Judith A. Ramaley

Higher education is being asked to pay more attention to student learning and to contribute to the enhancement of the social and economic conditions of the community it serves. As a result, educational institutions will no longer be self-contained. Community members and organizations have become not only critical partners in framing the goals and intentions of the educational reform movement, but they also have assets that must be tapped by educational institutions that wish to implement change and respond to social needs.

Preparing the Way for Reform in Higher Education:

Drawing Upon the Resources of the Community-at-Large

Higher education faces two challenges as we approach century's end: (1) to offer first-class undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare students to respond effectively to the complex issues of society and promote social responsibility and good citizenship, and (2) to respond to the social and economic concerns of the communities we serve without additional resources to support these activities and relationships.

As James Ogilvy has pointed out, we may be entering a "New Educational Order" where the resources of higher education will be deployed toward significantly different ends than they are at present. We are likely to be directly engaged with the social problems of our day, including the issues of sweeping educational reform (Ogilvy, 1993). Ogilvy envisions that the shift to engagement and interconnectedness will be implemented through partnerships and shared resources, rather than being designed and implemented from within a particular institution. He also believes that the change will be beneficial. Learning will

be "enhanced by a paradigm shift that transforms knowledge from a passive, spectral representation of objects at a distance (like watching old films and videotapes of world events) to a much more active - interactive - involvement with the world and with other people ."

Many institutions are now seriously reviewing their roles and responsibilities. In *Campus Trends 1994*, Elaine El-Khawas documents a growing emphasis on academic program redirection. "Most campuses have reviewed their current programs, especially to consider how well each program contributes to the institution's overall mission...New programs are being developed, sometimes involving comprehensive changes in approach. Many of these actions represent a direct response to changing needs among students and the community."

However, it is easier to acknowledge the need for change than to launch fully into the process itself. As El-Khawas reports in *Campus Trends, 1995*, "a gap remains between accepting and broadly implementing new approaches. Although most campuses have some activities in these areas, suggesting a general acceptance, relatively few reported extensive activity."

The educational reforms necessary to introduce new learning modes into the curriculum, to broaden the scope and nature of faculty scholarship, and to develop new forms of university-community partnership will be difficult to undertake and difficult to sustain, especially in an era when little if any new investment will be made in the nation's system of public higher education.

Change in higher education tends to be incremental and piecemeal and does not usually spread beyond its point of origin because there are no consistent mechanisms to transmit change through an institution (Hefferlin, 1969).

We cannot respond to societal demands unless we undertake genuine institutional transformation. We cannot settle for minor modifications and improvements. According to Hefferlin (1969), significant change is possible when (1) the resources are available for it, (2) there are advocates interested in it, and (3) the system is open to new ideas and new people. Successful change depends upon a healthy balance of these three factors but a whole web of institutional conditions — traditions, norms, beliefs, structure, power relationships, and roles — contribute to the difference between institutions that successfully undertake intentional and meaningful change and those that do not. Some factors are more important than others. These include:

- the possibility of reward or benefit,
- individual influence or inspired leadership, and
- whether an institution is structurally open to external influence.

As Hefferlin put it: "Neither presidential leadership nor faculty collegiality nor low role specification nor high faculty turnover by themselves appear to contribute unilaterally to the process. Instead, a whole network of factors — attitudes, procedures, mechanisms, pressures — appear to be involved." Observers of institutional change tend to report that, despite the perceptions of faculty to the contrary, the impetus for change generally arises from outside the academy, as institutions that function as biologically open systems react to external forces. The most powerful of these external forces is the budget cut. Conventional wisdom holds that "outsiders initiate; institutions react," although internal conditions can alter the sensitivity, nature, and completeness of the reaction to outside forces.

True institutional transformation is possible, therefore, if the university functions as an open system, exchanging information and resources with the community around it and sensitive to community input. This condition can be achieved and maintained if the majority of students and faculty are engaged in activities in the community.

