

School-Community-University Partnerships:

**Effectively Integrating Community Building and
Education Reform**

Ira Harkavy

University of Pennsylvania

Paper presented to Conference on

**Connecting Community Building and Education
Reform: Effective School, Community, University
Partnerships**

Joint Forum

U.S. Department of Education

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Washington, D.C.

January 8, 1998

May 12, 1998

Reporting on an October 1997 meeting of a representative group of mayors, school superintendents, and school board members held under the joint auspices of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the Council of Great City Schools, David Broder wrote: "The bad news is that the meeting should have been held years ago. The good news is that it finally happened. . . ." [\[1\]](#)

That same sentiment might be expressed about this extraordinary, "first-time-ever" U.S. Departments of Education and Housing and Urban Development Joint Forum. Given the multisided, complex, interconnected, systemic, seemingly intractable problems afflicting our schools and communities, a joint forum on how to connect community building and education reform should have been held years, even decades, ago.

But both meetings did not occur "back then." Today's forum follows the mayors-superintendents gathering by a mere three months. Although no direct connection exists between the two, they share a core proposition that successful community building and genuine education reform are intrinsically linked. You simply can't have one without the other.

The understanding that community building and education reform are "joined at the hip" is not, of course, a new idea. It has its roots in John Dewey's emphasis on the school-community-society connection. The revival of the Deweyan trilogy is a direct result of increasingly severe "Savage Inequalities" between urban, largely minority, schools and communities and much of suburban America.^[2] The school-community connection is evident in the multiple interrelated plagues of poverty, violence, disease, broken families, drug and alcohol abuse and academic failure. A quote from the principal of an elementary school located in a distressed area of North Philadelphia illustrates this point with particular clarity.

A 1994 New York Times article broadly surveyed the deplorable state of Philadelphia public schools. According to the article, after Rebecca Kimmelman became principal of the Meade Elementary school in 1991, she initiated ten innovative programs funded by large governmental and private foundation supplemental grants. Moreover, she also worked hard to overcome the problem that "most of our instruction is out of the Dark Ages," i.e., rote teaching and learning. The reporter then noted, however, that in Kimmelman's judgment:

. . . teaching is not Meade's biggest problem. . . . That distinction, Ms. Kimmelman said, belongs to the blighted community in which the school exists. "You could give me \$80 billion to improve the school," she said, "but it won't make much difference unless you make changes out there. If a 6-year old's mother is a drug addict and a prostitute and she's dying of AIDS and she's all

but abandoned the child, what can we do to turn that child around?" [emphasis added].[\[3\]](#)

Although obvious, community impacts on schooling have not been seriously addressed by either governmental policy or American higher education. For too many politicians and academics "School is a school is a school is a school," with one size fitting all, no matter where it is and who attends. Prattling about high standards for all children without confronting "the blighted community in which [many] school[s] exist" will most likely result in frustration and disillusion, rather than achievement and success.

Similarly, revitalized cities and communities necessitate revitalized and excellent schools. At the joint mayors-superintendents meeting in October 1997, Mayor Paul Helmke of Fort Wayne, current president of the Conference of Mayors, expressed that idea as follows: "We [mayors] now realize how crucial schools are to the future of our cities. Good schools encourage parents to remain in the city, bad schools drive them away and keep employees out."[\[4\]](#) A recent campaign headed by High Price, president of the National Urban League, illustrates that reducing the particularly pernicious savage inequality in educational achievement has become a major national issue.

Price has drawn together 20 national black organizations, with approximately 25 million members, including the Congress of National Black Churches for a Campaign for African-American Achievement. A statement announcing the campaign stated: "We have to reverse the increasing gap in academic achievement

between African-American and other children. We have to increase the low rates of enrollment of African-American youngsters in college preparatory courses and attack the inequitable allocation of resources for public education [emphasis added]."[\[5\]](#)

An emphasis on the preeminent role of education for individual and societal success also has deep roots in Dewey's work, in particular his 1902 essay, "The School as Social Centre." Dewey, in effect, observed that, during the 20th century, the schooling system would increasingly function as the strategic subsystem of the increasingly complex industrial (and "post-industrial") societies produced by the post-1800 economic and communications revolutions.[\[6\]](#) Twenty-five years after he wrote "The School as Social Centre," Dewey wrote *The Public and Its Problems* and highlighted another theme central to our deliberations.

In that work, Dewey unequivocally identified the existence of "neighborly community" as indispensable for a well-functioning democratic society: "There is," he wrote, "no substitute for the vitality and depth of close and direct intercourse and attachment. . . .Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community."[\[7\]](#) By 1927, however, as Robert Westbrook has observed, Dewey had sharply downgraded schools as agents of progressive change. He never suggested in *The Public and Its Problems* which other agent or institution could and would act to construct "cosmopolitan communal community" (my term) required for the "Good Participatory Democratic Society" (again my term).[\[8\]](#)

This two-day forum, in effect, can be seen as both advancing the work of contemporary colleagues (including the mayors and superintendents) and building on and extending Dewey's work by identifying school-community-university partnerships as a possible (indeed a likely) vehicle to get us from here to there. That is, getting us from the promise of realizing to the practical realization of "The [Democratic] Promise of American Life for All Americans" (to extend Herbert Croly's influential progressive vision of 1909).

The significance of working hard to identify an agent to get something done cannot be overstated. Among the besetting sins of academia and academia-influenced policy makers is to describe and analyze problems without giving serious and sustained attention to the important question of identifying who (broadly conceived to include institutions) should do what to change things that need to be changed. All too often the market's invisible hand, government largess, or public will are invoked in the concluding pages of a huge tome filled with facts, figures, and descriptions.

Although we should be applauded for identifying a strategic agent that might help produce the change we wish to see, we have, of course, miles to go. We need to answer two really hard questions: 1) What are the optimal ways for school-community-university partnerships to function, if we are to realize our goal of a much better America; and (the hardest question of all) 2) What should be done by whom (e.g., government, business, schools, unions, churches, community-based organizations, higher educational institutions, individuals) to make it likely that school-community-university partnerships do what we want them to do?

The agenda for this two day forum clearly places these questions, to mix metaphors shamelessly, on the table and front and center. Since the conference organizers asked me to help "set the table," my task is easier than those who follow. I am "merely" to explain why universities are an appropriate and central partner to help develop and sustain better schools and communities. I will not, however, "wimp out" on the how to questions posed above. I will later suggest what could and should be done by government, foundations, and higher education to create and sustain comprehensive, strongly symbiotic, mutually-beneficial, school-community-university partnerships that help America to better fulfill its democratic promise.

Democracy and the American University

Why should American universities actively, wholeheartedly adopt collaboration with schools and communities as their categorical imperative for the new millennium? Because they will then be better able to fulfill their primary mission of advancing and transmitting knowledge for a democratic society. Discarding the aristocratic, elitist Platonic model of the English dons and transcending the quasi-open elite model of the German research university, the American university constituted, as political scientist Charles Anderson has noted, a "radical transformation of the long-standing views of the purposes of this institution, of the life of the mind, of reason itself."

Because Anderson brilliantly captures the "extraordinary recasting of historic predispositions" that occurred during early decades of the American research university, I quote him at length:

The classic understanding was that the life of philosophy, of self-conscious reflection, was the highest of human attainments, and reserved to the very few. Even in modern times, it has normally been assumed that the capacity for reflective intelligence was rather unevenly distributed. The work of the university was taken to be essentially aristocratic. It dealt with the higher questions. It prepared the qualified for the learned professions [original emphasis]. The university's role was rational speculation, and in the hierarchy of human interests this was thought to be quite remote from the concerns of everyday life.

