There seems to be renewed interest in having universities and other higher education institutions engage with their communities at the local, national, and international levels. But what is community engagement? Even if this interest is genuine and widespread, there are many different concepts of community service, outreach, and engagement. The wide range of activity encompassed by community engagement suggests that a precise definition of the “community mission” is difficult and organizing and coordinating such activities is a complex task. This edited volume includes 18 chapters that explore conceptual understandings of community engagement and higher education reforms and initiatives intended to foster it. Contributors provide empirical research findings, including several case study examples that respond to the following higher education community engagement issues: What is “the community” and what does it need and expect from higher education institutions? Is community engagement a mission of all types of higher education institutions or should it be the mission of specific institutions such as regional or metropolitan universities, technical universities, community colleges, or indigenous institutions while other institutions such as major research universities should concentrate on national and global research agendas and on educating internationally-competent researchers and professionals? How can a university be global and at the same time locally relevant? Is it, or should it be, left to the institutions to determine the scope and mode of their community engagement, or is a state mandate preferable and feasible? If community engagement or “community service” are mandatory, what are the consequences of not complying with the mandate? How effective are policy mandates and university engagement for regional and local economic development? What are the principal features and relationships of regionally-engaged universities? Is community engagement to be left to faculty members and students who are particularly socially engaged and locally embedded or is it, or should it be, made mandatory for both faculty and students? How can community engagement be (better) integrated with the (other) two traditional missions of the university—research and teaching?
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NOTE

1. From 1928-1995, CBS Broadcasting, Inc. was formally known as Columbia Broadcasting System.
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*PSCIE* is sponsored by the University of Pittsburgh Institute for International Studies in Education (IISE), which manages the review of submissions and provides editorial assistance in manuscript preparation. Selected University of Pittsburgh doctoral students have the unique opportunity to gain editing and publishing experience working or interning at IISE as a member of our editorial team.

The series is supported by a strong network of international scholars and development professionals who serve on the International Advisory Board and participate in the selection and review process for manuscript development. Working with our International Advisory Board, periodic calls will be issued for contributions to this series from among the most influential associations and organizations in international studies in education, including the Comparative and International Education Society, World Council of Comparative Education Societies, and UNESCO.

In future volumes in the *PSCIE* series, we encourage the generation of exceptional CIDE scholarship from researchers, policy makers, and practitioners from around the world. We hope this volume will encourage prospective authors and editors to submit manuscript proposals to the *PSCIE* series about their current research and project interests.
In this chapter we examine several community engagement strategies with higher education institutions (HEIs) worldwide. We begin by defining community engagement in higher education. Next, we look at several different levels of community engagement in higher education, recognizing it occurs at many levels, including international, regional, national, provincial/state, and local.

We define community engagement in higher education to be sustainable networks, partnerships, communication media, and activities between HEIs and communities at local, national, regional, and international levels. Engagement activities between communities and higher education may be formal or informal. Example engagement initiatives include establishing relationships; collaboration initiatives; business ventures; co-sponsored meetings, conferences, sports events, research projects; and a thousand other activities. Vast online repositories through university libraries and other digital media provide a unique ability for HEIs to share information with communities in ways that were unimaginable prior to the 1990s. There is an inevitable and symbiotic relationship that exists between communities and HEIs. Communities help provide human resources that are necessary for higher education systems to foster and carry out their purposes. HEIs in turn train students who eventually fill job vacancies and establish businesses of their own in society.

While core higher education functions have traditionally centered on (1) research and innovation, and (2) teaching and training, a third area of essential note is the role HEIs play in community development (Goddard 2007; Duke 2008). It is now commonplace for annual evaluations of faculty members to include a review of scholarship contributions, teaching performance, and community service. Research 1 universities may place a greater emphasis on research activity than what is expected of faculty members at vocational or community colleges, which tend to have greater emphasis on teaching.

Students also engage in regular community service activities. Current and former students are the lifeline between communities at all levels (e.g., global, national, and local levels) and HEIs. Current students establish research projects,
business ventures, and student clubs/associations that often rely or revolve around community engagement initiatives. Former students often contribute with substantial donations, endowments, and marketing outreach efforts (through word of mouth and life-long allegiances to sports teams, schools, and programs). The engagement realm is reciprocal and dynamic. Many community members actively pursue partnerships and linkages with HEIs.

In Figure 1.1 we highlight the five levels of community engagement discussed in this chapter and much of the rest of the book. You will note that each of the levels are designated by a line circling a HEI. Each HEI is in essence part of these five community engagement levels. The figure also depicts a dotted line for the local community in order to highlight the importance of the reciprocal relationship between HEIs and the local communities in which they reside.

*Figure 1.1 Pittsburg Model of Community Engagement in Higher Education*

*Source: By the authors.*
We suggest that HEIs should be intimately established within their local communities in order to have a sustainable impact on society; likewise local communities should have a seamless network with HEIs in order to maintain an equal and positive partnership. This porous border is symbolized by the dotted line rather than a solid line that too often resembles walls between local communities and HEIs. There needs to be constant efforts from both those within HEIs and local communities to maintain this important foundational community relationship. All other community engagement-level relationships, for good or for bad, build upon the nature of the local level foundation.

Bridges are depicted in Figure 1.1 as necessary in order for HEIs to establish lasting outreach programs, networks, and important community relationships at the four outer levels. We title Figure 1.1 the Pittsburgh Model of Community Engagement in Higher Education for a reason. Historically positioned as the center of industrial United States in the latter part of the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth century, Pittsburgh was often referred to as the “buckle” of the Rust Belt (steel center). One of the city’s common nicknames is the City of Bridges, and this is fitting because of the many steel bridges that crisscross the Three Rivers Region of the city. Pittsburgh is also home to the foundational resources needed to produce steel for bridge building—coal, iron ore, and steel scrap. The three colors of the bridges in Figure 1.1 resemble these three materials. We wanted to emphasize the need HEIs and communities have in establishing sustainable bridges between each other, thus steel bridges are emphasized. Any HEI can sign a paper that indicates it has established a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with another university, business, or community. But in reality, this MOU is nothing more than a piece of paper. What is needed is the establishment of a sustainable partnership between HEIs and communities regardless of the level. There needs to be partnerships forged based on strategy, a shared vision, and equality. Sustainable partnerships are those that are comparable to the many formidable steel bridges that grace the rivers surrounding the Pittsburgh peninsula. Community engagement in higher education is about bridge building. Thus, the Pittsburgh Model is fitting if the goal is to forge lasting relationships with communities.

The depth of community engagement differs substantially between HEIs. Some have stronger community relationships than others. In some instances, HEIs have very little influence outside of their local communities. Other prominent universities have long-established reputations and networks that connect them with national, regional, and international communities. These elite universities are often viewed by most as atop the pantheon of HEIs worldwide. Sometimes HEIs must partner with other HEIs to obtain networks and influence beyond their own potential outreach. In these cases, they forge strategic alliances, partnerships, and consortia.

We recognize that not all engagements between higher education and communities are positive. Sometimes the relationship between HEIs and the communities in which they reside is unbalanced or one-sided. Some higher education traditions (e.g., the tenure system), tuition fees, and government support initiatives (e.g., where national and state/provincial governments guarantee annual...
funding to HEIs) are viewed by many in the general public as increasingly negative. We also note that some HEIs may take advantage of students and the communities in which they live by charging exorbitant tuition rates that may not be equitable with national policies and needs. Some scholars note how some for-profit HEIs pursue the commodification of higher education, where they can be “guilty of commodifying, trivialising knowledge, and of pedalling credentials of dubious worth, all at partial public expense” (Geiger and Heller 2011, p. 14).

Despite these shortcomings, we argue that communities and HEIs should actively seek ways in which to strengthen their relationship and partnership opportunities. There are almost endless possibilities for positive engagement between higher education and communities. We hope that stakeholders from both sides will do everything they can in seeking mutual opportunities and benefits (in a synergistic or win-win fashion), and in advocating for equitable and sustainable partnerships in all of their collective endeavors.

**International Community Engagement**

Philip G. Altbach (2013a) argues how times have changed to where global engagement in higher education stands as one of the preeminent strategic foci of most higher education administrators in the twenty-first century. “[A]t the core of global engagement,” he adds, is the need to provide “a positive overseas experience for undergraduates, encourage[e] international faculty research, and ensur[e] that foreign students, postdocs, and visiting scholars have a positive experience and contribute to campus life” (p. 12). Examples of international higher education community engagement agencies include the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC), International Association of Universities (IAU), World Federation of Colleges and Polytechnics (WFCP), and the United Nations University (UNU).