Colleges and universities can provide an excellent educational experience for their students, operate their campuses more productively, and address community concerns more effectively if they incorporate service-learning experiences into the curriculum for all students, both undergraduate and graduate, and if they conduct a significant proportion of their research and teaching activities in cooperation with community partners. To accomplish this, the institution must embrace community involvement as a core institutional priority and then systematically undertake actions that create supportive conditions for community-based work. Regardless of particular local circumstances and history, there are a few necessary, if not sufficient, conditions that must exist if a community-based strategy is to be successful.

- Community work must be valued as a meaningful educational experience and a legitimate mode of scholarly work.
- Mediating structures must be provided to help faculty and students identify community-based learning and research opportunities and technical support must be provided to help faculty and students use these opportunities and assess the results of such programs.
- Opportunities must be provided for faculty and students to develop the skills required to participate in research and curricular programs in a collaborative mode with partners from different academic disciplines and with significant community involvement.

An institution that wishes to undertake sweeping changes in both graduate and undergraduate education as well as in the conduct and aims of research, must examine both its explicit and its implicit reward structures. Are faculty consistently encouraged to engage in activities that fit the institutional mission? Do official documents say one thing while the institution actually recognizes and rewards something else? How much recognition has been given to how time-consuming and difficult it is to work in a collaborative mode, either on campus or with community partners? Does the campus attempt to make it easier for faculty and academic programs to work in interdisciplinary or community-based ways? Does the campus make a genuine effort to document and evaluate work of this kind?

In 1991, Portland State University undertook an ambitious strategy to create the capacity to achieve its urban mission. Our experience leads us to several observations that may be helpful to others who wish to do the same.

To expand their capacity for curricular reform and to facilitate the application of new knowledge to society's problems, universities must create networks of local, regional and national organizations and promote effective working relationships among the members in order to tap these resources in addressing local opportunities and problems.

Our colleges and universities no longer can afford to be self-contained and conduct their research and teaching entirely with their own resources and within their own campus facilities. Significant external resources can, and must, be tapped to support the process of institutional and curricular change. Community resources can be applied both to the design and delivery of the curriculum and to enhancing and extending the capacity of the school, college, or university to participate effectively in local and regional community development efforts.

University goals and community needs are connected through the scholarly work of faculty and students. A university can focus more faculty and student attention on local and regional issues and provide additional resources to support work on community problems by forming appropriate university-community partnerships. Without the creation of such networks, it is difficult for individual faculty or students to identify and utilize appropriate community resources for research and teaching and to sustain an effective involvement in the community over time.

Universities that set out to create productive community partnerships often make three mistakes. The first is that universities frequently choose to work with community organizations and groups represented by especially vocal and effective advocates of community interests. By doing this, we often fail to hear from people who have the most profound and significant needs.

Second, we often play the wrong role in our partnerships. We prefer to be experts who have solutions to problems, when, in fact, nobody has the answers to the most critical questions facing society today. The goals of the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies, which is affiliated with Portland State University but operated by an independent board, can provide a useful model for a more appropriate role for universities as partners:

- identify the most pressing regional needs that university assistance can meet;
- bring academic resources from participating institutions of higher education together with local and state organizations to address regional challenges;
- provide a neutral forum for public officials, business and civic leaders, and citizens to discuss policy issues;
- facilitate the exchange of information and the transfer of a new methodology/technology;
- sponsor and fund public service research;
- sponsor and fund student participation in projects that address community concerns.

A third mistake that both universities and service agencies make is to assume that our job is to identify deficiencies and correct them in order to get the results we think best for the community. In their work on community development, Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) start their argument from a *different* premise: that our task is to identify organizational and community strengths and build on them, based on the priorities or needs identified by the community itself. Kretzmann and McKnight define three types of assets that can be focused on the task of community development. They are (1) locally controlled assets, such as churches and civic groups; (2) secondary assets within the community but controlled by others, such as public schools and fire stations; and, (3) potential building blocks originating outside the neighborhood and controlled by outsiders, such as grants from Federal agencies and the resources of colleges and universities.

A university can draw upon these assets and play the role of facilitator, broker, and coordinator of joint efforts that draw upon resources held by a number of participating groups and organizations, both in the immediate neighborhood and elsewhere. It is becoming clear to urban-serving universities that we must carefully assess our role in the community and accept only those responsibilities that naturally derive from our special capacities.