With deliberate defiance, those who created the American university (particularly the public university, though the commitment soon spread throughout the system) simply stood this idea of reason on its head. Now it was assumed that the widespread exercise of self-conscious, critical reason was essential to democracy [original emphasis]. The truly remarkable belief arose that this system of government would flourish best if citizens would generally adopt the habits of thought hitherto supposed appropriate mainly for scholars and scientists [emphasis added]. We vastly expanded access to higher education. We presumed it a general good, like transport, or power, part of the infrastructure of the civilization.

Furthermore, it was assumed that not only the exalted subjects, but the humblest ones as well, were properly the subject of rational analysis. Thus, if we could improve philosophy, science, literature, and the arts through systematic critical analysis, we

could do the same for agriculture, commerce, and home economics.[\[9\]](#)

Why take Anderson's position at face value? Because, among other reasons, because it resonates with the words and actions of the founders and early leaders of the American research university. In 1876, Daniel Coit Gilman, in his inaugural address as the first president of Johns Hopkins, America's first modern research university, expressed the hope that universities should "make for less misery among the poor, less ignorance in the schools, less bigotry in the temple, less suffering in the hospital, less fraud in business, less folly in politics."[\[10\]](#) Judged against Gilman's criteria, the performance of the American research university over the past 120 years has not been, to put it very mildly, adequate. More to the point, the abiding belief in the democratic purposes of the American research university echoed throughout higher education at the turn of the twentieth century. For example, in 1908, Harvard's president Charles Eliot wrote: "At bottom most of the American institutions of higher education are filled with the democratic spirit of serviceableness. Teachers and students alike are profoundly moved by the desire to serve the democratic community. . . . All the colleges boast of the serviceable men they have trained, and regard the serviceable patriot as their ideal product. This is a thoroughly democratic conception of their function."[\[11\]](#)

University presidents of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries worked to develop the American research university into a major national institution capable of meeting the needs of a rapidly changing and increasingly complex society. Imbued with

boundless optimism and a belief that knowledge could change the world for the better, these captains of erudition envisioned universities as leading the way toward a more effective, humane, and democratic society for Americans in general and residents of the city in particular. Progressive academics also viewed the city as their arena for study and action. They seized the opportunity to advance knowledge, teaching, and learning by working to improve the quality of life in American cities experiencing the traumatic effects of industrialization, immigration, and large-scale urbanization.^[12] This animating mission to advance knowledge "for the relief of man's estate" (to use Francis Bacon's wonderful phrase) is readily identified in the histories of four leading urban universities at the turn of the twentieth century: Johns Hopkins, Columbia, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania.^[13]

Hopkins' president, Daniel Coit Gilman, for example, was the guiding force behind the organization of the Charity Organization Society (COS). An organization designed to provide a scientific approach to helping Baltimore's poor, COS, studied the causes of poverty, collected useful data, and worked to get at the root causes of destitution. Moreover, a number of Gilman's leading faculty members such as Herbert Baxter Adams and Richard Ely had close ties to Levering Hall, the campus YMCA, which was deeply engaged in work with Baltimore's poor. Students in Adams' and Ely's Department of History, Political Economy and Political Science worked through Levering Hall "to use the city as a laboratory for economic study." John Glenn, chair of the executive committee of COS, remarked in 1888 that Hopkins was the first university where social welfare work was "almost a part of the curriculum."^[14]

Hopkins may have been the first, but certainly not the only, university to integrate social welfare work as part of the curriculum. More generally, Progressive Era academics, viewed the city as an extraordinarily appropriate, valuable site for study and action. It was the center of significant societal transformation, the center of political corruption, poverty, crime, and cultural conflict, as well as a ready source of data and information. To quote Richard Mayo-Smith of Columbia, the city was "the natural laboratory of social science, just as hospitals are of medical science." Simply stated, the city was the logical site for creative faculty and students to effectively integrate theory and practice.[\[15\]](#)

In most cases, Progressive Era university presidents and academics had an expert-driven model of change founded on the assumption that the expert, with scientific knowledge in hand, would increase efficiency in governmental agencies and design institutions that improve the quality of life for the urban poor and immigrant. The expert's role was to study and assist, but not to learn from the community.[\[16\]](#)

Not all turn of the century academics shared that authoritative, elitist conception of the university's role. Seth Low, president of Columbia from 1890 through 1901, promoted a decidedly democratic approach in dealing with New York City and its communities. In his inaugural address, Low stated "the city may be made to a considerable extent, a part of the university." Columbia was also to be part of the city, resulting in a democratic, mutually-beneficial relationship between town and gown. In an article, "The University and the Workingman," Low wrote that the "workingmen of America. . . [should know] that at Columbia College. . . the disposition exists to teach the truth. . . without fear

or favor, and we ask their aid to enable us to see the truth as it appears to them [emphasis added]." [\[17\]](#)

Low is also notable for his enthusiastic embrace of New York City as the source of Columbia's greatness. He not only brought "the College into closer touch with the community," but also significantly improved Columbia by successfully encouraging faculty and students to focus their intellectual work on helping New York solve its problems. [\[18\]](#)

A mediocre institution in the 1870's and 1880's, Columbia was widely viewed as a snobbish school for rich young men. Upon assuming the presidency, Low made his goal clear: "I am desirous," he told an alumnus, "to build Columbia into a great university, worthy of New York. . . ." [\[19\]](#) He took the occasion of his inaugural address to emphasize that Columbia was not simply in New York City, but of New York City. [\[20\]](#) In his inaugural address, Low also echoed Francis Bacon's proposition that the purpose of scholarship is service for the betterment of humanity:

Consider for a moment the significance to the college of a great city about it. First of all, it means for every one of us that there is no such thing as the world of letters as apart from the world of men. There are such things, undoubtedly, as most unworldly scholars, men oftentimes "of whom the world is not worthy," but such scholars are never made except out of men who see humanity, as in a vision, ever beckoning from behind their books. The scholar without this vision is a pedant. He mistakes learning

for an end in itself, instead of seeing that it is only a weapon in a wise man's hands [emphasis added].[\[21\]](#)

Low went beyond posing and answering the question, "knowledge for what?" He called on students to become engaged directly with the city and its communities and people. Engagement with, and study and action in New York City, according to Low, would produce educated, prepared, and moral students, as well as significant contributions to knowledge:

. . . the real world is not to be found in books. That [real world] is peopled by men and women of living flesh and blood, and the great city can supply the human quality which the broad-minded man must not suffer himself to lack. There is a variety of life in this city, a vitality about it, and, withal, a sense of power of which, to my thought, are of inestimable value to the student whose desire it is to become a well-rounded man There is but one New York on all of this continent, and, for the purposes of technical and professional training her location in New York supplements the work of Columbia with advantages not elsewhere to be had. So, also, I believe the great city will lend itself readily to the encouragement of profound research. As there is no solitude like that of a crowd, so there is no inspiration like it [emphasis added].[\[22\]](#)

No other university president had so clearly articulated a morally inspired, instrumental, active approach to research, teaching, and learning. In effect, repudiating Plato's notion of the groves of academe with its physical and intellectual separation of town and gown, Low linked town and gown, identifying a mutually-beneficial, interactive relationship between Columbia and the city as crucial to intellectual and institutional advancement. Low even went so far as to invoke Bacon's standard of progress as the test of inquiry and research. In Low's case, the specific test was Columbia's ability "to influence the life of New York."[\[23\]](#)

Low's presidency was a great success. As one authority has noted: "By 1901, Seth Low had taken a small, dissension ridden college and made it into a great university. He had taken a financially undernourished institution and infused it with great quantities of fresh money, and, by building Columbia a new home [Morningside Heights campus], he had made certain that the university would remain in the City of New York."[\[24\]](#)

Low's extraordinary contributions to Columbia and to the practice and theory of community-university partnerships have largely been forgotten. His vision of a cosmopolitan, democratic, civic university was significantly ahead of its time. Moreover, the brevity of his tenure, the forty-three year imperious reign of his successor (Nicholas Murray Butler), and the dominance of Plato's aristocratic, scholastic, "liberal" educational theory in American colleges and universities also account for Low's limited impact.