OECD is an NGO based in Paris, France that commissions research studies to inform its member governments in an effort to help them “foster prosperity and fight poverty through economic growth and financial stability” (OECD 2013). OECD works with member governments, ministries of education, HEIs, and societies on multiple areas, including higher education. Established in 1960, OECD now consists of 34 member countries. In a publication titled *Higher Education and Regions: Globally Competitive, Locally Engaged*, OECD (2007, p. 20) notes that

Higher education makes considerable direct economic contribution to the local and regional economy. Higher education institutions are employers and customers as well as suppliers of goods and services. Their staff and student expenditure have a direct effect on income and employment in the cities and regions.

WINHEC was organized in 2002 and provides an “international forum and support for Indigenous Peoples to pursue common goals through higher education” (WINHEC 2005). The Consortium exists to help preserve indigenous languages,
cultures, and homelands by building sustainable networks between HEIs and communities around the world (Jacob et al. 2013). WINHEC also serves as the world’s leader in accrediting HEIs worldwide from an indigenous lens, with a goal to recognize through the accreditation process “indigenous education initiatives and systems that identify common criteria, practices and principles by which Indigenous Peoples live” (WINHEC 2005).

IAU was founded in 1950 and is based at UNESCO in Paris, France. Members include HEIs and other higher education-oriented organizations from approximately 120 countries. IAU (2013) “collaborates with various international, regional and national bodies active in higher education” and its various services are offered to members and “organisations, institutions and authorities concerned with higher education, as well as to individual policy and decision-makers, specialists, administrators, teachers, researchers and students.” IAU’s mission is “based on the fundamental principles for which every university should stand: The right to pursue knowledge for its own sake and to follow wherever the search for truth may lead; [and] The tolerance of divergent opinion and freedom from political interference.” In accordance with the Association’s mission, IAU highlights the need to advocate on behalf of HEIs worldwide to the public and to non-partner organizations.

The World Federation of Colleges and Polytechnics (WFCP) is a network of national and international higher education associations that focuses on strategic planning and best practice initiatives “to increase workforce employability in countries around the world” (WFCP 2014). With 44 member organizations, the Federation holds world congresses every two years and offers an online forum through its website that enables member institutions and associations (and potential member organizations) to learn about and collaborate with each other.

The United Nations University (UNU) was established in 1973 and now includes branch campuses in 13 countries. The overarching goal of UNU (2013) is to “contribute to global sustainable development that will enable present generations to live a decent life in peace, in freedom, in safety, and in good health without compromising the ability of future generations to do the same.” Many of the thematic initiatives UNU sponsors are cross-cutting and encourage sustainable research linked to societies and communities across the earth. For instance, the Science and Technology for Sustainable Societies initiative—based at the UNU Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS) in Yokohama, Japan—examines issues of poverty, inequality, and global warming. Undertaking actions “to overcome these challenges and foster equitable and sustainable societies is an urgent imperative.” Drawing from the linkages to communities worldwide, the UNU strives to learn from traditional knowledge and best practices to build “more equitable and sustainable societies” (UNU-IAS 2013).

Regional Level Community Engagement

Higher education involvement in regional economies can amount to between 1 and 4 percent of the total GDP. This is especially recognizable in regional areas where
higher education systems are well developed (OECD 2007, p. 20). Of the top 100 universities, the vast majority are located within certain regions of the earth (see Table 1.1).

Table 1.1 Regional Distribution of Top-Ranked Universities, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Africa THE</th>
<th>Asia THE</th>
<th>Europe THE</th>
<th>Latin Amer. &amp; Caribbean THE</th>
<th>Oceania THE</th>
<th>USA &amp; Canada THE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 500*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Times Higher Education (2014) only ranks the world’s top 400 universities.

Sources: Times Higher Education (2014) and Shanghai Jiao Tong University (2014).

The Times Higher Education (THE) and Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU) rankings indicate that the 10 top universities in the world are either in the United States or the United Kingdom. Of the top 100 universities worldwide, roughly half are located in the USA and Canada and over 30 within Europe. No more than 10 universities make the top 400 global ranking list from within the Africa and Latin American and Caribbean regions.

At the regional level, community engagement programs may span multiple countries within a geographic region of the earth. Regional community examples include the European Union, East African Community (EAC), Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL), and the regional accreditation agencies in the United States.

The European Union (EU) has had tremendous influence on shaping the face of higher education, especially in terms of how HEIs engage with local, national, and regional communities within Europe and beyond. Higher education cross-border programming, networking, and resource sharing is a hallmark of the EU since its inception in post-World War II Europe. Everything from the standards setting Bologna Process and the more recent Lisbon Strategy that outlines a vision to help the EU become the leading knowledge-based economy among all global regions, the EU has played an important role in fostering a regional focus to leverage the entire higher education subsector. The EU’s potential regional influence doesn’t stop within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), as non-European governments and individual HEIs often strategically partner with EU countries and HEIs when it comes to international higher education linkages, exchanges, research collaborations, and institutional investments.

The EAC is comprised of member nations from Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda. In 1980, EAC established an Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA) to help collaborative partnerships between regional HEIs. The following objectives provide an overview of the current engagement areas of this regional Council:
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Facilitate networking among universities in East Africa, and with universities outside the region;
2. Provide a forum for discussion on a wide range of academic and other matters relating to higher education in East Africa; and
3. Facilitate maintenance of internationally comparable education standards in East Africa so as to promote the region’s competitiveness in higher education. (IUCEA 2013)

In the EAC, for instance, it is difficult for a single HEI to retain highly-skilled and well-known faculty members. This is especially true where annual salaries are at best meager in comparison with the pay of faculty members from other regions of the earth. With over 200 HEIs within the EAC, it is common for renowned professors and lecturers to hold positions at more than one HEI (“Encourage Universities to Share Lecturers” 2013).

Founded in 1956, the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL) is a nongovernmental organization (NGO) comprised of 182 HEIs from 20 countries. ASAIHL’s (2013) purpose is to “assist member institutions to strengthen themselves through mutual self-help and to achieve international distinction in teaching, research and public service. In so doing, the institutions contribute strength to their respective nations and to the entire region.”

Six regional accrediting agencies exist in the United States, and each is responsible for accrediting the majority of all HEIs in their respective regions. Regional accrediting agencies are part of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), which is comprised of more than 3,000 HEIs primarily in the United States but also including several HEIs from other countries. CHEA works with 60 accrediting organizations that in turn provide specialized accrediting oversight to various institutional and programmatic needs for its constituent member institutions in each region (CHEA 2012).

National Community Engagement

The global trend toward mass higher education is providing many individuals with the opportunity to attend higher education if they desire to. Still, there remains significant disparity within countries in terms of access and equity opportunities in higher education (Holsinger and Jacob 2008). Countries with national strategic frameworks that include favorable government policies for higher education community engagement are generally the most successful in their ability to provide a national enabling environment for sustainable linkages to occur between HEIs and communities (Cross and Pickering 2008; Goddard and Puukka 2008; Vietnam Ministry of Education and Training 2008; China Ministry of Education 2010). Simon Marginson and Mark Considine (2000) consider all Australian universities as “enterprise universities.” This is a significant shift away from the purely academic focus they once had to a predominantly market-driven focus that is closely linked to national and international business community needs, demands, and trends.
Several associations and organizations that help coordinate linkages between HEIs and the national community include the American Association of Community Colleges (USA), Association of Indian Universities, Association for the Study of Higher Education (USA), Canadian Association for University Continuing Education, Colleges and Institutes of Canada, Community-Based Research Canada, Global Alliance on Community-Based Research (Canada and India), Higher Education Research Network (Zambia), National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (UK), Participatory Research Initiative in Asia (India), and the Consortium of Indonesian Universities–Pittsburgh.

Founded in 1920, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) has codified many of the ongoing workforce development collaborations on its website. Its section on Industry Partnerships elaborates upon workforce training offered by community colleges in the United States to meet needs as diverse as aerospace, agriculture, automotive, biotechnology, chemical, energy, healthcare, information technology, logistics, manufacturing, and social media. So well understood is the socioeconomic role of community colleges that its mission is one of the few areas that inspires bipartisan support from both leading political parties.

The Association of Indian Universities is a hub of higher education activity in India that facilitates research and scholarship opportunities through workshops, seminars, meetings, publications, and through its website. The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) was established in 1976 and remains an active center for higher education networking among scholars, students, and professionals. It is home to the *Review of Higher Education*, one of the leading scholarly journals in higher education.

Established in 1954, the Canadian Association for University Continuing Education (CAUCE) “remains the most robust of the three elements that form the dynamic triangle of community engagement” in Canadian higher education (Hall 2009). CAUCE (2015) specializes in promoting “activities aimed at fostering a greater role for universities in responding to Canada’s needs for training and retraining.” CAUCE has played a major role in helping to make community engagement become and remain a major focus of continuing education efforts in Canada. Other efforts that CAUCE engages in include higher education community-based research and community service learning.

