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Chance Encounters, Transformation, and New Beginnings

From the Editor

Dr. Marybeth Lima is the Cliff and Nancy Spanier Alumni Professor at Louisiana State University

I was heading to the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) annual meeting, the one I attend almost every year in which I drink out of a fire hose for several days to learn more about what others are doing in this discipline and to be inspired to continue my own work. As an engineer who cares about service learning and community engagement, I often feel lonely within my profession. For the few days of ASEE each year, I feel like part of a larger tribe—there is something energizing about sharing space with engineers who believe that engagement is the key to ensuring that future engineers are humanitarians and not highly skilled barbarians.

I entered the New Orleans airport and as I was checking in for my direct flight to Salt Lake City and ASEE, I felt a hand on my shoulder. When I turned around, I recognized one of my former students, one who had gone on to get a PhD in neuroscience at UCLA and was now engaged in full-time research. He and his family live in Salt Lake City and had just finished visiting extended family in Louisiana. We sat together at the gate and I asked about his quest to change careers; Jeremy had contacted me a few months earlier about leaving research and entering full-time, K–12 teaching.

We were discussing ideas when the woman sitting next to me looked up from her book and said, “Excuse me for eavesdropping, but I couldn't help overhearing your conversation. She looked at Jeremy and continued, “I'm Mandy, nice to meet you. I am the national teacher of the year, and I want you to know that we need you. If you are even thinking about teaching, please go for it. We need people who care about students in the classroom, and it is clear that you care.” The three of us went on to talk about ways to be effective in the classroom and the transformative ways that teaching and mentoring lift not only the students, but ourselves as well. “Always put students first,” Mandy declared, “and listen to their stories.”

I am so appreciative of unexpected, unscripted situations like these, which, upon reflection, leave me amazed at how small the world really is. (What are the chances that I'd randomly sit down next to the National Teacher of the Year? What are the chances that I'd run into a former student I taught almost 20 years ago who lives in a city I happen to be traveling to for a conference on teaching, or the chances that this student is working toward becoming a teacher himself?) I am equally amazed at how the same themes about education—valuing students, listening to stories, transforming lives and communities—continue to resonate. Mandy teaches high school English and math to students who come to her classroom from other countries, and in so doing, is “on the front lines” of one of the critical societal and moral issues of our time (http://neatoday.org/2018/04/23/2018-national-teacher-of-the-year-mandy-manning/).

I am honored to be the new editor of JCES. I feel like an unlikely editor—it certainly wasn't a career goal. What drew me to JCES, though, and what continues to draw and inspire me, are the stories that are told in the pages of this journal. Like the ASEE conference, reading JCES connects me to a larger tribe of people who care deeply about the world being a safe, just place—one community at a time. Like Mandy Manning and her teaching philosophy, reading the pages of JCES enables me to “listen” (through reading) to stories, including those of students, community partners, faculty, and communities. As editor, I plan to continue to facilitate the telling of stories that have yet to be shared.

I am so thankful to University of Idaho Professor Emeritus of Natural Resources and Society Nick Sanyal, the outgoing editor of JCES, for showing me the ropes when I began the associate editor position and for his sage advice about becoming editor. Nick is a consummate professional who took special care to demystify the publication process for new authors. He has provided thoughtful leadership as editor, which has enabled JCES to publish work that offers insightful perspectives on civic engagement. I will miss him. At the same time, I look forward to working...
with Drew Pearl, who has just assumed the associate editor position at JCES. Drew is the Director of Academic Engagement at the University of North Georgia. He is an accomplished engaged scholar and colleague. JCES has already benefited greatly from his insights and expertise, and I couldn’t be more excited to continue to work with him.

The articles in this issue of JCES tell stories: of a new perspective to gain insight on the effectiveness and nuances of long-term, town/gown relationships; of high school student civic engagement with respect to the great recession of 2008; of a new framework for ensuring community/university partnerships that are equitable; of the role that service learning has in enhancing the global citizenship skills of high school students; and of a service-learning mentoring program focused on leadership development that uses a virtual component to ameliorate geographical and resources issues. Articles contributed to the “Student Voices” section of the Journal include reflective insights on sexual violence and assault, as well as a program to enhance community access to swimming. Three book reviews provide information on recent publications involving future ways in which higher education can effectively engage with communities; the importance of public scholarship and “making it count” in the academy; and the use of deliberative pedagogy and how it can be used to address critical societal issues.

I encourage you to read and enjoy the stories and perspectives shared in this issue. I also encourage you to submit your insightful work to JCES. Manuscript preparation information begins on page 74. I look forward to reading your stories.
Don’t Confuse Exhaustion With Impact

From the Associate Editor

Dr. Andrew Pearl is director of Academic Engagement and assistant professor at the University of North Georgia

I’m an avid podcast consumer. While a lot of my queue is populated with various comedy shows, and the occasional sports radio program, I also try to listen to a show from which I can learn something new and which will challenge the way I think. One of the shows that has found its way into my regular rotation is “Pod Save the People.” The podcast focuses on issues related to culture, social justice, and politics, structured through a news segment followed by an in-depth interview. The hosts are passionate and insightful, and they never fail to expose me to a new idea, point of view, or way of thinking about critically important issues. The show often starts with a short introductory monologue from one of the hosts. A couple of months ago, the host said something that has been rolling around in my head ever since: “Don’t confuse exhaustion with impact.”

