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Social Embeddedness Steering Committee

A 35-person steering committee was established in September 2005. This committee’s work was intended to be focused over a nine month period. A subcommittee met monthly and the full committee met twice between September 2005 and May 2006.

Mission

To advise and inform the social embeddedness agenda and implementation for ASU’s campuses and university-wide, and to establish connections and support with faculty and staff across all campuses that encourage and support true partnerships with community through:

• teaching and learning about and with community input and content;
• guidance and collaboration in capacity building to increase the sustainability of communities and community organizations;
• support of mutually beneficial community development and economic investment;
• research and evaluation that enhances partnerships and dialogue – encouraging sustainability and the transformation of both university and community

Committee Responsibilities

• Provide input and advice into the plan for strategic implementation (of the social embeddedness initiative, as defined through consensus at the series of steering committee meetings) at all levels of the University – staff, faculty, administration, students
• Consider potential enhancements to curriculum (teaching and learning) – university-wide, college-/school-wide
• Determine key input from community required to inform university direction with respect to community capacity building
• Establish university-wide (and if necessary, campus-specific) guidelines and standards for economic and community development partnerships (investment)
• Build understanding of appropriate community-based research and learning
• Recommend appropriate reward structure (recognition, promotion, etc.)
• Determine best process for securing support (and participation) from the broadest possible cross section of faculty to consider and incorporate, wherever possible, the tenets of social embeddedness as defined by ASU
• Organize/facilitate appropriate outreach discussions within departments and across disciplines to guarantee broad understanding of the definition of social embeddedness (encouraging cross-disciplinary work, beyond current individual projects, centers, programs, etc.)
• Assess potential for campus-wide “launch”
• Recommend parameters for ASU internal structure to ensure effective implementation and long term sustainability
• Evaluate need for “name” of effort and/or branding for short and/or long term viability
• Leadership role in implementation of the plan, as developed over the course of the coming nine months.
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Interview Process

From September 2004 through November 2005, one-on-one, in-person interviews were conducted with more than 200 internal and external stakeholders (see appendix for demographic distribution of interviewees), including faculty, administration, and staff at ASU, community leaders, nonprofit executive directors, funders, elected officials (state, county, city), business, civic, and ethnic leaders, and others. Most interviews lasted between 60 and 90 minutes, with some taking as long as three hours. Nearly all interviews were taped and transcribed. The format for the interviews was informal, at the homes or offices of the interviewee, with a few taking place at restaurants or public places. All interviewees were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality.
Interviewees: Demographic Analysis

Total Interviews

- Govt (non-elected): 4%
- Govt (elected): 9%
- ASU Administration: 23%
- ASU Deans: 11%
- ASU Faculty: 17%
- ASU Center Directors & Staff: 5%
- Foundations: 4%
- Nonprofits/Community: 15%
- Business & Labor: 11%
- Educators: 1%

Interviews: Internal vs. External

- Internal: 56%
- External: 44%
Interviews: Internal

- ASU Administration: 40%
- ASU Deans: 20%
- ASU Faculty: 30%
- ASU Center Directors & Staff: 10%

Interviews: External

- Business & Labor: 25%
- Nonprofits/Community: 34%
- Educators: 3%
- Foundations: 9%
- Govt (elected): 20%
- Govt (non-elected): 9%
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Social Embeddedness: Working Definitions

In August 2004, as part of a presentation to the President of Arizona State University, Fern Tiger Associates developed a set of three working definitions – each of which could be considered a way to explain how universities engage with communities.

Pros:
- Easy to implement
- Those individuals already “doing the work” will feel acknowledged
- ASU faculty and staff, as well as the community, are accustomed to this type of relationship
- No extra burden of implementation
- Opportunity to capture the breadth of what is being done in the community; document it, highlight it, and share broadly
- Opportunity to better understand the needs of the community

Cons
- Tied to specific faculty, staff, and students
- May not be strategically conceived
- No cumulative impact
- No way of knowing if real/changing community needs are being addressed
- Limited capacity-building to strengthen the community
- Does not link to changes in ASU’s perception of itself or community’s changing perception of itself
- No new visibility outside of the region
Working in close partnership, ASU and the community share knowledge, resources, and experiences to attract and nourish students, faculty, and residents, while actively engaging them in the greater social good of creating Phoenix’s civil society.

Pro:  
• Shows the university as a collaborator  
• University participants can learn a great deal through the process  
• University would have strong understanding of community needs  
• University would be more engaged than it has been previously  
• Some degree of community capacity-building  
• Stronger university and community interaction and feedback  
• Community would feel more engaged with the university  
• May be interim step towards ongoing social embeddedness

Cons  
• May set up community expectations that cannot be met  
• May not meet changing, dynamic needs of the community
Empowered by and through ASU engagement, the community strengthens its own capacity and resources while challenging ASU toward continual openness, innovation, and responsiveness in an ongoing, dynamic cycle of change.

**Pros:**
- True model of the university being challenged in new ways by the community
- Sense of ownership of ASU by the community
- Could turn ASU skeptics into supporters
- Organic process may lead to more sustainability
- Community may view as a refreshing new approach
- Will see visible changes in the university and the community in terms of increased trust and reciprocity
- Opportunities for visibility (PR value); may lead to new partnerships, funding, new support
- University could become as dynamic as the community
- Potential for constant redefinition of the University

**Cons**
- Difficult to control and manage
- University is exposed to risk; pressures from the community to do things beyond the University's agenda
- Challenges traditional partnerships; requires real flexibility
- Potential for constant redefinition of the University
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Lessons Learned from University/Community Visits

Potential barriers to effective, lasting engagement

- Interviews conducted with representatives of diverse institutions reveal conflicting views of the effectiveness of creating a separate “center” focused on community issues and community-based research. There is a compelling argument that the creation of such a center essentially lets the rest of the university “off the hook,” as in, “Community engagement is being taken care of over there, so we don’t have to bother about it.”

- Campus communities with a history of volunteering and “good works” may take some time and indoctrination to learn how to move beyond “service” to a genuine two-way, mutually beneficial relationship with the surrounding community. There is a corollary temptation to allow the interest of the university to dominate, or to “serve” the community in ways that are essentially paternalistic or imperialistic. A collaborative planning process in which community voices are on a par with the university should be helpful in combating this tendency, although this can be difficult for an institution which is not as “process-oriented” as community groups.

- Non-coordinated, independent engagement initiatives or research projects by different faculty in different departments and colleges may duplicate efforts and create confusion or even distrust in the community. However, coordination – even creating a comprehensive data base or clearing house – is complicated, difficult, and requires ongoing attention and support and related resources.

- Faculty buy-in is critical and essential to any broad-based engagement, especially if it is to involve the most valuable resource of the university – research and new ways to think about teaching young people who will ultimately play leadership roles in communities. In different universities, in different cities, with different degrees of faculty participation both in university governance and in local civic affairs, different strategies for obtaining faculty support will be more or less effective. But in all cases where faculty participation is high and supported beyond the initial attention of the president, faculty were engaged early on and in some unique ways. (e.g. Portland State University).

- Faculty and universities that are lionized and rewarded for their work on international/global issues may see themselves as resources for “larger” dimensions than the local scene.

- Faculty may be less likely to support and participate in community engagement initiatives if the initiatives are driven by the administration without evidence of strong ties to teaching and research. Such administration-driven programs are often seen as “fluff,” lacking the rigor of academically involved projects and programs. Involvement of deans and academic department heads in planning, implementation, and evaluation is essential.

1 In 2005, Fern Tiger Associates visited the campuses of 15 colleges and universities whose efforts at engaging with communities were noted in literature and by peers as exemplary. For additional information related to these visits, see Embedding Arizona State University, Fern Tiger Associates, July 2005.
• Unless tenure criteria specifically include engagement or community-based research, younger, non-tenured faculty may be difficult to recruit for community partnerships, as engagement is often seen as antithetical to substantive research. Similarly, successfully involved departments need to work with professional organizations to increase the visibility of engagement as a powerful research and teaching model.

• Universities need to understand the high risks involved with commitment to community. Universities often use soft money to create programs on which communities rely. When the funding is reduced or eliminated, the university is faced with few options, but community expectations have already been raised and the “bad guy” is the one who pulled the plug, not the one who cut the budget.

• Understanding the complexities and dynamic nature of communities is a truly interdisciplinary undertaking. Many research universities have long standing biases against cross-disciplinary work, as they encourage faculty to attain prominence in a particular discipline.

