Working to Educate Global Citizens and Create Neighborly Communities Locally and Globally: Penn's Partnerships in West Philadelphia as a Democratic Experiment in Progress

Ira Harkavy *, [a], Matthew Hartley [b], Rita Axelroth Hodges [c], and Joann Weeks [d]

[a] Associate Vice President and Founding Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, USA

[b] Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, USA

[c] Assistant Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, USA

[d] Associate Director, Netter Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, USA

Abstract: In this essay, the authors discuss the central role of higher education institutions in contributing to the public good, as well as the obstacles that have prevented them from effectively fulfilling that role. Furthermore, they explain and illustrate (using the case of the University of Pennsylvania) that by working to solve global problems manifested locally higher education institutions could increase their contributions to the public good. They also describe and propose a strategy (using examples from their own work) for how local engagement can be part of a process of global engagement and change. For the authors, when colleges and universities give very high priority to actively solving strategic, real-world problems in their local community, a much greater likelihood exists that they will significantly advance citizenship and the public good. The essay concludes that creating local university-community-school partnerships is one of the best ways to help develop democratic, globally competent students, K-20+, and thereby significantly contribute to the development of democratic schools, democratic universities, and democratic good societies in the 21st century.

Keywords: higher education; public good; global problems; local engagement; global engagement; democratic schools; democratic universities; higher education civic responsibility, higher education social responsibility

"To be a great university, we must first be a great local university."
Shirley Strum Kenny (Former President, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1999)

Introduction

In the rapidly accelerating global era in which we now live, human beings must solve a vast array of unprecedentedly complex problems. Perhaps the most complex and significant

Suggested citation: Harkavy, I., Hartley, M., Hodges, R. A., & Weeks, J. (2016). Working to educate global citizens and create neighborly communities locally and globally: Penn's partnerships in West Philadelphia as a democratic experiment in progress. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 6*(2), 43-56. http://dx.doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v6i2.311

* Author correspondence: harkavy@upenn.edu

problems facing society today are persistent and widening social, economic, and political inequality; globally destructive, man-made climate change; rising racism and xenophobia; and increasingly frequent savage terrorist acts. Given their proclaimed dedication to critical intelligence, and their unique constellation of formidable resources to develop it, institutions of higher education, we submit, have a unique responsibility to help solve these problems—indeed all the problems intensified by globalization. It seems self-evident, to us at least, that given the current state of the world, colleges and universities are not contributing as they could and should. We further submit that working to solve universal problems, such as poverty, inadequate schooling, inequality, and intolerance as these problems are manifested locally is a powerful (perhaps the best) means to advance higher education's (particularly the university's) mission of advancing knowledge for the improvement of human welfare. Stated even more strongly, democratic engagement with its local schools and communities may not only be the best means but also the best indicator of a higher education institution's contribution to the public good locally, nationally, and globally.

Given the position outlined above, we will try to do three things to give credence to our argument:

1) Discuss the central role of higher education institutions in contributing to the public good, as well as the obstacles that have prevented them from effectively fulfilling that role.
2) Explain and illustrate (using the case we know best—the University of Pennsylvania) that by working to solve global problems manifested locally higher education institutions can increase their contributions to the public good.
3) Describe and propose a strategy (again using examples from our own work) for how local engagement can be part of a process of global engagement and change.

The Role of Higher Education Institutions in Contributing to the Public Good

Universities are uniquely local and global institutions, as well as the most influential institutions in modern societies across the globe. In 1990, Harvard's President Derek Bok identified "the modern university as the central institution in post-industrial society" (Bok, 1990, p. 3). Universities possess enormous resources (most significantly human resources), play a leading role in developing and transmitting new discoveries, educate societal leaders, and most importantly, in large measure, shape the schooling system. As stable anchor institutions, community colleges, colleges, and universities (public as well as private) all play crucial, multifaceted roles in their communities and surrounding regions, including in education, research, service, housing and real estate development, employment, job training, purchasing, business and technology incubation, and cultural development (Harkavy, Hartley, Hodges, Sorrentino, & Weeks, 2014).

For colleges and universities to fulfill their great potential as anchor institutions and more effectively contribute to positive change in their local communities, cities, and metropolitan areas, however, they will have to critically examine and change their organizational cultures and structures and embed civic engagement across all components of the institution (Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005). Comprehensive involvement of all the resources of higher education institutions are required to genuinely develop democratic schools, universities, and communities.

