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Community University Engagement is inherently place-based in the sense that interactions such as those described in this monograph happen in a particular locale. Universities contribute to the social and cultural milieu of the places where they are located in three primary ways: as educator, preparing students for active citizenship and future employment; as information resource for addressing community issues; and as partner in formal community and economic development initiatives. In order to have strong community-university partnerships, institutions must make engagement central to their mission. Colleges and universities have done this in many different ways, as befits the places where they are located. This chapter focuses on the work of higher education institutions to provide arts/cultural programming and other services for local residents and to strengthen community infrastructures. A discussion of the university as an actor in the broad community opens the monograph because the examples presented in this chapter represent the prevailing understanding of community and university leaders alike about the role of higher education institutions in communities. These attitudes underlie much of the current thinking about when, how, with whom, and to what end university representatives should engage with community members.

In this chapter, I highlight three ways that universities have pursued these goals: as placemaker, as economic development partner, and more recently by enacting an anchor institution mission. Each term reflects a particular set of ideas from the literature on community-university engagement. I use the term placemaker in this chapter to connote an entity actively shaping the
character of the communities it serves through activities such as those outlined in the following section (Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995). When university administrators/agents act as community development partners in a community or region, they harness institutional resources to support the generation of new jobs, new technologies, and new industries in local communities. Very recently, universities have begun to recognize their importance as an anchor institution in a particular community; scholar-practitioners and policy makers use the term anchor institution to emphasize the ways in which universities are anchored to the places where they are located. Unlike corporations, higher education institutions would be unlikely if not unable to relocate in search of, for example, more attractive tax incentives. As an anchor institution, the university plays a key role in the social and economic well-being of a community. Institutional leaders can be said to be enacting an anchor institution mission when they recognize the role of their university in the place where it is located, and then proactively contribute to stronger local economies and increase individual and collective well-being (Hodges & Dubb, 2012).

Each of these roles reflects the scholarly discussion of community–university engagement as well as various aspects of the argument I am advancing in this monograph. By insisting on locating these interactions in a particular city or region, I am also intentionally highlighting the importance of “all the particulars of nature and culture that locally shape human perception of, and participation in” that place (Fettes & Judson, 2011, p. 123). Formal partnerships and informal interactions alike can serve either or both of these purposes. This chapter reviews examples of each, and examines the literature related to community–university partnerships, shifting ideas about the role of higher education in community development efforts, and the emerging anchor institution movement, featuring institutions as diverse as Le Moyne-Owen College and Yale University, and the community development partnerships institutional leaders are forming with community organizations. Examples of placemaking, community–university partnerships, and activities reflecting an anchor institution mission follow in this chapter; each represents a different focus for university activities in geographically or socially defined communities.

Placemaking

Higher education institutions are key partners in placemaking, the process by which human beings “transform the places in which we find ourselves into places in which we live” (Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995, p. 1; see also Herts, 2011). The work of placemaking is “poetic,” rather than “technical” or instrumental, because “the making of places—our homes, our neighborhoods, our places of work and play—not only changes and maintains the physical world of living; it also is a way we make our communities and connect with other people” (Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995, pp. 1–2). Scholars who frame community–university interaction as placemaking ask questions about what is done in a place, how it is done, and the values that underlie those activities. Understanding these three elements of the placemaking process provides important background information supporting efforts to change some part of a community or a group’s story. Acts of placemaking are not just about “strengthening relationships of people to their places” through, for example, festivals celebrating local history. The placemaking process also creates public spaces, through neighborhood planning initiatives or other municipal processes, and “foster[s]... relationships among the people in places” that support community infrastructures (emphasis in original; Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995, p. 1).

Placemaking is, in this way, “the practice of democracy” (Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995, p. 110). University representatives can support cities in engaging citizens in civil dialogue. For example, municipal officials and community members in Roanoke, Virginia, consulted with urban planning scholar–practitioners from a local university, requesting assistance in restructuring the functionality of the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership (RNP) and the City of Roanoke’s Office of Community Planning; the aim was to make it easier for residents to make their neighborhoods better, and to do so in a community-driven way. City officials faced specific challenges: several decades of urban decay, reduced federal spending on community revitalization, and fiscal austerity. These officials saw residents and neighborhood associations as important and very willing participants in neighborhood revitalization projects. The problem, the new mayor realized, was a city government structure that did
not facilitate public participation. The RNP hosted a series of community planning sessions facilitated by the consultants; with the assistance of university scholar–practitioners, residents designed an easy-to-navigate process facilitating the participation of interested citizens, thereby advancing democratic practices in the city.