Colleges and universities in both urban and rural areas can become centers for

integrating networks of resources, some within the community and some elsewhere, that can be tapped through collaborative strategies to help a community respond to its problems. At the same time, a university can use this network to open up new educational and research environments for its faculty and students and thus achieve its own academic goals by utilizing resources of its community partners to extend its own capacity.

A university-community network, which represents a significant source of social capital to invest in community projects, ought to be created carefully in order to be truly representative of the strengths and capacities of the region. An institution that wishes to create or expand such a network can profitably ask itself two questions:

1. Which organizations can act most effectively to coordinate or assist other organizations in our neighborhood or region? It is important to form lasting partnerships with organizations that really know the community in order to link our research and teaching efforts effectively to community capacity-building.

2. What kinds of community-wide research, planning, and decisionmaking processes can most democratically and effectively advance the rebuilding process in our neighborhood or region? If we are to measure our own success in part by our ability to help the community address its own pressing needs, we must find a way to identify those needs from many perspectives, not just from the point of view of the most vocal and able spokespersons, and we must have a way to design mutually acceptable indicators of progress and success that reflect our academic goals and the priorities of our community partners at the same time. The creation of such indicators can take inordinate amounts of time and the process can be very frustrating to all parties, but the results can provide powerful measures of shared success.

An institution that wishes to introduce a strong community base into its research, instruction, and outreach mission can utilize the natural demand arising within the professions for individuals trained to work in collaborative modes.

Community collaboration is becoming a component of many professional programs. Consider, for example, the experience of the mental health professions, including children's mental health, gerontology, adult mental health, and special education (reviewed in Newell et al., 1994). In 1984, The Child and Adolescent Service System Program (CASSP) at the National Institute of Mental Health (now called the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration), developed principles to guide professional practice in the field of children's mental health. The CASSP described effective care programs as family-centered, integrated, and comprehensive, and based on the individual needs of children.

Family-centered programs involve interagency cooperation and family partici-

pation in all aspects of the planning and delivery of services. To be able to create programs of this kind, professionals must learn to collaborate, both with people in other professional fields and with community volunteers and family members. Collaborative strategies are also being embraced by a number of other professions, including engineering, health professions, and K-12 education. Even colleges and universities are beginning to talk seriously about the collective responsibilities of faculty and the need for greater collaborative and interdisciplinary work in order to support curricular reform, professional outreach, and applied research.

To prepare professionals who can work collaboratively in student-centered or family-centered modes, professional and graduate programs, as well as in-service and agency-based continuing education programs, have begun to devise professional development strategies that utilize university faculty, participating practitioners, community members, students, and family members to help in designing the curriculum, participate in instruction, and pose questions and challenges that become the targets of research investigation by teams of pre-service students, practicing professionals seeking continuing professional education, and community participants. As Jivanjee, et al. (1995) have pointed out, there is clearly a growing trend toward training professionals in human services fields to serve families better by working collaboratively with other agency professionals, with families and with community volunteers.

An effective response to calls for the reform of undergraduate education is to utilize service-learning as a mode of instruction. Curricular reform is under way at the undergraduate level all over the country. Thomas Ehrlich (1995) points out that, "[a]t the founding of many public and private universities...service was the ultimate goal, with teaching and scholarship the means of achieving that goal. The institutions had a coherence of vision and a sense of shared purpose. In the course of time, however, the three primary activities of faculty — teaching, research, service — have drifted apart, and service has been drained of its original drive."

"Tell me, and I forget," said the philosopher and statesman, Benjamin Franklin. "Teach me, and I may remember. "Involve me, and I learn." In a few instances, curricular reform has been approached in a mode that engages all students in the work of their neighborhoods and communities. These activities are generally called "service learning" programs. Programs of this kind tap the needs and capacities of the local community to create an environment for learning that not only promotes the development of students as individuals, but also enhances their ability to put what they know to practical use and to serve the community while they learn. In some cases, the goal of service-learning is simply to offer more compelling and interesting

material to be used in achieving the educational goals of a curriculum. In other cases, a secondary goal may be to encourage social responsibility and good citizenship. As Ehrlich (1995) has said, "Education should not be value-free. It should serve to deepen our sense of connectedness and responsibilities to others. Incorporating volunteer service into undergraduate education, as an integral part of that education, emphasizes for students that serving others is part of being an educated person."