While Low provides the most compelling vision of community-university relationships, the University of Chicago in practice had the closest ties to its locality. Work emanating from Hull House,

the social settlement founded by Jane Addams and Ellen Starr on Chicago's West Side in 1889, was enormously significant in forming ties between the university and its city. Adopting a multifaceted institutional approach to the social problem of the immigrant groups in the Nineteenth Ward, Hull House residents offered activities along four lines designated by Addams as the social, educational, humanitarian, and civic. In addition to its various residents' programs, Hull House was a site for labor union activities; a forum for social, political, and economic reform; and a center for social science research. Regarding its research function, Addams noted, "The settlements antedated by three years the first sociology departments in universities and by ten years the establishment of the first foundations for social research."[\[25\]](#)

In 1895, Jane Addams and the residents of Hull House published *Hull House Maps and Papers*, a sociological investigation of the neighborhood immediately to the east of Hull House; in Addams' words, it was a record of "certain phases of neighborhood life with which the writers have been familiar."[\[26\]](#) Inspired by Charles Booth's *Life and Labor of the People* in London, the Hull House residents compiled detailed maps of demographic and social characteristics, and produced richly descriptive accounts of life and work in a poor immigrant neighborhood. Theirs was not dispassionate scholarship, as evidenced by Florence Kelley's poignant advocacy on behalf of sweatshop laborers, whose "reward of work at their trade is grinding poverty, ending only in death or escape to some more hopeful occupation. Within the trade there has been and can be no improvement in wages while tenement house-manufacture is tolerated. On the contrary, there seems to be no limit to the deterioration now in progress."[\[27\]](#)

In its early years, the University of Chicago demonstrated that by doing good, a research university could do very well. When Chicago's first President, William Rainey Harper, described the mission of his newly-minted university as "service for mankind wherever mankind is, whether within scholastic walls or without those walls and in the world at large," he expressed a pervasive attitude of Progressive Era academics that teaching, research and service were fully compatible." [28] It is not surprising that male sociologists at the University of Chicago were closely associated with Hull House, acknowledging that "it was Addams and Hull House who were the leader and leading institution in Chicago in the 1890's, not the University of Chicago." Indeed, Hull House Maps and Papers "established the major substantive interests and methodological technique of Chicago Sociology that would define the School for the next forty years." [29]

Undoubtedly, the most notable work at Chicago during this period was the development by Dewey and his colleagues of the "Chicago School of Philosophy." Hailed by William James as so "wonderful. . . that it deserves the title of a new system of philosophy," the Chicago School emerged from the action-oriented engagement of Dewey and his colleagues in the real-world problems of the city in which they lived and worked. [30] Dewey's Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, moreover, served as the most important vehicle for developing and disseminating the ideas of the philosophy department. Dewey's work with the Laboratory School adumbrates the scholarly (and to some extent societal) potential of school-community-university partnerships.

From the University of Chicago's founding in 1892 through and beyond Dewey's departure to Columbia in 1904, the city's reform movement was closely tied to the university, with scholars playing key roles in efforts to improve education and politics.[\[31\]](#) According to a leading authority on the Chicago Pragmatists, moreover, these "practical endeavors were encouraged as fitting for a university, providing a broad field for testing ideas and theories."[\[32\]](#)

Chicago academics were by no means unique in involving themselves in city reform movements. In Philadelphia the independent administration of Rudolph Blankenburg received significant assistance from faculty in the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School. The early Wharton School most fully exemplified an entire "college" within a wider university devoted to integrating research and teaching with political activity. Endowed in 1881 by Joseph Wharton as the School of Finance and Economy, it quickly developed in practice into a "School of Political and Social Science," under the direction of Edmund James. James, a future president of both Northwestern University and the University of Illinois, saw Wharton's future as dependent upon its successful involvement with local issues and real-world problems. He created, therefore, a unique organizational innovation— a school devoted to providing a social scientific response to the problems of industrialization.[\[33\]](#)

James' innovations went beyond his fashioning of the Wharton School's direction. In 1889, he established the American Academy of Political and Social Science as an organization linking academics and leading citizens for the study of societal problems. James and his Wharton colleagues also played key roles in establishing the Municipal League of Philadelphia and the

National Municipal League. Like the American Academy, these organizations were predicated on the concept of partnership between academics and reformers. Among the scholars and other leaders who participated in the National League were Theodore Roosevelt, Herbert Baxter Adams, Richard Ely, Francis A. Walker, Edward L. Godkin, and Daniel Coit Gilman.[\[34\]](#)

James' organizational innovations, institutional alliances, and personal relationships with leading Philadelphians established the basis for Wharton's success. Under his friend and successor, Simon Patten, Wharton arguably became along with the University of Chicago, one of the two premier centers of American social science between 1900 and the outbreak of World War I. Continuing James' strong urban emphasis, Patten enlisted Wharton undergraduates and graduate students in Philadelphia's Progressive Movement.[\[35\]](#) As an eminent scholar, he exemplified that being actively engaged in public affairs could contribute to academic success. Within a few years, however, Patten and like-minded colleagues ran afoul of hostile University of Pennsylvania trustees.

In the 1890s, a number of social scientists had faced serious difficulty because of their reform-oriented writings and activism. The trial of Richard Ely by the Wisconsin Board of Regents and the dismissal of Edward Bemis from the University of Chicago are two of the best known cases. Although Wharton's more comprehensive reform approach may have helped shield individual faculty, the school became quite vulnerable as its campaign for reform went further than local elites wished. Indeed, the Penn trustees fired Simon Patten's close friend and junior colleague, Scott Nearing, in 1915; two years later, they refused to extend Patten's tenure beyond the age of retirement, as

was routinely done for distinguished faculty members. By 1917 and America's entry into World War I, most of Wharton's reform faculty had resigned or been dismissed.[\[36\]](#)

World War I closed one chapter and began another in the history of community-urban university relationships. The brutality and horror of that conflict ended the buoyant optimism and faith in human progress and societal improvement that marked the Progressive Era. American academics were not immune to the general disillusion with progress. Indeed, despair led many faculty members to retreat into a narrow scientific approach. Scholarly inquiry directed toward creating a better society was increasingly deemed inappropriate. While faith in the expert and in expert knowledge carried on from the Progressive Era, it separated from its reformist roots.[\[37\]](#)

From the Detached, "Ivory-Towerish," Post-World War I University to the

New American Civic University for the New Century

The four historical studies presented above are not designed to evoke images of a paradise lost. Among other things, except for Seth Low's Columbia, these efforts were neither participatory nor democratic. More centrally, they failed to become the dominant model for the American university. They were, quite simply, far in advance of their time, particularly given America's engagement in what Robert Nisbet has termed a "Seventy-Five Years War."[\[38\]](#) At a recent meeting of the Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development (PHENND), a coalition of 26 Philadelphia-area colleges and universities, Lee Benson, commenting on political philosopher William Sullivan's keynote

address, characterized the orientation of the post-World War I higher educational system as follows:

In the decades after World Wars I and II, American higher eds increasingly competed, ferociously, egocentrically, narcissistically, for institutional prestige and material resources. Almost single-mindedly pursuing their self-centered goals, they increasingly concentrated on essentially scholastic, inside-the-Academy, problems and conflicts rather than on the very hard, very complex problems involved in helping American society realize the democratic promise of American life for all Americans. As a result, they increasingly abandoned the public mission and societal engagement that had powerfully, productively inspired and energized them during their pre-World War I formative period of great intellectual growth and development.