According to the great American pragmatic philosopher John Dewey, "democracy approaches most nearly the ideal of all social organization; that in which the individual and society

are organic to each other" (Dewey, 1969, pp. 237-238).[1] Dewey further emphasized that participatory democratic schooling is mandatory for a participatory democratic society. Simply put, unless the schooling system, from pre-K through 20, is transformed into a participatory democratic schooling system, the United States will continue to fall far short of functioning as a decent, just, participatory democracy. The transformation of higher education is crucial to the transformation of the entire schooling system and the education of creative, caring, contributing democratic citizens (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007).

We contend that Dewey's ideas about education and society benefited from his time as a faculty member at the University of Chicago and the great importance the first president of the university, William Rainey Harper, placed upon his university's active engagement with the severe problems confronting its dynamically growing city—particularly its public school system. For example, criticized by a university trustee for sponsoring a journal focused on pedagogy in precollegiate schools, Harper emphatically proclaimed, "As a university we are interested above all things else in pedagogy."[2] Harper's belief in the centrality of pedagogy logically derived from two propositions core to his vision for the University of Chicago in particular and American universities in general:

1. "Education is the basis of all democratic progress. The problems of education are, therefore, the problems of democracy" (Harper, 1905, p. 32).
2. More than any other institution, the university determines the character of the overall schooling system: "Through the school system, the character of which, in spite of itself, the university determines and in a large measure controls . . . through the school system every family in this entire broad land of ours is brought into touch with the university; for from it proceed the teachers or the teachers' teachers" (Harper, 1905, p. 25).

Given those two propositions and the role Harper assigned the American university as the *to-be-expected deliverer* of American democracy, he theorized that the major responsibility of universities is the performance of the schooling system as a whole (1905). If the American schooling system does not powerfully accelerate democratic progress, then American universities must be performing poorly—no matter whatever else they are doing successfully. By their democratic fruits shall ye know them, is the pragmatic performance test Harper, in effect, prescribed for the American university system.

Obstacles Limiting Higher Education's Contribution to the Public Good[3]

In recent years, colleges and universities have increasingly been called on to do the right thing and democratically engage as genuine partners with their local and regional communities, but in order for them to engage effectively, they must reduce the burden of tradition. In his attempt

[1] Democracy, for Dewey, encompasses much more than the activities of the state. In 1916 in *Democracy and Education*, he wrote: "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience." In 1939 in his brilliant speech, "Creative Democracy," Dewey provided an even broader definition, "Democracy is a way of life controlled by a working faith in the possibilities of human nature." (See Dewey, 1916, p. 101; Dewey, 1981, p. 226).

[2] Harper quoted in Woodie Thomas White, "The Study of Education at the University of Chicago: 1892-1958" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1977, p. 15). For our views on the Harper-Dewey relationship at the University of Chicago, see Benson and Harkavy, 1999; Benson and Harkavy, 2000, p. 174-96.

[3] This chapter draws significantly from a chapter written by one of the authors (see Harkavy, 2015, pp. 6-19).

to create a new, innovative college in and for the New World of America, Benjamin Franklin was keenly aware of that burden.

In 1749, Franklin described the purposes and curriculum of the Academy of Philadelphia "as consisting in an *Inclination* join'd with an *Ability* to serve Mankind, one's Country, Friends and Family" (Best, 1962, pp. 150-151). Shortly before he died in 1790, Franklin angrily denounced the trustees of what by then had become the University of Pennsylvania for their conservative and destructive approach. Franklin explained their intellectual inertia by asserting that "there is in mankind an unaccountable prejudice in favor of ancient Customs and Habitudes, which inclines to a Continuance of them after the Circumstances which formerly made them useful, cease to exist" (Reinhold, 1968, p. 224). A "prejudice in favor of ancient Customs and Habitudes," in our judgment, continues to function as a primary obstacle limiting colleges' and universities' contribution to the public good.

Although a primary obstacle, it is by no means the only one. In our judgment, the forces of commercialism and commodification, misplaced nostalgia for the *Ivory Tower*, traditionally elitist, traditional liberal arts, intellectual and institutional fragmentation, and the predominant faculty and institutional reward system also function as significant obstacles to needed change.