Even if not in those exact words, I’m sure it’s a sentiment I’ve heard before, but for whatever reason, the context and timing of the advice really stuck with me. I often find myself, like I’m sure many of us do, spinning my wheels some days, coming home at the end of a long day thinking that I checked off a lot of boxes on my to-do list, but with the feeling that I didn’t actually make a lot of progress on things. Sure, I’m exhausted because I’ve done so many things, but I sometimes still question what I actually did in any sort of meaningful way.

Entering into community/university partnerships requires a great deal of careful planning, relationship building, and hands-on work. At times, this can feel like we’re progressing for the sake of progress. The beauty of community engagement, however, is the tremendous collective impact that can result from these mutually beneficial and reciprocal partnerships.

It’s important for us to remember the why behind the work we do, and not get caught up in the minutiae to the point that we forget that we’re ultimately looking to address, as Ernest T. Boyer stated, “…our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems…” as we seek to fulfill our promise of intellectual and civic progress. One benefit of a journal like JCES is that it serves as a further incentive to purposefully and thoughtfully consider our impact, as well as how that impact is measured and documented, from the inception of the project, all while giving voice to all stakeholders. The articles in this issue do exactly that, and are excellent examples of why I am proud to continue to be affiliated with this fine publication.

“Don’t confuse exhaustion with impact.” This has definitely found its way to a sticky note on my computer monitor. I need the constant reminder.
Campus and Community Leadership in the Spotlight: How University Presidents and City Managers View Town/Gown Relationships

Stephen M. Gavazzi

Abstract
This paper begins by reviewing literature that underscores the critical role university presidents play in establishing functional campus/community relationships. Using the metaphor of marriage, a conceptual and methodological framework is offered for understanding and assessing the quality of the town/gown interaction. The presentation of a town/gown relationship model based on the twin dimensions of effort and comfort levels sets the stage for the presentation of results from interviews conducted with university presidents and city managers that focused specific attention on their perceptions of town/gown relationship types. More specifically, these leaders were asked to discuss the type of relationship they inherited at the start of their tenure, as well as how the town/gown interactions in which they were immersed had evolved over time. Finally, themes are presented as a set of “Town/Gown Ten Commandments” that highlight the critical role both campus and community leaders play in the development and maintenance of harmonious town/gown relationships.

Calls for more robust connections between universities and their host communities have taken many forms over the years. This has included the encouragement of “engaged institutions” by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (2000), the classification for community engagement supported by the Carnegie Foundation (Driscoll, 2008), the vision of regional stewardship advanced by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (Saltmarsh, O’Meara, Sandmann, Giles, Cowdry, Liang, & Buglione, 2014), and the Innovation & Economic Prosperity Universities Designation developed by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU, 2017).

The engaged university concept long has spawned comparisons between campus/community relationships and the interactions that occur between partners in a marriage (Hill, 1994). Gavazzi (2015c) wrote that “the relationships that exist between institutions of higher learning and the communities that surround them resemble marriages in some striking ways. The relative health of those relationships seems to rest on many of the same factors that create strong marriages” (p. 147). Within such a perspective is an important fundamental truth that applies equally to town/gown relationships and marriages: Higher education leaders ignore their institutional relationship with community stakeholders at their own peril (Gavazzi, 2015a).

Unfortunately, that fact seems to have been lost on many university administrators over the years, leading to many points of friction. For instance, Sungu-Eryilmaz (2009) has discussed the conflict that arises when a university wishes to embark on a new development project that involves property on or near the edge of campus. A different set of examples comes from Fox (2012; 2014), who has described the various difficulties that arise as the result of the university’s mismanagement of off-campus student housing issues, including most prominently student misbehavior in neighborhoods near campus. Taken together, land use and student residential concerns have been portrayed as the most prominent issues on the edge of campus property that inevitably drive a wedge between institutions of higher learning and the communities in which they are embedded (Gavazzi, 2016).

Thus, it is asserted here that higher education leaders should take co-responsibility for engaging their host communities, especially before major problems arise around these “edge/wedge” issues. There is shared accountability here, of course, because town/gown relationships are shaped by the reciprocal interactions of campus and community stakeholders. Therefore, municipal leaders likewise cannot afford to ignore the opportunities and challenges that come with having an institution of higher learning in their midst.

After reviewing previous literature that has underscored the important role that university presidents play in establishing functional campus/
community relationships, this paper offers a conceptual and methodological framework for understanding and assessing the quality of relationships that exist between campuses and communities. Using the metaphor of marriage discussed earlier, this work asserts that the most functional (i.e., harmonious) town/gown relationships are those that have partners who display both high levels of effort and comfort in their interactions with one another. Other relationship types (traditional, conflicted, and devitalized) represent less desirable campus/community interactions that reflect lower levels of effort and/or comfort.

The presentation of this town/gown relationship model sets the stage for the presentation of data culled from interviews with university presidents and city managers that focused specific attention on their perceptions of these town/gown relationship types. Here, these leaders were asked to discuss the type of relationship they inherited at the start of their tenure, as well as how the town/gown interactions in which they were immersed had evolved over time. Out of this information arose a set of themes that are presented as the Town/Gown Ten Commandments, leading to a discussion of the critical role that campus and community leaders can and should play in the development and maintenance of more harmonious town/gown relationships.