After World Wars I and II, Professor Sullivan observes, despite their remarkable expansion in size, resources, prestige, and influence, American higher eds "lost. . . [their] animating sense of mission. . . [their] sense of purpose. . . ." "Having abandoned their public mission and lost their sense of larger societal purpose, they suffered from and "continue to suffer from a sense of demoralization and decline." In effect, after the First and Second World Wars, American higher eds gained the world and lost their souls.[\[39\]](#)

New conditions, however, now prevail that make it both essential and highly likely that school-community-university partnerships will become the hallmark of the "New American

University in the New Century" (to adapt Ernest Boyer's concept of the New American College).[\[40\]](#) Evidence abounds (including the Joint Forum itself) that points to "higher eds" becoming increasingly engaged with their neighboring schools and communities. What are the new conditions that lead me confidently to predict that current developments are more than a passing trend?

Stated directly, "real-world" developments are "forcing" higher eds, particularly urban higher eds, to become genuinely civic institutions devoted to solving the pressing problems of our society. The democratic promise of the American university sharply, disturbingly contrasts with the reality of American society. In 1992, Representative George E. Brown Jr., then-chairman of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, expressed this view as he spoke to this committee:

From the perspective of policy makers [the perception that the federally-funded research system is under] stress may be manifested by discord between the promised benefits of research and a society beset by a range of seemingly intractable economic, environmental, and social problems.[\[41\]](#)

For urban colleges and universities, needless to say, the reasons for engagement are particularly clear and compelling. The condition of the American city itself is indeed reason enough. No need exists to recite the litany of horrors afflicting our cities and many of its citizens. It is now widely recognized that the problem of the city is the strategic problem of our time. To quote the 1996

proposition of the international organizing committee of the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlement (known as Habitat II): "Sustainable urban development will be the most pressing problem facing humanity in the 21st century" [emphasis added].[\[42\]](#)

The problem of the city has, in my judgment, already become the most pressing problem facing urban colleges and universities. Simply put, higher eds cannot move (as other more mobile institutions have increasingly done) to escape the poverty, crime, and physical deterioration at their gates. The impact of a declining physical environment on a university's ability to recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff is obvious. Perhaps less obvious, but no less important, is the impact of faculty flight to "safer ground" (with better public schools and services) on a university community itself. As Julian H. Levi, executive director of the South East Chicago Commission from 1952 to 1980, noted in 1963:

A university is more than a collection of scholarly commuters. It is, rather, a community of scholars living with one another and with their work. The relationship of student and faculty is disrupted if the community around the university cannot attract and hold faculty members as residents.[\[43\]](#)

Self-interest rooted in the day-to-day impacts of physical location is only part of the explanation for the changing stance of urban higher eds toward their localities. The financial, public relations, and political costs of institutional aloofness are

becoming too steep to bear. It is untenable to be perceived as a distant island of affluence in a rising sea of poverty and despair. It is particularly untenable given the major role universities play in shaping modern society.

In his seminal *Universities and the Future of America* (1990), then-president of Harvard Derek Bok highlighted the growth in importance of universities since World War II. Noting that "all advanced nations depend increasingly on three critical elements: new discoveries, highly trained personnel, and expert knowledge," and that American "universities are primarily responsible for supplying two of these ingredients and are a major source of the third," Bok described "the modern university as the central institution in post industrial society" [emphasis added].[\[44\]](#) As the central institution in modern society, what is the university's responsibility for the condition of society? According to Bok, plenty— particularly given the widely held belief that "higher education in the United States has no peer":

If universities are so important to society and if ours are so superior, one might have thought that America would be flourishing in comparison with other industrialized countries of the world. Yet this is plainly not the case. . . . [The greatest challenge facing industrialized societies is]. . . how to build a society that combines a healthy, growing economy with an adequate measure of security, opportunity, and well-being for all its citizens [emphasis added].[\[45\]](#)

Ernest Boyer's March 1994 article in the Chronicle of Higher Education calling for creating the "New American College" has particular relevance here. Deploring the "crisis in our public schools" and desperate condition of "our cities," Boyer challenged American higher educators to change their priorities radically and act effectively to meet their civic and societal responsibilities: "Do colleges really believe they can ignore social pathologies that surround schools and erode the educational foundations of our nation?" Specifically, Boyer called for creating a "New American College. . . [which takes] special pride in its capacity to connect thought to action, theory to practice. . . .The New American College, as a connected institution, would be committed to improving, in a very intentional way, the human condition." [\[46\]](#)

Leaders of urban universities are acutely aware of the necessity of "taking up" the "Bok-Boyer challenge"— or at least appearing to do so. Universities face public scrutiny as never before. Public funds are more and more tied to direct and relatively short-run societal benefit. Foundations are also interested in seeing how their support of higher education will help improve K-12 schooling, increase civic responsibility, and strengthen community, among other pressing public problems. To put it another way, "altruism pays"— doing good may be the best way for universities to do well. This argument formed the central point of the editorial, "Evolution of Higher Education," in the August 1997 issue of Science.

Universities and colleges in the United States are encountering a turbulent climate. The quality of their future in many ways

depends on how well they respond to evolving realities in the larger world beyond their walls

...[emphasis added].

Public universities have experienced financial problems as many state legislatures lowered their appropriations. Universities in general have increased tuitions faster than inflation. Partly as a result, parents are questioning the quality of the instruction provided. Opinion is widespread that the teaching of undergraduates has a low priority. . . .

If truly learning communities were established, universities would be uniquely valuable. They would be alert custodians of the world's increasing heritage of knowledge. Their graduates would be better equipped for service to society and better motivated to engage in lifelong learning. Universities would merit the increased respect, approval and financial support they so sorely need [emphasis added].[\[47\]](#)

The shifting stance of the American research university is not merely a product of local and societal pressures or of various forms of self-interest. A growing chorus of voices is also expressing concern about the quality of teaching, a loss of university mission and a sense of scholarly community, and, most significantly, the failure of higher education to promote responsible citizenship among its students. In the October 6, 1995 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, Alexander Astin discusses why "student interest and engagement in politics are at an all time low."[\[48\]](#) Astin's explanation places responsibility squarely at the feet of the American university. Despite their

traditionally professed mission to promote good citizenship, universities have devoted few resources to that mission and performed it badly. Why? Astin's answer is simple and direct—higher education has lost its way, focusing on narrow status concerns rather than fundamental purposes:

Why has higher education failed for so long to make good on its professed commitment to promote citizenship? Many institutions are caught up in the "pursuit of excellence," which usually means competing to acquire as many resources as possible and jockeying to build up their reputation so that they move up the pecking order among similar institutions. Those traditional approaches to excellence can lead us to ignore academe's own "citizenship" responsibilities, embodied in our basic purposes of teaching and public service [emphasis added]. It is not that we don't need reputations or resources, but rather that the efforts to achieve them can become ends in themselves, leading us to forget that they ultimately should contribute to improving the education and service they provide.