Based in Ottawa, Canada, Colleges and Institutes Canada (CIC) serves as the national organization that represents Canada’s public post-secondary colleges, institutes of technology, polytechnics, cégeps, and university colleges. CIC engages over 3,000 communities in Canada and also leverages individual and national outreach efforts with higher education partners in more than 100 international locations.

With a mission to champion and facilitate community-based research and campus-community engagement, Community-Based Research Canada (CBRC 2015) focuses on strengthening the nation’s social, economic, and environmental priorities. CBRC evolved from the Pan-Canadian Coalition on Community Based Research and was founded in 2008. CBRC hosts an annual conference that brings together higher education researchers with leaders of government, industry, and
indigenous peoples of Canada. It serves as the hub for other community-based research networks in Canada and abroad, including the Arctic Institute of Community-Based Research, Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning, Research Impact and Community Campus Partnerships for Health, Living Knowledge Network in Europe, the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement in the United Kingdom, and the Global University Network for Innovation.

The Global Alliance on Community-Engaged Research (GACER) was established in 2008 as a network that strives to “facilitate the sharing of knowledge and information across continents and countries to enable interaction and collaboration to further the application and impact of community-based research for a sustainable just future for the people of the world” (GACER 2015a). The Global Alliance currently has three initiatives: (1) UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education Policy Brief and Research Initiative; (2) Global Dialogue on Enhanced Community University North-South Collaboration in Community University Engagement; and (3) Knowledge, Democracy, and Action Project (GACER 2015b).

Established in November 2012, the Higher Education Research Network (HERNet) of Zambia includes a collective group of 23 HEIs from the United States and Zambia. Activities include an internship program for graduate students, capacity building research seminars, joint research studies related to higher education and community engagement, and a coordination link with the Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training, and Early Education of Zambia. HERNet members include government and private HEIs.

The National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) has a mission to “support universities to increase the quantity and quality of their public engagement activity” (NCCPE 2013a). Established in 2008, the NCCPE was launched to help overcome sometimes negative stereotype relationships that exist between HEIs and local communities.

With a mission to work towards the promotion of policies, institutions, and capacities that strengthen citizen participation and promote democratic governance throughout India, the Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) has community-engagement programs throughout India and in eight other Asian countries. PRIA’s higher education community-engagement initiatives including providing adult and continuing education opportunities through certificate programs and internships, strengthening partnerships between local businesses and HEIs, and in helping governments and societies work toward greater equality on issues of gender, governance, and health.

The Consortium of Indonesian Universities–Pittsburgh (KPTIP: Konsorsium Perguruan Tinggi Indonesia–Pittsburgh) was organized on 24 September 2007 at the University of Pittsburgh, USA. The setting that led to its formation was a higher education management training visit of seven Indonesian rectors who visited the University of Pittsburgh as part of USAID’s Decentralized Basic Education 2 Project. KPTIP holds regular meetings on various thematic topics and includes a strategic plan to help build the capacity of each of the 19 participating
HEIs. The Consortium also sponsors a journal—Excellence in Higher Education (http://ehe.pitt.edu)—as a publication output that demonstrates the commitment of member HEIs toward the promotion of quality and innovation in Indonesian education. To this end, KPTIP works to create sustainable national, regional, and global partnerships to meet national education reform mandates.

In order to have successful community engagement initiatives, there needs to be a “national framework consistent between the domains of higher education and territorial development which facilitates or permits conjoint action at the sub-national level” (Goddard and Puukka 2008, p. 37). One of the keys to establishing such a national framework is in the proactive government efforts to either directly build bridges between HEIs and industry and communities, or through providing an enabling environment that encourages HEIs and/or business to build bridges of their own. Greater managerial autonomy is a key to the bridge building process (Clark, 1998). Enhancing the development of more entrepreneurial universities is becoming an objective of new higher education policies in many countries” (Goddard and Puukka 2008, p. 30).

Provincial/State-Level of Community Engagement

The United States has a long history of community engagement partnerships with HEIs. In the nineteenth century, many states established land grant universities that included establishing strong links between higher education, agriculture, heavy industries, and local communities. The gradual transition from a predominantly agriculture- and heavy industry-based economy to a knowledge-based one shifted the focus of higher education curricula in the United States and globally (Douglass 2008). Today research and development and innovation center on what Richard Florida (2000, 2005) calls the “creative class” of workers. This creative class is highly skilled and includes artists, architects, business managers, educators, engineers, entertainers, scientists, writers, and all others who have the potential to innovate and contribute new ideas, technology, and creative content to the economy. Figure 1.2 provides a state-by-state comparison of the total employment of workers in high technology industry fields as a percentage of all workers. The United States national average came to 5.6 percent, with Washington (11.4 percent), Massachusetts (9.4 percent), Virginia (9.3 percent), and Maryland (8.9 percent) leading the country in the percentage of total workers in high-tech fields. Wyoming (1.8 percent), Mississippi (2.0 percent), South Dakota (2.0 percent), and Iowa (2.3 percent) rounding out the lower end of the number of high-tech workers as a percentage of the total workers in their respective states.

In 2002, the University of California has a substantial influence on the State of California’s economy, with OECD (2007, p. 28) indicating the University of California’s impact on the local economy was approximately USD15 billion “with a rate of return of 3.9 in state-funded research.” Consider the additional economic impact if the entire higher education system’s impact was calculated into this scenario in the State of California.
Higher education plays an important role in job creation in local economies, but especially in those that are highly-developed. In Massachusetts, Antoine Artiganave and colleagues (2010, p. 13) argue that the education and knowledge creation cluster of the state’s economy—which is centered on Massachusetts’s robust higher education system—is responsible for the vast majority of jobs created from 1998 to 2007. In 2011, high-tech industry employment comprised 5.1 percent of the total workforce in the Boston-Quincy, Massachusetts metropolitan area (Bay Area Council Economic Institute 2012, p. 35).

![Dispersed Pattern of High-Technology Industry Employment, 2011](image)

*Figure 1.2 Dispersed Pattern of High-Technology Industry Employment, 2011
Source: Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011; calculations by the authors.*

The Provincial University of Lapland was established in 2006 as a pilot for the rest of the country. In Finland, provincial universities include a network of HEIs (universities, polytechniques, and vocational schools) that offer “education and research to satisfy the demands of the [local] adult population” and economy (Konu and Pekkarinen 2008, p. 118).
Local Community Engagement

The triple helix approach that links local governments, industries, and HEIs is a model that has enabled many HEIs to engage with their respective communities at several levels (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 2000; Khan and Park 2011). Perhaps the most important initial step of the triple helix model is what Henry Etzkowitz (2012b, p. 766) calls “the permeability in university boundaries.” This permeable boundary is essential in establishing an entrepreneurial relationship between communities and HEIs.

Community colleges offer a quintessential prototype of higher education serving the socioeconomic and educational needs of its local population. Once described as a “uniquely American invention” (Thelin 2004, p. 250), community colleges are especially widespread in many countries including Canada and the United Kingdom (Latiner-Raby and Valeau 2009). Originally founded as junior colleges dedicated to providing the first two years of higher education with a focus on the transfer function, community colleges in the United States have evolved into far more intricate forms of local connectivity. Today’s community colleges educate 45 percent of all undergraduate students, including 56 percent of all Hispanic students and 49 percent of all African Americans (AACC 2013). Their comprehensive missions often articulate the value placed upon workforce and professional development, continuing, adult, or lifelong education, remedial education, and specialized services designed to respond to local needs.

A brief retrospective on the historical evolution of community colleges in the United States will permit us to dimension more completely the complex relationships between this subsector of higher education and the communities they serve. Many early community colleges were initially governed by local school boards, and were placed under the direction of the district school superintendent (Cohen and Brawer 1994). To this day, many community college presidents in California bare the title Superintendent. In 1936, the president of a junior college in Pennsylvania articulated the vision of a two-year institution dedicated to “meeting community needs . . . providing opportunities for increased adult education . . . and closely integrated with the work of high school and the work of other community institutions” (Baker 1994, p. 18). This vision was articulated on a national level by The President’s Commission on Higher Education (commonly known as the Truman Commission), that “called for two-year colleges to be fully integrated into the life of their communities” (Gilbert and Heller 2010, p. 7). The Truman Commission recommended free public education until Grade 14. Twenty years later, new community colleges were founded at the rate of one per week during a seven-year growth spurt—primarily fueled by concerns for access, affordability, and regional economic growth (Altbach, Gumport, and Berdahl 2005, p. 62). There was a shared belief that community colleges “contribute to the well-being of their community by providing access for people who would otherwise be unable to participate in postsecondary education” (Cohen and Brawer 1994, p. 9). Edmund J. Gleazer (1998, p. 6), former AACC President, understood that “a sense of community awareness” was a core value upon which institutional functions, purposes and priorities could be defined.
Manifestations of community outreach are the rule rather than the exception. North Harris Montgomery Community College (Houston, Texas) formed a partnership with the Harris County Public Library to jointly own and operate a new facility (Roueche and Jones 2005). Guilford Technical and Community College in North Carolina developed highly-functioning collaborate relationships to introduce career awareness and developmental opportunities at the K-12 levels (Roueche et al. 2008). Kirkwood Community College in Cedar Falls, Iowa opened a Skills to Employment Center to serve the needs of unemployed and underemployed local residents. Seminole Community College (north of Orlando, Florida) partnered with local builders to construct and operate a Center for Building Construction to offer instruction to construction trades through apprenticeship programs and to partner with local high schools. Springfield Technical Community College in western Massachusetts opened an Enterprise Center to incubate, orient and train local entrepreneurs (Roueche and Jones 2005). These are but a few of literally thousands of examples of outreach, agility in curriculum design, sensitivity to evolving local needs, and responsive behavior as community college administrators, faculty members, and staff share a sense of bonding and common cause with the populations they serve.