The Role of the University President in the Community

Scholarship focused on the role of the university president typically has included at least some mention of their need to attend to community relationships. For instance, in her 2012 book On Being Presidential: A Guide for College and University Leaders, Susan Resneck Pierce pointed out that presidential involvement with the local community presents both opportunities and risks. To provide a sense of how potential rewards versus costs can be weighed by university leaders, Pierce posed questions for presidents to ponder when considering initial (or greater) involvement in community partnerships. Interestingly, many of these questions seem lopsided in that they focused attention so heavily on whether campus needs were being met, echoing one of the major criticisms repeatedly lodged against university involvement in the community; that is, you only come to us when you want something for yourself. That said, “improved town/gown relationships” was present on the list of core issues for presidential deliberation generated by Pierce (p. 172).

Weill’s (2009) description of the president’s role in developing positive town/gown interactions seemed a bit more balanced in terms of laying out the costs and benefits for both campus and community. As well, Weill provided case examples that illustrated some of the steps that a president needs to take to more effectively engage community constituents. The steps included actions related to the formation of a stakeholder committee, for example, and the identification of specific goals to be accomplished through the activities undertaken within the partnership.

There are other breadcrumbs that can be followed as we aspire to learn more about how senior university leaders conceptualize the role they play in developing healthy town/gown relationships. One rather significant resource in this regard is a 2006 book entitled Leadership in Higher Education that was compiled by Francis Lawrence, the former president of Rutgers University. This book contains material culled from his interviews with 12 university presidents, all of whom were asked to respond to various important questions, including one that requested commentary on the role of the university within the communities that surrounded their campuses.

Virtually every university president interviewed by Lawrence (2006) underscored the importance of town/gown issues in one way or another. One example of a university president’s quote included in Lawrence’s (2006) book helps illuminate the point that university presidents play a critical role in determining the quality of relationships among campus and community stakeholders. Here, Mary Sue Coleman, former president of both the University of Iowa and the University of Michigan, argued that an ongoing campus/community dialogue was an essential component of the interdependent nature of the town/gown relationship. She is quoted as saying:

We don’t always agree because sometimes we have differing needs and differing expectations, but I think the communication is absolutely critical because we are totally dependent on each other. The university is dependent on having a nice city. The town is dependent on us to draw people here (Lawrence, 2006, p. 172).
Conceptualizing and Measuring the Optimal Town/Gown Relationship

Presently, there is at least one conceptual framework and an associated measurement technology that can provide standardized and longitudinal documentation of the quality of town/gown relationships that can be used to inform campus and community leadership activities. Using the lens of a marital metaphor, Gavazzi, Fox, and Martin (2014) sought to encourage more effective and evidence-based activities designed to promote campus/community partnerships. These authors asserted that two distinct and yet related conceptual dimensions could be used to describe the quality of campus/community exchanges. The first dimension pertains to the level of comfort that higher education personnel and community stakeholders experience inside of their relationship, while the second dimension of this model involves the level of effort required to maintain the present state of the town/gown relationship. By combining the comfort and effort dimensions (see Figure 1), four types of relationships are used to describe the characteristics of campus/community interaction: harmonious, traditional, conflicted, and devitalized.

The harmonious type—relationships consisting of higher comfort levels and higher effort levels—is the most optimal form of town/gown relationship as described by Gavazzi, Fox, and Martin (2014). In marriages, harmonious couples tend to report the highest satisfaction levels, owing in large part to the fact that they contain partners who are working together in ways that define and enhance their relationship with one another. Similarly, harmonious town/gown relationships are defined by the relatively high amount of activity that is directed toward the pursuit of goals that are of shared benefit to the campus and community.

The traditional type—a combination of higher comfort levels and lower effort levels—is thought to be the default “state of affairs” for most campuses and communities according to Gavazzi, Fox, and Martin (2014). While traditional couples report modest satisfaction levels, the partners typically have little contact with one another, and often lead very separate lives. The hallmark of the traditional town/gown relationship is the way that university and community representatives operate in largely autonomous fashion, often ignoring each other as they pursue their own individual goals.

The conflicted type reflects relationships that are comprised of lower comfort levels and higher effort levels, often as not used to describe less than satisfactory marriages that are defined by persistent fighting between the partners. Lots of energy is expended on issues that seem to be beyond the reach of the partners to resolve. In corresponding fashion, conflicted town/gown relationships are marked by ongoing quarrels, often about chronic issues such as land use (Sungu-Eryilmaz, 2009) and student misbehavior (Fox, 2012) mentioned above.

Finally, the devitalized type—a combination of low comfort levels and low effort levels—was used by Gavazzi, Fox, and Martin (2014) to describe relationships with the least amount of overall satisfaction. In marriages, devitalized couples report high levels of disappointment along with the sense that something was “lost” along the way. This sentiment underlies the notion that all devitalized relationships formerly reflected qualities of the other relationship types. As applied to town/gown associations, some campuses and communities that once were locked in combat simply give up on each other and refuse to communicate at all. Alternatively, a devitalized relationship can come about when hopes of a harmonious relationship are dashed repeatedly by the failure of one or both partners to follow through on promises and assurances.

Gavazzi, Fox, and Martin (2014) provided illustrations of each of the four relationship types through specific case examples from universities and their host communities. At the same time, however, there was explicit recognition of the need to push this area of scholarship beyond theoretical frameworks and toward more measurement-oriented activities. As a result, a tool known as the Optimal College Town Assessment (OCTA) has been developed that provides the field with some initial attempts to standardize the assessment process (Gavazzi, 2015a; 2015b; Gavazzi & Fox, 2015). By directly measuring effort and comfort...
levels, the OCTA generates scores that identify patterns of campus/community interactions consistent with one of the four town/gown relationship types. In addition, OCTA scores have been demonstrated to display distance decay effects, such that the dimensions of effort and comfort are rated at their highest levels by community residents who are geographically closest to the campus. Further, specific groupings of town/gown partners also display significant differences—for example, business owners’ versus local school district educators’ perceptions of university faculty members—underscoring the importance of disaggregating data in order to better understand critical differences between and among campus representatives and community stakeholders.