Just as excessive materialism and narcissism can interfere with the individual's ability to become a good citizen, so can an academic institution's preoccupation with acquisitiveness and self-aggrandizement interfere with its ability to be a good citizen in the community of institutions and in the larger society.

If we want our students to acquire the democratic virtues of honesty, tolerance, empathy, generosity, teamwork, and social responsibility, we have to demonstrate those qualities not only in

our individual professional conduct, but also in our institutional policies and practices [emphasis added].[\[49\]](#)

Astin connects the concern for low student interest and engagement in politics to a pressing external crisis: "Something," he writes, "is terribly wrong with the state of American democracy." As noted, I too believe that the primary reason for the current critique of higher educational institutions is the state of American society itself. There is no need to belabor the increasing failure of urban institutions to assist those in greatest need, the inability of our schooling system to keep up with the economic and social changes of the late twentieth century, and the widening gap between rich and poor. The visibility of these problems and the pressures that universities are experiencing have significantly increased because the cold war ended.

The end of the cold war had a particularly direct impact on university research in science and technology. Vannevar Bush's report, *Science and the Endless Frontier*, shaped American research and development policy at the close of World War II. Issued in July 1945, Bush's report called for significant governmental investment in science and technology to assure America's world leadership, and even survival. Postulating "a perverse law governing research" under which "applied research invariably drives out pure," Bush ideologically helped to enshrine so-called pure research as the sole appropriate focus of university research and government support.[\[50\]](#)

Bush's elitist Platonic dictum was "proven" in the form of bushels upon bushels of federal funding to universities. Given

that funding and the dominant role that science and technology played in the massive expansion that characterized the post-World War II university, it is not surprising that both local issues and pressing practical problems become more and more relegated to a second class, inferior status. Following the launching of Sputnik, and the fears that the Soviet Union might surpass American science, government spending on research and development increased dramatically.[\[51\]](#) In spite of a renewed concern for the city and the poor in the 1960's, real money went for producing guns, not butter. University power and prestige tended to spring from physics, engineering, and scientific medical discoveries which illustrated American superiority over the Soviet system.

In short, the Cold War became the defining issue that led to the development of the vast American university system. Propelled by fear of and competition with the Soviet Union, American politicians, with significant support from the American public, unquestionably accepted requests from the "military-industrial-academic complex" for increased aid and support to higher education.[\[52\]](#)

The collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991 signaled the end of the "Cold War university." As Donald Stokes writes in his brilliant *Pasteur's Quadrant*: "With the cold war winding down, wide portions of the policy community in the United States came to believe that competing in the global economy was the foremost challenge to the country's R & D now that the needs of military security were greatly reduced."[\[53\]](#) More generally, however, the end of the cold war meant that long ignored internal problems could be ignored no longer. Over forty-five years of looking outward had its

terrible costs as unresolved domestic problems developed into unresolved, highly visible crises.^[54] These crises led Bok, Boyer, Astin, as well as other academic leaders, to ask, in effect, this penetrating question: If the American higher educational system is really so great, why does American society have such great and growing problems?

The University as an Essential Partner in Community Building and Education Reform

The growing movement from isolated, insulated ivory towers toward societally-connected, socially-responsible higher eds engaged in school-community-university partnerships is largely a response to the marked disjunction between the promise and power and the actual performance of American higher education, particularly its research universities. The increasing number of universities and colleges actively trying to find ways to collaborate effectively with their neighboring communities is demonstrates that things are changing. The speed and seriousness of that change, in my judgment, is not what it should and could be, nor what it needs to be given the state of our cities and schools. Indeed, the deteriorating conditions of America's urban communities is evidence that more- much, much more- must be done by urban colleges and universities. As of now, proclamations and public relations far outstrip what is really being done and achieved. Nonetheless, noticeable progress has occurred in recent years.

To make further progress, in my judgment, all "higher eds" should rank among their highest priorities (indeed perhaps their highest priority) helping to create the local coalitions needed to

establish, develop, and maintain school-community-university partnerships. Earlier I suggested that universities would be better universities if they learned from their turn of the 20th century predecessors and made the problem of the city their central intellectual and real world problem. To extend that argument further, unless universities learn from their history and go "back to the future," the crisis of our schools and communities will necessarily grow more severe.

Simply put, the need for universities to function as leadership institutions is greater than ever before. The interrelated complexity of today's problems requires a broad, comprehensive view that transcends institutional particularism and avoids, as much as possible, confusing institutional with societal interest. Research universities, in principle, are the only modern institutions both designed to encompass the broad range of human experience and devoted to the use of reason to help deal with the enormous complexity of our society and world. In principle, they also approximate a universal institution- an institution whose mission is the general mission of societal improvement and democratic development, and whose resources, if appropriately organized, can help achieve that mission.

Higher educational institutions, quite simply, have both the interest and ability to make a profound difference. Universities have compelling reasons- including enlightened self-interest- to help to improve America's communities. They are among the only institutions rooted in the American city. They cannot move- the community's fate is their fate. Moreover, working to solve the problems of their university's locality provides students and faculty members with an outstanding opportunity for effective learning, service, and the advancement of knowledge.

Universities also have enormous resources— human, economic, and other kinds— which can be used creatively to overcome economic and community disintegration.

Most centrally, universities significantly shape the American schooling system. That system has become, as Lee Benson and I have written elsewhere, the core subsystem, the strategic subsystem of modern society. By the strategic subsystem, Benson and I mean "the one, which, more than any other, influences the functioning of the societal system as a whole; the subsystem which, on balance, has the greatest 'multiplier' effects, direct and indirect, short and long-term." [\[55\]](#)

Has the American higher educational system contributed to the successful functioning of the American schooling system? To answer that question, we need to first determine how we would measure successful functioning. Do scores on

SAT-9 exams, for example, tell us much about the state of American schooling? If so, how much? Does the widening chasm in the educational achievement of urban, largely minority, primarily African-American and Hispanic youth and their largely white suburban counterparts tell us even more? To answer those very hard questions requires very hard thinking. It also requires us to define the aim(s) of education.

Once again, Dewey's work, with its emphasis on education for democracy, provides a useful place to begin. In a 1997 article on "Democracy and Inquiry," Charles Anderson summarizes Dewey's position as follows:

Dewey thought that democratic citizenship could be understood as the unifying aim of education [emphasis added]. But Dewey thought of democracy as but one manifestation of a power that was vested in and distinctive in humanity. That power was inquiry. . . .

Inquiry, Dewey taught, was the method of democracy. It was also the method of science. And as the century wore on, it in fact became the method of management, of the law, of education itself.

