete more effectively for federal funding. Campus Compact advocated the establishment of campus offices or centers dedicated to coordinating and supporting service-learning. This strategy brought to the surface the ongoing debates about the nature of this work: Should it be led by student affairs or academic affairs? Should the work emphasize student development or academic learning? While some centers focused on broader work (for example, developing university-community partnerships), the vast majority were dedicated to promoting service-learning. By the end of the 1990s, service-learning had moved from being a strategy of the civic engagement movement to an end in itself. In addition, several academic journals were launched in the 1990s, providing an outlet for research on service-learning and community-based research, and elevating the national discourse about its place in the movement."
As more faculty members began teaching service-learning courses, ideological differences began to emerge among its proponents. Early advocates tended to see service-learning as a means of transforming students and the academy in the interests of promoting a just society. Later adopters often saw it as a practical and effective means for conveying disciplinary learning. Nowhere was this tension more evident than in a faculty-focused initiative called the Invisible College, founded by John Wallace, a philosophy professor at the University of Minnesota. Wallace envisioned that the group—comprising faculty and staff from across the country with significant experience in community-based teaching, learning, and research—would highlight and disseminate the most current and promising practices in the field. A significant ideological rift quickly emerged, though. As one participant noted,

It didn’t take long to see that there were two very, very different visions of what the Invisible College should be. One vision was that this organization could provide the concrete resources that would legitimize faculty concerned with community-based work. . . . [Then there was] a group that saw the Invisible College as almost like a confraternity of people who share a certain spiritual vision of higher education as a moral-ethical force. (Anonymous interview, 2 February 2007)

One of the most thoughtful advocates of the former position was Edward Zlotkowski, who wrote,

Until very recently the service-learning movement has had an “ideological” bias; i.e., it has tended to prioritize moral and/or civic questions related to the service experience. Such a focus reflects well on the movement’s past but will not guarantee its future. [. . .] Only by paying careful attention to the needs of individual disciplines and by allying itself with other academic interest groups will the service-learning movement succeed in becoming an established feature of American higher education. (1995, p. 123)

The March 1997 issue of the American Association for Higher Education Bulletin announced a monograph series focused on service-learning and the disciplines funded by the Atlantic Philanthropies. Zlotkowski served as senior editor of the 21-volume series that described the uses of service-learning in a range of academic disciplines. Predominantly, the series illuminated disciplinary concepts, not the use of disciplinary expertise, to address and alleviate problems facing communities or to advance civic and democratic competencies.

The leadership of Campus Compact recognized the disparate values and beliefs motivating members of the movement. In 1996, ISAS director Sandra
Enos composed a memorandum to the organization’s leadership in which she quoted Everett Rogers (1995) on the diffusion of innovations. Enos wrote, “We can generally suggest that the first wave [of service-learning adopters] is motivated by community concerns, sometimes tied to social and civic responsibility and social transformation, while the second wave is motivated by a strong perceived pedagogical value.” Strategically, the increased emphasis on the pedagogical benefits of service-learning was (and has been) highly effective, as evidenced by Campus Compact’s tremendous growth.

However, while adapting to prevalent academic norms broadened membership, the disciplinary-focused framing was problematic in other regards. By the end of the 1990s, one service-learning pioneer, Stanford University professor Nadinne Cruz, was shocked to find herself at an association meeting having to defend social justice as a possible desired outcome of service-learning (Stanton et al., 1999). Many of the early pioneers who championed the transformation of higher education and were deeply committed to promoting social justice began to feel a sense of alienation within the movement. Increasingly, they saw service-learning promoted not as a strategy for transformation but as an end in itself—a better way to convey traditional disciplinary content. The movement had reached a crisis of purpose.