At Portland State University, faculty who are designing our new general education curriculum, which introduces significant service-learning activities for *all* students (White, 1994), and those participating in collaborative research projects with community partners report that they find their work more exciting and fulfilling.

On most campuses, however, community work is still defined as a useful, but voluntary, activity that students, faculty, and staff may choose to do as a *supplement* to their primary commitments. Community-based work is not commonly built directly into the curriculum or expected of every student, nor is it acknowledged as scholarly work by many faculty.

Campuses that wish to spread a community-base throughout the curriculum and research mission must create policies and practices and organizational designs that support collaborative and community-based work. In such environments, community work acquires a higher value. In 1994, an office of Urban and Metropolitan Programs (AASCU/NASULGC, 1995) surveyed the membership of both organizations to create a profile of the nature and extent of urban community services at the nation's public "urban-serving" universities. Most institutions reported some organized form of community outreach, confined to particular academic programs or special centers and institutes.

The survey also reported that the primary barriers that limit community outreach arise from the experience of faculty: lack of time, lack of technical assistance, and lack of rewards and recognition for community-based work, which is generally not considered to be a scholarly activity.

It is not easy to introduce significant community involvement throughout an institution. The University of Pennsylvania, for example, initiated a grand experiment over a decade ago to respond to the rapid decline of West Philadelphia. When the university began its work, the original project leaders believed that the future of the university was tied to the future of the city, that the university could enhance its overall mission of advancing and transmitting knowledge through effective community involvement, and that it could make a real contribution to improving the quality of life in its neighborhood (Harkavy and Puckett 1991).

It was hoped that the resulting community partnership would also serve as a model for what Harkavy and Puckett (1991) call "academically-based public service-service rooted in and intrinsically tied to teaching and research...that seeks to integrate the teaching, research and service missions of the university and to stimulate intellectual integration across the institution." A decade later, however, most institutions, including Penn, remain largely disconnected from the life of their neighborhoods and region.

It is time to rethink the consequences of the division of faculty work into teaching, research, and service, and the narrow range of activities we have accepted as valid expressions of all three, and to understand the influence of these conventions on our ability to work effectively with our community. Several years ago, Ernest Boyer opened up a new way of thinking about scholarship in his monograph *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990)

Ernest Boyer, with Robert Diamond of the Center for Improvement of Instruction at Syracuse University, and Ernest Lynton of the New England Resource Center for Higher Education at the University of Massachusetts-Boston, are working on similar projects, to define faculty roles and responsibilities in terms more meaningful for an era in which application of scholarly work to community needs is becoming a goal of both the curriculum and the research programs of institutions, and to design effective ways to measure the quality and impact of new forms of faculty activity, such as professional service and participation, in service-learning.

Scholarship can be viewed in a number of ways. The model we are starting to use at Portland State University contains four components. These are *discovery*, *integration* into a body of knowledge, *interpretation* of knowledge to a variety of audiences, and *application* in a variety of settings. Work done primarily with students can be called "teaching." Work done primarily with faculty colleagues and communicated to an academic audience through traditional peer-reviewed channels can be called "research." Work done in the community with active participation of community representatives may be called community service, public service, professional outreach, community-based research or applied research, depending upon the inclinations of the observer and the content of the work. What really matters in evaluating the quality and impact of all forms of scholarly activity, however, is:

- What are the goals of the work?
- How good is the work?
- Who cares about the results?
- How well is the work explained and who uses the results?