• Universities have done little to produce the knowledge base or the people with the skills needed to help communities and nonprofits. Very few community leaders would point to their university education as being the basis for their understanding of and desire to participate with communities.

• While the inclusion of community foci can be handled by many faculty, not all faculty members are temperamentally suited for community-involved work or research. Individuals who appear arrogant and “unknowledgeable” despite possessing key information and knowledge about the community in question might do best performing background research.

• Communities generally perceive the university as capable of getting whatever it wants from the city, the state, etc. They do not see the university as vulnerable – which is how they see themselves.

**Successful Strategies**

• Early recognition and intentionality about a new mandate for cultural change may be helpful in managing the slow, evolutionary nature of a “campaign” to institute such a change. (Kellogg research indicates a minimum of eight years.)

• Consistent, vocal support from the president or chancellor is essential. This means a focus at events such as new faculty orientations, graduation ceremonies, events for incoming students, and presentations in the community as well as on campus. However, it is important to ensure that there is widespread buy-in, understanding, and support so that the “words” translate to commitment and to operation. It is important to note that change of personnel at the top is the most often cited reason why a successful and potentially sustainable initiative begins to slip. Building in sustainability that is not personality-dependent is one of the great challenges.
• Expressions of the university’s interest in, support of, and intentional direction toward involvement should be evidenced on the university’s web site and should be part of the mission of the university at the highest level of recognition (not buried on the third page). Similarly, the university’s own strategic plan should have goals set for engagement – university-wide, and by department.

• While university visits did not reveal real strategic planning for a long-term future, such planning (possibly even in conjunction with the community) would go a long way to anticipate the future, availability of resources, etc.

• Identifying faculty who are already involved in community-based research or service learning, and including them in early planning and oversight – especially if they are well-respected academic leaders – as well as asking them to champion engagement with their peers, can give the new initiative an important boost with the rest of the faculty.

• Over time, a university that has established and made broadly public an institution-wide ethos of community engagement will attract new faculty who are predisposed to community-based teaching and research and a student body interested in becoming informed leaders. At that point, the university has been transformed and no longer needs to “sell” its new ethos.

• Community-based learning programs (a.k.a. “service learning”) that are sequential, that include linked series of courses related to the theory and practice of community engagement, or that build on previous work should be developed and made attractive to students, faculty, and community partners.

• True partnership with the community requires a deep understanding of the local CBO/NGO environment, local resources for neighborhood-based activist/advocacy groups, and local government structures that often include bonafide neighborhood-level entities (Seattle, Minneapolis, Atlanta, Oakland.)

• Universities can support community engagement efforts by waiving overhead fees for grants obtained by faculty, programs, or departments to support work with community partners.

Specific Examples of Successful Strategies

• Georgia State University’s RFP process for Freshman Learning Centers (multi-disciplinary clusters of academic courses focused on local topics—“Atlanta-based Learning”)

• Georgia Institute of Technology’s commitment to its adjacent community (as evidenced in its master plan and strategic plan) that it will not encroach on the neighborhood, despite its aggressive land banking and growth plans

• Strong recognition at University of Maryland, Baltimore County, of differences between experiential learning, internships, volunteerism, and the development of a graduate program designed to encourage and prepare participants for leadership positions in communities and governments
• University of California, Berkeley’s willingness to take risks, to invest substantial funds, and to bring together the very top university officials, electeds, and corporate leaders

• University of Illinois, Chicago - Great City Initiative’s branding, presence on the campus website, and commitment to community in mission statement

• Trinity College’s intensely engaged service learning program and massive financial commitment to revitalization and to the development of The Learning Corridor

• University of Southern California’s definition of ‘neighborhood’ as a tightly defined area surrounding the campus, showcasing evidence of results

• Occidental’s patience

• University of California, Los Angeles’ focused relationship with small nonprofits across the city, and its private funding

• University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee’s engagement process that kicked off The Milwaukee Idea’s ten initiatives; the president’s pledge of financial support; pulling together existing programs under a single banner

• University of Minnesota’s Council on Public Engagement, its reward system, and establishment of college liaisons to spread the message

• Portland State University’s faculty-driven process to integrate engagement and city-focused research

**Hallmarks of Sustainability**

• Public commitment and involvement of top administration leadership (the president, chancellor, or strong provost) is critical for a university-wide community engagement ethic to take hold.

• A multi-level strategy, including economic development activities, community-based research, and community-related coursework, is essential for sustainability.

• The best community research programs are truly interdisciplinary – which benefits students as well as community partners.

• Initiatives that target specific, community-identified problem areas for work and study – rather than simply funding random proposals from faculty or the community – offer greater opportunities for grant funding, longevity of projects, and significant problem solving in the community.

• Evaluation strategies that are realistic and tailored to prescribed definitions of success, the conditions in the community, and the duration of the project will be more effective than numerical tallies or benchmarking. “You can have systematic evidence of a non-quantitative nature if it is gathered from all your units, including comparable information. It’s a powerful kind of evidence. It may be more powerful than the quantitative data.”
Specific Examples of Sustainability

- Georgia State University’s course “credit” accounting/allocation system (rewarding departments whose faculty participate in Freshman Learning Centers) and the evolutionary development of Freshman Learning Centers and Atlanta-Based Learning
- University of Maryland’s endowed Shriver Center
- University of Illinois’ permanent funding through the state legislature.
- University of Southern California’s Civic and Community Relations
- Cultures and Communities Program at University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
- University of Pennsylvania’s Center for Community Partnerships
- Portland State University’s capacity to integrate the community agenda into coursework, programs, and administrative decisionmaking without any apparent need for a “leader” to guide sustainability

Recommended Practices for Successful Partnership

- Make sure a critical mass of faculty – and if appropriate the faculty senate – are on board before announcing the initiative to the public.
- Clearly define, through a joint, collaborative university-community planning process, what community engagement and “partnership” mean to both the university and the community.
- Design a mission/vision statement for the university that respects and incorporates the community’s agenda.
- Create a cohesive program agenda linked to local needs identified and articulated by the community. For example, focus on housing, education, health.
- Extend the university’s core educational mission into the community, by jointly developing relevant courses and opening them to neighborhood residents as well as community leaders.
- Get people accustomed to understanding what the university’s intentions are and to the terminology being used, and to the reality that this is a long term commitment.
- Determine the most appropriate structure for engagement within the university, such that it will integrate as broadly as possible, have credibility for academic units, and have the greatest chance for long term sustainability.
- Seek a permanent funding stream or a small endowment to ensure long term sustainability.
- Participate in the national dialogue about engagement and consider hosting inter- and intra-university discussions on best practices.
• Design an ongoing assessment/evaluation mechanism to monitor efforts and inform practice.

• While leadership is required from the top of the university to guide – but not dictate – the tone, vision, culture, and implementation of community engagement programs, support from other top power-brokers (e.g. regents, business leaders, elected officials) is also critical.

**Additional Points to Consider**

• The university’s website can make finding information about the community and about its engagement practices and programs easy to find. The university can also create links to neighborhood- and community-based organizations’ home pages.

• It is important that the university’s strategic plan carefully supports community engagement as both an academic and institutional transformation component.

• A mechanism for individuals throughout the university to exchange information and collaborate across departments is helpful. That may mean centralizing activities through one office.

**Observations**

• Interest by universities in being embedded in communities seems to have grown in recent years; some believe this is a result of the age of those in power who reflect on their experiences in the 60s and 70s.

• Campus/community partnerships are discussed in a range of literature that incorporates a variety of terms: civic engagement, outreach(programs), community engagement, civic responsibility in higher education, and “the engaged campus.” Programmatically, these partnerships include or straddle teaching, research, and service.

• Community engagement strategies include: student and faculty volunteering, academic centers and university affiliated centers, service learning courses, and capstone courses.

• Universities frequently intermingle diverse community engagement concepts - community planning processes (related to zoning, land use, permitting), service learning course work, student volunteer activities, activities open to the public (e.g., sports), advocacy/ government relations, public relations, job recruitment, and charity work - to the detriment of creating a strategic practice of engagement that encourages the transformation of both the university and the community.

• Most universities tend to lack a focused mission and purpose for approaching the community.

• Universities that have an institution-wide ethos to support and encourage community engagement attract more (and generally more meaningful) faculty involvement.
• It is difficult for individual faculty members or departments to start and/or maintain community engagement activities without broader university support and encouragement (this includes a culture that encourages engagement as well as monetary support).

• The university has many “communities” to engage with - city departments, businesses, neighborhood associations, etc. Each constituency has different needs and often view success differently.

• Community engagement is often used as a vehicle to accomplish other institutional goals.