Places are also made through formal, intentional collaborative efforts involving senior university officials and requiring the dedication of institutional resources and, in some cases, significant change in the way the institution operates. Arizona State University’s downtown campus provides one such example. Around 2006, ASU officials joined Phoenix leaders in imagining a new arrangement for the downtown area (Fettes & Judson, 2011). Over the next three years, the university contributed to realizing that vision by constructing a downtown campus, establishing a new College of Public Programs to be housed there, and relocating other academic units whose mission fit that of an urban campus (Friedman, 2009). The RNP and ASU’s downtown campus represent small- and large-scale, informal and formal partnerships that strengthen relationships of people to the places where they live and among those people who live there.

Scheneckloth and Shibley (1995) explain placemaking as a three-part phenomenon: changing the physical place, strengthening the relationships of people to that place, and enhancing interpersonal relationships. Formal and informal partnerships and programming ranging from cultural events bringing visitors to the community, to continuing education offerings and university extension and outreach programs each constitute placemaking. Examples of each type of placemaking are offered in the following sections.

**Community Tourism**

Higher education institutions are important partners in regional tourism development (Herts, 2011). Increasingly, campuses house visitor centers. Many such centers were opened by an Office of Admissions to greet prospective students and their families. Through partnerships with state convention and visitors’ bureaus or departments of tourism, several of these have been recognized as official state visitor centers. Visitors attend athletic and cultural events, arts and music festivals, and other community-based activities.

For example, the University of Idaho hosts the Lionel Hampton Jazz Festival each February; in 2007, the National Endowment for the Arts recognized the event with the National Medal of Arts, the nation’s most prestigious arts award. Each year, more than 8000 tickets are sold for concerts, master classes, lectures, and other performances by world-class musicians. Middle and high school choirs and jazz bands from across the Pacific Northwest travel to Moscow, Idaho, for solo and ensemble competitions during the festival, and the Jazz in the Schools program connects nearly 8000 students from K–12 schools in the surrounding area with visiting musicians. Community residents participate in smaller arts festivals at other universities: Auburn University’s Tournees Film Festival invites community members to campus for French cinema; the Ohio State University’s MFA Alumni Bookfair and Festival offers book readings/s signings and public lectures on creative writing and small press publishing.

**Continuing Education**

Film festivals and cultural events represent lifelong learning opportunities. Cantor (2006) links lifelong learning with professional continuing education, describing a multifaceted endeavor. These various activities extend the placemaking efforts/capacity of universities in a variety of ways. Very commonly, universities act as workforce development partners by offering certificate programs and continuing education courses required in various professions (e.g., nursing, veterinary medicine, and counseling) to working professionals through university continuing education units. The wide range of activities offered by the University of Georgia are typical of many U.S. institutions. The Georgia Center, the university’s conference facility, hosts thousands of guests each year, including fans attending university athletics events, conference attendees, and participants in short-term industry-specific professional development courses. Community groups such as the Georgia Hospice Palliative Care Organization, state high school sports officials, and the Georgia Water Resources Board have recently chosen the Georgia Center for their conferences, making this professional development center a key resource for the state’s professional community.
Continuing education units also serve free agent learners (Caudron, 2004) who pursue continuing education to achieve personal development goals. These lifelong learners resemble the original patrons of programs like Elderhostel, providing residential short courses for older learners since 1976 (and today operating as Road Scholar, www.roadscholar.org), and Other Lifelong Learning Institute programs on campuses across the United States. See, for example, the University of Delaware’s tuition-free degree completion program for Delaware residents over 60 (http://www.pcs.udel.edu/credit/over60.html).

Continuing education professionals are also important participants in community/university interactions intended to serve the public good (Shannon & Wang, 2010). Continuing education units “are in a unique position to build connections . . . across both campus and community,” and thereby “accelerate[e] connectedness with the greater community” (p. 109). They act as conveners, linking academic faculty with community members/organizations to address specific issues, such as community emergency response and professional development for nonprofit organizations, and thereby transform the communities served by these groups.