We must measure the quality of this work, in order to give it legitimacy. There are ways to address the barriers that most faculty encounter when they seek to respond to community needs: lack of incentives, lack of time, and lack of technical support for collaborative work. Departmental and curricular linkages to the community can be improved or facilitated by paying careful attention to how faculty roles and responsibilities are defined, both formally and unintentionally, how campus resources are deployed to support what faculty and students do and how faculty and students can successfully utilize community resources, as well as campus resources, to support collaborative work.

An institution that wishes to build community relationships and partnerships into its institutional design, or wishes to encourage a significant number of faculty to use the community as a classroom or laboratory in their research and teaching, must reflect these goals and values in promotion and tenure guidelines, faculty development programs, assessment strategies, and academic support structures. It is important for deans and provosts to seek explicit definitions of collective responsibilities at each level of organization, from the individual department to the school or college and the institution as a whole, and to reward effective teamwork as well as individual excellence.

It is time to revisit the nature and character of the academic disciplines, graduate study, and the role of the academic department and open up opportunities for community involvement. A more significant engagement with our community may heal the fragmentation that many faculty experience in their professional lives today. In most of the campus discussions that were held around the country last year under the auspices of the Pew Roundtable, time was spent exploring the sense of loss that pervades most of our institutions: loss of a common language, of common assumptions, of a sense of community, and of a common set of intellectual tools and approaches to scholarly inquiry. There are many forms of fragmentation: of scholarly work into the artificial categories of research, teaching and service; of knowledge into disciplines; of inquiry into theory and practice; of universities into departments and schools; of metropolitan regions into decaying inner cities and thriving suburbs; and of states into urban and rural interests.

To respond to these concerns, we must make our frame of reference larger than the department or the discipline it represents. As Ira Harkavy of the University of Pennsylvania has often pointed out, attention to community concerns, both on a campus and in the surrounding neighborhoods, can set the stage for a reintegration of the artificially fragmented aspects of our intellectual lives. Referring to the original purposes of Hull House in Chicago, which sought to integrate social science and

social work, Harkavy and Puckett (1994) suggest that "the key challenge" is for universities to provide "illuminated space for their communities as they conduct their mission of producing and transmitting knowledge to advance human welfare and to develop theories that have broad utility and application." As many wise observers have remarked, however, societal problems do not come in the form of disciplinary questions. Societal questions require multidisciplinary approaches.

Every college or university has significant resources that could be used to address community concerns: its faculty and their scholarly interests, its academic programs, its student body, its staff, and its physical plant. Most of these resources operate within relatively impermeable departmental structures and are not reliably and consistently deployed in response to external needs. To evaluate how well it is responding to community needs, a college or university must ask itself:

- In what ways are we involved with the larger community beyond the boundaries of the campus?
- How productive are our community relationships from both our point of view and from the perspective of our partners?
- To what extent are our institutional resources dedicated to departmental or school/college purposes as contrasted with shared or institution-wide purposes?

Until recently, external factors that might cause a college or university to respond or change have only indirectly influenced what faculty and students actually do. Such external pressures have been felt largely by senior administrators who have responded to legislative criticisms or external complaints by trying to persuade faculty to change their behavior, to spend more time advising students, for example, or to work more closely with local industries. If our institutions are to become more naturally responsive to the needs of society, we must significantly change what faculty and students do with their time. For this to occur, the influences from the community must directly reach faculty, who are responsible for designing the curriculum and setting its goals, and for identifying and exploring research questions.

Community influences and messages must play most strongly in the academic department, which serves on most campuses as the basic academic home or unit of activity and function for both faculty and students. Recently, Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck (1994) documented the constraints at departmental level that prevent faculty from working together on collaborative projects. These same constraints can reduce the impact of external pressures and influences. Fragmented communication

patterns limit the amount of faculty conversation about curricular and educational matters. In addition, tight budgets limit opportunities and time for innovative work and place further strain on already stressful faculty interactions, as colleagues compete for limited departmental resources. Third, prevailing methods of evaluation and campus reward systems emphasize individual faculty accomplishments and undermine efforts to work in a collaborative mode, especially when collaboration extends beyond departmental boundaries.