POLICY INITIATIVES RELATED TO COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Policy reform initiatives help enable or hinder community engagement initiatives in higher education. In this section we highlight how proactive government initiatives have helped forge sustainable ties between the community and HEIs. We also note a couple of negative examples, where government policy can stifle community engagement opportunities with higher education systems. Mark Drabenstott (2008) recognizes how public policies can encourage stronger links between HEIs and regional economies.

Many examples can be referenced in large countries like Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, but we will only include a select few. Recent government reforms have helped reshape how health care professionals at all levels are trained in Brazilian HEIs. The federal government of Brazil implemented the Programme in Support of Plans for Expansion and Restructuring of Federal Universities (REUNI) in 2007, which calls for HEIs to deliver a more interdisciplinary and team-oriented approach to coursework, including the health care curriculum that focuses more on community engagement and meeting social needs (Meyer et al. 2013). The implementation of the REUNI national higher education reform has met some resistance, however, especially when it comes to long-held traditional norms and delivery practices. HEIs will continue to play an important role in re-shaping Brazil’s health care services, especially in helping to bridge the social inequalities that remain based largely on market demands (Almeida-Filho 2011).

Higher education in the post-Soviet era has had its share of successes and failures in the past 35 years and continues to have a rough transition in preparing graduates with the necessary skills for employment in many industrial career paths.
(Shergi 2011). Several scholars argue that there needs to be a significant reform of the higher education system in order to better link community needs, including market and industry employment needs, with Russian HEIs (see for instance Kortunov 2009; Kuz’min 2014). Russian technical and vocational colleges, largely patterned after the traditional industry-focused model that existed during the Soviet era, have in many ways been able to maintain community engagement linkages necessary to best meet local and national industry demands (Zamani-Gallaher and Gorlova 2009). However, graduates from technical colleges and other HEIs have less national mobility than they had in previous generations, and are also limited in terms of mobility outside of the Russian Federation (Motova and Pykkö 2012; Burlutskaia 2014).

There are many challenges Indian HEIs face in being able to meet the local and international demands of preparing a workforce to meet the needs of industry. Pawan Agarwal (2009) lists four key areas that are hindering the higher education subsector in India: (1) inability to provide sufficient and quality training to graduates in “several sectors of [the] economy”; (2) quotas that limit access to the top-ranked HEIs and, in many ways the best-paying jobs afterwards; (3) growing pressure to become and remain competitive with other countries also heavily investing in their higher education subsectors; and (4) India has an enormous higher education system that is struggling to keep pace with its burgeoning student population (pp. xxix-xxx). Similar to what you would find in most countries with large higher education systems, some of the leading HEIs in India have established an exemplary reputation of modeling social media outreach to their stakeholders and in targeted community outreach efforts. A recent study by Kalpana Chauhan and Anandan Pillai (2013) demonstrated how 10 top-ranked management HEIs in India implemented several community engagement initiatives online through targeted successful social media campaigns (e.g., Facebook) for capacity building to local communities and businesses. Established in 1982, the Participatory Research Initiative in Asia (PRIA) supports many community-engagement initiatives, including those with HEIs. One of its higher education community engagement initiatives includes the UNESCO-sponsored Community-Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education Project, which focuses on knowledge generation and sharing through partnerships among universities (academics), communities (civil society) and government (policy-makers) leading to new capacities; new solutions to pressing problems related to sustainability, social and economic disparities, cultural exclusion, mistrust and conflict; awareness among policy makers; enhanced scholarship of engagement; and modified pedagogy of community based research. (PRIA 2015)

With the continued increase of Chinese students studying abroad, the amount of cultural exposure and civic engagement they witness first-hand in their host countries will inevitably have an impact on how they view and engage in community activities upon their return home. Local HEIs in China are becoming more global in terms of cultural diversity and exposure, and Chinese students
studying in Chinese HEIs are also becoming more informed about community engagement opportunities and possibilities that lay before them as students and following graduation (Volet and Jones 2012; Altbach 2013b). Participants from a recent survey of students, faculty members, and alumni of Shandong University in Jinan responded that environmental sustainability was among the top concerns and priorities for higher education community engagement in China (Yuan et al. 2013). Despite the tremendous progress China has achieved in recent decades, there remains a tremendous gap between the higher education opportunities in the eastern coastal, eastern regions and the more rural and remote regions of the country. Many of China’s top-ranked universities (e.g., Peking University, Tsinghua University, and East China Normal University) have partnered with sister HEIs in rural and remote regions to help strengthen their human and institutional capacity (Jacob et al. 2015). This model is one that other countries could learn from in order to help strengthen the higher education training, quality, and accreditation needs that are so prevalent in the twenty-first century.

The Ford Foundation-funded Community – Higher Education – Service Partnerships (CHESP) was established in 1999 to help South African HEIs plan and operationalize community engagement initiatives. Five CHESP programs were launched at the beginning of this partnership: grant-making; capacity building; monitoring, evaluation, and research; advocacy; and resource and innovation services. Many of South Africa’s largest and most well-known universities have participated in one or more CHESP programs, including the University of Cape Town, University of Pretoria, and the University of KwaZulu Natal (Lazarus et al. 2008). Nationwide, the Department of Education (1997) provided a strong foundation for community-based research and engagement initiatives in higher education with its foundational White Paper titled Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education. More recently, the Department of Higher Education and Training published a White Paper for Post-School Education and Training in 2014 that provides strategic direction on how HEIs can help best meet the community needs of all South African citizens including adult learners who have not completed or graduated from high school. HEIs have for many years played an important role in community engagement in an effort to curb and overcome the AIDS epidemic. This has been and continues to be the case with many HEIs in South Africa. Serving as testing and counseling centers and locations where antiretroviral (ARV) treatment is commonplace, HEIs have in many ways helped lead the battle against the AIDS epidemic in South Africa. Undoubtedly, this health service will continue to play an important role in higher education community engagement efforts well into the future.

As part of an organized government initiative to strengthen local and international public engagement with higher education in the UK, the Research Councils UK established the NCCPE in 2008. One of these government-funded initiatives was titled The Beacons Project, which was conceptualized to help overcome a long-held negative cultural paradigm that often prevented those within academe from interacting with others in the general society. The Beacons Project was launched to help lead a cultural paradigmatic shift, by establishing six
university-based centers that help “support, recognise, reward and build capacity for public engagement” and each center was “at the forefront of efforts to change the culture in universities, assisting staff and students to engage with the public” (NCCPE 2013b). Partners on this NCCPE initiative included members of the media, government agencies, corporations, charities, museums, as well as HEIs. One of the six Research Councils UK Beacon centers named Edinburgh Beltane Beacon for Public Engagement (EBBPE). The Edinburgh Centre defined public engagement as “sharing knowledge between communities, policy makers (internal and external to higher education institutions…) and researchers” (EBBPE 2012, p. 1).

One of the most world-renowned geographic knowledge clusters is located in the greater to San Francisco Bay area, and especially in Silicon Valley in California. The linkages between industry and society—with universities at the center of these linkages—are well known and governments from around the world have attempted to replicate the success model. Etzkowitz (2012a) considers the geographic knowledge cluster a successful implementation of the triple helix model. The unparalleled success of Silicon Valley is largely attributed to the strong knowledge centers in the greater region, especially with the influence of Stanford University and the University of California, as well as countless think tank and research and development centers that have emerged from the university entrepreneurial model over the years. Etzkowitz (2012a, p. 2) argues that

Silicon Valley’s rise was supported by double helix university-industry and government-university interactions that converged into triple helix university-industry-government relationships. The Valley has expanded from a local generator of new technologies and industries into the key node of a global network, with multi-national firms, countries, regions and universities maintaining outposts to market or source advanced technologies.