A Period of Growth and Dispersion, 1998–2004

With the proliferation of service-learning and the campus infrastructure to support it, hundreds of colleges and universities across the country by the end of the 1990s were promoting community-based teaching, learning, and research. At the same time, concerns about the civic disaffection of society became the focus of two national reports, A Call to Civil Society (Council on Civil Society, 1998) and A Nation of Spectators (National Commission on Civic Renewal, 1997). The message was clear: The most important crisis facing the nation was a crisis in its collective civic life. However, higher education was largely ignored in the documents’ search for solutions. William Damon, a professor of education at Stanford University, responded to this “chorus of concern over the state of our ‘civil society,’” in a Chronicle of Higher Education opinion piece (1998). He spoke for many who believed that higher education could play a key role, noting that “the cursory nature of the authors’ mention of higher education speaks volumes about their lack of faith in its ability to do much to redeem civil society” (1998, p. B-4). He pointed out that for students to “participate constructively in civil society,” they needed not only “intellectual abilities” and “moral traits” but also “practical experience in community organizations, from which young people can learn how to work within groups, in structured settings” (p. B-5). The
solution was for higher education to develop more service-learning programs that would “send students out to help disadvantaged members of their communities or otherwise contribute to the public good,” letting students “pursue both academic and social goals” (p. B-5). Damon also highlighted that service-learning needed to be more than an academic exercise or a means for conveying disciplinary truths; it was a potentially powerful way for higher education to be relevant to the national crisis of civic renewal. To do so, service-learning would have to become part of a broader commitment of civic engagement in higher education, requiring significant change in institutional culture and commitment. Damon’s response conveyed a widespread sense of urgency and need for action.

That sense of urgency was captured in the first of a series of statements issued as national calls to action. The 1999 _Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University_, crafted at a Campus Compact meeting, focused on “efforts to better prepare people for active citizenship in a diverse democracy, to develop knowledge for the improvement of communities and society, and to think about and act upon the public dimensions of our educational work” (Boyte & Hollander, 1999, p. 7). Declaring that “now is the time to boldly claim the authority and ability to focus our energy on the civic purposes of higher education,” the _Wingspread Declaration_ was directed strategically at research universities as the most powerful and influential higher education institutions. It framed these institutions as “agents of the democracy” that would prepare “a next generation of involved citizens . . . to do the work of citizenship” (p. 8). A broader civic imperative was at the center of the case for engagement. It argues that the “the challenges facing higher education go beyond the need to add more service-learning experiences or to reward faculty for community-oriented research . . . The more fundamental task is to renew our great mission as the agents of democracy” (p. 9). The _Wingspread Declaration_ called for a national “movement that reinvigorates the public purposes and civic mission of our great research universities and higher education broadly” (p. 14).

A second widely circulated call to action was _Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution_ (1999), developed by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, a group of 24 land-grant presidents as well as foundation and corporate representatives. The report drew on a rich history of cooperative extension and outreach and argued for a need to move beyond “inherited concepts emphasizing a one-way process in which the university transfers its expertise to key constituents” to embrace “engagement” that would go “well beyond extension, conventional outreach, and even most conceptions of public service” (p. 27). The document defined “the engaged institution” as one that “redesigned [its] teaching, research,
and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetic and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined” (p. 9). This conceptualization of “engagement” diverged sharply from that of the Wingspread Declaration. This was no call for a revival of “active citizenship” or for faculty and administrators to become engaged in public work. With the important exception of an emphasis on reciprocal community partnerships, the “engaged university” looked surprisingly like the traditional university (a fact underscored in the very title of the report).

Two points of tension embedded in these reports had broad implications. One was whether civic engagement had core democratic implications for political involvement as well as policy change implications, and the other was whether campuses could truly be engaged without a commitment to organizational and cultural change. Apolitical engagement that enabled campuses to maintain the status quo was an idea that could be widely embraced, but in the process, civic engagement risked losing its transformative potential.

Perhaps the most cogent call to action came in 1999 from a group of college and university presidents associated with Campus Compact who issued a report titled Presidents’ Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education. Rather than promote the continued development and institutionalization of service-learning (as Campus Compact had done throughout the 1990s), this document challenged higher education institutions “to become engaged, through actions and teaching, with [their] communities” (p. 2) and renew their role “as vital agents and architects of a flourishing democracy” (p. 4). The Presidents’ Declaration offered a “vision of institutional public engagement” that would serve as the foundation for “a national movement to reinvigorate the public purposes and civic mission of higher education.”