Here then is a theme that can unify education as it unifies the spheres of everyday life [emphasis added]. Citizenship now carries enhanced meaning. It pertains not just to public affairs but to our performance in every realm of life [original emphasis].[\[56\]](#)

Based on the Deweyan criteria of education for democratic citizenship, American universities have had, and continue to have, in my judgment, harmful effects on the American public school system. While proclaiming democratic purposes, American higher education has tended in practice to be aristocratic, elitist, and anti-democratic. Or, to put it another way, Plato (modified by Pareto and his theory of circulating elites) still dominates the American university, ensuring the inability of public schools to perform their roles well, particularly their role of effectively providing democratic education for a democratic society.[\[57\]](#) To "prove" that point would require a much longer paper. Let me merely suggest that we consider the direct and indirect harmful effects resulting from the following two things:

- 1) University pressures to produce high school graduates suitable

for admission to prestigious colleges; and (to quote Harry Judge's 1982 study) 2) The "deliberate choice" of leading Graduate Schools of Education to largely ape more prestigious Schools of Arts and Sciences, thereby, "distancing themselves from both the task of training teachers for elementary and secondary schools and that of addressing the problems and needs of those schools." [\[58\]](#)

My position is simple: No radical reform of American higher education, no successful education reform. The radical reform of higher education, I contend, is most likely to occur in the crucible of significant, serious, sustained, active engagement with public schools and their communities. Splendid abstract, contemplative, inner-ivory tower isolation will neither shed intellectual light nor produce societal fruit.

A "Democratic Devolution Revolution" and University-Assisted Community Schools as Possible Strategies for Getting Us from Here to There

To call for radical reform of higher education through school-community-university partnerships is easy to do. The hard thing is to figure out how to do it. The hardest thing of all, of course, is to actually get it done. Working intensively, systematically, and effectively to "get it done" should be, in my judgment, our post-Joint Forum categorical imperative. To stimulate discussion and debate as to how we might respond to that "categorical imperative," I propose a strategy in which school-community-university partnerships function as the core means to create an effective, compassionate, "democratic devolution revolution." [\[59\]](#)

As is widely recognized, a broad rejection of big, impersonal, distant government has occurred. Simultaneously, strong movements exist within corporations, unions, and schools to shift from big bureaucracy toward flexible, democratic, human-sized structures that foster individual initiative and action. All levels of government, it is also widely recognized, need to shift to small-scale, participatory structures. For government to function as a catalyst that sparks creative initiative throughout society will require new, creative thinking. Both welfare state models and abdication to market forces will hinder, rather than spark, successful innovations.

Two necessarily-linked approaches seem to me to be worth considering. The first involves practicing new forms of interaction among federal, state, and local government, as well as agencies at each level of government. The "vertical and horizontal integration" of government is crucial to solving the complex, interrelated, multifaceted problems of our cities. (The Joint Forum is clearly a step in this direction.) Government integration by itself, however, does not meaningful change make. New forms of interaction among the public, profit, and not-for-profit sectors will also be needed, with government functioning as a collaborating partner, facilitating cooperation among all sectors of society to support and strengthen individuals, families, and communities.

A democratic devolution revolution would involve government serving as a catalyst, providing funds to create stable, ongoing partnerships. Government would, however, be a second tier deliverer of services, with universities, community-based organizations, unions, churches, other voluntary associations,

school children and their parents, and other community members functioning as the core partners. Government would guarantee aid and significantly finance welfare services, but local, personalized, caring delivery of services would occur through the third (private, non-profit, voluntary associations) and the fourth

(personal, i.e., family, kin, neighbors, friends) sectors of society. Or, to state it differently, government would not be primarily responsible for the delivery of services, but it would have macro fiscal responsibilities, including provision of funds.

The strategy suggested above calls for adapting local institutions (universities, hospitals, faith-based organizations, public schools, community centers, civic organizations) to the needs of local communities. Colleges and universities, simultaneously preeminent international, national, and local institutions, are, as I have claimed, potentially particularly powerful partners, "anchors," and catalysts for change and improvement in the quality of life in America's cities and communities.

For colleges and universities to fulfill their potential and really contribute to a democratic devolution revolution means that they have to do things very differently than they do them now. A change in "doing" will require, in the first instance, a recognition by higher eds that, as they now function, they are a major part of the problem, not a significant part of the solution. To become a part of the solution, in turn, will require full-hearted, full-minded devotion to becoming socially responsible, civic universities as well as a strategy for achieving that goal.

A strategy employed by Penn, as well as an increasing number of other higher eds, focuses on developing university-assisted community schools designed to educate, engage, activate, and serve all members of a community. This strategy assumes that a school can be the focal point for creating healthy urban environments. Schools, in this approach, can function as environment-changing institutions if they become centers of broad-based partnerships involving a variety of community organizations and institutions. Because they belong to all members of the community, public schools are particularly suited to be hubs around which local partnerships are generated and formed. In this partnership role, schools are community institutions *par excellence*, providing a decentralized, democratic, community-based response to significant community problems.

The university-assisted community school reinvents and updates an old notion that the neighborhood school can effectively serve as the core neighborhood institution, an institution that both provides comprehensive services and galvanizes other community institutions and groups. The idea motivated the early settlement workers, who recognized the centrality of the neighborhood school in community life and its potential as a catalytic site for community stabilization and improvement. At the turn of the 20th century, settlement pioneers mediated the transfer of social, health, and recreational services to the public schools of major American cities. In effect, settlement leaders recognized that though there were few settlement houses, there were very many public schools. [\[60\]](#) Dewey's ideas about "the school as social Centre" had been, in fact, directly shaped by his work with Jane Addams (and others) at Hull House:

I suppose, whenever we are framing our ideals of the school as a social Centre, what we think of is particularly the better class of social settlement. What we want is to see the school, every public school, doing something of the same sort of work that is now done by a settlement or two scattered at wide distances through the city.[\[61\]](#)

Dewey did not emphasize, however, two critically important functions that the community school might perform: 1) the school as a community institution actively engaged in the solution of community problems; and 2) the school as a community institution which educated young children, both intellectually and morally, by engaging them in real-world community problem solving. He did recognize that for the neighborhood school to function as a genuine community center, it needed additional human resources and support. Although a University of Chicago faculty member engaged with other colleagues in work with his Laboratory School, Dewey never identified, to my knowledge, universities as the (or even a) key source of broadly based, sustained, comprehensive support.

To suggest the potential of a university-assisted community school for advancing an effective, compassionate, democratic devolution revolution as well as for achieving Dewey's goal of cosmopolitan, communal community, I briefly summarize some results from "community school-creating" efforts in progress across the country: Undergraduates as well as dental, medical, social work, education, and nursing students are learning as they serve; public school students similarly are connecting their

education to real-world problem solving, providing service to other students and community members; adults are participating in locally-based job training, skills enhancement, and ongoing education; and increasing integration (as distinct from co-location) of services for school children and their families is occurring.

University-assisted community schools, whether they involve Penn, University of Alabama-Birmingham, University of Kentucky, Virginia Commonwealth University, or University of Michigan-Flint, all have a great deal more to do to successfully tap the enormous untapped resources of the community, enabling individuals and families to be both recipients and local deliverers of service in caring, compassionate, hardworking communities. My support of a democratic devolution revolution through a university-assisted community school approach, does not, of course, remotely imply support for the federal government to abdicate its Constitutional responsibility to "promote the general Welfare." To the contrary. My goal is to have the federal government promote the general welfare far more responsibly, democratically, and effectively than it has to date.

Conclusion: Toward Implementing "The Noah Principle"

At a two-day education summit convened by Fortune magazine in 1988, Lewis V. Gerstner, Jr. (then President of American Express, now chairman and chief executive of IBM) called for the adoption of "that famous Noah Principle": "No more prizes for predicting rain. Prizes only for building the arks" (emphasis added).^[62] The severe and worsening conditions in America's urban schools and communities, I contend, require that government, foundations, and universities immediately,

specifically, systematically, and collaboratively implement the Noah Principle.