**University Extension**

Lifelong learning opportunities for personal and professional enhancement are also available through university extension programs. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 established the national cooperative extension system, comprised of extension units at each of the 50 land-grant universities established under the Morrill Act of 1862. Extension professionals are employed by the university and placed in every county in each state to provide programming and services to the residents of that county. The traditional image of a county extension agent depicts an agriculture expert focused on “cows, plows, and sows” (D. Barton, personal communication, January 15, 2001), educating farmers and ranchers on topics related to crop management and animal husbandry. Historically, Family Consumer Science (formerly Home Economics) agents organized demonstration clubs focused on traditional household management and child rearing activities, and facilitated friendship networks for isolated rural women who worked at home (Allen, Dunn, & Zaslow, 2011). Neither of these descriptions reflects 21st century extension professionals, who are actively involved in community economic development, and programming targeted toward improving the quality of life for young people, families, and other residents in communities of every size across the United States (McDowell, 2001).

The issues addressed by extension professionals differ from state to state and, as a result, so does the variety of organizations/agencies in their network (e.g., faith-based organizations, public schools, trade associations, social service organizations, community/cultural organizations, state government, private associations, and professional associations; Bartholomay, Chazdon, Marczak, & Walker, 2011). The extent of the networks, as well as the importance of these networks to extension programming and partnerships, would however be virtually the same across the United States. For example, the University of Minnesota Extension’s organizational network is very wide, and includes several sub-networks clustered around particular program areas (Bartholomay et al., 2011). The network is maintained through five types of relationships: contributing administrative, financial, or physical labor support (7.5%); providing substantive information (22.4%); offering expert advice (15.7%); influencing an organization’s processes/outcomes (11.3%); and sustaining formal partnerships (43.1%). In other words, slightly under half of the University of Minnesota’s network relationships are focused on formal partnerships structured “around a joint effort with mutual benefit” (Bartholomay et al., 2011, Figure 1). This final statistic suggests that extension professionals are not only an important part of the land-grant university’s outreach effort, but also key contributors to the university’s community engagement initiatives and to placemaking.

University extension contributes to placemaking by developing the capacity of individuals and community organizations to accomplish goals together (Civitrolo & Davis, 2011). Extension professionals play an important role in building and supporting social networks linking university actors with community organizations and individual residents. The relationships that underlie these networks facilitate identifying issues, exploring possible options to address the issues, building community support for proposed solutions or
programming, and establishing mutually beneficial, reciprocal partnerships (Adedokun & Bal Schweid, 2009; Robinson & Meikle-Yaw, 2007).

**Community–University Partnerships**

Community well-being in many U.S. metropolitan areas seems bleak after several decades of de-industrialization, suburbanization, and shifting federal funding priorities. Today, the U.S. urban landscape is changing under the influence of shifting federal funding priorities and philosophies of government intervention in individuals’ lives. Community officials and nonprofit sector leaders all over the United States turn to university actors when seeking partners for revitalization projects, or in an effort to grow new opportunities supporting a community’s prosperity (Dubb & Howard, 2007; Hodges & Dubb, 2012).

Community–university partnerships have a long history in the United States, dating to the 19th century settlement houses. For example, Jane Addams partnered with faculty at the University of Chicago; UC students regularly volunteered at Hull House (Hodges & Dubb, 2012, pp. 3–6). Established partnerships now exist in cities across the United States, and the literature related to effective partnership practices is broad, spanning many disciplines (e.g., Hartley & Soo, 2009; Israel et al., 2006; McNall et al., 2009; Prigge & Torrace, 2007). Two of the longest running partnerships exist in East St. Louis, Illinois, and West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