Another strength of the Silicon Valley community engagement model is the active role the state and federal government funding and favorable laws played in helping to encourage entrepreneurialism, innovation, and research and development (Douglas 2008). This scenario led to unlimited potential for new business and new ideas to emerge. While some of the first successful business establishments in Silicon Valley date back to the early twentieth century, many of the leading IT firms are headquartered or have a branch office there. Some of the most notable success stories involved student-led initiatives that have grown into some of the largest companies on the earth, including Sun Microsystems, Yahoo!, and Google. Historically there has been a unique academic institutional culture and strong entrepreneurial emphasis on establishing linkages between Stanford University students and “emerging technology industries” (Stanford University 2013). Apple Computer was co-founded in Silicon Valley in 1976 from a former UC Berkeley undergraduate student, Steve Wozniak, and Steve Jobs; later renamed Apple, it has risen to become the largest publicly-traded company in the world (Apple evolves strategy to meet China halfway 2013).
Higher education policy initiatives can help or hinder engagement initiatives. In most cases, effective and sustainable community engagement is difficult to achieve. Chris Duke (2008, p. 89) notes how “even with the best will and the greatest clarity, the ground is muddy and hard to work” in establishing successful partnerships between communities and HEIs. Many governments often struggle to support higher education policy initiatives if there is little or no support (be it financial, political, and/or stakeholder support) to help with the implementation of laws and regulations. The scenario is only exacerbated in rural and remote regions, which often suffer from a lack of sufficient government oversight and qualified management and faculty personnel to help implement successful community engagement approaches (Gray et al. 2011).

Other reasons for failed higher education community engagement initiatives include a lack of support and buy-in from one or more key stakeholder groups (e.g., students, faculty members, staff, administrators, alumni, parents of students, policy makers, and community members). Stakeholders should be involved in every aspect of the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation processes of community engagement initiatives. Participation is simply key to long-term sustainability and ownership (Soska and Johnson Butterfield 2004; Hart and Northmore 2011; Pike et al. 2011). It is perhaps the single most important ingredient that is too often neglected. Along with teaching and research, community engagement is now widely recognized as a third core function of HEIs. However, it is not generally given equal weight. In fact, in many cases too much emphasis is placed on research, teaching or both research and teaching, with community engagement and service coming in a distant third, as almost an afterthought. Why do they have to be so compartmentalized? If promotion and tenure rewards structures are so stringent that they only reward quality research and teaching outputs, it is highly unlikely that community engagement will be able to play the significant and potential role that it can and should play in higher education (Strum et al. 2011). More emphasis should be made to link teaching and research with community engagement initiatives. In this way, the three-fold mission of higher education can capitalize on a synergistic relationship that helps strengthen each other.

SUMMARY OF BOOK CHAPTERS

In this section we note how each of the contributing authors provide evidence of higher education community engagement. The book is divided into three sections. Five chapters are included in Part I, which addresses several thematic issues related to higher education community engagement.

Chapter 2 by Kassie Freeman addresses the continuing negative consequences of the forced displacement of members of the Black Diaspora from ancestral homelands into foreign environments. She includes consideration of the dynamics of a century of colonial occupation of much of Africa by European countries, many of which had been engaged in the original slave trade that initially took indigenous people away from the continent only to have those remaining oppressed by
foreigners in more recent times. She suggests ways in which access to advanced education can be enhanced through community engagement and renewed dedication to establishing new national identities that fully embrace members of the Black Diaspora and do not pit them against more favored groups, nor against each other in very destructive ways. She concludes by identifying steps that can be taken by higher education institutions to overcome the ways of the past in order to achieve more positive and productive outcomes, including forging community partnerships, engaging with broader stakeholders, and redefining participation and practices in ways that are more appropriate for a globalized world.

Hurricane Katrina traumatized much of the Gulf Coast. New Orleans was especially victimized. Chapter 3 by Alex Johnson and David Hoovler offers an overview of service learning and the important role that student volunteers and higher education institutions from afar played in the post hurricane recovery efforts. They describe the value of a “culture of engagement” and the importance of coordinating service learning with partners that include a community college along with federal, state, and local officials. Clear educational objectives were defined for the students, and lessons were learned. Alex Johnson was President and CEO of Delgado Community College in New Orleans during this challenging time.

Tatyana Dumova highlights in Chapter 4 the important and often neglected role technology plays in establishing successful higher education community partnerships. She emphasizes how various digital media now dominate communication between higher education students, faculty members, and administrators as well as the many communities in which they interact. Technology is especially important in reaching out to next and future generations of higher education students. Dumova introduces the term community informatics, which she defines as an “interdisciplinary area of knowledge concerned with the application of technology in a community setting.” Knowledge sharing through online libraries, databases, and other media enable HEIs to disseminate information to the public across down the street or to another continent. Dumova identifies three topics she argues are at the crux of understanding the dynamic role technology plays between universities and the communities they engage with: interactivity, asynchronicity, and de-massification. A section on challenges and shortcomings is included to help interested readers avoid potential pitfalls in establishing successful technology-based partnerships and communication media. Chapter 4 is well referenced and could easily serve to fill the gap in the literature about the important role technology plays in enabling HEIs to engage successfully with communities at all levels.

In Chapter 5, Maria Adamuti-Trache and Adrienne E. Hyle analyze the challenges, processes, scope, objectives and lessons learned from a partnership between the School of Education, University of Texas at Arlington, and the Arlington Police Department. This case study offers a story of community engagement involving data based planning focused on delinquent youth. The authors provide a candid assessment of what worked and why. They similarly comment upon components of the original vision that have yet to be fulfilled.
Readers benefit from a practitioners’ guide to launching a highly focused community initiative.

In Chapter 6, Linda Silka, Mario Teisl, and James Settele make the case that successful higher education community engagement initiatives should ideally focus on integrating local and global opportunities. Too often the dialectic between the global and the local is segregated in academic circles of teaching, research, and service (see for instance Arnove et al. 2013). These are the very areas Silka and her colleagues argue need to be strengthened for engaged HEIs of the future. They conclude that in order to achieve the full potential impact of higher education community engagement, change must occur at five levels, beginning with individual faculty members, while also encouraging efforts from academic programs, centers, schools, and ultimately multi-campus initiatives. Some of the community engagement initiatives should be part of short- and long-term strategic planning initiatives at the institutional level while others could be the result of individual networks and research linkages in a more serendipitous fashion. The authors argue that being open to all potential opportunities is a key to being able to fully achieve the outreach engagement potential of higher education.

Part II, “Institutional Programs, Partnerships, and Case Studies in the United States,” is comprised of seven chapters that examine higher education institutional community engagement programs from across the United States. Tracey Soska, in Chapter 7, begins with an historical perspective on the European roots of higher education in the United States, moving to the explicit intervention through the Morrill Act, passed in 1862 by the federal government, that was designed to use higher education as a mechanism for local and national economic development of the growing nation that was to emerge in the decades following the Civil War. This law allocated public land for the explicit purpose of establishing institutions of advanced learning that included but was not limited to “agriculture and the mechanic arts.” It provided access to advanced education for the masses, departing significantly from the much more elite European model. It also incorporated the notion of community service into the mission of the university, adding a third dimension to the already established elements of teaching and research. The service dimension was essential to the assimilation of the waves of immigrants who flocked to the United States at the turn of the twentieth century, working in tandem with other social agencies that evolved, especially in the growing cities of this era. Soska describes how resolution of town-gown conflicts led to increasingly more extensive community engagement by institutions of higher education, regardless of their location in urban or rural areas. He concludes with consideration of the emergence of service learning as a key element in higher education in the United States, a phenomenon that is leading to ever increasing community engagement spanning local, national and international settings.

Stewart E. Sutin and Kathryn Bethea describe in Chapter 8 how the goals and purposes of community colleges changed during the second half of the twentieth century from providing the first two years (“junior” college) of a four-year college education to more community focused endeavors such as workforce development and building professional skills under changing social and economic conditions.
They provide several examples of specific community college initiatives that both broadened the scope of programs offered and narrowed the focus to local needs for an educated citizenry with specific types of skills. Also documented are examples of increasing involvement of community colleges with secondary schools in preparing students for college-level academic work. All of this has resulted in a continuing pattern of increased demand for and enrollment in certificate as opposed to degree programs. The authors conclude with a discussion of issues in finance and quality assurance.

Leaders and faculty of urban universities often reflect upon choices and opportunities to contribute to the greater wellbeing of their adjoining communities. The authors in Chapter 9 provide us with a detailed case study of Duquesne University (USA) and the way in which it embraced service learning as a requirement for its undergraduate students. Readers also gain from a brief literature review that is foundational to the descriptive components of this chapter. The authors describe practical application of John P. Kotter’s (1996) eight-stage process to change, and the way in which service learning was embraced within the university strategic plan, thereby supporting its likely sustainability.