• In most instances of campus/community partnerships, the campus dominates. Universities often approach communities with a paternalistic or superior attitude which community members resent.

• Many university efforts are sporadic, creating the perception that students or faculty gain more than community members do.

• The greatest criticism of university community partnerships is that they tend to be short-lived (due to resource challenges, changes in administration, lack of being truly incorporated into the long term goals of the university), marginalized (because of where they are administered), and that they lack legitimacy.

• Superficial programs and what is perceived by the community as “public relations stunts” do not constitute genuine community engagement and are spurned by community leaders.

• Student service-learning programs can transform university teaching and should play an important part in community engagement.

• While some universities stress the importance of maintaining an entrepreneurial spirit so that individual faculty members can become passionate and pursue their ideas for community engagement, such individually-driven efforts often evaporate when key faculty members retire, go on sabbatical, or otherwise “shift” to other interests.

• Programs are often most successful when faculty actually live in the communities where the interchange is occurring.

• Independent efforts often duplicate and/or contradict one another, creating the perception that the university is disorganized. Also, individual projects are often not holistic or brought together to create larger scale change. It appears to be rare, among universities studied, to have a coordinated and strategic approach.

• Engagement efforts can run into community turf issues. Some interviewees felt that this means the university has been effective and stress the need to work harder at that point to build lasting partnerships or to recognize that the community might now be mature enough and have increased its capacity to the point that it does not rely on the university for “expertise” or “direction” but rather as a “colleague.”

“What you have to do is put the resources of the university to work in reciprocal partnership with the community and you need to have a sense of expectations and benefits which would hopefully lead to the transformation of the community and also to changes at the university.”

-External
Interdisciplinary efforts usually fit very well within professional graduate schools (e.g. business, planning, engineering, law, nursing, social work, etc.), but are less effective or relevant in the humanities and sciences, especially at the undergraduate level.

Some departments, such as planning, are more easily equipped to engage with community groups. They need less encouragement (but not less support).

A few universities have established separate and independently governed organizations and partnerships in order to exhibit values of equity, to bypass overhead costs, to pursue outside funding, etc. The creation of a legitimate, academically-based coordinating entity ensures focus, consistency, and coordination.

Most private foundations do not believe they have seen university/community partnerships that legitimately engage the interests of community residents.

University administrations are pushing community engagement activities - all over the country they are encouraging faculty. Some are creating new incentive systems and changing tenure rules.

Younger, non-tenured faculty are less likely to participate in community efforts for fear that these activities are not considered appropriate when seeking tenure.

Some universities have succeeded in persuading the state legislature to set aside state budget funds specifically dedicated to university-community partnerships. Universities have been successful with legislatures and other elected officials by pitching the institution as an economic driver.

Most universities develop and actively promote a brand name for their strategic partnership or program with the community. (Note: this branding could undermine a broader and more transparent social embeddedness, recreating the more typical project-driven – rather than all-encompassing – vision of the university’s role in the community.

One of the disincentives for faculty, departments, staff, etc. to become effectively engaged with community efforts is the overhead costs taken by the university for independently acquired grants.

In general, there is a lack of consistency in the messages and information in the community about the amount and kinds of engagement a university is involved in. Community residents often only know the one program that they attended or heard about and describe the university’s involvement through a single interaction.

Universities can be both involved with community organizations/ offer services and be perceived as a “bad neighbor” (especially on issues related to capital/land use disputes etc.), indicating to some that the two entities (community and university) do not share similar goals, even if they work well together to accomplish isolated and distinct objectives.
Organizations that Support University-Community Engagement
**Organizations that Support Engagement**

**Campus Compact**

Founded in 1985 by the presidents of Brown, Georgetown, and Stanford universities, Campus Compact is now a national coalition of more than 1,000 college and university presidents – representing five million students. The association challenges higher education institutions to make civic and community engagement an institutional priority – advancing the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility. Campus Compact is the only national higher education association dedicated solely to campus-based civic engagement. It promotes public and community service that develops students’ citizenship skills, helps campuses forge community partnerships, and provides resources and training for faculty seeking to integrate civic and community-based learning into the curriculum.

Campus Compact sponsors workshops and conferences (Education Leadership Colloquium on the Civic Mission of Education, Network for Academic Renewal, The Civic Engagement Imperative: Student Learning and the Public Good, etc.).

**Committee on Institutional Cooperation**

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), established in 1958, is a consortium of 12 major teaching and research universities in the Midwest. Its programs and activities extend to all aspects of university activity except intercollegiate athletics. The CIC headquarters at the University of Illinois, Urbana, is supported through member university dues. A number of committees meet to discuss collaboration across campuses. The Committee on Engagement explores topics such as: defining engagement, bench-marking activities across CIC, sharing best practices, reinforcing institutional commitment to engagement strategies, and identifying structures for coordinating and directing activities.

**The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH)**

CCPH is a national and international nonprofit organization founded in 1996 to promote health through partnerships “between communities and educational institutions that build on each other’s strengths and develop their roles as change agents for improving health professions education, civic responsibility and the overall health of communities.” Its goals are achieved through service-learning, community-based participatory research, broad-based coalitions and other partnership strategies. CCPH promotes the idea that these partnerships are powerful tools for improving health professional education, civic engagement, and the overall health of communities.
Great Cities’ Universities Coalition (formerly The Urban 13)

Incorporated in 1998, the Great Cities’ Universities (GCU) Coalition is the successor organization to an informal association of urban universities known as “The Urban 13.” Established in the late 1970s, the Urban 13 served as the organizational structure through which a group of like-minded urban university presidents worked collaboratively to advance the interests of their institutions across a range of public policy areas. The Urban 13 presidents comprised one of the nation’s first leadership groups to advocate for the concerns of public urban universities and their cities.

Today GCU is a coalition of nineteen public research universities located in major American cities across the country. Together they serve a collective student body of some 340,000 full- and part-time undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. GCU is committed to strengthening both its institutions and its communities through strategic alliances and public-private partnerships that have maximum local impact.

GCU is poised to be the catalyst and driver of public-private partnerships for innovation in areas like urban education, criminal justice and crime abatement, skilled workforce initiatives, digital government, urban transportation, and the biomedical and health care delivery professions. To date, GCU has raised more than seven million dollars to strengthen its communities and make a difference in the lives of residents.

GCU believes that one key to revitalizing urban America is to harness the knowledge and intelligence resources of public urban universities and direct them toward solving contemporary problems. Universities need incentives to address the applied research and education issues of urban revitalization. This will not happen without a focused strategy, along with a coordinated action plan implemented by knowledgeable and committed leaders.

The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities

A consortium of seventy-seven universities, operating out of the Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities brings together schools that share the mission of striving for national excellence while contributing to the economic development, social health, and cultural vitality of their urban or metropolitan centers.

The founding members shaped the Coalition as an association that would focus on sharing information about their institutions and enhance both internal planning and external understanding. The group initiated an academic journal for university-community engagement research, Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum. This journal continues to serve as a unique venue for exploring the characteristics and experiences of urban and metropolitan universities. They also sponsored occasional national conferences, and engaged in funding direct research on its institutions. Its primary goal continues to be the enhancement of internal and external understanding of the metropolitan mission.
The Association for Community and Higher Education Partnerships

ACHEP is a young and small, but potentially growing, national membership organization. It supports university partnerships with economically distressed communities. Based at the University of Memphis, it promotes the exchange of information, advocates for resources, and promotes institutional change within schools as well as government and community organizations.

The association was created at the 1999 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) Conference, when a group of attendees met and decided to pursue collaborative efforts. Working with COPC partner universities, ACHEP has begun to support advocacy and public policy efforts.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal arts education. Its members are committed to extending the advantage of a liberal education to all students, regardless of their academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915 by college presidents, AAC&U now represents the entire spectrum of American colleges and universities—large and small, public and private, two-year and four-year. AAC&U includes more than 1,000 accredited colleges and universities with more than five million students.