The work of Campus Compact mirrored a wider shift away from a focus on service-learning as the driving force of the movement to a broader focus on the “engaged campus,” of which service-learning would be a part—an issue that had been simmering for years. Before Boyer articulated “the scholarship of engagement” as an institutional commitment in 1996, Russell Edgerton (1994), the president of the AAHE, had issued a call for its national conference around the theme of “The Engaged Campus: Organizing to Serve Society’s Needs.” Edgerton noted that “a useful starting point for thinking about ‘The Engaged Campus’ is to realize that all of the critical tasks we do—teaching, research, and professional outreach—need to change if we are truly to connect with the needs of the larger community” (p. 4). By the end of the 1990s Campus Compact had embraced this vision of the engaged campus and conceptualized its work as a “pyramid of civic engagement” (Campus Compact, 1999) that required attention to the whole campus and
to multiple constituencies, from students to faculty and staff, community partners, administrative leadership, and presidents. This agenda was one that called for fundamental change (Edgerton, 1994).

Part of the change that gained new legitimacy focused on faculty research grounded in participatory approaches that included collaborations with community partners. There was a growing interest in community-based participatory research (CBPR; Strand et al., 2003), which gained academic currency as a valid and rigorous means of inquiry, while attempting to produce social change (Herr & Anderson, 2005). CBPR as an approach to research, and service-learning as a form of teaching and learning, raised issues related to faculty reward policies and whether faculty would be recognized for such activities as part of their core faculty roles. Since Scholarship Reconsidered (Boyer, 1990), discussions had occurred about what activities constitute scholarship, and how institutional policies might be changed. Schön had observed that new forms of scholarship meant that “the rules that govern what counts both as legitimate knowledge and as appropriately rigorous research” (1995, p. 34) would need to be reconsidered. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff argued, “Documentation must be open to a more eclectic array of materials in order to treat newer forms of scholarship fairly . . . including more genres of published and unpublished work. . . . It is important to recognize that appropriate and credible reviewers may be found not only among fellow specialist and current students but also among former students, clients, non-academic authorities, and practitioners in the field” (1997, p. 38). Faculty rewards also needed to be reconsidered. O’Meara and Rice (2005), in their national study of provosts, noted the importance of revising guidelines that rewarded community engagement. In sum, for civic engagement to be institutionalized within an engaged campus, the work would need to be recognized with the system of faculty rewards.

By the late 1990s, service-learning had entered the mainstream, with a critical mass of faculty adopting the pedagogy. Landmark research demonstrated service-learning’s efficacy as a teaching and learning strategy, which in turn supported its growth and expansion. In 1999 Eyler and Giles published Where’s the Learning in Service Learning, the results of a national study funded by the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), providing empirical evidence for an array of positive student-development outcomes attributable to service-learning. Similarly, Astin and colleagues at the Higher Education Research Institute published “How Service Learning Affects Students,” the results of a national study based on longitudinal data from 22,236 college undergraduates (2000). Their study affirmed the educational and personal growth benefits of service-learning, including an increased sense of personal efficacy, awareness of the
world, awareness of one’s personal values, and engagement in the classroom experience (Astin et al., 2000).

In addition, the results of the first National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) made clear that if campuses wanted students to be engaged in learning, then service-learning programs represented an effective way to increase engagement (2002). NSSE findings indicated great benefits when “complementary learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom augment the academic program,” and as such, “service-learning provides students with opportunities to synthesize, integrate, and apply their knowledge” (p. 11). The NSSE affected the civic engagement movement in two ways. First, it further confirmed the benefits of service-learning for student learning. Second, it muddied the engagement discourse, because in the NSSE formulation, engagement meant engagement in learning, not necessarily engagement with communities as part of learning. During the early 2000s, engagement language became more widespread, but it did not always mean engagement with local communities. At the same time, the civic in civic engagement, aligned with the framing in Returning to Our Roots, was applied to nearly every campus interest or activity that had a wider public purpose.