Civic learning and democratic engagement should be central to higher education community engagement activities according to Seth S. Pollack in Chapter 10. Pollack argues that in most cases, service learning is the most common form of civic learning adopted by HEIs. He reviews the importance of the Campus Compact coalition within the United States and the Talloires Declaration globally, noting how many HEIs are committing to make service learning and community engagement an integral part of their curriculum, research, and outreach initiatives. Pollack then turns to the case of California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) to describe how students, faculty members, and administrators integrate a critical-service-learning approach into CSUMB’s academic programs. Service-learning opportunities include teaching it in the classroom, credit-based internship programs, and many community service work opportunities. Each CSUMB undergraduate student is required to participate in a two-semester-long service-learning course component that gets students out and into the Monterey Bay regional community. Pollack concludes that in order to best meet the higher education needs of the twenty-first century, higher education and community stakeholders at all levels should embrace critical civic literacy as a core goal.

In Chapter 11, Kecia Hayes and Emily Zenke share the history of Teacher’s College and its founding mission as a basis upon which readers learn about the institutions’ ongoing initiatives to partner with the New York City Department of Education to operate a seven school Partnership School Consortium. The scope of this collaboration is clearly defined, along with challenges and lessons learned. This is a comprehensive case study of institutional commitment to applied education “best practices” at the K-12 level within an urban setting.

Anne Kaplan (Chapter 12) details several exemplar community engagement initiatives Northern Illinois University (NIU) has established within the Chicago metropolitan area. NIU has a long history of collaborating with local and regional government agencies, community colleges, school districts, and health agencies.
Building on this partnership legacy, Kaplan notes how NIU is well positioned to lead both regional and national/international higher education community engagement efforts, including serving as the North American node of PASCAL Observatory International. Kaplan heads the Division of Outreach, Engagement, and Information Technologies, which coordinates NIU’s community engagement efforts university-wide, including the PASCAL initiatives. Kaplan argues that much of the success NIU has experienced is due to the sustained top-level leadership and support provided toward community engagement projects and initiatives. Without this top-level administrative support structure, it is difficult to have long-term sustainable engagement at the local, national, and international levels (Lee et al. 2014; Thomashow 2014).

In Chapter 13, Carolyn M. Shields discusses the community engagement roles Wayne State University (WSU) has played in Detroit’s urban development. The chapter is grounded on the notion of what Shields calls the need for “critical community engagement,” especially in struggling urban centers faced with poverty and the need for renewal. Sometimes community engagement initiatives do not necessarily target those in most need, and this has been the case with several of WSU’s recent community engagement goals according to Shields. The social justice aspect of higher education community engagement too often lags behind the entrepreneurial focus on development, job creation, and research-linkages. Shields also rightly acknowledges the external and internal challenges higher education administrators face in an era where many key community stakeholders (e.g., policy makers, community leaders, employers, and the general public) are questioning the rationale and role of higher education engagement, especially with the escalating costs of higher education and the difficulty many HEIs have in being able to prepare graduates with sufficient twenty-first century skills (Kay and Greenhill 2011; Symonds et al. 2011; Kaplan and Flum 2012; Pellegrino and Hilton 2012). While WSU has made significant inroads in a positive directly, Shields concludes that more community engagement still needs to be done, especially in helping to alleviate community inequalities and social justice shortcomings in Detroit.

The final section, Part III, includes five chapters on institutional case studies from China, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, and Saudi Arabia. China’s long history of higher education service is recognized by Sumin Li and Dongfang Wang in Chapter 14. The authors begin their chapter with a historical overview of contemporary higher education service engagement in China, dividing the post-Cultural Revolution era into three phases: the Initial Stage (from 1977-1985), the Deepening Stage (1985-1992), and Mature Stage (1993 to the present). Li and Wang then describe how service is interwoven in Chinese higher education through direct links with the other two institutional mission areas of teaching and research. By categorizing all Chinese HEIs into one of three types—research universities, higher vocational colleges, and local universities—Li and Wang outline how the service-oriented portion of higher education institutional missions differ depending on the type of HEI. While the different types of HEIs exist, Li and Wang argue that collectively they are able to meet the societal and outreach service needs at local, national, and international levels.
In Chapter 15, Futao Huang draws from the Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey conducted in 2007-2008 in 18 countries and Hong Kong. The CAP survey was in many ways a follow-up survey of a Carnegie Foundation-funded survey in 1991-1992. The chapter focuses on the Japanese case and responses, and compares Japanese respondents with those from the other participating countries and Hong Kong. The CAP survey examines amount of time and interest faculty members spend on research, teaching, service, and administrative roles. Futao provides comparisons and commentary of Japanese participant results from both the 1992 and 2007 surveys, noting how service activities changed in several areas. The survey findings and Futao’s analysis also highlight several differences that exist between the participating countries with more mature economies (e.g., Germany, Japan, and the United States) than those countries in which their economies are emerging (e.g., Brazil, Mexico, and South Africa). Faculty members from mature countries tended to spend much more time devoted to service activities than those from emerging countries. Japan was among the top-ranked sample countries in the amount of time faculty members devoted to teaching and ranked second (only after Germany) in amount of time devoted to service activity engagement.

In Chapter 16, David K. Serem and Augustine M. Kara describe how their newly chartered institution, Maasai Mara University (MMU), located in a particularly sensitive environmental area of southwestern Kenya, has taken steps to promote sustainable development. As the first university in the area of Kenya traditionally inhabited by the Maasai, a pastoral tribe that has traditionally existed by raising cattle in close-knit families for whom advanced learning was not a priority, MMU was founded to expand educational opportunities and aspirations. The region is also home to the Maasai Mara National Park, a magnet for tourists from all over the world who visit to view the spectacular wildlife. The authors discuss the institution’s evolution from an affiliated college of Moi University into a fully chartered, independent university, highlighting ways in which its founding principles supported initiatives related to sustainable development. From its inception, MMU has sought ways to engage the Maasai community in advanced education, including offering incentives for enrollment such as lowered admission requirements and expanding financial support for students whose qualifications are too low for them to received government scholarships. The authors conclude with a discussion of further steps required to fulfill the promise of sustainable social as well as environmental and economic development.

Gustavo Gregorutti and colleagues detail in Chapter 17 a university-community engagement initiative in Montemorelos, Mexico. The chapter focuses on the case of the Center Luz y Vida (Light and Life) at Montemorelos University, in which students, faculty members, and community members participate in planning, implementing, and evaluating community health projects. They are real projects for the people of Montemorelos, and community leaders and members are actively engaged in helping to curb the obesity epidemic, especially among children. Gregorutti and his colleagues point out how those engaged with this ongoing initiative are involved in active learning and research projects that aim to help
improve ways in which the Center can best meet local public health needs. Changes from several of the projects have been substantial and in many ways reciprocal. Community leaders, including politicians, were able to recognize the value the health initiatives has on society in general. And participating students and faculty members also benefited in terms of being able to better align their coursework and research with practical cases linked to their own community.

Finally, in Chapter 18, Eiman S. Abokhodair provides a case study of higher education community engagement through a leadership training workshop with senior administrators of Princess Nora Bint Abdul-Rahman University. The chapter addresses how new modes of training are required to reach female leaders of HEIs in Saudi Arabia. Abokhodair argues that Saudi higher education leaders must be willing to “take risks, respond positively to change, and … facilitate change, so that the rate of organizational transformation matches or exceeds the rate of environment change.”

CONCLUSION

The unparalleled role HEIs play in communities is an important piece in the cultural and economic development of all societies. Not all stakeholders view the current and future role of higher education in the same light. In an era when higher education continues to be scrutinized by many policy makers, those in the media, and the general public, it is especially important to recognize the significant contributions HEIs play in local, national, and international community engagement activities. This volume offers readers a glimpse into many unique and comparative higher education community engagement initiatives.

In this chapter, we began by defining community engagement in higher education and highlighted the various bridging and symbiotic relationships that exist between communities and HEIs. There is a spectrum of relationship types that exist, ranging from personal networks to long-term sustainable initiatives between institutions, governments, and industry. Community engagement and outreach is discussed geographically at the local, state/provincial, national, regional, and international levels, with several success and failure examples provided. Types of community engagement activities are equally diverse, but are often linked to teaching, research, outreach, and service-learning activities. Information communication technology (ICT) continues to serve as an essential lever in establishing broader and optimal outreach initiatives (Joshi et al. 2013); and ICT is often able to reach out to key stakeholder groups at all levels and increasingly in more efficient ways. In addition to stakeholder participation, buy-in, and ownership, there is a continual need for sufficient and committed leadership, relevance to community needs, and a focus on quality assurance principles, which are all identified as key ingredients necessary for successful and sustained engagement initiatives. Without these key ingredients many higher education community engagement initiatives fail. The 33 contributors of this volume offer unique insights and personal experiences from many higher education community engagement initiatives that address these important issues.


NOTES

1. The three colors are those of the Pittsburgh Steelers American football team’s logo, with yellow representing coal, orange representing iron ore, and blue steel scrap.