Through its publications, meetings, public advocacy, and campus-based projects, AAC&U organizes its work around four broad goals:
1. Preparing all students for an era of greater expectations
2. Educating students for a world lived in common
3. Making excellence inclusive
4. Taking responsibility for the quality of every student’s education

AAC&U works to advance both the individual benefits of a college education and the ways that higher education serves the public good. Its vision of liberal learning includes a strong focus on developing students’ civic capacities, sense of social responsibility, and commitment to public action. AAC&U initiatives help campuses develop avenues through which students learn about the promise and reality of American democracy and develop a commitment to participating in building more just and equitable communities in the U.S. and throughout the global community. AAC&U projects and publications help campuses develop courses and programs that enable students to gain knowledge, but also to learn how to use knowledge ethically in the service of the public good. AAC&U works in partnership with a set of higher education associations to gather and disseminate resources related to higher education and civic engagement. It is also currently collaborating with Campus Compact in the development of a Center for the Liberal Arts and Civic Engagement.
The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

The National Forum is a non-profit organization that encourages community engagement activities and sponsors a number of conferences. Its mission is to “significantly increase awareness, understanding, commitment, and action relative to the public service role of higher education in the United States.”

Formed in 2000 with a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, The National Forum collaborates with organizations, institutions, researchers, and policy makers to make higher education a leading force in American society. It aims to sponsor activities in three broad categories: Leadership Dialogues that foster national conversations with higher education leaders; Connecting Research and Practice programs to help create partnerships between public service scholarship organizations and professional associations; and Public Policy & Public Stewardship activities that advocate for new ways for colleges and universities to act on their missions.

Among the many projects The National Forum sponsors, perhaps the most well-known is the Wingspread Conference Series hosted with the Johnson Foundation. This is a series of three annual conferences (2003-2005) held at the Wingspread Conference Center in Wisconsin.
National Forums

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions and the Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative

The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH) is taking a leadership role in promoting more community engagement in the area of health and health care. In 2003 the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship was created to spur a more supportive culture and reward system for health professional faculty involved in community-based participatory research, service-learning and other forms of community-engaged scholarship. In 2005, they released a national strategy. In 2004, CCPH was awarded a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) to lead a collaborative of ten schools in initiatives to significantly change faculty review, promotion, and tenure policies.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities

The Commission was supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. It issued six reports over three years, the last in 2000, to lay the groundwork for a “renewed covenant” between land-grant universities and the publics they serve. In addition, the reports outlined thirty major recommendations for universities to implement including increasing access and engagement. These documents were signed/endorsed by twenty-four current university presidents and chancellors, including the President of ASU.

The Kellogg Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

Supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and affiliated with the Center for the Study of Higher and Post-Secondary Education at the University of Michigan’s School of Education. This forum sponsors conferences such as the National Leadership Dialogue Series.

National Outreach Scholarship Conference 2005

Since 2001 this annual three-day meeting, sponsored by the University of Georgia, Ohio State, Penn State, and the University of Wisconsin-Extension, has provided an opportunity to explore ways that universities are achieving tangible, positive impacts for local communities and society at large. The conference’s two premises are that university outreach can change society, and that outreach can also change the university. In 2003 more than 400 people participated, representing sixty-eight universities and colleges from thirty-three states.
Pew Higher Education Roundtable

The Pew Higher Education Roundtable began in 1986 with funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts to foster an informed national dialogue on the challenges facing higher education. The Institute for Research on Higher Education at the University of Pennsylvania was in charge of the program, which brought together some two dozen leaders of colleges and universities from around the country to discuss the challenges they saw confronting higher education institutions. This original roundtable group identified three basic issues: the cost of higher education; quality teaching and learning; and access. In 1988, the Roundtable began publication of Policy Perspectives as a means of extending this dialogue to higher education administrators, trustees, faculty, and those who help to shape higher education policy at both the federal and state levels.

The Pew Roundtable has now facilitated more than 130 campus roundtables at research universities, comprehensive institutions, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges throughout the United States. A campus roundtable brings together about two dozen members of a campus community — faculty, administration, students, and trustees — for two separate day-long discussions of the institution, the issues and challenges it confronts, and the possibilities that exist for fulfilling its missions more effectively.

University-Community Partnership Conference

Beginning in 2004, the Virginia Institute of Technology’s Service Learning Center has hosted an annual three-day conference for educators, administrators, and community leaders to explore how universities and communities can build partnerships and work together to affect positive social change. The conference offers a combination of practical and interactive workshops, case studies, and researched presentations that provide participants a learning opportunity to launch their own partnership efforts and to examine critical issues and challenges that are foundational to partnership development and sustainability. The inaugural conference attracted eighty university faculty, administrators, and community leaders from Virginia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.

University-Community Research Partnerships Conference (CUexpo2005)

Organized by the Winnipeg Inner City Research Alliance (WIRA) and community partners, CUexpo2005 seeks to strengthen the understanding of, and support for, the unique and diverse nature of action-oriented research involving innovative collaboration between university and community partners.
Wingspread Conference

The Johnson Foundation co-sponsors Wingspread conferences at their facilities in Racine, Wisconsin with nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, and government agencies. Wingspread conferences are by invitation only. Participants are selected and invited by the co-sponsoring organization.

Among the many conferences that take place at Wingspread, leaders from various colleges and universities, who are committed to university-community engagement, assemble at the Wingspread Conference Center to discuss strategies, best practices, and progress. In 1999 a conference coordinated by the University of Michigan Center for Community Service Learning with sponsorship by nine other higher education-focused organizations and foundations produced the Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University. In 2003 Campus Compact and the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good, with generous support from the Ford Foundation and the Johnson Foundation, convened a group of forty nonprofit and higher education professionals to discuss the current and future state of community-campus partnerships. In addition, the participants helped identify resources that could help nonprofit organizations develop and deepen collaborative projects with higher education partners.
Funding
Funding

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

The Carnegie name is attached to a number of organizations. The Carnegie Corporation of New York is the main grantmaking body, awarding funds in the areas of education, international peace and security, international development, and strengthening U.S. democracy. In the area of education they concentrate on literacy, urban school reform, and teacher education reform. In the area of strengthening democracy, the focus is on civic education for youth and immigrant issues. The Corporation continues to consider support for evaluation/research of school-based civic learning (includes service learning), and other systems-level change. They do not, however, consider grants for individual programs, only for projects or organizations that have the potential for widespread national or international impact. They do not cite community-university engagement as a funded strategy.

The Carnegie Foundation, on the other hand, is based in Stanford, California. It is a beneficiary of corporation grants and has an endowment. As a private operating foundation it does not itself make grants. The Carnegie Foundation is a policy center that conducts studies, publishes reports, and convenes individuals in the field of education.

To this end, they have worked since 1973 to develop (and continuously revise) the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, a tool that describes the diversity of higher education largely based on degree-granting. The 2005 revision will create a more flexible system that will allow users to cross-reference institutions by additional specific characteristics, and use a new web-based interface to customize classifications. As part of this overall revision process, Carnegie is developing a voluntary classification for Community Engagement – universities and colleges will elect to be included in the classification “universe.” A set of indicators is currently being developed to create a framework. Thirteen universities are participating in the pilot, reviewing proposed documentation processes and definitions.

Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC), U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

In 1994, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) launched the Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) program, out of the Office of University Partnerships (OUP). The purpose was to foster and support community development collaborations between universities and their surrounding neighborhoods and cities.

Through COPC, HUD provides two types of grants to two- and four-year institutions of higher education located in urban areas and engaged with community. “First Time” grants are 3-year grants of up to $400,000 awarded to those who have never before received a COPC.
“New Directions” grants are available to previous COPC grantees who demonstrate that they are implementing new eligible activities in a current COPC neighborhood, or the same or new activities in a new neighborhood. These are two-year grants of up to $200,000.

Promoted activities involve housing, economic development, neighborhood revitalization, health care, job training, education, crime prevention, environment, and community organizing. Applications should address three or more urban problems, with one distinct activity applied to each separate problem. COPC does not support non-applied research, capital expenses, or administrative costs above 20 percent of the total grant. In addition, they require a match, a community advisory committee, dissemination of practices, and outreach/technical assistance services equal to 75 percent of total project costs. A school cannot apply for more than one COPC at a time.

**Ford Foundation**

Ford is a national and international foundation, focusing on strengthening democratic values, reducing poverty and injustice, promoting international cooperation, and advancing human achievement. Within these broad ideals, Ford is structured into three program areas: Asset Building and Community Development; Peace and Social Justice; and Knowledge, Creativity and Freedom. None of these areas cite community-university engagement, specifically, as a funded strategy. The first program area is the most likely to support a community-university partnership grant, through the Community and Resource Development program. Ford looks for projects with wide impact and strong collaborations between the nonprofit, government, and business sectors. They do not support routine operating costs or capital.

**Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education**

Established through the Education Amendments Act of 1972, the U.S. Department of Education administers FIPSE and its primary responsive grant making program – the Comprehensive Program. Each year, the Comprehensive Program awards approximately 50-80 grants (for up to three years) with an average grant size of between $150,000 to $600,000 over three years.