The early years of the new century were marked by both heightened urgency for greater civic engagement and a tendency toward rhetorical claims rather than substantive commitments. The sense of urgency was reignited with the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Edward Zlotkowski articulated this most cogently in the keynote address at the 2002 AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. Zlotkowski, a revered figure in the service-learning world, addressed what he called “the academic challenge of September 11, 2001.” He asked,

[How] do we know seize the moment? How do we act on the recognition that the “assumptive world of the academic professional” is no longer capable of meeting the challenges facing American higher education in the twenty-first century? How do we proceed to build something that allows us not only to bring over all that is still vital in the traditional academy but also to reconstitute it in a way that leads to genuine renewal? (2002, p. 22)

Zlotkowski put the need for civic engagement in a broader context. The urgency was not unique to the horrific events of 9/11 but relevant to “the everyday conditions of social injustice and economic need to which we as a nation have almost become inured” (p. 27). The 9/11 attacks and the response to them brought renewed energy and commitment to those in the academy who sensed that higher education needed to embrace its democratic
purpose more than ever. For example, over 300 academics made their way to Berkeley despite trepidations about travel in the fall of 2001 for the first conference of the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLC). The 2002 AAHE Forum was the association’s largest conference. For those in the movement, this time was critical. However, despite Zlotkowski’s plea to seize the moment, the academy reacted to 9/11 with what can only be called a stunning silence. Absent was an increase in campus dialogues about U.S. foreign policy, and precious little discussion or debate took place about the war in Iraq.

The rhetorical claims of civic engagement and the lack of a clear definition raised concerns as the term invaded the discourse on campuses (American Association of State College and Universities, 2002). According to the American Association of State College and Universities (AASCU), overuse of the term “can leave some campuses and their leaders with the impression that they are ‘doing engagement,’ when in fact they are not” (p. 8). The lack of clarity also dulled the edge of change, and there was a tendency to claim a commitment to civic engagement without doing anything differently. This was also a time of emerging national projects that sought to bring clarity and substance to the civic engagement movement. Imagining America, a national organization that advances public engagement in the arts, humanities, and design disciplines, grew out of a 1999 White House conference. As noted above, the first annual conference of IARSLC was held in 2001. In 2003 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching launched the Political Engagement Project, and AASCU launched the American Democracy Project (ADP).

With these new projects, the period came to an end with increased activity and great expansion but also a need for clearer focus and purpose, and a new commitment to organizational and cultural change. Movement leaders issued the report Calling the Question: Is Higher Education Ready to Commit to Community Engagement? (Brukardt, et al., 2004) raising their concern that despite all the calls to action of the preceding decade, and regardless of the proliferation of service-learning and campus structures to support it, “Engagement has not become the defining characteristic of higher education’s mission nor has it been embraced across disciplines, departments and institutions” (p. ii). For that to happen, there needed to be greater clarity of purpose: “This kind of commitment can only come from a clear understanding of what the truly engaged institution is—and is not” (p. 6). Moreover, it would have to be clear that a commitment to civic engagement would mean “nothing less than the transformation of our nation’s colleges and universities” (p. ii). The leaders argued that committing to civic engagement “is an imperative” (p. 18):
If higher education is to serve our students with deep learning, our faculty and staff with opportunities for integrated scholarship, and our communities with our creative and intellectual resources, it will require broad support in making possible the kinds of institutional transformation that only engagement can provide. . . . Engagement is higher education’s larger purpose. (p. 18)

Civic Engagement and Higher Education’s Future, 2004–2012

The effort at providing greater clarity and the need to address critical issues around advancing civic engagement resulted in a number of national convenings and subsequent reports. New efforts to address the outcomes of civic engagement emerged during this period, amid increased pressures for greater accountability in higher education. The emphasis on civic engagement outcomes measures was the result of more than a decade of growing assessment trends in higher education. By the middle of the first decade of the 2000s, an explosion was occurring in the literature on civic engagement. Books, articles, and the emergence of new journals proliferated, covering service-learning, community partnerships, faculty rewards, institutionalization, research methods, leadership, and every dimension of civic engagement theory and practice. This expansion partially reflected the widening practice of civic engagement, and part of it was due to the increasing importance of globalization and of civic engagement as a major international trend in higher education. The year 2005 marked the first international Talloires Conference and the release of the Declaration on the Civic Roles and Social Responsibilities of Higher Education, signed during the conference of university presidents at the Tufts University European Center in Talloires, France (Talloires Network, 2005). University presidents who signed the Declaration dedicated themselves to “strengthening the civic role and social responsibility of our institutions,” pledging to “promote shared values and universal human values, and engagement by our institutions with our communities and with our global neighbors” as “central to the success of a democratic and just society.”