2. The following six U.S.-accrediting organizations are recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2013): Middle States Commission on Higher Education; New England Association of Schools and Colleges – Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC–CIHE); North Central Association of Colleges and Schools – The Higher Learning Commission (NCA–HLC); Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and Commission on Colleges; Western Association of Schools and Colleges – Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC–ACCJC); and Western Association of Schools and Colleges – Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (WASC–ACSCU).

3. Formerly known as the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) since the organization founding in 1972, the name was changed to CIC in 2014.

4. PRIA (2015) has active programs in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Nepal, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka.

5. Also known as the Morrill Act because of its sponsor Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont, the Land-Grant College Act of 1862 essentially provided states and territories with land from the federal government to help them establish HEIs with an agricultural and/or mechanic arts focus. Participating states and territories had the autonomy to establish new HEIs or to sell the land to provide funds for the establishment of HEIs that often became known as agriculture and mechanic (A&M) colleges and universities (Williams 1991). The more than 80 HEIs ultimately established through such federal grants include the University of Alaska Fairbanks (1917), American Samoa Community College (1970), Pennsylvania State University (funded in 1862, although it was founded in 1855), Texas A&M University (1876), University of California (1868), and Utah State University (1888).

6. In addition to Facebook, there were many other social media platforms used by the participating HEIs, including Twitter, YouTube, Orkut, Blogger, Wordpress, Slideshare, Scribd, Delicious, Digg, Reddit et cetera (Chauhan and Pillai 2013).

7. This guiding policy document laid the groundwork for the Department of Education’s (2001) National Plan on Higher Education that recognizes community engagement as one of three core functions of South African universities, along with teaching and research.

8. Sun Microsystems was founded in 1982 by three Stanford University graduate students—Andy Bechtolsheim, Vinod Khosla, and Scott McNealy. Yahoo! was founded by David Filo and Jerry Yang in 1995, both of whom were Stanford University graduate students. Google was founded in 1998 by two doctoral students at Stanford University, Larry Page and Sergey Brin.

9. The Campus Compact coalition was established in 1985 by the President of the Education Commission of the States and the presidents of Stanford, Georgetown, and Brown universities. It has since grown to include over 1,100 presidents of HEIs in the United States with a mission to advance “the public purpose of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility” (Campus Compact 2015).

10. The Talloires Declaration was drafted in 1990 in Talloires, France and is sponsored by the Association of University Leaders for a Sustainable Future (ULSF). It is comprised of a ten-point community engagement action plan that incorporates “sustainability and environmental literacy in teaching, research, operations, and outreach” at HEIs worldwide. Originally, only 22 university heads signed the declaration, including Wesley W. Posvar, Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, but this number has since grown to over 400 worldwide (ULSF 2015).
PART I

THEMATIC ISSUES RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
2. DIVIDE AND CONQUER

Long-Term Consequences for Education, Economic Participation, and Higher Education Engagement

This chapter’s focus on educational issues about members of the Black Diaspora at first blush sounds as though it is going to be negative and condemning. However, the hope is that it will instead provide a new and/or different way of looking at historical events that have created quite a dilemma in the past and have left soaring vestiges of questions about the future, particularly as it relates to education at all levels and economic participation for all. Higher education community engagement is exactly the arena that can help institutions and their stakeholders wrestle with different sets of challenges and engage in debates that will hopefully lead to new policies—or, at a minimum, shed new light on engaging possibilities. After all, bringing people together and providing spaces to address important issues is a central purpose of higher education institutions, both individually and collectively.

DIVIDE AND CONQUER: THE LONG-TERM CONSEQUENCES FOR EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION

What does this mean for reforming higher education policies and practices, particularly as it relates to community engagement? It is easy to assume that any time the subject of Divide and Conquer is broached that both terms conjure up negative, divisive language and thoughts, and can mean placing blame. That is not the intent of this writing. Actually, this long overdue focus is on the education participation, or lack thereof, of Black populations across the Diaspora. The intent is to first provide a brief historical context, followed by global implications of the Divide, particularly as it relates to education, and conclude with implications of the Divide for reforming policies and practices as it relates to higher education engagement and partnerships.

BRIEF HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

First, it is important to understand the backdrop of the creation of the Black Diaspora. It is as James Anderson (1988) indicated, that to understand the experiences of Black people (of any people), it is necessary to examine the historical context of their existence. The Black Diaspora can be defined as the “dispersal of people removed/exiled from a common territorial/geographic origin, Africa” (Pierre 2001, p. 1). Although slaves were traded since as early as the
fifteenth century, it was during the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 that a meeting was held between European nations to create rules on how to peacefully divide Africa among themselves for colonization.

At that meeting in the second half of the nineteenth century, after more than four centuries of contact, including the African slave trade that constituted the largest forced migration in human history (Wikipedia 2012), the European powers finally laid claim to virtually all of Africa. Parts of the continent had been “explored,” but now, representatives of European governments and rulers arrived to create or expand African spheres of influence for their patrons. Competition was intense. Spheres of influence began to crowd each other. It was time for negotiation, and in late 1884, a conference was convened in Berlin to sort things out. This conference laid the groundwork for the now familiar politico-geographical map of Africa, drawn with virtually no concern for historical residential patterns of tribes and ethnic groups.

The Berlin Conference was Africa’s undoing in many ways. The colonial powers superimposed their domains on the African Continent. By the time Africa began regaining its independence in the 1960s, the realm had acquired a legacy of political fragmentation that could neither be eliminated nor made to operate satisfactorily. The African politico-geographical map is thus a permanent liability that resulted from a three-month period when Europe’s search for minerals and markets had become insatiable. In other words, now almost 130 years after the Berlin Conference, Africa was released from the domination of European nations and, in many cases, individuals from those colonies were removed to the corresponding countries, whether Great Britain, France, Portugal, later to the United States, Brazil, and the Americas, as examples. Today, individuals still come from formerly colonized countries, both voluntarily and involuntarily, to the countries that colonized them.

What does a comparative analysis of the Black Diaspora afford researchers and practitioners, particularly as it relates to education participation generally and, more specifically, community engagement? There are at least three reasons why this analysis is essential: First, a historical context can provide an examination of similar and different educational challenges to better determine different and new paths. Second, a broader examination of the educational experiences of Black populations going beyond those of African Americans, offer the opportunity to rethink new and different solutions. Third, a review of similarities and lessons learned across groups can lead to broader and more generalizable possibilities, using history and cultural contexts as lenses.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE DIVIDED BLACK DIASPORA

There were several consequences of the Divided Black Diaspora. The first of many was the process of marginalization and silencing. Decisions were made and executed far away from the affected individuals—on another continent, with no voices to speak for the affected individuals.
Marginalization/Silent Voices

The process began with the affected groups not participating or having voice in the course for the direction of their lives, especially not participating in education. Particularly, as new arrivals in different countries, small in number, and in unfamiliar terrain, Black populations were relegated to lower status in every sector. For example, writing about the Afro-French and linking invisibility with marginalization, Crystal M. Fleming (2012) states the following:

Ironically, their ethnoracial ‘visibility’ in metropolitan classrooms is accompanied by a symbolic ‘invisibility’ due to a lack of representation in the historical and cultural material included in the centralized French educational system. The paradox of both being marked and unmarked, visible and invisible, contributes to the complex challenges Antilleans face in being both Caribbean and French. (p. 80)

Even countries like Sweden that purport to be neutral on most things, including race, still reflect the marginalization of Afro-Swedes (Habel 2012):

Today, Afro-Swedes are certainly visible as a growing minority in Sweden, yet exceptionally marginalized in political and cultural terms. Even if the history of the Black presence may go back as long as in many parts of Europe, it enjoys an ambivalent status: on the one hand it is recurrently spectacularized as purportedly recent—something intriguingly cool, different, and exotic (or abject) in quotidian culture. On the other, the presence and achievements of Black people is often overlooked or erased in historical records. (p. 107)

This same situation is described repeatedly in countries where Black populations have migrated, voluntarily or involuntarily (in many cases enslaved and brought against their will). They are marginalized and/or voiceless.

Uneven, but Constant, Lack of Participation in Education at Every Level

If you fast-forward, another consequence of the Divided Black Diaspora, using the United States, England, France, and/or the Americas as examples, is that Blacks are disproportionately uneducated or undereducated at every level of schooling, especially higher education. For instance, in Portugal, according to the Honorable Fernando Ka (2012), the percentage of the Black population with at least a compulsory school (ninth grade) education is less than 1 percent, when the Black population is 8 percent to 10 percent. According to Ka, Afro-Portuguese school success will depend, undoubtedly, on addressing infrastructures for such issues as after school programs, places where students can receive assistance with their homework and be supported in their studies by appropriate teachers while they are waiting for their parents to come home (p. 75).