Education for profit, not virtue; students as consumers, not producers of knowledge; academics as individual superstars, not members of a community of scholars—all of these are examples of the commercialization of higher education, which, among other things, contributes to an overemphasis on institutional competition for wealth and status (Bok, 2003). Perhaps the most important consequence of the commercialization of higher education is the devastating impact it has on the values and ambitions of college students. When higher education institutions openly and increasingly pursue commercialization, their behavior legitimizes and reinforces the pursuit of economic self-interest by students and contributes to the widespread sense that they are in college *exclusively* to gain career-related skills and credentials. Student idealism and civic engagement are also strongly diminished when students see their universities abandon academic values and scholarly pursuits to function openly and enthusiastically as competitive, de facto profit-making corporations. Commercialism also powerfully contributes to higher education being seen as a private benefit, instead of a public good.

In part as a response to galloping commercialism, some have made the case for a preservation of, or return to, traditional liberal arts education—an essentialist approach with roots in Plato's antidemocratic, elitist theory of education. What is needed instead is, to quote Carol Geary Schneider, "a *new liberal art* [emphasis added]" involving "integrative learning—focused around big problems and new connections between the academy and society" (Schneider, 2014, p. 51).

A 1982 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development report titled *The University and the Community* claimed, "Communities have problems, universities have departments" (Center for Educational Research and Innovation, 1982, p. 127). Beyond being a criticism of universities, that statement neatly indicates another major reason why colleges and universities have not contributed as they should. Quite simply, their unintegrated, fragmented, internally conflictual structure and organization impede understanding and developing solutions to highly complex human and societal problems. Colleges and universities need to significantly decrease the fragmentation of disciplines, overspecialization, and division between and among the arts and sciences and the professions, since these departmental and disciplinary divisions have increased the isolation of higher education from society itself.

Towards Increasing Higher Education's Contribution to the Public Good: Focus on Local Engagement

So, what is to be done to reduce the obstacles and increase higher education's contributions to a better society and world?

To help answer that question, we turn to one of John Dewey's most significant propositions: "Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community" (Dewey, 1927/1954, p. 213). Democracy, Dewey emphasized, has to be built on face-to-face interactions in which human beings work together cooperatively to solve the ongoing problems of life. In effect, we are updating Dewey and advocating the following proposition: *Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the engaged neighborly college or university and its local community partners.* Neighborliness, we contend, is the primary indicator that an institution is working for the public good.

The benefits of a local community focus for college and university civic engagement programs are manifold. Ongoing, continuous interaction is facilitated through work in an easily accessible location. Relationships of trust, so essential for effective partnerships and effective learning, are also built through day-to-day work on problems and issues of mutual concern. In addition, the local community provides a convenient setting in which a number of service-learning courses, community-based research courses, and related courses in different disciplines can work together on a complex problem to produce substantive results. Work in a university's local community, since it facilitates interaction across schools and disciplines, can also create interdisciplinary learning opportunities. And finally, the local community is a democratic, real-world learning site in which community members and academics can pragmatically determine whether the work is making a real difference and whether *both* the neighborhood and the higher education institution are better as a result of common efforts (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2011). Indeed, we would contend that a focus on local engagement is an extraordinarily promising strategy for realizing institutional mission and purpose. Or as elegantly expressed by Paul Pribbenow (2014), president of Augsburg College, the "intersections of vocation and location" (p. 158) provide wonderful opportunities for both the institution and the community.

To explore this local engagement strategy in greater depth and to illustrate how it has enhanced the public good, we now turn to the case we know best, the University of Pennsylvania (Penn).

The University of Pennsylvania as a Case Study

In his 1749 proposal to establish a college, Franklin called for local engagement, making the extraordinarily radical suggestion for the times that students visit and learn from "neighbouring Plantations of the best Farmers" (Best, 1963, p. 148). The core values articulated in Franklin's original vision are highlighted by Penn today in its many print and online materials.[4] The Franklin-inspired idea that Penn not only exists to produce new knowledge but also to use that knowledge to solve significant real-world problems for the betterment of society and humankind, finds expression in the Penn Compact, President Gutmann's strategy for institutional advancement.

In her inaugural address in October 2004, President Gutmann announced a comprehensive "Penn Compact" (the Compact) designed to advance the university "from

[4] For examples, see Penn's *Admissions* webpage (http://www.admissions.upenn.edu), Penn's *2013 Commencement Program* (www.archives.upenn.edu), and Penn's *2008-09 Financial Report* (www.finance.upenn.edu).

excellence to eminence" (Gutmann, 2004). Although the Compact's first two principles—increasing access to a Penn education and integrating knowledge—had, and continue to have, significant importance for Penn, the third principle of engaging locally and globally is particularly relevant to our discussion.