The International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy (IC) held its first conference in 2008. IC sought to advance the contributions of higher education to democracy both on college and university campuses and in their local communities. As a collaboration between the Council of Europe (CoE) and its Steering Committee on Educational Policy and Practice (CDPPE), it included representatives of the 50 states party to the European Cultural Convention, as well as representatives from the United States (the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, the Association of American
Colleges and Universities, Campus Compact, the Democracy Commit-
mment, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administra-
tors), Australia (Engagement Australia), and the United Kingdom (repre-
sented by the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement). The Barbara
and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University
of Pennsylvania hosted the executive offices of the consortium, with Ira
Harkavy, associate vice president and founding director of the Netter Center,
serving as U.S. chair. The consortium sponsored three major conferences
in Strasbourg, France (2008), Oslo, Norway (2011), and Belfast, Northern
Ireland (2015), and published edited volumes from the ideas generated from
each gathering.¹⁰

In 2009 a national task force coordinated by the University of Pennsylva-
nia and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
sought to advance the idea of universities and medical centers as “anchor
institutions” that could help stabilize troubled urban areas. The mission of
the Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF) was to forge democratic civic
partnerships involving anchor institutions (2009),¹¹ and grew into an organ-
ization with over 600 individual members, explicitly emphasizing its core
values of collaboration and partnership, equity and social justice, democracy
and democratic practice, and commitment to place and community (Brophy
& Godsil, 2009). The notion of anchor institutions has garnered consider-
able attention abroad and has expanding the work of the AITF beyond the
United States.

One expression of increased attention to accountability was aimed at
measuring how colleges and universities were affecting their local commu-
nities. This question was raised in AASCU’s Stewards of Place, a report that
sought a way for public institutions to demonstrate public accountability
through engagement efforts. Additionally, a group of campuses formed an
“anchor institutions task force” in 2009, and a coalition of campuses affil-
iated with the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU)
developed a focus on “urban-serving universities,” seeking to collect and ana-
lyze “data across a network of public urban research institutions to create a
reliable, factual foundation for the universities’ work in cities.”

Accountability was also expressed through increased attention to stu-
dent learning outcomes—particularly civic learning outcomes. This was an
important shift away from a focus on pedagogical inputs by faculty, such
as service-learning, to student learning outcomes. AAC&U, in partnership
with the Lumina Foundation and others, developed an agenda for articulat-
ing and assessing student civic learning outcomes as essential to determining
how higher education contributed to civic engagement. As part of the “valid
assessment of undergraduate education” project, AAC&U developed a “civic
engagement rubric” that could be adapted across courses and disciplines to assess student civic learning. By 2011 the Lumina Foundation released a “degree qualifications profile” outlining the kind of learning that should be an outcome of any college degree. One of the five learning categories it identified was “civic learning,” which required “the integration of knowledge and skills acquired in both the broad curriculum and in the student’s specialized field,” and “civic preparation [that] also requires engagement—that is, practice in applying those skills to representative questions and problems in the wider society” (2011, p. 9).