Applications must reflect a significant and innovative idea with the potential of developing into a national model. The funding stream favors implementation and dissemination grants for highly ambitious plans, rather than research. An ideal FIPSE project, while based on current research, creates new knowledge and practices. This requires a strong evaluation component.

Congress did not appropriate new funds for the Comprehensive Program in FY 2005, though it did provide money to support ongoing grants. The Bush Administration’s FY 2006 budget restores funding, though it is possible that FIPSE will again be stripped.
Community-University Partnerships, W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Kellogg is a national and international foundation, primarily funding in the areas of: Health; Food Systems and Rural Development; Youth and Education; Philanthropy and Volunteerism; Greater Battle Creek; Cross-Programming Work in Devolution; Southern Africa; and Latin America and the Caribbean.

Through focus areas, Kellogg has sought innovative ways to stimulate systems change. They supported the Community-University Partnerships initiative (which ended in 1998), a ten-grant, three-year initiative that promoted family and community development practices. Strategies included capacity building, asset mapping, community organizing and empowerment, and utilizing multi-cultural and cross-cultural perspectives. Kellogg also sponsored conferences; scholarship on topics such as service learning; and the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Colleges. The Commission published a series of influential documents that championed community engagement.

Kellogg continues to fund programs that utilize community engagement strategies, such as Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Through their Youth and Education area they support partnerships between post-secondary educational institutions and communities to promote learning, academic performance, and workforce preparation among vulnerable youth.

Learn and Serve Grants
Corporation for National and Community Service

The Corporation for National and Community Service houses many initiatives promoting volunteering and community service, such as AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and Learn and Serve America (LSA). LSA specifically supports service-learning programs in schools, colleges, and non-profit organizations through grants. These grants require a community match. Currently several K-12 schools in Maricopa County receive LSA support.

For universities and colleges, two funding streams exist. A single university can apply for funding for service-learning program(s) – these grants average between $150,000 - $200,000 each year, for up to three years. A second type of funding is available when a consortium of universities and organizations, often from multiple states, approaches LSA – these consortium grants are up to $400,000 each year, for up to three years. One university acts as the grantee and contracts with, or re-grants funds to, members of the consortium.

The Maricopa County Community College District is a current grantee, heading the Supporting Actions for Engagement (SAFE) consortium. While they reserved part of the grant for themselves, they are re-granting to a number of institutions, one as far away as Florida. Mesa Community College and Arizona State University (for the Jumpstart Tempe program) are also recent, individual institution, LSA grant recipients.
The Rockefeller Foundation

Rockefeller is a national and international foundation committed to five program areas: Health Equity, Food Security, Working Communities, Creativity & Culture, and Global Inclusion. None of these areas cite community-university engagement, specifically, as a funded strategy. Of these five, Working Communities provides the best opportunity for community-university partnership funding due to the emphasis on fostering economic stability, ensuring adequate financing for public education, and encouraging affordable housing. They do not support individuals, endowments, or capital campaigns.

The Pew Charitable Trusts

The Trusts have three main areas of work: Informing the Public, Advancing Policy Solutions, and Supporting Civic Life. Though grant sizes vary over the three areas, the median grant size is $300,000. Pew often provides grants to universities for their research and projects in the specific areas outlined by the foundation. None of these three clusters, however, specifically identify university-community engagement as a funded strategy.

Two programs that surfaced during research, the Pew Partnership for Civic Change and the Pew Higher Education Roundtables, were supported through the Venture Fund, a funding stream that allows Pew to pursue opportunities outside of their clearly defined program areas. While there is no restriction on what can be funded, projects tend to address emerging issues and new solutions to older problems – innovation and timeliness are key criteria. Most of these projects are developed internally or in collaboration with other organizations. Projects that are submitted to the other funding areas, but seem to fall into the Venture Fund definition, are also considered. There is no process for contacting the Venture Fund directly.

The National Science Foundation (NSF)

NSF is an independent federal agency, created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide research and education grants in most fields of science and engineering. Their grant review criteria include questions about the broader impact that a proposed project will have on society, and the inclusion of underrepresented groups. NSF also supports collaborative projects involving academic institutions, private industry, and state and local governments.
Curriculum Innovation Trust: Proposed Guidelines
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Background

A pilot funding stream, the Innovation Fund for Curriculum, will be created as a funding stream through the Office of the President.

Grants will challenge faculty, whole departments, or entire colleges – university-wide – to rethink curriculum to address ASU’s emergence as the New American University by incorporating the vision of social embeddedness (see attachments); by developing socially-committed students prepared to become productive, active leaders; and by building the capacity of the community itself to address its needs in new and sustainable ways. Grant amounts will range from $5,000 to $25,000. Funds will be distributed based on a competitive, peer-review process led by the Social Embeddedness Team. It is anticipated that this funding stream will continue in future years.

As ASU emerges as the New American University, it will measure its academic quality by the educational challenges and experiences its students receive while attending ASU. The evolution of curricula is an ongoing endeavor and ASU is looking to create new, and reinvigorate existing, curricula to align with the values, vision, and goals of the New American University and social embeddedness.

The New American University is an institution whose researchers consider the public good while pursuing scholarly interests. Its students, faculty, and staff work to share responsibility for the economic, social, cultural, and environmental vitality of the communities the university serves. Core to the New American University is the idea of social embeddedness, a university-wide ethos and vision for what engaging community can and should be. Social embeddedness is an interactive, and mutually-supportive partnership with the communities of Arizona. Through the office of the President, a university-wide committee has worked to define both a vision and goals for social embeddedness.

While many universities talk of working with the community and of being “engaged” with community, too often they are referring to programs and initiatives that were developed to accomplish their own institutional goals. It is tempting to aggregate diverse forms of community relations, public relations, programming open to the public, and volunteer activities, calling it a comprehensive engagement initiative. At the heart of the New American University is the redefinition of engagement with the community in a way that is strategic, transformative, collaborative, entrepreneurial, and sustainable.

This new Innovation Fund for Curriculum is intended to prompt the university as a whole to meet the challenges associated with creating and sustaining a university-wide ethos of social embeddedness. All applicants should make the case as to how their proposed course and/or program supports the vision and goals outlined in Attachment.
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Structure for Proposals

Proposals should be no more than 3 pages in length (approximately 1,500 words) and include the following:

Brief Proposal Narrative

Provide a description of the strategies and/or activities that will be used to create, expand, or revise curriculum. Proposals should show how the program, project, or course will help the community and the university to become more socially integrated, meeting as many of the goals and subgoals for social embeddedness as possible. All requests must be for new work or expansion/revision of current projects or curricula to meet social embeddedness goals (rather than to support ongoing projects or existing courses). In addition, proposals should emphasize sustainability (continuity for the community and students year-to-year), entrepreneurism (knowledge exchange), as well as mutually-beneficial collaboration with the community and across disciplines (schools, colleges, departments, etc.) if applicable.

Evaluation

Describe key benchmarks toward completion of the curriculum or project, as well as measurements of how the proposed program, project, or course can and will move the university toward its vision of social embeddedness. Applicants should specify objectives, goals, and timeline.

Budget

Provide a budget and a narrative justification for all requested line items. The following can be supported: technical or support personnel; consultants; supplies and reproduction costs; summer salary or teaching buy-out; travel.

Timeline

Provide anticipated completion date. Grant terms are for up to one year. Requests for no-cost extensions will be considered after submission of a formal, written request and progress report.

Indication of Support

Provide letter of support by department chair/director or dean. Letter should indicate endorsement and intended implementation by the college, school, or department, upon completion of Innovation Fund Grant.
Eligibility

The fund is open to all ASU faculty, projects, and programs. While collaboration across disciplines is encouraged, a principal investigator or grantee must be designated. With the application, provide a very short (½ to 1 page) description of the institution (department or college) or principal investigator's history (CV) working with or in community, as well as the capacity to carry out the proposed strategies and activities.

Submission Deadline

To be determined

Review Process

Work groups for those interested in applying for these funds will be convened prior to the submission deadline.

Criteria for Review

• The significance, coherence, and innovation of the course, project, or program and its relationship to meeting ASU’s social embeddedness goals.

• The impact of the course, project, or program, and its potential to be transformative to ASU and to the community.

• Sustainability for the program and the community; demonstration of commitment to institutionalize the course/program if successful.

• The potential for collaboration across disciplines, community organizations, and/or non-ASU institutions or businesses.

• The feasibility of the proposal to be successfully completed within the grant term and proposed budget.

• Demonstrated expertise and/or scholarly promise of the applicant(s).