**East St. Louis.** In 1987, a group of ministers from the poorest neighborhoods of East St. Louis, Illinois, contacted their state representative requesting assistance in establishing a partnership with the University of Illinois to address chronic issues facing their community. The resulting partnership, the East St. Louis Action Research Project (ESLARP), continued for 23 years, making it one of the longest running, formal community–university partnerships in the United States (Reardon, 1999; Sorensen & Lawson, 2011). Over more than two decades, the relationship evolved from a one-way outreach/professional expert model into a participatory action research project, primarily involving faculty and students in UIUC’s Department of Urban and Regional Planning, and community leaders and elected officials. One notable success: “a new mixed-use, mixed-income, mixed-finance [housing] development in the area surrounding the newly built Emerson Park Rail Station” (Reardon, 2003, “Parsons Place,” para. 2). This project, like so many other successes in the ESLARP partnership, did not originate with university representatives or elected officials. Instead, a community member empowered to speak for the community and supported by university faculty negotiated with the power structures which have traditionally constrained community options for self-directed economic and community development successes in East St. Louis. This community-driven agenda setting, drawing on the university for support, was characteristic of the partnership for most of its history, making ESLARP a striking example of engagement as a process to engage a broad representation of community in the partnership activities.

**West Philadelphia.** One of the earliest community–university partnerships still in existence links the neighborhoods of West Philadelphia with the University of Pennsylvania, and provides another example of the engagement-as-process ethos advanced in this monograph. The community–university relationship between “West Philly,” as the residents call their home, and Penn has matured significantly over the last three decades (Benson & Harkavy, 2000). The West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC) began in 1985 as an after-school program at a local elementary school; WEPIC has grown over three decades to include educational collaborations, urban clean-up projects, and environmental stewardship efforts between Penn faculty and students, parents, and community members at various K–12 schools in West Philadelphia (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 1996, 2000).

Today, the Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships is Penn’s main vehicle for these programs. The Center supports more than a dozen other diverse collaborations, ranging from improving college access to redesigning local business models. The Netter Center at Penn strives to solve the complex, comprehensive, and interconnected problems of local urban living through mutually beneficial and respectful partnerships with the West Philadelphia community (Netter Center, 2012).

**Support for Other Partnerships.** Financial as well as philosophical support for community–university partnerships is evident on many fronts, including universities, philanthropic foundations, state and local governments, and national policy organizations, such as Campus
Compact, a coalition of 1100 university presidents and the institutions they lead committed to furthering the civic mission of higher education. Marga, Inc.—a consulting firm headed by scholar-practitioner David Maurrasse—and the members of the National Anchor Institution Task Force (http://www.margainc.com/initiatives/aitf/) engage with universities and their communities to build capacity for collaborative partnerships recognizing the university as a key player in the economic stability and growth of the United States’ cities. Other organizations, such as CEOs for Cities, recognize higher education’s important role in economic development, building on the work of Florida (2004, 2005) who has long advocated the importance of higher education in attracting creative entrepreneurial professionals to a community as the cornerstone of urban growth. The Talloires Network, an international coalition of universities in 71 countries committed to engagement, the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, and the Kellogg Foundation are among the many organizations that recognize excellence in community-university partnership with annual awards and cash prizes.

The many examples of placemaking activities presented above indicate that universities around the United States are actively responding to calls by civic and education leaders to engage with their communities. Most community members, and many senior university leaders, focus on high visibility formal partnerships such as these as the venue for acting on calls for engagement. Some partnerships do show evidence of broad-based community participation in the planning process, but others do not. Even so, all could be said to advance the university’s goal for engagement. The examples offered in this chapter reflect intentional partnerships, and—in some instances—community leadership in setting the agenda for the partnership. However, many other institutions still emphasize engagement as a product rather than shifting to an engagement ethos as a way to facilitate broad participation to advance the community’s vision for itself.

Driving the Economy

The Great Recession of 2008–2010 brought a new urgency to discussions of community-university interaction. Business/civic leaders, senior university administrators, and higher education scholars now use terms like economic driver to describe the role of universities in economic development (Lane & Johnstone, 2012). This rhetoric is particularly common from civic and business leaders. More than a decade ago, higher education scholar Alexander (2000) characterized this economic engine role as “an increasing burden on higher education” (p. 412). Others worried publicly that the commercialization of research was threatening the free exchange of ideas upon which academia depends (Williams-Jones, 2005). Nonetheless, there were also examples of university leaders advocating institutional involvement, and sometimes outright leadership, in economic development particularly at metropolitan universities (O’Brien & Accardo, 1996; O’Brien, Grace, Williams, Paradise, & Gibbs, 2003). Today, high profile leaders such as State University of New York Chancellor Nancy Zimpher embrace the economic engine role enthusiastically: “[T]he path to [U.S.] economic vitality . . . is ahead of us,” she has suggested, and “. . . America’s universities, colleges, and community colleges will build the bridge to get us there” (USC Rossier School of Education, 2013).