Gutmann's articulation of Penn's core values and aspirations in the Compact brought an increased emphasis to realizing the university's institutional potential through working to solve real-world problems in partnership with communities, while continuing to invest its economic resources locally. Local engagement work moved from being primarily a means to help Penn revitalize its local environment to becoming a way for it to achieve eminence as a research university. Moreover, the Compact's clear directive has become infused in nearly every aspect of the university, shaping both operations and culture across campus. For example, Penn's comprehensive capital campaign from 2007 through 2012¸ *Making History,* was rooted in the principles of the Compact.

President Gutmann has also championed the work of the Netter Center for Community Partnerships, which was officially founded in 1992 but whose work in West Philadelphia began in the mid-80s. Since 1985, the university has increasingly engaged in comprehensive and mutually beneficial university-community-school partnerships. Coordinated by the Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships, more than 200 Academically Based Community Service (ABCS) courses (Penn's approach to service-learning) have been developed. ABCS courses integrate research, teaching, learning, and service around action-oriented, community problem-solving. Penn students work on improving local schools, spurring economic development on a neighborhood scale, and building strong community organizations. At the same time, they reflect on their service experience and its larger implications (e.g., why poverty, racism, and crime exist). In 2014-2015, approximately 1,600 Penn students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) and nearly 50 faculty members (from 26 departments across eight of Penn's 12 schools) were engaged in West Philadelphia through 63 ABCS courses. (This represents significant growth since 1992, when three faculty members taught four ABCS courses to approximately 100 students.)

At the core of many of Penn's ABCS courses are ongoing faculty action research projects. For example, in 1991 Dr. Francis Johnston, professor and then-chair of the anthropology department, revised his undergraduate seminar on medical anthropology to focus on community health in West Philadelphia. Over the past 24 years, students in this course, as well as Johnston's other courses, have addressed the strategic problem of improving the health and nutrition of disadvantaged inner-city children by doing systematic, in-depth research designed to understand and help improve the education and nutritional status of youth in West Philadelphia. Professor Johnston, whose work had previously largely concerned nutritional problems in Latin America, found that his seminars on West Philadelphia were not only more enjoyable to teach, but they also contributed to his own scholarly work through the development of ongoing participatory action research projects involving undergraduates, public school students and teachers, and community members.

Currently, faculty members in political science, psychology, nursing, the Wharton School of business, as well as some of Johnston's colleagues in anthropology, teach and have research projects connected to what is now known as the Agatston Urban Nutrition Initiative (AUNI). AUNI has become the Netter Center's largest project with over 20 full-time employees working in university-assisted community schools in West Philadelphia (described below), as well as in other sections of the city.

The Moelis Access Science program further exemplifies the institutional and community benefits that result from academic partnerships with the local community. Begun in 1999 with support from the National Science Foundation, Access Science works to improve science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education of both K-12 students and undergraduate and graduate students at Penn. The program now involves faculty and students from across numerous Penn departments—including biology, mathematics, environmental science, physics, education, chemistry, engineering, and computer science—working in local West Philadelphia public schools. For example, Community Physics Initiative is an ABCS course taught by Dr. Larry Gladney, the Associate Dean for the natural sciences. Aligned with the School District of Philadelphia's curriculum for introductory high school physics, Gladney's course links the practical and theoretical aspects of foundational physics. By developing and teaching weekly laboratory exercises and classroom demonstrations at a nearby high school, Penn students learn science by teaching science to high school students.

A similar development of service-learning has occurred at other institutions across the United States (Hartley, 2011). For example, Campus Compact, a U.S. coalition of community college, college, and university presidents dedicated to civic engagement, grew from three institutional members in 1985 to approximately 1,100 today, roughly one quarter of all degree granting higher education institutions in the United States. In a 2014 Campus Compact survey (with 434 of 1080 institutions responding), member institutions report that 39 percent of their undergraduate and graduate students participate in service and service-learning courses annually, with an average of 3.5 hours served per week; approximately 97 percent of institutions have an office or center supporting this work, with 35 percent reporting that academic service-learning is the primary purpose of this office; and 65 percent of campuses reward service-learning and community-based research in promotion and tenure decisions (Campus Compact, 2014, pp. 2-5, 9).