Proposals are especially encouraged from units considering the social embeddedness approach for the first time and also from those with demonstrated records of success working with communities.
“Promising Practices: ASU on the Ground”
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Community Stories; University Stories”

Proposed Nominating Process

Background

As ASU evolves into the New American University it is appropriate to look at internal exemplars of community engagement, to document and disseminate promising practices to colleagues locally and around the country and to the community itself, and to evaluate our efforts as we strive to achieve the goals set for expanded social embeddedness (see attached). This analysis is intended to be the first in an ongoing series of unique publications, documenting the work of the New American University and prompting debate inside both academic and community circles about the broadened role of universities as social, cultural, and economic drivers for the 21st Century.

Core to the New American University is the concept of “social embeddedness” – a university-wide ethos and vision for what engagement with community can and should be. While many universities “talk” of working with the community and of being engaged with community, too often they refer to programs and initiatives that were developed to accomplish their own institutional goals, rather than goals shared with community. At the heart of the New American University is the redefinition of engagement with the community in ways that are strategic, transformative, sustainable, and collaborative. This publication will seek out model programming to illustrate the meaning and application of social embeddedness at ASU – in the classroom, in academic units, in colleges, and in communities.

This publication will explore – in journalistic form – the actions ASU has spearheaded in the past one to seven years to be an engaged university and the lessons it has learned from these experiences. It is intended to be a highly informative, graphic, documentary-style book-length product that will captivate both university and community audiences. We currently plan to highlight 20-30 projects, programs, and curriculum concepts that showcase the best of ASU’s definition of social embeddedness.

This publication will focus on “stories” (through brief case studies) depicting selected projects. Content will be developed from interviews (conducted by third parties through the President’s office). Interviewees will include faculty, students, community organizations, constituents, and other key project stakeholders. No time will be required from those chosen to participate, beyond a 1-2 hour interview. Each journalistically-written case study will be enhanced with documentary photography.
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We anticipate broad dissemination of the publication, which will hold to the social embeddedness standards – accessibility and usefulness to the university and to the community – providing community partners with professionally printed copies of their individual “story,” for distribution to their constituents and/or funders.

Projects accepted for publication will receive ASU President’s Award (for both the program and the college/school), as well as special consideration in the competitive process for Innovation Fund for Curriculum grants for expansion/revision of ongoing project. (See Guidelines for Curriculum Innovation Trust.)

**Structure for Nominations**

Proposals can be submitted by deans, administrators, or faculty members. Proposals should include a one to two page abstract that describes the project. The description should answer the following key questions:

1. In what way does your project, course, program reflect the social embeddedness goals outlined in the attached definition?
2. What is the likelihood of sustainability of the project, course, program?
3. How have students or faculty (or the university as a whole) been transformed as a result of this effort?
4. How has the community been transformed as a result of this effort? (anecdotal information or quantifiable data/evaluation)?
5. What particular obstacles have to be overcome prior to implementation?

**Submission Deadline** To be determined.

**Review Process**

The Office of the President will review submissions. Following announcement of selected nominees, interviews with project-related staff and community will be scheduled.

**Criteria for Review**

- Significance, coherence, and innovation of the course, project, or program and its relationship to meeting the goals of social embeddedness as defined in the attached document.
- Impact of the course, project, program on both ASU and the community.
- Sustainability/longevity
- Collaboration across disciplines, with community organizations, and with non-ASU institutions or businesses.
- Special consideration will be given to securing a diversity of submissions and choosing models representing departments university-wide, including those whose efforts faced particular challenges.
**Preliminary Foundation Research**

Following is a list of local and national foundations that were felt to look promising enough to pursue further. This analysis focused solely on the two projects (case study book and curriculum innovation trust) of particular interest to ASU - January/February 2006.

**Local/Arizona-based Foundations**

**Arizona Community Foundation**

Primary areas of interest include “improving quality of life for people in the state” and “community building – emphasizing a comprehensive and coordinated approach to economic and social revitalization in depressed communities.” The Foundation is dependent on donor advised funds. (Steve Mittenthal, previous CEO was an early interviewee who expressed both interest and also concern about the social embeddedness initiative. In 2006 a presentation of the preliminary concepts for social embeddedness at ASU was made to the new foundation president.)

**Flinn Foundation**

Primary areas of interest include improving “the competitiveness of the state’s biomedical research enterprise.” The pitch would need to emphasize support for departments that impact or work with the biosciences. Flinn committed funds to support the Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture, which might create an opportunity for partnerships with ASU. The foundation does not accept unsolicited proposals, but it would be wise to inform the Foundation of this work and to focus on how Flinn’s interests and ASU’s efforts with community match.

**The Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust**

Primary areas of interest include elderly, arts and culture, youth, and early childhood. Piper is interested in strengthening prevention and wellness activities for the elderly as well as: increasing the ability to “age in place”; improving health and mental health; and increasing community engagement. Under arts and culture Piper is interested in strengthening organizational capacity and partnerships/collaborations. With youth, Piper supports after-school activities, mentoring, and “growth experiences.” For the early childhood area Piper supports strengthening families through parent/caregiver education, improving child care and preschool programs, and increasing access to health care. The pitch would be to request funding to support academic units that impact or work with the elderly, young children, and families. (Judy Mohraz, President, was interviewed early in the process.)
Nina Mason Pulliam Charitable Trust

Primary areas of interest include women, children, and families; and enriching community life in Phoenix. While the Trust does not accept proposals for faculty training or research, it does support “projects that link higher education institutions to their communities through service learning opportunities.” The pitch would likely involve a redefinition of “service learning,” and/or a focus on the departments that impact the trust’s other areas of interest.

Rodel Charitable Foundation of Arizona

Primary area of interest is education, K-12. Rodel’s vision is to have Arizona’s education system recognized nationally by 2020. To meet this vision they support three “focus areas”: partnerships to exchange ideas and resources; Rodel Initiatives which are replicable educational strategies designed to supplement existing curriculum and support teaching; and grants for programs, especially those that are focused on academic achievement. The pitch would need to emphasize support for departments that impact or work with youth or K-12 and an emphasis on how the curriculum innovation fund and/or the book would support the Foundation’s own goals, as well as those shared with ASU. (Carol Peck, Executive Director was an early interviewee.)

St. Luke’s Health Initiatives

Primary areas of support: community-based health and health care initiatives (the Arizona Health Futures program); and community development and capacity building to improve health and health care. St. Luke’s supports civic discourse and community engagement efforts, as well as reconnecting “citizens, schools, business, and policy makers to community life.” The pitch would focus on support for ways to partner to impact health and health care issues and the creation of innovative courses at ASU that would help further the goals of St. Luke’s Health Initiatives’ programs. (Roger Hughes, Executive Director was an early interviewee.)

Valley of the Sun United Way

Primary “impact areas” include: Learning, Empowering, and Caring. Learning supports child care, early education, mentoring, social skills development, and adult and family education and literacy. Empowering supports job training, family counseling, financial literacy, affordable housing, and independent living skills development. Finally, Caring supports prevention and intervention of: child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, homelessness, medial/dental/vision problems. The pitch is clear. (Paul Luna was interviewed twice during the research phase of this project.)
Private Foundations (beyond Arizona)

Carnegie Corporation of New York

Primary areas of interest include Strengthening U.S. Democracy which emphasizes K-12 and immigrant education to increase civic participation. Each grant should have a policy or systems level impact. The pitch would focus on “new” ways to partner in K-12 education, how the development of innovative courses in higher education would address concerns, and how social embeddedness strengthens democracy by increasing participation and understanding of communities and real world activities.

Carnegie also has a Special Opportunities Fund, which does not accept unsolicited proposals, but does much of its more innovative funding through that program.

Marguerite Casey Foundation

While Marguerite Casey Foundation is focused on a single effort – building a network of advocates from low income families – the Foundation has focused on the 10 states with the highest rates of child poverty (which includes Arizona) and is interested in innovative ways to address the problem of poverty and family disenfranchisement. A case could be made for ways in which the university could be a unique avenue to pursue the training of advocates and the building of a unique base through which to assist families in poverty.

Ford Foundation

Part of Ford's mission to “strengthen democratic values” and to “advance human achievement,” broadly supports the kind of goals addressed through the social embeddedness agenda. Primary areas of interest for the Foundation include Community and Resource Development giving “low-income communities greater ownership and control of key community institutions and resources.” Within this area is the Asset Building and Community Development program through which Ford makes grants that “seek to improve the quality of life and opportunities for positive change in urban and rural communities...” supporting “community-based institutions that mobilize and leverage philanthropic capital, investment capital, social capital, and natural resources.”