This pattern of exclusion of Black populations’ participation in education is repeated in other European countries, for example, Germany. In his research, Long
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(2012) cites the work of Massaquoi who indicated, “Children of African Diaspora families were many years not allowed to attend secondary schools or were limited to the Berufschule that educated them for low-skilled trades” (p. 125). Cecile Wright (2012) writes about the differential treatment of Blacks in the United Kingdom. She poignantly indicates, “Within educational discourse, Black and minority students have been regarded historically as a problem in and for the British educational system (p. 66).

However, this pattern of excluding Black populations’ participation in education is not limited to Europe. In Latin America, the pattern is similar, even in countries, like Brazil, where Blacks are in the majority. In Brazil, although the Black population is 51 percent, according to the U.S. Department of State, Blacks are terribly underrepresented in education. Dassin (2013), reporting from a 2005 World Bank publication, indicated that “higher Education in Latin America remains largely elitist, with the majority of students coming from the wealthier segments of society” (p. 20). With newly voted comprehensive affirmative action policies, where a person’s race can be taken into account, Brazil will be an interesting case to watch.

An often overlooked and under-researched Black population in Latin America is Afro-Ecuadorians, who have only recently been able to claim their Black heritage. According to Johnson (2012), “for the first time in history, Ecuadorian people of African descent were able to identify themselves with the normal census conducted in 2001” (p. 27). Even with only recent ethnic identity, there has been differentiation in the quality of schooling. As Johnson has indicated, “schooling in the city of Esmeraldas is racially segregated and unequal regarding economic and cultural resources” (p. 38).

Because of the value of education in uplifting people from their circumstances, how Black populations globally have confronted this reality is particularly important. Unfortunately, this reality continues as a consequence of the divided Diaspora.

Unemployment or Underemployment

The next common thread among Blacks across the Diaspora is the high level of unemployment and/or underemployment that has deep historical roots. Just as Black people in America were relegated to working the land and as servants to increase the wealth of this country, so were Black people in European countries. For example, according to Fryer (1992), “The majority of the 10,000 or so black people who lived in Britain in the eighteenth century were household servants—pages, valets, footmen, coachmen, cooks, and maids—much as their predecessors had been the previous century” (p. 73). Although working menial jobs, Fryer conceded that as a Liverpool writer declared in 1893, “It was the capital made in the African slave trade that built some of the docks and the price of human flesh and blood that gave us a start” (p. 66).

Similarly, in Germany, Black people “were forced to cultivate export products or to work on plantations and in the mines of whites” (Opitz et al. 1992, p. 25). The
same was the case in Portugal. According to Saunders (1982), “The nobility employed—or underemployed—large numbers of slaves solely as domestic servants” (p. 63).

Through his interviews with Afro-Ecuadorians, Johnson (2012) found explicit examples of differential treatment as it related to employment opportunities. An interviewee made this observation:

For example, in the opportunities for employment in our environment, in the few private companies there are, there does not exist the well-defined possibilities for a Black, for example, to access very easily a job. Applying for a job I would say it like this, those administrators and company owners prefer the non-Blacks. They prefer them and I have seen it. (p. 36)

Although the Divided Diaspora had historical consequences on the employment status of Black populations, the remnants of the status remain today. Across the globe, Black populations continue to be unemployed and underemployed. The United States is an example. Where the overall unemployment rate in the United States is just under eight percent, for African-Americans unemployment is almost double that percentage at 14-15 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). These rates of unemployment contribute to the high rate of poverty among Blacks.

*High Levels of Poverty*

Lastly, a consequence of the Divided Black Diaspora, tragically, includes high levels of poverty. In the United States, the poverty rate for Blacks is approximately 27.4 percent, more than one in four, compared to one in seven (15.1 percent) nationwide (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). In Great Britain, the poverty rate of Black Africans is 45 percent and Black Caribbeans is 30 percent, compared to 20 percent White British (Kenway and Palmer 2007).

This level of poverty of Black populations is similar across different parts of the world. For example, according to Johnson’s (2012) findings, Ecuador census data indicated that within the city and province of Esmeraldas, 56 percent of the overall population live at or below the poverty line while 79 percent of Afro-Ecuadorians live in poverty.

The high levels of Black uneducated and undereducated populations contribute to continued high levels of unemployment and poverty. Higher education institutions have a role to play in both highlighting and combating this global dilemma.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR REFORMING CURRENT HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

What are the implications and importance for reforming current higher education policies and practices of community engagement? To answer this question, community engagement needs to be defined and understood. I am using the definition from the National Resource Center on Advancing Emergency
Preparedness for Culturally Diverse Communities (2012): “Community engagement is the process of working collectively with and through groups of people affiliated by geography proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well-being of those people.” Further, they state, “It often involves partnerships and coalitions that help increase resources and influence systems.” This definition highlights important roles of higher education engagement. For one, higher education is a place of special interest, as outlined in the definition. The key is working collectively, targeting specific goals to achieve common outcomes.

More importantly, higher education community should be based on partnerships and coalitions that help increase resources and influence systems. The following are four suggestions for leveraging these partnerships and coalitions.

*Bringing Together Communities/Partnerships to Address Concerns (Equal Voices)*

Bringing together communities/partnerships to address education participation at every level is an imperative. Higher education institutions are ideal communities to begin to create partnerships to rethink the influence of the vestigial remains of conquering and dividing on the current outcomes of education participation. However, rather than working collectively to achieve different goals as it relates to Black populations across the globe, this research suggests that higher education institutions have been almost silent partners. In every country, Black populations have been underrepresented in education participation at every level. More disheartening is the lack of the voices of these populations in discussions of different alternatives to address some of these issues.

How does the higher education community change this? It begins with acknowledging that a problem exists. It then requires focusing attention on establishing true partnerships and engagement to influence resources and systems. Questions must be addressed to identify what different systems should be put into place and what resources are necessary to achieve different outcomes.

However, the partnerships must be equal voices and a combination of voices must be included, not just voices from the higher education community alone. There should not be silent or marginalized voices, as a carryover from processes created from the past.

*Engaging with Broader Stakeholders*

Next, it is necessary to engage broader stakeholders. These stakeholders must include a range of educators (scholars and practitioners), economists, policymakers, and it must truly be from a global perspective. The higher education community certainly has a leadership role to play in engaging these stakeholders, given education is so critical in a globalized world. There must be partnerships both intra- and inter- community. By this, I mean partnerships and action plans must be defined within the Black community and developed and shared among global communities. Certainly, there are recognized cultural and language barriers
between Black populations. Even so, the challenges of education participation, poverty, and unemployment of Black populations are similar across groups and countries. Consequently, as a first step, discussing and determining common plans and goals must occur between and across groups as a critical first step.

Given that it is rare that Black populations have come together to discuss the commonalities and possible solutions to common problems, such as the educational dilemma facing Blacks globally, defining steps to address such an ingrained problem is important before suggesting to groups outside of the culture how they can form beneficial partnerships. It is imperative to address questions such as the following: What should be the first steps? How can Black populations from different cultures share common solutions, while maintaining their identity? How should other communities be engaged? Can and/or should similar patterns be formed and be productive across cultures?

A range of different voices and institutions must be included in these new stakeholder relationships. For example, what role should Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and predominately-Black higher education institutions in other countries play with respect to building intra- and inter-community relationships?

It is after these intra-community discussions that higher education engagement can be most effective. Otherwise, the higher education community will be following old models and paradigms in determining what is best for different populations without their input or voices. Understanding how these communities unfold for the betterment of all is a highly necessary step and can determine the most appropriate higher education community engagement strategies.

Redefining What the Current Higher Education Participation Policies and Practices Should Be in a Globalized, Mobile World

Redefining what the current education participation policies and practices should be in a globalized, mobilized world must be addressed. How should higher education participation be increased, truly utilizing multiple stakeholder voices? At present, there continues to be a void in Black voices being included in the development of solutions regarding their education participation. Are Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) the answer to higher participation and quality participation for inclusion? What should be the distribution of higher education participation across various sectors? What should be new and different linkages between higher education and the world of work that truly value multiple stakeholders? What is the real value of study abroad and why has it stayed stagnant across groups? How could documentation through research and practice be better applied to recruit, retain, and graduate more students from diverse ethnic backgrounds?

These are just some of the questions that need to be addressed to value and appreciate broader participation in higher education in a globalized, mobilized model, and to ensure authentic higher education engagement.
K. FREEMAN

Developing/Defining New/Different Paradigms

Finally, what higher education researchers, scholars, and practitioners will agree is that the current education models are not working for all, particularly for Black populations, across the Diaspora. There has to be that acknowledgement. No policies can or will be effective without allowing the affected individuals’ voices in their own solutions.

Higher education must move away from the old divide and conquer mindset and model to a unified and equal voices partnership. This must be a true community engagement and groups like higher education institutions and associations must be the catalyst. After all, it is through engagement that partnerships and coalitions can be developed that can help increase resources and influence systems to increase higher education participation for all.
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