In 2005 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching piloted a new elective “classification for community engagement” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015). The foundation, under the leadership of its president, Lee Schulman, sought to create a “special-purpose classification” that would “open the possibility for involving only those institutions with special commitments in the area of community engagement” (McCormick & Zhao, 2005, p. 56). The classification’s framework focused on three major areas: foundational indicators such as institutional commitment and institutional identity and culture, curricular engagement, and outreach and partnerships. Amy Driscoll, who had earlier led community engagement assessment efforts at Portland State University and California State University at Monterey Bay, guided the development of the framework and drew from earlier institutionalization rubrics for service-learning and civic engagement (Furco, 1999; Holland, 2000; Hollander, Saltmarsh, & Zlotkowski, 2001; Kesckes & Muylleart, 1997) as well as the input of leading scholars. Driscoll worked with representatives from 13 campuses to pilot the framework. The discussions among scholars serving in an advisory capacity and participants from this pilot group reflected the tensions around the type and amount of emphasis that should be placed on the “civic” in civic engagement. Some felt that the framework ought to capture work aimed at fostering citizenship and advancing democracy, while others felt that such an approach would alienate potential participants, advocating instead for a focus solely on community partnerships. The name of the classification was a compromise that emphasized “the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/ state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/). The classification was seen by some as emblematic of a much broader “counterbalancing” shift in higher education. Gary Rhoades, general secretary of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), wrote that “if the effect of Carnegie’s efforts (and those of Dupont Circle and AAUP) in the first three quarters of the 20th century
was to inscribe in academic structures and in the consciousness of faculty a national [and cosmopolitan] orientation, those organizations are increasingly emphasizing the value of the local” (2009, p. 12).

Student voice and leadership took on heightened importance in the movement at this time also. The understanding that learning takes place most effectively in situations that draw on student experiences and assets brought to the forefront the role of students in deepening campus civic engagement through the curriculum and in the community. The 2001 Wingspread meeting of students organized by Campus Compact fueled greater attention to student leadership in the movement. This meeting led to the student-authored *The New Student Politics* (Long, 2002), in which students refuted the characterization of their community service as an alternative to politics and a form of political disengagement. Instead, they made the case for service as an alternative form of politics and claimed a role for their leadership in the movement. Campus Compact responded with the Raise Your Voice campaign, coordinated by Nick Longo and involving more than 270,000 students on over 500 campuses between 2002 and 2005. A study of student leadership for civic engagement, particularly academic engagement, resulted in the book *Students as Colleagues* (Zlotkowski et al., 2006), a compilation of campus case studies coedited by Zlotkowski, Longo, and James Williams, finding that “the movement has now reached a point where it needs resources that students alone can supply” (p. 3). Promoting student voice and leadership reflected a deeper sophistication in the movement for collaboration that extended into communities and the classroom.

All of these efforts pointed to a key issue of cultural change within the university that had been simmering for years: the need to revise faculty reward policies in order to fairly and appropriately recognize and validate engaged faculty work. The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good convened in 2005 and issued *Taking Responsibility: A Call for Higher Education’s Engagement in a Society of Complex Global Challenges* (Pasque, Hendricks, & Bowman, 2006). Achieving the organizational change needed for establishing an engaged campus would require higher education institutions to reexamine their purposes, processes, and products to assess whether and to what extent they aligned with the democratic and civic mission on which they were established. Changing the culture would require campuses to “identify, recognize, and support engaged scholarship” and “bring graduate education into alignment with the civic mission” (p. 5).

This emphasis on cultural change was echoed at another 2005 national meeting and in the attendant 2006 report *New Times Demand New Scholarship: Research Universities and Civic Engagement*, which focused more specifically on the research university and the preeminence of faculty research in its
reward structure (Stanton, 2008). In order to fulfill and advance their civic mission, the report claimed, “Research universities must entertain and adopt new forms of scholarship—those that link the intellectual assets of higher education institutions to solving public problems and issues” (p. 5). As with the report from the National Forum, *New Times Demand New Scholarship* stressed that campuses would need to “support and reward faculty members’ professional service, public work, and/or community-based action research or ‘public scholarship,’” which meant specifically that policies would need to “ensure that engaged scholarship is valued in tenure and promotion decisions, grant awards, and public recognition, regardless of discipline” (p. 6).