Faculty and administrators promote economic vitality in multiple ways (Lane, 2012). Through multisector collaborations, universities create research infrastructures with an eye to establishing an industrial cluster in a particular region (Shaffer & Wright, 2010). For example, the Georgia Research Alliance hosts the Eminent Scholars Initiative. With matching funds from state and university partners, Eminent Scholars has attracted 60 scholar-entrepreneurs to the Atlanta area, brought in $2.6 billion in research funding, generated 150 new companies, and created 5500 jobs in the science and technology fields. Universities support local businesses through workforce development initiatives, small business development services, and entrepreneurship training. The Riata Center for Entrepreneurship Studies at Oklahoma State University in Tulsa offers similar experiences through a six-week “Entrepreneur Boot Camp” for micro- and small businesses in Northeast Oklahoma. Higher education institutions also prepare their graduates as new members of the workforce educated for the knowledge economy and socialized to engage in the civic life of their communities (Johnstone, 2012).
Higher education institutions are also "spender[s] and consumer[s]." acting as "economic units" in their local community (Gais & Wright, 2012, p. 34). Universities receive revenue in the form of tuition and research grant dollars, which is in turn spent on employee salaries, utility costs, office supplies, and materials for use in construction projects. Students and their occasionally visiting parents, alumni, and university employees contribute directly to the local economy, through expenditures on living expenses, travel, lodging, dining, and entertainment. Universities themselves are also important customers of local businesses. For example, in 2008–2009, the overall economic impact of the University of Iowa on the state was $6.0 billion; this figure includes $2.6 billion in direct expenditures, and an additional $3.4 billion in "induced or indirect spending within the state" (Tripp Umbach, 2010, p. 1); in short, "[e]ach $1 invested in the University of Iowa [through state funding, for example] returns $15.81 to the state" in revenue (Tripp Umbach, 2010, p. 2).

Further, state and local leaders look to universities to step up partnerships for strengthening community well-being, in a sense asking the university to "define its role in community engagement as undertaking strategic community revitalization with specific neighborhood(s) through reciprocal, enduring, and diverse partnerships" (Vidal et al., 2002, p. vii; Shaffer & Wright, 2010). By alleviating poverty in the surrounding community or increasing the educational achievement of area children, community and university leaders build stronger, more welcoming communities. University participation is not, however, completely altruistic. In many instances, institutional leaders act from an enlightened self-interest. Undoubtedly, reducing poverty and increasing educational attainment does improve the community, but one can question whether or not the university entered into the partnership to contribute to the community's new vision for itself or to enhance its own ability to recruit and retain students, faculty, and administrative professionals (Maurrasse, 2001).

Sorting out this complex mix of motivations may in the end be impossible. Evaluating the impact of engagement on a particular community requires examining the process through which the partnership goals were established. Community development scholars question the effects of community revitalization through economic development because of the potential to disenfranchise local residents (Barker & Brown, 2009; Bridger & Alter, 2006). Enacting engagement as a process requires universities and their individual representatives to cultivate a sense of themselves as members of a community and to participate in building this shared vision. In doing so, university actors support the revitalization of communities and also enjoy the benefits of safe, desirable neighborhoods.

Reconciling Competing Roles: The Anchor Institution Mission

Community–university partnerships addressing community health and university participation in economic development activities are often seen—and therefore have been presented in this chapter—as separate activities for higher education institutions; they are also sometimes discussed as competing goals. Recent writing positions the university as an economic actor, as above. Indeed, in the United States' 100 largest cities, the business activities of a university and/or a hospital represent one of the largest forces shaping local and regional economics (Hecht, 2012). In October, 2011, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Shaun Donovan spoke to a group of urban leaders and business executives at the CEOs for Cities conference in Chicago. He focused his remarks on HUD's ideas for growing cities and regions; in essence, he pointed to "eds and meds" and other institutions anchored in a particular city/region that might translate into drivers of economic growth for that place (Bergen, 2011). This idea of linking the future well-being of a particular place to successful collaborations with particular types of entities has taken the community–university partnerships common for more than a century to a new place, and situated the university as a key component in first stabilizing and then revitalizing communities (Hodges & Dubb, 2012; Maurrasse, 2001).