The Netter Center has also been working for over 20 years on developing and sustaining university-assisted community schools (UACS). Community schools bring together multiple organizations and their resources to educate, activate, and serve not just students but *all* members of the community in which the school is located. UACS engage students, grades pre-K through 20, in real-world community problem-solving designed to have positive effects on neighborhoods and help develop active, participating citizens of a democratic society. Penn students taking ABCS courses (such as Johnston's and Gladney's courses described above), work-study students, and student interns and volunteers (over 2000 students annually) provide vital support for these programs, serving as tutors, mentors, classroom fellows or activity and project leaders. The Netter Center is currently working with a network of five UACS in West Philadelphia, involving approximately 3,000 K-12 children, youth, and their families.

West Philadelphia, like many other urban communities, has become the home to a growing population of immigrants from all over the world. At one of our elementary school partners, over 40 languages are spoken, including numerous African tribal languages. Penn students, therefore, are working with students and families of many different backgrounds and cultures. The skills developed through this democratic partnership help them understand and interact with an increasingly globally interdependent world. To again paraphrase Dewey (1927/1954): Democracy and global citizenship must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community (p. 213).

Many other institutions—Florida International University, Johns Hopkins University, Montclair State University, Seattle University, University at Buffalo, University of California-Los Angeles, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, University of Maryland-Baltimore,

and University of Tennessee-Knoxville to name a few—are also developing a UACS approach. In our region, the Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development (PHENND), a consortium of over 30 institutions of higher education, has developed a K-16 network, and is supporting, through the AmeriCorps-VISTA, coordinators at 16 public schools who are assisting to secure higher education and community supports in these schools. It is important to emphasize that Penn and other institutions that are developing university-community-school partnerships still have a very long way to go before they can fully mobilize the powerful, untapped resources of their own institutions and of their communities, including those found among individual neighbors and in local institutions (such as businesses, social service agencies, faith-based organizations, and hospitals).

A Global Movement: Building National and International Networks

Thus far, we have argued that *every* university should democratically work with its neighbors to solve universal problems as they are manifested in its *local* community. To produce optimal civic learning and genuine large-scale progressive change for the public good, national and global networks, we now argue, need to be developed that connect higher education institutions that are engaged in local democratic work.

In winter 2008-2009, for example, one of the coauthors, Ira Harkavy, was asked to convene and chair a national task force, comprised of college and university presidents and other leaders, to advise the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on how the agency could leverage anchor institutions, particularly institutions of higher education and medical centers ("eds and meds") to improve communities and help solve significant urban problems. Soon after the task force submitted its report, *Anchor Institutions as Partners in Building Successful Communities and Local Economies*, it became an ongoing organization with the mission of forging democratic civic partnerships involving anchor institutions. Since 2009, the Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF) has hosted annual conferences, produced several publications, created professional development affinity groups, and has created partnerships internationally. The AITF continues to be chaired by Harkavy and is directed by David Maurrasse, president of Marga Incorporated, which serves as AITF's administrative home.

The AITF is guided by the core values of collaboration and partnership, equity and social justice, democracy and democratic practice, and commitment to place and community. With approximately 700 individual members, AITF is an important voice for increasing the engagement of anchor institutions in their localities and regions in the United States and around the world (Guarasci & Maurrasse, 2015). AITF emphasizes that higher education institutions should engage their full range of resources—human, cultural, academic, economic—in democratic, mutually beneficial, mutually respectful partnerships with their communities (Harkavy et al., 2009). Similar developments are occurring globally.

In 1605, Francis Bacon identified "a closer connection and relationship between all the different universities of Europe" as necessary for realizing his goal that knowledge contribute to the progressive, continued betterment of the human condition (Sargent, 1999, pp. 53-54). Since 1999, the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy (IC) and the Council of Europe (CoE) have worked together to advance higher education's democratic contributions to democracy and human rights across Europe, the United States, and beyond. The IC seeks to explain and advance the contributions of higher education to democracy on community college, college, and university campuses; their local communities; and the wider society.