It is possible to rise above these constraints. The most powerful community linkage that faculty can construct is the curriculum. When the faculty design opportunities to practice collaboration and to work in community settings into undergraduate majors and graduate programs, as has happened fairly recently in many professional programs, more students and faculty will be paying attention to community issues and identifying projects that will support the educational and research goals of the institution.

The goals and purposes of the undergraduate major are already under review, guided by the efforts of national associations such as the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU.) The reform of graduate education will soon be upon us. Already, there are clear messages being delivered to the academy from employers who tell us that recently minted PhDs do not have the range of skills, versatility, and flexibility that they will need to thrive in the rapidly changing environment that characterizes higher education, government and industry. The demand for traditional discipline-based researchers is declining and the need for more broadly prepared people who can address research and development needs in emerging production, service, and information enterprises is growing.

Basic reforms in doctoral education will be needed, both for students seeking academic careers and students seeking to work in the nonacademic sector. The faculty of our doctoral-granting institutions must design a curriculum that more broadly prepares students to employ disciplinary frameworks in complex, applied, community-based, and interdisciplinary settings as well as in traditional disciplines and laboratory settings.

In other words, our doctoral graduates must emerge more versatile, grounded in the fundamentals of their chosen field, conversant with several subfields, and not overly specialized in a single line of inquiry. Graduates must be able to communicate complex ideas to nonspecialists who must have access to the results of basic research more quickly, they must be able to work with teams of people who have different perspectives and areas of expertise than they have, and they must have the

ability to continue to learn in fields with which they are not very familiar.

Furthermore, these abilities will be needed not only in non-academic settings, but also in our colleges and universities, by faculty who will design and deliver new undergraduate and graduate and professional curricula that incorporate collaboration and community-involvement.

In addition, master's education is overdue for a thorough review and revision. Enrollments in the nation's masters programs continue to soar but we have not thoroughly examined what our students' educational goals are and how they plan to use their advanced education. Fewer masters degree recipients go on for doctoral work than in the past. In many fields, a master's degree has been viewed as a milestone along the path to a doctorate or a consolation prize for people who were not accepted as doctoral candidates. If this is no longer true, what should the goals of a master's education be? If master's work is being used by many students as a professional credential, even in the arts and sciences, opportunities for collaboration and community-involvement will be needed at the master's level also. Chickering and Gamson (1991) describe how student learning is facilitated by greater faculty/ student interaction, more cooperation among students, active engagement in learning, problem-focused learning that is based on questions of interest to the students involved, and a respect for different talents and ways of learning. As the undergraduate curriculum and K-12 education are adapted to incorporate these practices, the gap between how graduate students learn and faculty do research (i.e. learn), and how undergraduate students learn will continue to grow. This disparity can be prevented by institutional practices that encourage a greater diversity of scholarly activities and modes of inquiry among faculty, including support for collaborative, interdisciplinary, and university-community interactions as part of the accepted and documented repertoire of faculty scholarship.

An institution that wishes to encourage collaborative work must develop credible and comprehensive measurements of the productivity, quality, and impact of faculty and academic programs that are operating in a collaborative mode with the community. The impact of institutions on the social, economic, and cultural concerns and conditions in their region or state must be documented and evaluated. These measures are needed for both internal and external purposes. Internally, the information will help in the design and implementation of curricula built on concepts of community collaboration and service learning. Externally, this information will improve our capacity to respond to demands for greater accountability. We must move beyond preparing a pamphlet that reports the overall campus budget and extrapolates an economic impact based on what the campus and its employees and

students spend in the community or the increased earning power of its graduates. We must trace our influence on the effectiveness and productivity of businesses, schools, government agencies, neighborhood associations, community policing, and other local entities, and the impact of these changes on the experiences of people they serve. We must document whether our work improves indicators of quality of life that the local community has identified as significant.

We also need measures of the productivity and success of institutional partnerships. As our institutions increasingly enter into new and more complex institutional and community partnerships, we need ways to evaluate the quality, productivity, and value of the time and money we expend in partnership activity. Many institutions are embracing their surrounding community as a necessary component of their campus missions. We must develop ways to track and evaluate the impact of scholarly activity and educational programs in the community at large. How effective are interinstitutional research and academic program initiatives? Which alliances are mutually beneficial to all participants? Which partnerships are worth continuing?