Taken together, the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data has been portrayed as part of a larger “mobilization cycle” regarding the use of assessment findings in the optimizing of town/gown relationships (Gavazzi, 2015c). Data gathering is situated in the middle ground of this process, bookended by preparatory activities on one side and evidence-based application efforts on the other. Stated most simply, there are a number of important accomplishments that must take place both prior to (awareness raising; coalition building) and following (data interpretation; evidence-based action planning) such data gathering efforts in order to maximally enhance the understanding of town/gown relationships among community stakeholders and campus representatives.

Specifics of the Town/Gown Leadership Study and Data Analysis Procedures

To generate some initial understanding of the way university leadership impacts the quality of campus/community relationships, four former university presidents and four former city managers were recruited to participate in a confidential interview regarding their town/gown experiences. After obtaining permission to conduct the study through the Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University, a short description indicating the time length and basic study procedures was emailed to a group of university presidents and city managers whom the author knew professionally through interactions at higher education conferences and leadership trainings. Campus and community leaders who were interested in the study were asked to reply by email directly to the author.

When the response was positive, a telephone interview was set up at the participant’s and author’s mutual convenience. Prior to the telephone interview commencing, participants were read a verbal informed consent script that also contained a short description of the study aims and assurances. Next, the interview participants were read the interview questions one at a time, with one version used for the university presidents and one version used for the city managers. Finally, participants were then debriefed regarding the aims of the study.

Content analysis procedures were employed to identify and organize themes that emerged from the transcribed text of all participant responses to the interview questions. The author reviewed the transcribed data in search of systematic patterns of answers to the questions posed to the participants, and then developed a coding scheme along the way as part of this review process. Each answer was typed on a separate piece of paper and then placed in separate piles according to the category of response best reflected within the coding scheme. After all responses were sorted, a constant comparison method of data analysis was employed to compare each answer to all the other answers contained in that category. As will be seen below, the responses were sorted into 10 categories. These categories reflected themes associated with: desire to create partnerships; time spent building relationships; respect; concerns about reciprocity; student issues; alumni awareness; valuation of faculty; historical connectedness; mindfulness of current issues and concerns; and a focus on posterity.

**Forty Thousand Feet Up: The Role of University Presidents**

Anonymity was guaranteed to maximize the opportunity for the four presidents emeritus (one had held the title of chancellor due to the specific organization of higher education institutions in that specific state) to speak freely about their experiences. That said, all four participants served as the senior administrators of some of the larger research universities located in quintessential college towns within the United States.

The information-gathering process followed a semi-structured interview format. While a standard set of questions was asked of each university president, each participant was encouraged to take the conversation wherever necessary to generate the fullest possible portrait of the role they played in developing and maintaining campus/community relationships. The full contents of these interviews are reported elsewhere (Gavazzi, 2016). What follows are the aggregated responses of presidents to the two questions that focus attention on
town/gown relationship types, which follow the original question and answer format employed in the interviews.

**Question 1: Using the Optimal College Town Assessment typology as a reference point, what sort of town/gown relationship did you inherit at the start of your presidency?**

Often as not, the presidents used the “traditional” town/gown type to describe the situation they inherited. That is, the relationship between campus and community was relatively low on effort, but at least somewhat higher on comfort levels, mostly due to a lack of interest in making connections between town and gown activities. One former president shared:

> I think I inherited something that was less than ideal...there was a kind of benign neglect on the part of the university with the town. I wouldn't say there was an all-out war between the two entities, but it certainly wasn't a relationship that was at the optimal point, despite the fact that there were a lot of things that I saw very soon that could be done between the town and the university that would really help both sides.

Another president stated unequivocally that he had inherited a harmonious relationship:

> There was a town/gown committee that was already in place by the time that I arrived. That committee was the formalization of what had already been a very positive relationship between the university and the community.

Further probing questions indicated that some of the relationships might have been labeled more accurately as having contained devitalized and conflicted relationship characteristics. One president described low effort in combination with low comfort (in this case, high suspicion), and went on to describe how much more difficult it was to do something with the discomfort factor.

> When there's a tradition of suspicion, it's more difficult to overcome than just low effort. When it's just low effort, you can simply put in greater effort. But when there's a tradition of suspicion, there are always questions. What are you doing that for? Is it really going to benefit us, or is it just for you?

Another example focused more specifically on distrust surrounding student housing issues:

> The relationships were pretty good at the start. But there was a little tension around certain issues, like housing, where the university by virtue of previous decisions that had been made was perceived to be unfairly competing with developers and what they were trying to do.

Finally, the term “exploitation” was introduced by one former university president to describe this lack of comfort inside of the town/gown relationship:

> There is a tendency on both sides toward exploitation. And maybe this is not unlike the marriage model as well. This is where the city sees the university as a target of opportunity, especially in terms of economic gain. What do I mean by that? Let's take as an example real estate development. Private developers would want that vacant property that was strategically located either within the university campus or adjacent to it. They would want to purchase that land on an anticipatory basis whereby in three to five years the university would need that property and buy it back for a much larger sum. In turn, the university began to be more forward looking and proactive ourselves, so we started buying up property before they could get to it or understanding what we would likely need five or ten years down the road.