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Some of the primary areas of interest for the Foundation include education (K-12), environment, and performing arts. Hewlett has a Special Opportunities Fund that does not accept unsolicited proposals, but traditionally grants awarded through this channel have supported “excellence in higher education.” The pitch would focus on social embeddedness as critical to accomplishing the Foundation's goals in higher education.
The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Primary areas of interest are health and healthcare, including issues related to access, quality, substance abuse, healthy behaviors/lifestyles, and education/training. Any proposal would need to include a policy or systems level impact. The pitch (if done in conjunction with either or both of the two focused projects – innovation fund or case study book) would need to focus on supporting particular aspects of curriculum and academic units that impact or work with health and health care such as public health, medical, and related departments – possibly with emphasis on underserved populations (Native American, Latino, low income).

The W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Primary areas of interest include Youth and Education. One major funding stream is to develop “a more seamless educational pipeline, especially engaging post-secondary education institutions with communities to achieve mutually beneficial goals.” We believe Kellogg (which has a long history of funding university/community partnerships) is a good potential funder. Recent changes in leadership at the Foundation could alter the organization’s priorities.

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

Primary area of interest includes Civil Society, which supports democratic institution building, strengthening communities, promoting equitable access to resources, and ensuring respect for rights and diversity. To achieve these goals Mott supports strengthening the nonprofit sector and improving civic participation. Their U.S. grantmaking in this area supports “a strong, independent and inclusive nonprofit and philanthropic sector” through better governance, accountability, and partnerships. They also support improved race relations and building “community assets to address community needs.” A strong pitch could be that social embeddedness and particularly the projects developed through this initiative fit with the Foundation’s goals. Mott is a clear option here and support of the local community foundation would be a helpful boost. Mott also has a fund for Exploratory and Special Projects that does not accept unsolicited proposals. These are generally smaller grants.

Omidyar Network

Primary area of interest is citizen-driven models “that promote: equal access to information, tools and opportunities; rich connections around shared interests; and a sense of ownership for participants.” The pitch should include the use of technology and/or knowledge transfer.
Open Society Institute and Soros Foundation Network

Primary areas of interest include shaping “public policy to promote democratic governance” as well as “economic, legal, and social reform.” OSI Initiatives cover several issues including education, strengthening civil society, economic reform, public health, and arts and culture. The Youth Initiative most closely corresponds to ASU’s interests – it develops “analytical, research, and self-expression skills” so that youth can “think critically about their world” and “engage actively in US society.” The pitch would include support to impact youth.

The Bernard & Audre Rapoport Foundation

Primary areas of interest include the Community Building and Social Services initiative, where the Foundation makes grants to “build grassroots networks,” as well as the Democracy and Civic Participation initiative, where the foundation “supports efforts to make government more responsive and to encourage citizens to take an active interest in political life.” Unsolicited grant applications from organizations outside the Foundation’s main geographic region (Waco/McLennan County, Texas) are funded “infrequently” and are usually “solicited by the Foundation trustees.” A letter explaining the full blown scope could be sent – pitching the potential for ASU’s work to be a model that could be replicated in smaller communities.

Skoll Foundation

Primary area of interest is social entrepreneurship. They invest in, connect, and celebrate these individuals – but do not provide grants to individuals. Rather Skoll supports social entrepreneurs’ organizations. The pitch would be to present the president of ASU as a social entrepreneur (or to build on the groundwork laid out through the Kauffman funds, if they materialize at ASU).

Corporate Foundations

AT&T Foundation

Primary areas of interest include giving “communities the resources they need to help them accomplish great things” – as long as the project intersects with AT&T’s business interests/communities where AT&T has a significant business presence. One of their priorities, Civic & Community Service, supports programs “that address community needs, encourage volunteerism, and promote leadership with integrity.” The fit might require use of technology and/or knowledge transfer.

Washington Mutual

Primary areas of interest include K-12 public education, financial education, affordable housing, and community development (especially in locations/cities where they have a business interest). Within education, WaMu mainly supports training and professional development for K-12 teachers and administrators. The pitch would focus on these areas.
Social Embeddedness: “Start-up” Phase
Social Embeddedness: “Start-up” Phase⁴

For the past two years, Fern Tiger Associates (FTA) has worked in close partnership with Arizona State University (ASU) to understand, identify, and define a concept and direction to enable the university to be socially embedded in the communities of Arizona – most specifically those of the greater Phoenix area, where ASU’s four campuses continue to grow and influence the development of these communities. Through extensive interviews, community meetings, data collection, and research on best practices, FTA – with the support of an ASU advisory committee and work team -- has articulated a vision and goals intended to transform ASU, through a university-wide effort, into a truly new American university, where unique relationships are fostered with Arizona communities, based on mutual trust and shared responsibility.

It is clear that both the university and greater Phoenix are at a crossroad – defined by growth, excitement, public goodwill, and a sense of urgency to capture this vitality and put it to good use. In order to capture the momentum of ASU’s support for social embeddedness, and to create a model that is not based on “the easy route,” it is critical that the recommended next steps move forward quickly and intensely.

The recommendations (presented in May to the President of ASU, to the Social Embeddedness Steering Committee, to University Council, and others) indicate that if social embeddedness is truly threaded throughout the university – in its teaching, research, service, and decisionmaking – ASU could become a model, transformed in ways unparalleled in higher education. In this model, confining the university’s social embeddedness to an “institute” or “center” would be counter-productive, marginalizing a concept that should pervade every aspect of the university. Yet, implementation will need the guidance, support, nurturing, creativity, and persistence of a dedicated and well-placed leader, for a period of about 5-8 years, as the thinking matures and is understood throughout ASU.

The first five years of implementation will rely heavily on numerous factors including the visible leadership and support of both the Provost (to ensure integration with curriculum and academic success) and the President (to guarantee implementation and influence in decisionmaking beyond academics). Day-to-day stewardship should rest with a “director”⁵ who will be the liaison to all programs and efforts related to social embeddedness and who will work to ensure that these concepts become a deep and vital part of the culture of ASU. He/she will report directly to the Provost and President.

The following pages briefly outline tasks related to the start-up (launch: July ‘06 to February ’07).

---

⁴ Fern Tiger Associates, July 2006
⁵ Title to be determined based on university categories. Director responsibilities could also be encompassed in the work of two individuals rather than a single professional.
**Description of Start-Up Phase**

The start-up phase (launch), leading to the full scale implementation of a set of coordinated social embeddedness efforts, is expected to last about eight months (July 2006 - February 2007). Over the course of these months, a “Director” of Social Embeddedness (or “Co-Directors”) will be recruited and hired; that individual will take on his/her responsibilities January 2007.

Between July 2006 and February 2007, numerous activities and tasks should be managed and completed in order to move the recommendations forward seamlessly – without losing the momentum set during this past year of planning. The activities for this launch period fall into several broad categories:

- Development of a strategic funding plan
- Planning, implementation, and management of community outreach and related events (July 2006 through February 2007)
- Design and production of project collateral and branding
- Internal and external communications
- Managing curriculum development related to social embeddedness
- Planning for program sustainability including start-up efforts to design evaluation tools and structures
- Management and facilitation of advisory committee

**Fund Development (July ‘06 - February ‘07)**

Activities related to the launch, early implementation, and sustainability of social embeddedness as described in the strategic recommendations will require dedicated funds. It will be imperative to devise a strategic approach to raising these funds, especially in light of the diverse donor activities already underway at ASU. We believe that several of the early start-up activities could be especially attractive to local donors, and that the longer-term components might be of interest to a broader range of funders and national foundations. However, if ASU is to begin to move from recommendations to implementation of a socially-embedded campus, a commitment of approximately $750,000 will be critical during these first eight months.

While some very preliminary research on funding prospects was done early in 2006, a more carefully-crafted longer-term funding plan will need to be designed and then executed:

- research potential funding prospects
- develop a comprehensive funding strategy and plan (private donors and foundations)

---

6 During the outreach process, naming options will be developed and tested, followed by a process of branding the social embeddedness initiative, visually and through messaging.
• draft grant templates to be used in grant-seeking efforts that will occur over subsequent years
• early prospect development efforts, funder meetings, presentations, and site visits

Community Outreach and Events (July ‘06 - February ‘07)

To build momentum for the social embeddedness design imperative within the broader community beyond the university, community outreach and engagement will be critical. Tasks to create a create a “street-level” dialogue between ASU and the community include:

• recruiting and training approximately 1,000 ASU students, faculty, and staff (“the ASU 1000”) along with community members to go door-to-door, talking to residents to get information about their desires, needs, and hopes and fears about relations between the university and the community and to distribute information about ASU (It is expected that this outreach effort will reach 15,000+/- households in greater Phoenix.)