Summary

In the past five years or so, the demand for educational reform, at both public schools and at the higher education level, has converged with increasing expectations that both public schools and postsecondary institutions will play broader roles in their communities. These conditions have led to several important lessons:

• Educational institutions are no longer self-contained. For many reasons, community members and organizations have become not only critical partners in framing the goals and intentions of the educational reform movement, but they also have assets that must be tapped by educational institutions that wish to implement reform.

• Restructuring will occupy the efforts of higher educational institutions for the remainder of this decade. The success of both institutional and educational restructuring and reform will be measured in part by the extent to which each institution contributes to the enhancement of the social and economic conditions of the community it serves—both indirectly through the abilities and contributions of its graduates, and directly through how well faculty, staff, and students contribute to solving community problems and creating community opportunities.

Suggested Readings

AASCU/NASULGC. "Urban Community Service at AASCU and NASULGC

Institutions: A Report on Conditions and Activities." Washington, D.C. : AASCU/ NASULGC, 1995.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered. Priorities for the Professoriate.* Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning, 1990.

Caroll, James B., and Walter H. Gmelch. "Department Chairs' Perceptions of the Relative Importance of Their Duties." *The Journal for Higher Education Management.* Summer/Fall, 1994.

Chickering, Arthur W., and Zelda F. Gamson. "Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education." *New Directions in Teaching and Learning*, Vol 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1991.

Diamond, Robert M. "The Tough Task of Reforming the Faculty-Rewards System." *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* May 11, 1994: B1-3.

Duffield, Ann. Remarks at "Innovations in Undergraduate Education. A Forum about Revitalization and Change in Undergraduate Learning," held at Portland State University, September 16-17, 1994.

Ehrlich, Thomas. "Keynote Address at Colloquium on National and Community Service." *Compact Current.* Vol 9 (1). January/February, 1995.

El-Khawas, Elaine. *Campus Trends 1994.* Higher Education Panel. Report No. 84. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. July, 1994.

El-Khawas, Elaine. *Campus Trends 1995.* Higher Education Panel. Report No. 85. Washington., D.C.: American Council on Education. July, 1995.

Harkavy, Ira, and John L. Puckett. "The Role of Mediating Structures in University and Community Revitalization: The University of Pennsylvania and West Philadelphia as a Case Study." *The Journal of Research and Development in Education.* 25: 10-25, 1991.

Harkavy, Ira, and John L. Puckett. "Lessons from Hull House for the Contemporary Urban University." *Social Service Review.* September: 299-321. 1994.

Hefferlin, Lon J.B. *Dyamics of Academic Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1969.

Jivanjee, P.R., K.R. Moore, K.H. Schultze, and B.J. Friesen. *Interprofessional Education for Family-Centered Services: A Survey of Interprofessional and Interdisciplinary Training Programs.* Portland Oregon: Portland State University, Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health. 1995.

Kretzmann, John P., and John L. McKnight. *Building Communities from the Inside Out. A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets.* Evanston, Il.: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University. 1993.

Lynton, Ernest B. *Making the Case for Professional Service.* Washington. D.C.:

American Association for Higher Education. Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. 1995.

Massy, William F., Andrea K. Wilger, and Carol Colbeck. "Overcoming 'Hallowed' Collegiality." *Change*. July/August, 1994, pp. 11-20.

Newell, S., P. Jivanjee, K. Schultze, B. Friesen, and R. Hunter. *Collaboration in Interprofessional Practice and Training: An Annotated Bibliography*. Portland Oregon: Portland State University, Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health. 1994.

Ogilvy, James. "Three Scenarios for Higher Education: The California Case." *The NEA Higher Education Journal* Vol.9: 1993, pp. 25-69.

Ogilvy, James. "Education in the 21st Century." *On the Horizon*. Vol. 2 June/July, 1994, pp. 4-5.

White, Charles R. "A Model for Comprehensive Reform in General Education: Portland State University." *The Journal of General Education*. Vol. 43: 1994, pp. 168-229.