Imagining America went further than others in creating a “Tenure Team Initiative” to tackle the issue of faculty rewards and institutional change. In 2008 the organization issued the widely read report *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (Ellison and Eatman, 2008). Written by Julie Ellison and Tim Eatman, the report noted the disjuncture between the fact that while “publicly engaged academic work is taking hold in American colleges and universities,” tenure and promotion policies “[lag] behind public scholarly and creative work and discourage faculty from doing it” (p. iv). The authors recognized that to advance the movement, reward policies would need to change. The report boldly took on the issues of broadening notions of what counts as a publication and who is considered a peer in peer review—core elements of academic culture. The report called for recognition of a range of “scholarly artifacts” (p. 12) beyond the narrow scholarly product of a journal article. It addressed the need to “broaden the community of peer review” (p. v) to include community-based partners with academic credentials as individuals with specialized community knowledge and expertise, and noted the importance of changing the campus culture to provide “support for graduate students . . . who choose academic public engagement” (p. xiv). *Scholarship in Public* put faculty rewards and cultural change at the top of an agenda for advancing the civic engagement movement.

Similarly, attention to cultural change and the democratic purposes of engagement were at the center of a meeting organized by the Kettering Foundation and the New England Resource Center for Higher Education in 2008 that resulted in the widely read “Democratic Engagement White Paper” (Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009). In its analysis, the white paper accomplished two objectives. First, it made the distinction “between civic engagement as it is widely manifested in higher education” (p. 7) and what it called “democratic engagement.” Engagement in a “democratic-centered framework” had “an explicit and intentional democratic dimension framed as inclusive, collaborative, and problem-oriented work in which academics
share knowledge generating tasks with the public and involve community partners as participants in public problem-solving” (p. 9). Second, the white paper linked engagement practices to significant cultural and organizational change on campus. Democratic engagement could not happen in higher education institutions as they were; it required fundamental and transformative change. The white paper recognized that “the dominant form of civic engagement that has emerged in higher education is largely devoid of both long-term democracy-building values and higher education’s contribution to the public culture of democracy,” and it offered “an alternative framework”—“democratic engagement”—that could “contribute to the reshaping of higher education to better meet its academic and civic missions in the 21st century” (p. 13).

This notion of advancing democracy was evident when, in 2011, the American Democracy Project (ADP) helped to catalyze a community college equivalent, The Democracy Commitment (TDC), to advance democratic engagement in community colleges. The Democracy Commitment issued a “Declaration” shaped by a political atmosphere of “bitter partisanship,” a lack of “collaborative solutions,” “widening divisions between Americans because of race, economic circumstance and geography,” and “alienation from politics and from the democratic process [that was] dangerous for the nation” (The Democracy Commitment, 2011). The declaration highlighted that nearly half of all undergraduates were in community colleges, that their students went on to earn four-year degrees, that they affordably educated a highly diverse population of students—much more diverse than their four-year counterparts—and that they were institutions embedded in their communities. The declaration was partly a response, amid a prolonged recession, to the increasing pressures for higher education, particularly community colleges, to focus on workforce development for economic recovery. While acknowledging this role, the declaration made clear that “American community colleges do more, however, than educate for the job market or for transfer to university”; they have “a critical role to play in preparing our students for their roles as citizens and engaged members of their communities.” The creation of The Democracy Commitment was intended to “provide a national platform for the development and expansion of programs and projects aimed at engaging community college students in civic learning and democratic practice,” with the goal “that every graduate of an American community college shall have had an education in democracy” (The Democracy Commitment, 2011).

This period in the history of the civic engagement movement closed and then set the stage for the future with a “national call to action” issued by one of the most powerful and influential higher education associations, the
AAC&U, and the U.S. Department of Education (DOE). In January 2012, at a meeting at the White House, the report *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future* was released through AAC&U by the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012). *A Crucible Moment* echoed every previous report during this period and responded to *Calling the Question* with a call to action to forcefully and urgently assert and enact the fundamental democratic commitments of higher education. It both captured the essential momentum of the movement and laid out an agenda for its future. Amid the devastation of the economic recession and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, *A Crucible Moment* declared that American democracy was in crisis and that higher education had to claim its role in educating for “civic learning and democratic engagement” (p. vii).