The Netter Center houses the Executive Offices of the IC, and three of the article's coauthors have played important roles in the organization. Joann Weeks serves as executive secretary; Matthew Hartley has been involved as a researcher on projects sponsored by the Council of Europe; and Ira Harkavy chairs the U.S. Steering Committee, which includes leadership from the American Council on Education, the American Association of Colleges and Universities, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, Campus Compact, NASPA (student affairs professionals in higher education), and the Democracy Commitment. Membership in the IC is by country, with a representative body or steering committee of organizations formally joining the IC. Australia has joined through Engagement Australia, the United Kingdom is represented by the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, and Ireland is represented by Campus Engage Ireland.

The IC works in collaboration with the CoE and its Steering Committee on Educational Policy and Practice with representatives of the 50 states party to the European Cultural Convention. The CoE, established in 1949, defends human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, develops continent-wide agreements to standardize member countries' social and legal practices, and promotes awareness of a European identity based on shared values and cutting across different cultures. The CoE's longstanding focus on democracy and democratic practice has informed and resonates with the development of other networks such as the IC itself and the AITF, particularly its values-oriented approach (described above) that emphasizes democratic partnerships, equity and social justice.

Complementary developments in the United States and Europe laid a strong foundation for the IC/CoE collaboration, including the CoE's Budapest Declaration for a Greater Europe Without Dividing Lines, adopted on the organization's 50th anniversary (May 1999), which designated the education system as the major societal means for democratic development. In July 1999, 51 college and university presidents in the United States signed a *Presidents' Fourth of July Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education* sponsored by Campus Compact. More than 500 universities have now signed the declaration, which highlights the university's central role in citizenship education.

The IC/CoE collaboration first launched a cross-national research project on "Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Responsibility" in 1999. Undertaken by a team of European and U.S. researchers, this study assessed the activities of higher education institutions that supported democratic values and practices, and it served as a means to identify and disseminate those activities. Working groups were established to develop the methodology and protocols for the research. Fourteen European and 15 U.S. universities completed the pilot study, the U.S. component of which was funded by the National Science Foundation. The CoE published the research findings in *The University as Res Publica: Higher Education Governance, Student Participation and the University as a Site of Citizenship* (2004).

The IC/CoE collaboration has hosted four additional global forums, and the CoE has published monographs on the conference themes, including *Higher Education and Democratic Culture: Citizenship, Human Rights, and Civic Responsibility* (2008), *Higher Education for Modern Societies: Competences and Values* (2010), *Reimagining Democratic Societies: A New Era of Personal and Social Responsibility* (2013), and *Higher Education for Democratic Innovation* (2016), which were published by the CoE. Additional partners joined in planning the conferences, including the International Association of Universities, the European Wergeland Centre, the

European Students' Union, and Queen's University-Belfast, which hosted the 2014 forum.[5] The 2014 forum on "Higher Education for Democratic Innovation" included 110 delegates from 25 countries, representing 85 higher education institutions, nongovernmental agencies, and governmental bodies; college presidents, vice chancellors, and governmental ministers and local leaders served as featured speakers.

The Belfast Global Forum exemplified the shared learning that the IC/CoE collaboration has promoted. It addressed the role of higher education in promoting democratic and inclusive societies through increasing access to higher education for marginalized populations and the implications of new technologies such as MOOCS (massive open online courses) for traditional campus-based education. Case studies of university-school-community partnership development from the perspectives of leadership at Widener University in Chester, Pennsylvania, a small, high-poverty city, and from a Belfast community leader and a Queen's vice chancellor, while varied by local context, elicited common themes: the need to acknowledge a contentious history, to rebuild trust and respect, and to work collaboratively on issues of importance to both. Site visits to Queen's community organization partners reinforced the positive role higher education can have when such partnerships are developed in ways that promote mutual benefit.

Each of the global forums has also included student participation in its planning and presentations through the European Students' Union. Compared to the United States, Europe has a strong tradition of student representation in the governance of its higher education institutions. Although participation in student elections is often low, students are represented in institutional governance in all European countries (Bergan, 2004). They are also consulted in systems governance in most, normally through the national student union. The European Students' Union, composed of national unions, is involved in the development of the European Higher Education Area. It also advocates on other issues of importance to European students. As a result of working with the CoE, we are convinced that Penn and other U.S. higher education institutions, despite formidable obstacles (including the corporatization of the university), could draw on Europe's experience to strengthen student participation in institutional governance (Bergan & Harkavy, 2013).