None of these comments should be surprising to readers. As noted earlier in this article, these sorts of land use issues are responsible for much of the conflict and stress that develop within town/gown relationships. Of course, the other major culprit is student misbehavior, and this issue also arose in response to this interview question. In the words of one university president: “There was the sense that the university wasn't controlling its students. I think that was a very damaging aspect of the relationship I inherited.”

**Question 2: Again using the Optimal College Town Assessment typology as a reference point, what was the nature of the town/gown relationship when you stepped down as president?**
All the former presidents reported significant movement toward more harmonious relationships by the end of their tenure.

One former president said, “I wouldn’t say that we succeeded in doing everything that we wanted to do, but certainly the relationships and the trust between the university and the town were at a much higher level.”

The one president who claimed that he had inherited a harmonious relationship believed that his main responsibility was simply to maintain the relatively high-quality town/gown interactions that were already occurring:

I would like to say that I turned things around when I became president but that’s simply not true. Anything I contributed was simply baby steps in the direction we were already going. So, there was never anything that I had to fix. It was making sure that we kept the momentum going and never took it for granted. That it was something very precious, and my job was to make sure I didn’t screw it up.

The number of years in the position seemed to be related to the degree to which more positive relationships ensued. Essentially, it seemed to be the case that longer presidential terms yielded more harmonious tendencies:

The role of the president is to create trust among a number of constituencies, particularly the faculty and the board of trustees within the university, but also trust within the business community, the immediate residential community, and frankly trust with the political and media networks. Quite honestly, over a number of years I think that’s what we got right. I was lucky in that I became a president fairly early in my career, and I had a relatively long tenure as president. If you have that kind of continuity and longevity, it’s possible to nurture relationships that build trust in a way that you can’t if you have someone in a leadership position maybe three to five years. A new person then comes in and you have to start all over again.

Much of this movement toward improved relationships surrounded the improvement in how campus and community leaders interacted with one another over the years:

As years went on, the collaboration and conversation became much more focused. We started to look at the possibility of consolidating certain services such as fire protection. The university had a fire service alongside one in the community. Eventually we agreed to merge these services into a single, mutually coordinated operation. The same thing happened in terms of police services. We were constantly looking for ways to actively collaborate with one another.

One university president noted that in the end it all came down to giving and receiving respect:

I think the main thing from the university’s standpoint is to be respectful. It’s easy, I think, for the president of a very large university with a multibillion dollar budget to try to look down their nose at the local small town community mayor or town council. Treating them with respect, including them in your orbit, so that at the very least you are telegraphing to them on a fairly regular basis that, yeah, we know you exist, and if you have any issues come talk to me. Or if I have any issues I’ll come talk to you. So I had dinner with these folks, lunch with these folks, and we invited them to all of our social events.

The View from the Town

Four former city managers (also known as city administrators) who had larger comprehensive research universities within their municipal boundaries also agreed to participate in a confidential interview to generate some initial understanding of the impact that municipal leaders have on town/gown relationship quality. As with the presidents, the information gathering process followed a semi-structured interview format, and each participant was encouraged to take the conversation wherever necessary to generate the fullest possible portrait of the role they played in developing and maintaining campus/community relationships.

Question 1: Using the Optimal College Town Assessment typology as a reference point, what type of town/gown relationship did you inherit when you first started as a city manager?
One of the city managers reported that he had inherited a harmonious relationship from his predecessor, while the remaining three individuals reported as having walked into town/gown relationships that were more traditional by nature. Here is an excerpt of what the one city manager said about the harmonious relationship he inherited:

There was already a strong relationship between the campus and the community by the time I arrived. What helped to really catapult this relationship to become even better was my appointment to the president’s cabinet as the city representative. I learned a lot sitting on that cabinet, and I think that they in turn learned a lot about how to consider the community around them when major decisions needed to be made.

In turn, an example is provided here about the traditional relationship that another city manager described as inheriting:

The university president and I started at about the same time. He was into building the university endowment, into expanding the international reach of the university, building relationships with his board of trustees, with donors, all that stuff. So, we were not on the center of his radar screen. We were on his radar screen, but it was out on the periphery somewhere. And the university had just abandoned a largely symbolic initiative where they had consciously created touch points between the university and city administrations. That initiative subsequently had been described to me as an elaborate opportunity to talk problems to death. It never really captured the attention of university leadership, and it just kind of went away right before I came. It seemed to die a death of natural causes.

The third city manager had described difficulties within the municipality that had to be dealt with prior to dealing with town/gown issues:

Twenty years ago, I don’t know if I was brave or stupid. I stepped into a situation where our governing body was the conflicted relationship. Almost every vote was a 4–3 vote, and I thought I had to fix that before I fixed anything else. We had a tough first year, with seven governing members who were hardheaded to the point that there was a lack of civility in our meetings. We spent that first year getting those members to act like a governing body. I basically told that group that we could not hope to have good external relationships with the university if we could not get along together inside of our own building.

Question 2: Again using the Optimal College Town Assessment typology as a reference point, how have you witnessed changes in effort and comfort levels over the years you have served as a city manager?