Hodges and Dubb (2012) use the term anchor institution movement to denote the growing trend among colleges and universities to recognize and act upon their responsibilities as anchors in the local or regional economy. In pursuing an anchor institution mission "the full range of university activities
are important” (Hodges & Dubb, 2012, p. xiv). Partnerships with public schools support educational attainment. Universities invest in communities by buying from local merchants and hiring neighborhood residents. Real estate development plans, for example, provide opportunities for universities to invest real dollars in the community, so as to better meet the educational and research functions of the institution.

In the interest of “mov[ing] beyond promotion, public relations and anecdotes,” Hodges and Dubb (2012) offer a typology based on the case studies of the roles 10 universities play in cities such as Cincinnati, Memphis, New Haven, Portland, and Indianapolis (p. xxv). Universities acting as facilitators support many partnerships, across a variety of sectors, and several different neighborhoods. Miami Dade College, Portland State University, and University of Indiana-Purdue University at Indianapolis, all acting from an institutional commitment to community well-being, support service-learning projects, volunteerism, and community–university partnerships across their metropolitan areas to address, primarily, education and public health issues. Other institutions act as leaders, applying significant institutional resources to the revitalization of low-income neighborhoods with an eye to improving safety and quality of life for the university’s students and employees. The University of Cincinnati, Yale University, and the University of Pennsylvania share a common attribute: high crime rates in neighborhoods adjacent to the campus. Each of these institutions has taken an active leadership role in the surrounding area to address these issues. While community stakeholders are typically consulted by leader institutions in developing appropriate strategies, university administrators retain most of the decision-making authority as they allocate institutional funds and dedicate staff to particular initiatives. Other campus leaders act as conveners in nonadjacent neighborhoods, convening cross-sector partnerships aimed at addressing community-based concerns (pp. xiv–xx, 11–16). LeMoyne-Owen College, the University of Minnesota, Syracuse University, and Emory University work in concert with municipal, civic, business, and social service entities to revitalize particular neighborhoods/areas within their city. The categories in Hodges and Dubb’s typology are not mutually exclusive; it is, however, typical for an individual institution to take primarily one approach over others, as dictated by that institution’s mission and administrative priorities.

Unbalanced focus on economic development of communities risks “increased inequality and divisiveness” (Bridger & Alter, 2006, p. 171). Rutheiser (2012), manager for the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s anchor institution initiatives, acknowledges the same with regard to the anchor institution movement:

"Without a clear 'anchor institution mission' that strategically deploys the economic, human, and intellectual capital of institutions to improve the long-term welfare of the communities in which they reside, the growth of universities by themselves will not necessarily improve circumstances for the people who live in distressed communities adjacent to these institutions and, indeed, could make conditions worse. (p. x)

Rutheiser cautions institutional leaders against an overemphasis on “the growth of universities by themselves,” referring to strategies that might advance the institution’s self-interest without considering the needs or desires of the surrounding community. For example, local critics of the University of Pennsylvania’s efforts to rebuild West Philadelphia and the University City neighborhood call those efforts “Penntrification,” and have in the past worried that national chain stores moving into the neighborhood will threaten the livelihood of locally owned businesses (Drummond, 2009).

Implicit in the scholarship related to community–university interactions is the critical nature of the relationships built among participants; the success of the partnership depends upon them. Strong relationships between Penn and its neighbors in University City could support the community in addressing their concerns. Schneekloth and Shibley (1995) discuss placemaking as synonymous with relationship building. “Social change, environmental change and management, and competent research in the practice of placemaking occur,” they say, “when there is a congruence between the various goals of people affected by this place” (p. 9). That congruence of goals is not a matter of happenstance; rather, as Schneekloth and Shibley remind campus
leaders, “it must be nurtured” (p. 9). Nurturing these relationships is “a complex task . . . rooted in fully appreciating the context of each professional interaction” (p. 9). Such an endeavor requires a commitment to deliberative practices as the basis for relationships with community members. In higher education institutions, these will require organizational and cultural changes.