We all know the problems, we can describe them, discuss them, predict their troubling course, and propose what should and must be done to make things better in the future. But "shoulds" and "musts" are very rarely implemented (or implementable); and conditions continue to deteriorate at an accelerating rate for the populations most in need of effective assistance. Although this state of affairs is morally and societally untenable, it will not change unless doing the right thing (which includes functioning democratically) replaces description of what is wrong and saying the right thing as the standard of excellence and the basis for approbation and support.

Am I engaging in wishful thinking to assume that government and foundations might practice the Noah Principle in their work with institutions of higher education? Perhaps. But conditions do seem to be ripe for a change in evaluating and rewarding America's colleges and universities. In previous sections of this paper, I identified some of these conditions. Most central among them is the gap (the chasm) between the American university's enormous promise, prestige, power and its actual performance in producing the knowledge, personnel, and democratic practice required to solve the problems confronting American society. I also previously mentioned that positive change is increasingly visible in the attitudes and actions of government and foundations. To illustrate my point that the time is ripe for widespread adoption of the Noah Principle, I cite a particularly hopeful and significant recent example of the principle being put into practice.

In 1994, a committee met in Washington to "help plan a major conference [held in April 1995] on the role of colleges and universities in improving the health of America's young people." In his letter of invitation to the planning meeting, Harvey V. Fineberg, then-Dean of the Harvard School of Public Health (now Harvard's Provost), described the 1995 "Harvard Conference on the Roles and Responsibilities of Higher Education in Improving the Health of Americans" as a practical application of Ernest Boyer's inspiring vision of the New American College.[\[63\]](#)

The Harvard Conference, which was supported by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), did advance Boyer's vision in practice. In other words, the conference had "legs," resulting in the formation of a new entity, the National Committee on Partnerships for Children's Health (PCH). Organized at Harvard with CDC support, the distinguished National Committee (co-chaired by Johnetta Cole and Julius Richmond) defined its primary goal as follows:

. . .to support a national network of post-secondary institutions (PSIs) committed to partnerships that integrate interdisciplinary research and teaching with community practice and policymaking in order to bring about a measurable improvement in the health of children and youth. Relatively few PSIs as yet make community health improvement a priority in their work [emphasis added].[\[64\]](#)

To reach its goal, PCH is exploring the very hard questions of what it would take for partnerships to really benefit children and

youth and how to evaluate whether those benefits have really been achieved. Building on that work, it hopes "to establish sustainable mechanisms to recognize and reward those PSIs that are institutionally committed to improvement in specific community health, education, and social priorities for children and youth" [emphasis added].[\[65\]](#)

The focus on real-world results as well as on rewarding institutions, as distinct from individuals, are in themselves extraordinarily important. Even more significant is PCH's explicit aim to alter the traditional, intellectually and societally dysfunctional (my terms) prestige hierarchy that largely defines, limits, and hinders (also my terms) the American higher educational system. Developing the yardstick of "social excellence," PCH will seek "to ensure that institutions that most benefit the communities' children are as admired as are the traditional academic and athletic powerhouses."[\[66\]](#) Or, as the project director Charles Deutsch wrote in *World Health*, the magazine of the World Health Organization:

Eventually there will be a new way to measure a good university: not by the number of articles and books its faculty publish for other scholars, but by the improvements in community life that result from applying what we know to what we do.[\[67\]](#)

In an attempt to contribute to getting us to that eventuality as soon as possible, I conclude with a few suggestions as to how we might begin to employ the Noah Principle:

1. The federal government should take a series of steps to reward higher eds for the contributions they actually make to improving schools and communities. Among these steps should be creating a prestigious (to coin a phrase) "Triangle Award" given to outstanding school-community-university partnerships. More generally, hard thought should be given to ways to encourage universities to engage in "programmatic practical research" designed to solve America's most pressing problems, particularly the problem of the city.
2. Foundations should similarly reward higher eds for performance with and not promises to schools and communities. A foundation or a group of foundations could convene a national panel to recommend both short and long term strategies for effectively evaluating the performance of colleges and universities, including their contributions to citizenship and democracy.
3. National educational organizations, especially those focusing on higher education (e.g., Campus Compact, American Association for Higher Education, Association of American Colleges and Universities, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, American Council on Education) should focus their national meetings, workshops, and publications on developing strategies to increase higher educations' contribution to schools, communities, and democracy.

Given my strong criticism of academics who end their work with a whimper by proposing "shouldisms," it is appropriate to

note that I am obviously guilty of that "academic sin." My excuse is that I really do not know what specifically should be done by whom to establish and advance mutually-beneficial, respectful school- community-university partnerships. My hope is that over the next two days of discussion we will develop concrete plans for creating significant, substantial, sustainable, and serious partnerships that powerfully contribute to a more just, decent, and democratic America. Needless to say, there is much for us to learn and do during this joint forum for us to get from here (the conclusion of this paper) to there (concrete plans of action by Friday afternoon).

I look forward to learning from and with you as we work hard to build the arks.

Endnotes:

1. Philadelphia Inquirer 20 October 1997, p. A14.
2. Jonathan Kozol, *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1991).
3. New York Times 19 May 1994, p. D23.
4. Philadelphia Inquirer 20 October 1997.

5. The Campaign for African-American Achievement is described in William Raspberry, *Philadelphia Inquirer* 6 December 1997, p. A20 and Bob Herbert, *New York Times* 14 December 1997, section 4, p. 13.

6. "The School as Social Centre" can be found in *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1902-1903*, vol. 2, ed. Joann Boydston (Carbondale: Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1976), pp. 80-93. For a discussion of Dewey's essay, see Lee Benson and Ira Harkavy, "School and Community in the Global Society," *Universities and Community Schools* 5, no. 1-2 (1997): 16-71.

7. John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (1927; Denver, Co.: Allen Swallow, 1954), p. 213.

8. Robert Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991). Also see Benson and Harkavy, "School and Community," pp. 18-32.

9. Charles W. Anderson, *Prescribing the Life of the Mind* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993), pp. 7-8.

10. As quoted in Edward LeRoy Long Jr., *Higher Education as a Moral Enterprise* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1992), p. 184.

11. As quoted in Lawrence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago; University of Chicago Press, 1965; First Phoenix Edition, 1970), p. 119.

12. For a discussion of the concept of "captains of erudition," see Steven J. Diner, *A City and its Universities: Public Policy on Chicago, 1892 -1919* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

13. The phrase from Bacon is from *Novum Organum*, quoted in Lee Benson, *Toward the Scientific Study of History* (Philadelphia: J.B.

Lippincott Company, 1972), p.xi. Much of the discussion on Hopkins, Columbia, the University of Chicago and the University of Pennsylvania first appeared in Ira Harkavy, "Back to the Future: From Service Learning to Strategic Academically Based Community Service," *Metropolitan Universities* 7 no. 1 (1996): 57-70.

14. The above discussion of Johns Hopkins is based on Jessica Eifenbein, "To 'Fit Them For Their Fight with the World': The Baltimore YMCA and the Making of a Modern City, 1852-1932." (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Delaware, 1996). The quoted phrases are from *Christian Advocate*, New York April 1889; and Letter from John Glenn to D.C. Gilman, 13 July 1888, Gilman Papers, MS 1 Ferdinand Hamburger, Jr. Archives, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.