All the city managers reported witnessing changes in the characteristics of the town/gown relationships across time. The one city manager with experience in multiple college town settings said this:

In all three instances, no matter how good the interactions were already, I saw movement toward more harmonious relationships. All three improved not only their relationships with each other, but also their understanding that the relationships had to improve. The competition these universities are facing for both faculty and students is driving this willingness to cooperate with towns. No student or faculty moves to a university any more thinking, “Hey, I’ll live my whole life inside these walls.” So, students and faculty members are going to be shopping for communities that have a high quality of life. Not to mention the shrinking financial resources. Universities now have to use an economy of scale with their surrounding communities to lower their infrastructure costs while improving the quality of life.

One city manager reported vacillating movement toward and away from a more conflicted relationship as the result of the rising influence of neighborhood associations, seen as a direct response to complaints about student behavior:

I would even go as far as to say that, depending on the issue at hand, the relationship can move right now between...
harmonious and conflicted. We have days and months where it's very harmonious and other times where it is very conflicted. It depends on the issue and what's going on at the time.

Another city manager noted that the trend toward greater interaction between the city and the university came as the result of more intense focus on student housing, which meant that the relationship moved from traditional to harmonious only after a period of conflict had been resolved around off-campus residential issues:

We were in a more traditional relationship pre-2008, when things were relatively calm and stable. This was during the growth curve of high school graduates, so universities had choices and lots of resources. And for us, the city had a long history of accepting the plight—the blight—of off-campus housing. We hadn't yet reached the point where we said "Hey wait a minute, maybe we don't have to accept this as a fait accompli. We can do some things to keep single family neighborhoods together, to keep students from living in squalor." I'd like to take some credit for challenging those things. We got the attention of the university in the midst of some riots that were happening in some off-campus student residential areas. Eventually they realized it was in their best interest to clean this up.

Still another city manager noted that the change in town/gown relationships came as the direct result of the changeover in university presidents:

When I wished to interact with the previous president, I was told that I had to make an appointment. That president's executive assistant would give me the choice of two or three days in the upcoming week or so. When the new president took over, he came to me, to my office, and said that he understood that there may have been some problems in getting together with the previous president. We talked for a while, and then he took out his business card, and with a pen he wrote his personal cell phone on the back of the card, telling me that I should feel free to call him anytime. I only had to use that phone number once in fourteen years of doing business with him, but it sure felt good to have that number in my hands.

The Ten Commandments of Town/Gown Relationships

As reported previously by Gavazzi (2016), it is very clear that the relative health of a town/gown relationship is the direct result of actions taken by both campus and community leaders. In fact, there was so much agreement in these interviews about 10 specific issues that Gavazzi (2016) decided to label them the Ten Commandments of Town/Gown Relationships. These Ten Commandments (see Table 1) can be broken into three subsets of directives. Taken together, the first four commandments serve as investment advice regarding the time and attention that campus and community leaders must give to building and sustaining their relationships with one another. Making town/gown relationships a high priority, setting aside the appropriate amount of time to nurture these associations, treating your partners with the utmost

Table 1. The Ten Commandments of Town/Gown Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commandment #1</th>
<th>Thou shall give high priority to efforts that build more harmonious relationships between campus and community members.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #2</td>
<td>Thou shall not miscalculate the time involved in developing and maintaining harmonious campus-community relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #3</td>
<td>Thou shall honor your campus and community partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #4</td>
<td>Thou shall seek win-win outcomes wherever and whenever possible in campus-community interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #5</td>
<td>Thou shall remember that students are the most important point of connection between campus and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #6</td>
<td>Thou shall know the power of your alumni, especially those living in communities immediately surrounding the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #7</td>
<td>Thou shall respect the notion that faculty members represent the face of both campus and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #8</td>
<td>Thou shall appreciate the history of the campus-community relationship you inherited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #9</td>
<td>Thou shall continuously assess the present state of the relationship between campus and community representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandment #10</td>
<td>Thou shall leave the campus-community relationship in better shape than you found it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respect, and seeking win-win outcomes wherever and whenever possible become the hallmarks of these relationship investment-oriented commandments.

The next three commandments focus on the central cast of characters outside of leadership circles that have the greatest impact on campus/community interaction. Institutions of higher learning exist for the primary purpose of educating students, and those students—for better and for worse—are the principal group that members of the community will interact with or otherwise get to know. Faculty members, in turn, are the individuals who are responsible for teaching those classes and conducting those research studies that provide the vehicles for students to gain their first entry points into the community. And, of course, those members of the community who are alumni—and especially those who have risen to positions of leadership within the community—represent the group of citizens who have the greatest potential to impact the quality of the town/gown relationship.

The final three commandments focus attention on the past, present, and future of town/gown relationships. Those campus and community leaders who do not understand the history of campus/community interaction surely are doomed to repeat it. Likewise, those same leaders who are not using standardized measurement tools to assess the quality of their present town/gown relationships are destined to forever play a guessing game (and one that often as not will generate misleading information). And finally, the most effective university administrators and municipal authorities are those individuals who plan for a future that does not require their physical presence to maintain the work they have accomplished.

Bringing it All Together: Town/Gown Theory, Data, and Interpretation of Results

The twin dimensions of effort and comfort are embedded in a 2X2 theoretical model that hypothesizes four distinct types of town/gown relationships: harmonious, traditional, conflicted, and devitalized (Gavazzi, Fox, & Martin, 2014). In turn, there is quantitative evidence that supports the measurement of campus/community characteristics as a function of those twin dimensions (Gavazzi & Fox, 2015). Left unanswered to this point, however, had been the degree to which the combination of effort and comfort could serve as a useful heuristic tool for the description of more personalized, and hence qualitative, descriptions of town/gown relationship quality. To this end, the present study has generated some important initial indications that the theoretical dimensions of effort and comfort resonated powerfully with the campus and municipal administrators who had agreed to take part in the interviews.