To achieve the shift from engagement as product to engagement as process advocated in this monograph, university actors will need to explore a series of issues currently challenging their ability to embrace the reunderstood engagement ethos discussed in the first chapter. This monograph is presented in the format of a research proposal, suggesting that further study might advance institutional and individual efforts to make the move from outcome to process. The second, third, and fourth chapters operate, in effect, as reviews of particular body of literature related to community–university engagement. As in a research proposal, we come to the end of such a literature review with a clearer sense of the gaps in the literature, and foci for future research projects. When community is framed as neighborhood, a place where residents collaborate to change the community, we see aspects of university structure and functioning that inhibit engagement as a process. The examples of community–university interaction presented in this chapter invite institutional change related to mission and particularly operating structures in order to effect a new approach to engaging with a broad representation of the community.

Directions for Future Research: Institutional Change

When campus leaders intentionally move to enact an anchor institution mission, or indeed “any, or all forms of engagement,” they typically do so in a move away from standard operating procedures (Hodges & Dubb, 2012, p. 27). Accordingly, leaders would be well served to draw on the results of empirical research related to institutional change at colleges and universities successfully prioritizing engagement as the process by which institutional actors engage with members of the surrounding community. Further, the literature related to adaptive leadership will provide important insights about possible approaches to manage change (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Randall & Coakley, 2007). Senior leaders might begin by reviewing the existing literature. For example, the institutions Hodges and Dubb highlighted “have begun to see themselves as part of their surrounding community,” and come to understand “their futures [as] intertwined with the success of their neighbors” (p. 27). Creating an engaged community will, their findings suggest, require changing the way the university understands its relationship to its physical surroundings and, perhaps more fundamentally, the institutional culture itself (Kezar, 2011; Ramaley & Holland, 2005). One implication of this line of scholarship is clear: institutional change is necessary to facilitate building and maintaining strong relationships with partners, or engagement as a process (McNall et al., 2009). Without such change, engagement will remain an outcome, or product, accomplished as possible within existing structures.

Effecting change on this order requires skilled leadership. Organizational learning and adaptive leadership approaches may support campus-level culture change, and therefore warrant attention here. University actors will also benefit from examples of other institutional leaders who have successfully implemented change, such as Judith Ramaley’s story of change leadership at Portland State University presented here. The chapter concludes with a discussion of research methodologies that might be employed to inform institutional change initiatives.

Leadership

Faculty at so-called engaged universities often portray their provost or president as an engagement champion who transformed a campus by creating or advancing a strong culture of engagement (Moore & Ward, 2010). Transformational leaders such as these rely on their personal charisma to achieve broad commitment to change, motivating individuals to achieve what might otherwise have seemed impossible in a given organizational context (Randall & Coakley, 2007). Transactional leaders use rewards to motivate specific acts of change; however, such an approach may be difficult to sustain in institutions where resources are limited (Pounder, 2001). Transformational leaders are not hampered by resource constraints; rather, their efforts are hindered by
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their tremendous responsibility to sustain change that may not withstand a particular person's departure from the institution (Randall & Coakley, 2007).

Embracing a role as placemaker and acting from an anchor institution mission represent transformative change initiatives for colleges and universities because these activities do not align with the traditional culture, attitudes, and functioning of higher education institutions. Accordingly, colleges and universities spurred into community–university engagement face adaptive challenges, systemic difficulties in current operating approaches brought on by change in the surrounding environment, much like the changes experienced by higher education institutions now being asked to engage more directly with community members (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). Making the shift from viewing engagement as an outcome of faculty or administrative effort to embracing a relational approach to interactions between community and university representatives presents an adaptive challenge to an individual institution, and invites constituents across the partnerships to embrace a process of change.