The IC-CoE collaboration has provided additional opportunities to share ideas about the role higher education institutions can play in strengthening our communities and our democracies. In 2007, for example, the CoE established an ad hoc advisory group, the Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights. This effort brought together scholars from a number of countries over a 2-year period to explore the connections between the concept of Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC), which the CoE developed to inform programmatic efforts in schools, and the practice of university-community partnerships from the United States. What emerged was the concept of *EDC partnerships*—partnerships that seek to solve pressing problems but that do so while fostering democratic values and practices built on the foundation of human rights (Hartley & Huddleston, 2010).

The advisory group also emphasized that EDC cannot merely be conveyed through civics lessons. While formal education plays a role, so does engaging in community-based work. School-university-community partnerships were identified as offering the best hope of creating a robust environment for the principles of democracy and its core values to be learned and cultivated: They do so by seeking to address pressing real world problems as members of a democratic community. The committee also delineated a set of key principles for such

[5] For more information on these organizations, you may visit http://www.iau-aiu.net/, http://www.theewc.org/, and http://www.esu-online.org/, and http://www.qub.ac.uk/

partnerships. Many of these were drawn from the decades of experience of U.S. colleges and universities involved in community engagement work. EDC partnerships see community as having assets; community members are essential partners in problem solving, not clients to be served, EDC partnerships follow and seek to promote democratic practices and values, and the work at hand should be defined by all the individuals involved. Such practices run counter to the technocratic bent that many universities in Europe (and many in the United States) embrace where faculty members are the "experts" and the community is the client (or worse, the "laboratory"). The conceptual work of this committee served as the basis for the writing of a monograph entitled *School-Community-University Partnerships for a Sustainable Democracy: Education for Democratic Citizenship in Europe and in the United States of America*, coauthored by one of the authors of this chapter, Matt Hartley, and Ted Huddleston from the United Kingdom. The monograph lays out the concept of EDC and offers a series of cases of how such partnerships can make a difference. The monograph has since been translated into a number of languages.

Other major global networks also promote the civic and social responsibilities of higher education institutions, such as the Talloires Network, with 350 institutional members representing 75 countries, and the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi), with 208 institutional members representing 78 countries. In 2005, Innovations in Civic Participation worked with Tufts University to organize the Talloires Network, an international consortium of higher education institutions committed to serving and strengthening the societies of which they are a part. Network members agree to promote the civic roles and social responsibilities of their institutions as well as to deepen engagement with local and global communities. GUNi formed in 1999 as an international network supported by UNESCO, the United Nations University, and the Catalan Association of Public Universities that emphasizes the social commitment of higher education.[6]

Among the major "defects" Bacon attributed to universities, their internal divisions and the failure of "all the different universities of Europe" to collaborate closely ranked high (Sargent, 1999, p. 54). Viewed in that perspective, the IC and networks such as Talloires and GUNi can be characterized as positive organizational responses to Bacon's critique of universities in his great 1605 work on the *Advancement of Learning*. We quote Bacon's most relevant passage:

> as the progress of learning consists not a little in the wise ordering and institutions of each university, so it would be yet much more advanced *if there were a closer connection and relationship between all the different universities of Europe than now there is*. For we see there are many orders and societies which, though they be divided under distant sovereignties and territories, yet enter into and maintain among themselves a kind of contract and fraternity, in so much that they have governors (both provincial and general) whom they all obey. And surely as nature creates brotherhood in families, and arts mechanical contract brotherhood in societies, and the anointment of God superinduces a brotherhood in kings and bishops, and vows and regulations make a brotherhood in religious orders; so in like manner there cannot but be a *noble and generous brotherhood contracted among men by learning and illumination*, seeing that God himself is called 'the Father of Lights.' (Sargent, 1999, pp. 53-54, emphases added)

[6] For more information, see the Talloires and GUNI websites: http://talloiresnetwork.tufts.edu/ and http://www.guni-rmies.net/

Conclusion

When colleges and universities give very high priority to actively solving strategic, real-world problems in their local community, a much greater likelihood exists that they will significantly advance citizenship and the public good. More specifically, by focusing on solving *universal* problems (e.g., poverty, poor schooling, and inadequate health care) that are manifested in their local communities, institutions of higher learning will be better able to realize Bacon's brilliant proposal that universities should closely collaborate across cultures and national boundaries to advance human welfare. Even more specifically, creating local university-community-school partnerships, we conclude, is one of the best ways to help develop democratic, globally competent students, K-20+, and thereby significantly contribute to the development of democratic schools, democratic universities, and democratic good societies in the 21st century. We conclude by calling on universities all over the world not only to focus on developing genuinely democratic, local partnerships with schools, communities, nonprofit entities, and government, but also to work together and learn from each other through growing international networks such as the IC.