It should be noted that the presidents and town managers recruited for this study were well-known as advocates for strong campus/community relationships. Thus, it was likely their responses to the interview questions were going to be skewed in a positive direction. And by and large, these leaders did in fact tend to portray their town/gown experiences in more optimistic ways, especially when discussing the results of their diligent exertions to make things work. Hence, higher effort and higher comfort levels seemed to be the rule rather than the exception for the campuses and municipalities associated with the study participants.

That said, these same leaders clearly understood what university and community life looked like when effort and comfort levels fell away from some adequate level of relationship functioning. Witness for instance the use of the terms “suspicion” and “exploitation” in descriptions provided by some of the university presidents. Equally important, the comments of the city managers lent themselves to an acute sensitivity regarding the ephemeral nature of good town/gown relationships, especially when leadership changes were experienced.

Notably, the responses given by university presidents and city managers to questions about effort and comfort levels also displayed some remarkably consistent themes. So much so, in fact, that their comments were rather straightforwardly classifiable into the 10 initial categories created to sort the data: desire to create partnerships; time spent building relationships; respect; concerns about reciprocity; student issues; alumni awareness; valuation of faculty; historical connectedness; mindfulness of current issues and concerns; and a focus on posterity. The illustrative value of describing these categories as a set of commandments was determined only later, and then only because of the recurring reactions of several higher education colleagues who were familiar with the results.1

These initial qualitative findings were instrumental in pressing forward to further investigate the perceptions of university presidents regarding the value of actively pursuing more optimal campus/community relationships. Interviews

1 One colleague was West Virginia University President E. Gordon Gee, who was the first to remark that “it sure looks like you’ve compiled a complete set of town-gown commandments here.”
conducted with 27 presidents and chancellors of land-grant institutions examined the relative strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats associated with the ability of these universities to meet the needs of the communities they were designed to serve (Gavazzi & Gee, 2018). To a person, these land-grant leaders reported that the establishment and maintenance of more harmonious relationships with community stakeholders was a vital component of their university’s mission. In fact, many of the university presidents pointed to these community engagement efforts as the very activities that can help lay the foundation for restoring the American public’s confidence in its public institutions of higher learning. As of late, public trust in our universities has been deteriorating in a remarkable manner, especially among those individuals whose political affiliations are more right-leaning (Pew Research Center, 2017).

**Application of Findings**

While the applicability of this work to activities aimed at enhancing town/gown relationships would seem to be far-reaching, there are two areas that would seem to warrant more immediate attention within the confines of the present article. First, there is the subject of how the Town/Gown Ten Commandments can be framed as suggested talking points for building more optimal campus/community associations. Second, and equally important, is the applicability of these directives in more pedagogically driven efforts to better understand the inner workings of town/gown relationships.

For starters, it is believed that the decrees offered here can be used as a convenient framework for discussions among leaders of universities and municipalities about the nature of their current town/gown relationships, as well as to provide guidance and direction about specific issues they must incorporate into their relationship-building process. Here, these leaders might ask themselves such questions as: Are you willing and able to commit to expending the relatively large amount of energy necessary for building and sustaining relationships with one another? Are you able to concentrate especially on the roles played by students, faculty members, and alumni who reside in the community? And finally, can you do all of this within a context that demands a simultaneous focus on the past, present, and future of the town/gown relationships in which you are involved?

In turn, the answers to these sorts of questions can be used to trigger discussions about how any shortfalls and challenges that were forecast in advance by presidents and municipal leaders (or identified subsequently through observation of various town/gown interactions) can be overcome through the stepped-up involvement of other campus and community partners. For example, if the president finds that she or he is not able to make regular meetings devoted to town/gown issues (an extremely common issue), who can attend that has enough decision-making authority to not impede the group’s progress in dealing with ongoing matters? And relatedly, in what other ways can that president’s presence be felt by community partners in a manner that would display the high level of commitment and respect demanded by the first four Town/Gown Commandments?

By extension, there also would seem to be additional applicability in the context of framing pedagogical efforts that are aimed at better understanding campus/community relationships. Here, the three main “buckets” of commandments—leadership issues, intentional inclusion of campus/community stakeholders, and a simultaneous awareness of history and posterity—would seem to provide a sound organizational structure for the delivery of coursework and trainings on town/gown relationships. In fact, your author has done exactly that, having developed an undergraduate course that uses the book containing the Town/Gown Ten Commandments (Gavazzi, 2011) alongside the Fox (2012) book that more systematically covers the municipal perspective on these issues. A more advanced course designed for graduate students uses both of those previously mentioned books alongside a compendium of refereed journal articles and book chapters on town/gown subject matter.

For both the undergraduate and graduate sections of this course, the semester is divided into three main component parts that follow the tripartite framework suggested by the commandment groupings. Leadership issues are dealt with initially, thus setting the stage for all that is to come for the students. This is by design, not only because these commandments appear first in the list, but also to underscore the fact that leaders set the tone for all that occurs inside of town/gown relationships. While that would seem to be self-evident, the latest books on higher education leadership continue to provide reminders about the “important but little understood” role that campus leaders play in terms of the health and well-being of the community (Trachtenberg, Kauvar, & Gee, 2018).