**Change as a Scholarly Act**

Even with empirical data in hand, changing the structure of an individual higher education institution could be a daunting task. Many have suggested that such an endeavor is somewhat futile, particularly given that “higher education institutions do not seem to learn from their mistakes,” as evidenced, for example, by a university that has previously implemented a new technology and experienced negative results, then adopts a second untried innovation (Kezar, 2005a, p. 1). Criticisms such as this assume that the university as an organization, distinct from the individual actors within the institution, can learn and that new knowledge/learning becomes embedded in the organizational systems themselves, transcending the individual people who move through positions as their career changes (Kezar, 2005b; Senge, 1990). Positioning the university as a learning organization may provide valuable tools for changing administrative practice, as well as fostering partnerships (Anderson, 2005). Such a shift in thinking about how the university does or can function would, from Anderson's perspective, precede focused efforts on a particular outcome such as increased engagement with the surrounding community.

Portland State University provides an example of a learning organization changing its administrative practice to support a new approach to engagement. Responding to a perceived budget crisis in the early 1990s, new president Judith Ramaley led the campus through a period of change that required significant organizational learning (Ramaley, 2002; Ramaley & Holland, 2005). PSU leaders framed transformational change as a scholarly act (Ramaley, 2000), and began with a thorough review of the empirical literature as well as institutional research data specifically related to the issue at hand. By doing so, campus leaders created a compelling case for action that changed administrative practice as well as campus culture (Ramaley, 2002), and ultimately transformed Portland State University into a national leader in the anchor institution movement. This story reflects many important ideas relevant to the discussion in this chapter, as well as suggesting directions for future research. First, wide-ranging change may be/likely is necessary to realize institutional goals for engagement as a process for interacting rather than simply an outcome of institutional efforts. Further, individual actors might resist change. However, inherent characteristics of universities and their constituents can be turned into assets in the change management process; namely, at Portland State, leaders framed change as a scholarly act and thereby drew faculty and academic administrators into research focused on organizational change. Ramaley and Holland (2005) justify this approach as “consistent with academic culture” (p. 77); scholars more readily participated in the change process that had been carefully grounded in the processes of social science research, including at PSU a thorough review of the literature on engagement and on organizational change.

**Methodologies to Advance Institutional Change**

Despite individual examples like the Portland State story, many administrators and scholars dismiss the learning organization framework as a management fad, and eschew organizational learning strategies (Kezar, 2005b; Senge, 1990). Doing so may set aside promising tools for reshaping the culture and practice of higher education. Action research (AR) traditions offer many possible research methodologies for investigating how organizations learn to operate in new ways and evaluating the efficacy of framing an institution as a
learning organization. AR is a cyclical process beginning with identifying a current concern in a particular environment. In this case, the issue is the need for organizational change to facilitate an engagement-as-process approach to community–university interactions. University leaders engaged in action research could make some change to the operating procedures, and then use action research methods to monitor the action/change by gathering data about what's happening. Evaluation of the new approach provides empirical evidence to be used to modify the practice in light of the evaluation (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005). Glassman, Erdem, and Bartholomew (2012) describe AR as a social change tool, focusing on patterns of interaction within a community. I take university to be synonymous with learning organization, and I think of a learning organization as a community of individual learners. A necessary first step in changing organizational practices is to identify the accepted practices and structural barriers that inhibit universities from being responsive to community-driven change (Glassman et al., 2012). For example, funding for a new public health intervention might be awarded to a university researcher through a federal grant or contract. Students in a particular course could staff a literacy program as part of a service-learning project. Standard operating procedures at the university might make it difficult for the community organization to receive funds from the grant or cover its services outside the 16-week semester (Ward, 2003). If so, changes can be made to the process to advance a shift to engagement as process. In turn, AR offers a promising approach for evaluating the new process, making adjustments and moving forward.

The need to effect organizational change within individual colleges and universities stems from two ideas at the heart of this monograph. One, overemphasis on economic development in communities threatens to undermine development of community capacity to lead development efforts and to disenfranchise further members of underrepresented groups such as those of lower socioeconomic status, racial minorities, youth, and the elderly (Bridger & Alter, 2006). Two, universities, and their individual representatives, are members of the community where the institution is located and as such they are important participants in community development. To realize their role as supporters of community-driven change, university actors must move away from engaging for the sake of being able to adopt the engaged campus moniker, and adopt engagement as a process for interacting with other members of the community.