References

Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (1999). University-assisted community schools as democratic public works. *The Good Society*, *9*(2), 14-20.

Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (2000). Integrating the American system of higher, secondary, and primary education to develop civic responsibility. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (p. 174-196). Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Hartley, M. (2005). Integrating a commitment to the public good into the institutional fabric. In A. J. Kezar, T. Chambers & J. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 185-216). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (2011). Democratic transformation through university-assisted community schools. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 50-81). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bergan, S. (2004). Higher education governance and democratic participation: The university and democracy culture. In S. Bergan (Ed.), *The university as res publica: Higher education governance, student participation and the university as a site of citizenship* (pp. 13-30). Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Bergan, S. & Harkavy, I. (2013). Cooperating across the Atlantic: Helping realize higher education's democratic mission. *Diversity & Democracy, 16(1),* 14-16. http://www.aacu.org/

Best, J. H. (Ed.). (1963). *Benjamin Franklin on education.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Bok, D. (1990). *Universities and the future of America.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Campus Compact (2014). *Three decades of institutionalizing change: 2014 annual member survey*. Boston: Author.

Center for Educational Research and Innovation (1982). *The university and the community: The problems of changing relationships*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: MacMillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1927/1954). *The public and its problems.* Denver, CO: Swallow Press/Ohio University Press.

Dewey, J. (1969). The ethics of democracy. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The early works of John Dewey, Volume 1, 1882–1888* (pp. 227-249). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dewey, J. (1981). Creative democracy—The task before us. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works of John Dewey, Volume 14, 1925-1953*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Guarasci, R. & Maurrasse, D. (2016). Higher education institutions as pillars of their communities: the role of anchor institutions. In S. Bergan, T. Gallagher, & I. Harkavy (Eds.), *Higher education for democratic innovation* (pp. 101-108). Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Gutmann, A. (2004, October 15). Inaugural address. Retrieved from http://www.upenn.edu/

Harkavy, I. (2015). Creating the connected institution: Towards realizing Benjamin Franklin's and Ernest Boyer's revolutionary vision for American higher education. In N. H. Hensel, L. Hunnicutt, & D. A. Salomon, *Redefining the paradigm: Faculty models to support student learning* (pp. 6-19). Valparaiso, IN: New American Colleges & Universities.

Harkavy, I., et al. (2009). Anchor institutions as partners in building successful communities and local economies. In P. C. Brophy and R. D. Godsil (Eds.), *Retooling HUD for a catalytic federal government: A report to Secretary Shaun Donovan* (pp. 147-169). Philadelphia: Penn Institute for Urban Research.

Harkavy, I., Hartley, M., Hodges, R. A., Sorrentino, A., & Weeks, J. (2014). Effective governance of a university as an anchor institution: University of Pennsylvania as a case study. In *Leadership and governance in higher education for decision-makers and administrators*, *Volume 2* (pp. 97-116). Berlin: Raabe Academic Publishers.

Harper, W. R. (1905). *The trend in higher education.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Hartley, M. (2011). Idealism and compromise and the civic engagement movement. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 27-48). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hartley, M., Harkavy, I., & Benson, L. (2005). Putting down roots in the groves of academe: The challenges of institutionalizing service-learning. In D. Butin (Ed.), *Looking in, teaching out: Critical issues and directions in service-learning* (pp. 205-222). New York, NY: Palgrave/St. Martin's Press. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403981042_13

Hartley, M., & Huddleston, T. (2010). *School-community-university partnerships for a sustainable democracy: Education for democratic citizenship in Europe and the United States of America*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Pribbenow, P. (2014). Lessons on vocation and location: The saga of Augsburg College as urban settlement. *World & Word, 34*(2), 149-159.

Reinhold, M. (1968). Opponents of classical learning in America during the revolutionary period. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 112*(4), 221-234.

Sargent, R. (Ed.). (1999). *Francis Bacon: Selected philosophical works.* Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Schneider, C.G. (2014). Making excellence inclusive: Liberal education and America's promise. *Liberal Education, 100*(4), 46-53.