15. For a discussion of the Progressive Era as a golden age of university-community relationships, see Sheldon Hackney, "The University and Its Community: Past and Present," *Annals of the American Academy* 488 (1986): 135-147. Quoted phrase can be found in Barry D. Karl, Charles E. Meriam and the Study of Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974): p. 31.

16. Hackney, "The University and Its Community," p. 145.

17. For an excellent discussion of Seth Low's Columbia, see Thomas Bender, *The New York Intellect: A History of Intellectual Life in New York City, from 1750 to the Beginnings of Our Time* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1987) pp. 279-284; the quotations can be found on pages 282 and 283. Also see Ira Harkavy and Lee Benson, "De-Platonizing and Democratizing Education as the Bases of Service Learning," in *Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*, eds. Robert A. Rhoads, and Jeffrey P.F. Howard (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1998), pp. 11-20.

18. Low as quoted in Gerald Kurland, *Seth Low: The Reformer in an Urban and Industrial Age* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971), p. 53.
19. Kurland, *Seth Low*, p. 55.
20. Bender, *New York Intellectual*, p. 282.
21. Edward Cary, "Seth Low: A Character Sketch," *Review of Reviews* 16 (1897): 40.
22. Cary, "Seth Low," pp. 40-41.
23. Bender, *New York Intellectual*, p. 284.
24. Kurland, "Seth Low," pp. 60-61.
25. Ira Harkavy and John L. Puckett, "Lessons from Hull House for the Contemporary Urban University," *Social Service Review* 68, no. 3 (1994): 299-321. The quotation is from Jane Addams, *The Second Twenty Years at Hull House: September 1909 to September 1929, with a Record of a Growing World Consciousness*, p. 405, cited in Lela B. Costin, *Two Sisters for Social Justice: A Biography of Grace and Edith Abbott* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983), p. 45.
26. *Residents of Hull House, Hull House Maps and Papers* (Boston: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1895; reprint, New York: Arno, 1970), p. viii.
27. *Residents of Hull House, Hull House Maps and Papers*, p. 41.
28. As quoted in Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Reform* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 33. Also see Diner, *A City and Its Universities*, p. 50.
29. Mary Jo Degan, *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1908* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1988), pp. 5, 24.

30. Darnell Rucker, *The Chicago Pragmatists* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), pp. 3-4.
31. Edward Shils, "The University. the City and the World: Chicago and the University of Chicago," in *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*, ed. Thomas Bender (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 210-230, esp. pp. 220-221.
32. Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 9.
33. Steven A. Sass, *The Pragmatic Imagination: A History of the Wharton School, 1881-1981* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982) pp. 55-89; R.A. Swanson, "Edmund James, 1855-1935: A Conservative Progressive in American Higher Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966); and Ira Harkavy and John L. Puckett, "The Role of Mediating Structures in University and Community Revitalization: The University of Pennsylvania and West Philadelphia as a Case Study," *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 25, No. 1 (1991): 10-23.
34. Sass, *The Pragmatic Imagination*, pp. 75-78.
35. Hackney, "The University and Its Community," p. 138.
36. Sass, *The Pragmatic Imagination*, pp. 125-126; and Rexford G. Tugwell, *To the Lesser Heights of Morningside: A Memoir* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), pp. 3-70.
37. Sheldon Hackney, "The University and Its Community," p. 138; Dorothy Ross, "American Social Science and the Idea of Progress," in *The Authority of Experts*, ed. Thomas L. Haskell (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), pp. 165-166; Martin Bulmer and Joan Bulmer, "Philanthropy and Social Science in the 1920s: Beardsley Ruml

and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 1922-29," *Minerva*, 19 (1981): 370.

38. Robert Nisbet, *The Present Age: Progress and Anarchy in Modern America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), pp. xi, 1-39.

39. Lee Benson "Comments on William Sullivan's Keynote Address," Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development (PHENND) Conference, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, 23 October 1997, p 2.

40. Ernest L. Boyer, "Creating the New American College," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 March 1994, p. A48.

41. Report of the Task Force on the Health of Research, chairman's report to the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 102 Cong. 2 sess., quoted in Donald E. Stokes, *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute, 1997), p. 92.

42. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Habitat II Clearinghouse Web Server," URL <http://www.huduser.org/habitat.html>. The exact quotation can be found at URL <gopher://huduser.org/73/00/habitat/about/habbro.txt>.

43. Julian H. Levi, "Ground Space for the University," in *The University, the City, and Urban Renewal: Report of a Regional Conference*, ed. Charles E. Dobbins (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1964), p. 11.

44. Derek C. Bok, *Universities and the Future of America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 3.

45. Bok, "Universities and the Future of America," p. 4.

46. Boyer "New American College," p. A48.
47. Philip H. Abelson, "Evolution of Higher Education," *Science* 277 (8 August 1997): 747.
48. Alexander W. Astin, "The Cause of Citizenship," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 6 October 1995, p. B1.
49. Astin, "The Cause of Citizenship," p. B2. For a more detailed discussion of these themes, see Astin, "Liberal Education and Democracy: The Case of Pragmatism," in *Education and Democracy: Re-imaginig Liberal Learning in America*, ed. Robert Orrill (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1997), pp. 207-223.
50. As quoted in Stokes, *Pasteur's Quadrant*, p.9.
51. Stokes, *Pasteur's Quadrant*, pp. 1-2, 45-57, 90-92.
52. The quoted phrase is taken from a speech by Senator J. William Fulbright printed in the *Congressional Record*, 13 December 1967. For a discussion of the "military-industrial-academic complex" during the Cold War, see Stuart W. Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).
53. Stokes, *Pasteur's Quadrant*, p. 94.
54. A discussion of the impact of the Cold War on the American research university can be found in Benson and Harkavy, "School and Community in the Global Society," pp. 68-70.
55. Benson and Harkavy, "School and Community in the Global Society," pp. 31, 49-50.

56. Charles Anderson, "Democracy and Inquiry," *The Good Society* 7, no. 2 (1997):16.

57. For an excellent discussion of Pareto's work, see Raymond Aron, *Main Currents in Sociological Thought, Vol. II* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1970) pp. 119-217.

58. Benson and Harkavy, "School and Community in the Global Society," pp.36-44; and Harry Judge, *American Graduate Schools of Education: A View from Abroad* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1992). The quoted phrase can be found on page 6.

59. A discussion of the concept of a democratic devolution revolution can be found in my testimony before the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Banking and Financial Service of the House of Representatives, 105 Cong. 1 sess. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997). For an extended discussion of the need to "progress beyond the Welfare State," see Lee Benson and Ira Harkavy, "Progressing Beyond the Welfare State," *Universities and Community Schools* 2, no. 1-2 (1991): 2-28.

60. Benson and Harkavy, *School and Community in The Global Society*," pp. 28-32.

61. Dewey, "The School as Social Centre," p. 90-91.

62. *Fortune*, 7 November 1988, p. 42.

63. Harvey V. Fineberg, "Letter of Invitation," 26 May 1994.

64. Charles Deutsch, "Mutual Benefit, Mutual Request," *World Health*, 50th year, no. 3. (1997):14.

65. National Committee on Partnerships for Children's Health, "Plan for Spring 1998 State and Regional Conferences."

66. National Committee on Partnerships for Children's Health, "Connecting Colleges, Children and Communities."

67. Deutsch, "Mutual Benefit, Mutual Respect, p. 15.