• developing and leading a series of discussion groups whose participants will be assembled by nonprofit leaders throughout the community (approx. 10-15 groups with 15-20 participants in each session), to solicit qualitative input and feedback to inform the vision and implementation of ASU’s social embeddedness work and to develop themes that might be used university-wide

• facilitating roundtable discussions with university and community representatives in the key communities of Phoenix, Tempe, Glendale, and Mesa.

Each of the activities noted above will require outreach, marketing, and promotion. They are conceived to be repeated on an annual or biannual basis.

Project Collateral (July ‘06 - February ‘07)

To communicate and share the social embeddedness concept at the onset, and to encourage support, participation, and excitement from the community, a coordinated set of unique project materials will need to be developed. FTA recommends designing and developing (text, photography, production):

• a book of ASU case studies appropriate for broad dissemination

[This book will include approximately 20 in-depth studies of innovative examples of social embeddedness at ASU and in the Phoenix community. Numerous individual interviews, site visits, and documentary photography will create a set of lively, compelling stories to share with constituents throughout ASU, Arizona leadership, peer universities, and communities. This activity could

7 Fund development activities, following the creation of the fund development plan and strategy should be the responsibility of the Director beginning February 2007.
8 These round tables are planned to be convened quarterly to move the social embeddedness agenda forward.
become a training program for graduate students in appropriate schools and colleges who could be taught to document, interview, write, and photograph for the stories under the guidance of professionals.

In subsequent years, additional case studies should be developed and distributed (semi-annually); every third year the new case studies should be collected for the creation of a larger compendium.

- an 8-16 page tabloid-style newspaper appropriate for insertion into all regional and statewide newspapers, including ethnic press (and/or for bulk mailing to all households within particular zip codes), containing topical issues related to social embeddedness, including the results of the ASU door-to-door walk and focus groups (which will have been conducted in fall 2006)

- other project materials, as appropriate, including flyers, brochures, posters, etc. for university-wide and/or community outreach and information sharing

Communications (July ‘06 - February ‘07)

Numerous activities need to be developed to ensure that internal and external constituents stay abreast of activities related to social embeddedness. Specifically, it is recommended that ASU:

- develop a mailing that will include an overview publication (24 pages +/-) of the draft social embeddedness plan explaining the findings (from interviews and site visits) and recommendations – to be disseminated to the 200+ individuals who were interviewed in the early phases of this work.9 (if appropriate, and if funding permits, these interviewees should be invited to a presentation and discussion of next steps)

- develop a speaker series to bring notable individuals (local and national) to ASU campuses and other Phoenix locations, to talk about social embeddedness and university/community engagement

- design a website dedicated to social embeddedness issues (and/or work with the Office of University Initiatives to make appropriate revisions to ASU in the Community)

- provide on-going communications and updates to ASU faculty, staff, and students and meet with colleges, centers, schools, and departments, as requested, to ensure thorough understanding of ASU’s definition and goals (and to assist units in the development of social embeddedness plans)

- develop branding based on naming decision

Curriculum Development (July ‘06 - February ‘07)

To make certain that social embeddedness becomes part of the culture and ethos of ASU, it will be critical to appropriately integrate these concepts into
course curricula across all units, departments, and colleges at the university. To accomplish this, it will be important to:

• lead unit-level discussions related to curriculum development and redesign
• facilitate a task force to undertake immediate discussions related to university-wide curriculum innovation (e.g. capstones, action research, etc.) and structural changes (scheduling, course continuity, etc.) needed to support academic activities related to social embeddedness

To support creative curriculum design efforts, a Curriculum Innovation Trust – a dedicated funding source to support the development and launch of curriculum related to social embeddedness has been proposed.

ASU will need to:
• coordinate early planning for the Trust, including structure, oversight, and donor identification (Beginning in January 2007, the Director will take over management of this activity, including targeted fund-raising.)

Program Sustainability and Evaluation (July ‘06 - February ‘07)

To ensure the longevity of social embeddedness at the University and in the community, sustainable structures will need to be put into place:
• Recruitment and hiring of “Director” (or “Co-Directors”) of Social Embeddedness and/or program associates
• Coordination of the design and development of an evaluation model which will include benchmarks and analysis on an annual basis
• Identification and coordination of a social embeddedness review team, comprised of university and community members to provide feedback and insight on the effective implementation of social embeddedness concepts and goals
ASU - Community Dialogue

Walk ABOUT Arizona
- Reach 15,000 Arizona residents (households/focus ASU sites)
- Provide information re: ASU/invite to September 2007
- Ask re: ASU image/Arizona needs

Talk ABOUT Arizona
- Present 2007/08 focus
- Analyze/brainstorm ideas/partnerships
- Disseminate SE publication/concepts
- Announce Innovation Trust winners
- Introduce ASU "SE Director"
- Kick off web-based forum

Making Change come ABOUT in Arizona
- Reps from each of 4 committees
- Community/ASU 2007/08 Theme Committee
- Community/ASU 2007/08 Theme Committee
- Community/ASU 2007/08 Theme Committee

Think ABOUT Arizona
- Focus groups: Participants organized by reg'l nonprofits
- 1st Annual Summit (3 parts)
- Community Leadership
- ASU Alumni
- National SE Forum (Jan 2008/50 year Anniversary)
- Focus groups through regional nonprofits

Establish committees with members from ASU (faculty/staff) at 4 campuses and community

- Speaker Series
- Events
- Seminars
- Community dialogue

- Planning and Oversight
- "SE in Action" Review Team
- SE Evaluation Committee
- Curriculum Task Force
- Journal Task Force (Faculty only)

- Create "Working Plan" for Social Embeddedness
- Participate in hiring & review of SE Director
- Develop metrics
- Determine feasibility of capstone requirement
- Develop plan to advocate for change in journal requirements to reflect Social Embeddedness

Proposed ASU Structure to Support Social Embeddedness
Proposed ASU Structure to Support Social Embeddedness
Commonly Used Terms
Commonly Used Terms

Community partnerships: Refers to a range of initiatives based at institutions of higher education, designed to enhance local neighborhoods through some form of working relationship with residents and institutions.

Cooperative education programs: “The integration of classroom instruction . . . with a series of paid, productive work experiences in a field related to a student’s career or educational goals.” (Kellogg Commission)

Cooperative Extension System: A nationwide education network of 74 land-grant universities in partnership with U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, and state and local governments. Examples of Cooperative Extension programs include 4-H, college courses, and international education.

Department-level initiatives: Research and technical assistance provided to community organizations, businesses, and government agencies through academic departments or colleges.

Industrial extension programs: Defined by The Kellogg Foundation as “universities working with small and medium-sized manufacturers to maintain their competitive edge.” (May be part of the Cooperative Extension System.)

Institutes: Often provide research and technical assistance to community organizations, businesses, and government agencies. Activities include trainings, workshops, and dissemination of reports.

Internships: Paid or unpaid opportunities for students to work within an organization that may be in their chosen field. Internships can be connected to the university, with many departments awarding credit for work completed in the host organization. Other internships are often sought by students outside their chosen field to gain diverse experience and exposure to other fields, populations, or professional opportunities.

Participatory or applied research: Research conducted by faculty or students that either focuses on active participation with subjects during the course of study, or research that is explicitly geared toward solving particular problems external to academia. Can also refer to research that is largely designed, conducted, and analyzed by the community with faculty input and guidance.

Practicum/Internships: A number of work/credit hours in a chosen field, required by specific professions in order to graduate. Examples include social work and teaching.
**Service-learning courses:** There is not one conclusive definition. The Kellogg Commission describes them generally as courses that combine academic study with an unpaid community service component. The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse expands this definition to include the “intent that the activity change both the recipient and the provider of service . . . [by linking tasks] to self-reflection, self-discovery, and the acquisition and comprehension of values, skills, and knowledge content.”

**Social movement:** A sustained collective action, involving the mobilization of a broad constituency around a common goal.

**Volunteer activities:** Many universities cite community service, volunteer days, and centers that coordinate student, faculty, and staff volunteer opportunities as community engagement. These activities – which lack an academic component – are usually characterized as being one-time, unpaid work within the community.

**Work study:** Some universities have been able to use federal work study program dollars to sponsor students to work in off-campus community service jobs.