The focus on “civic learning” and “democratic engagement” was intentional, emphasizing “the civic significance of preparing students with knowledge and for action” (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, p. 3). It emphasized that “community service is not necessarily the same as democratic engagement” (p. 5) and that knowledge of “civics” in the traditional sense was “essential, but no longer sufficient” (p. 3). Student engagement in communities was needed because “full civic literacies cannot be garnered only by studying books; democratic knowledge and capabilities also are honed through hands-on, face-to-face, active engagement” (p. 3). The report also responded to the pressures being applied to higher education by the economic recession by claiming that “it is time to bring two national priorities—career preparation and increased access and completion rates—together in a more comprehensive vision with a third national priority: fostering informed, engaged, and responsible citizens” (p. 13). *A Crucible Moment* laid out an ambitious and bold change agenda “to reinvent and reinvigorate higher education, our economy, and our democracy . . . transformations necessary for this generation” (p. 17).

**The Future of the Movement**

One way to understand the future of the civic engagement movement is to be attentive to how the next generation of engaged scholars is affecting civic engagement. Those scholars who are now shaping the community engagement movement in higher education have a professional identity and career path that has framed a unique generational narrative. For an earlier generation of academics who found their way to community engagement in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the narrative that resonated strongly was that framed by Parker Palmer in his 1992 essay “Divided No More.” The narrative told of mid-career faculty who reached a disconcerting realization that
the way they practiced their profession was deeply and painfully separated from the values that had brought them into their academic work. They had reached a crisis in their lives requiring a profound inner healing, a healing that was brought about by connecting their professional practice to their intensely held values, so that they would be divided no more. For faculty who had begun their careers in the academy with the ideals of educating for social justice and the belief in the transformative potential of education, now, post-tenure and well into their established careers, they experienced deep angst, rediscovered their formative values, and put those values into practice through community-engaged teaching, learning, and scholarship. This powerful narrative explained the personal and professional experience of a generation.

Next-generation engagement scholars offer a very different generational narrative. They do not discover engagement post-tenure; the groundwork for engagement was laid in high school and as undergraduates, and had begun shaping their identities as scholars during their graduate studies. They entered into their faculty careers with an expectation that they would be able to be engaged scholars—that they would be able to do engaged scholarly work in all aspects of their faculty role. They expected that the institution would provide the intellectual space and support to allow them to thrive as engaged scholars. They did not enter faculty careers resigned to delayed fulfillment of their ideals through accommodation to traditional norms only to be able to thrive later in their post-tenure careers. They would not have to heal the divisions in their inner life because they would resist the disciplinary and institutional cultures that fostered such division. They laid claim to lives as engaged scholars as they shaped their professional, personal, and civic identities while seeking academic homes that created space for them to deepen their work around civic engagement, public scholarship, and campus-community partnerships (Saltmarsh, Ward, & Clayton, 2011). This next generation of engaged scholars will shape the next period of the civic engagement movement.
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Notes

1. The organization renamed itself the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in 1995.

2. Quotations without citations are taken from interviews conducted with leaders of the civic engagement movement conducted by Matthew Hartley with the support of a NAE/Spencer postdoctoral fellowship in 2006–2007.

3. The transcript of the proceedings of the association on January 16, 1986, names the group the Coalition of College Presidents for Civic Responsibility.

4. In the 1980s the group was called the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education. It later dropped the word “internships” from the name.

5. A survey of 729 chief academic officers (CAOs) conducted by O’Meara and Rice (2005) found that two-thirds (68 percent) indicated that their institution had engaged in efforts to encourage and reward a broader definition of scholarship, and a third of that group (32 percent) said that the ideas in Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered were a “major influence” in the decision to do so.

6. These included the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (University of Michigan, 1994), the Metropolitan Universities Journal (Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities, 1995), and the Journal of Higher Education Outreach.
and Engagement (originally the Journal of Public Service and Outreach; University of Georgia, 1996).

7. Such debates continued into the next decade. As Denson observes, “There is not agreement within the service-learning field that social justice ought to be an intended outcome of service-learning participation” (2005).

8. Notably, the term service-learning was not mentioned once in this report.

9. Included among these journals were: Advances in Service-Learning Research; Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health; the Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education; Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement; and Reflections: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy.

10. See http://www.internationalconsortium.org

11. Soon after the task force completed its report, Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies, the AITF became a formal organization.