Intentional inclusion of campus and community stakeholders represents the second
pillar of the course’s tripartite framework, and this section begins with the impact students have on town/gown relationships. Again, there is an organizational effect here in terms of where the student-oriented commandment is found ordinally. However, students do seem to have a more pronounced effect on campus/community interactions, both for better and for worse. Therefore, there is more than a little self-reflection that can be sparked during this portion of the course. Discussions of the impact that faculty and alumni have on town/gown relationships are rounded out with consideration given to the disaggregation of community stakeholders into constituency groups that include, but are not limited to, business owners, local school district personnel, clergy, elected officials, and neighborhood associations.

The final component of this tripartite framework—focusing on the past, present, and future of town/gown relationships—is meant to convey to students the impact that time has on this subject matter. On the one hand, longevity in relationships seems to matter a great deal. The longer you are part of a campus and community, especially as a leader, the more opportunities you will have to make a difference (and typically, but not always, a positive one). On the other hand, there also is a cohort effect. Sometimes, the things that worked for one generation do not translate well to subsequent generations. Therefore, ongoing qualitative and quantitative assessment activities are asserted as a “gold standard” for determining town/gown relationship quality over time.

Conclusion

In addition to previous literature that highlighted the impact university presidents have on town/gown relationships, the interview data analyzed in the present paper provides additional evidence regarding the critical role that both campus and community leaders play in establishing more harmonious partnerships. Simply put, it takes great effort from both sets of partners to create the higher level of comfort necessary for the relationship to remain functional over time.

Some caveats are in order here. The presidents and city managers who participated in the interviews contained in this paper were connected to larger research universities located in quintessential college towns within the United States. Therefore, at present the generalizability of the Town/Gown Ten Commandments is not known. It is likely that more urbanized municipalities and/or smaller sized university settings that place less emphasis on research at the very least represent some important demographic considerations for further analysis.

In addition, it is important to emphasize that town/gown relationships are not static, but rather reflect a dynamic process that evolves over time. Presidents move on, and mayors and city council members step aside or otherwise lose elections to new community representatives. As a result, different decisions are made that expand or contract the university’s immediate impact on the community, and vice versa.

In closing, it seems safe to say that the marital metaphor seems to apply particularly well to the town/gown relationship, excepting of course the notion that, unlike partners in a marriage, campuses and communities cannot get a divorce from one another. This fact alone should provide university and municipal leaders with ever more reason to pause and reflect on the privileges and responsibilities related to the positions they hold at present, as well as the impact their actions will have on town/gown relationships for years to come.
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Adolescent Civic Involvement and the Great Recession of 2008: Testing the Certainty of Employment
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Abstract

This study employs data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 to investigate the relationship between the voluntary civic involvement of high school students and their subsequent employment status during the Great Recession of 2008. It also examines whether volunteering with a specific type of community organization relates to future employment. Such youth civic involvement offers experiential learning in which students use academic knowledge and skills to address specific community needs. Along the pathways to employment, students achieve learning objectives while experiencing real-world issues. Using SPSS, the authors conduct a logistical regression, and discuss the results using odds ratios. The authors also include gender, ethnicity, family composition, parents' highest level of education, and family income as demographic variables.

Introduction

Engagement in volunteer service during adolescence is linked to many important qualities that facilitate the transition to adulthood and, ultimately, the workforce, including increased personal and social responsibility (Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988) and the development of a professional demeanor (Gonzalez & Golden, 2009). For decades, researchers have noted the connection between volunteerism and favorable job search outcomes, in that volunteer service can demonstrate character through actions to better society, facilitate career exploration, develop skills, and build a network of professional contacts (Ellis, 1993). In the wake of the Great Recession of 2008, the national unemployment rate doubled from 5% to 10% from January 2008 to October 2009, and unusually high unemployment rates continued to prevail into 2013 (Spera et al., 2013). Using data from the Educational Longitudinal Study (ELS) of 2002 (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.), which describes the academic performance and social development outcomes of a high school cohort 10 years after their sophomore year (i.e., 2002 to 2012), this study sought to understand how young people fared with respect to employment after the Great Recession of 2008. Specifically, this study emerged out of a desire to understand if a relationship existed between volunteer service in adolescence and future employment. This has important implications for educational equity, as this study seeks to understand how volunteer partnerships can facilitate future employment, which can impact economic mobility.

Literature Review

This study builds on recent literature that tests the statistical relationship between volunteerism and employment (Spera et al., 2013) and addresses a gap in the literature by examining adolescent volunteering in high school and future employment. The literature linking volunteerism and employment coalesces around the following areas: (a) civic engagement and the transition to adulthood (Chan et al., 2014; Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Larson et al., 2002; Youniss et al., 2002); (b) volunteering and the development of social capital (Bourdieu, 1985; Flanagan et al., 2015; Oesterle et al., 2004; Spera et al., 2013); (c) cultivating human capital through service (Larson et al., 2002; Morrow-Howell, 2006; Spera et al., 2013); and (d) the acquisition of job skills through service (Hart et al., 2007; Raskoff & Sundeen, 1999; Spera et al., 2015).

As high schools are increasingly held accountable for producing college and career-ready graduates, researchers have pointed out that this emphasis overlooks the mission of schools to prepare students for civic life (Baumann et al., 2014). Recognizing that school and community settings are legitimate sites of learning, Baumann et al. (2014) argue for readiness that encompasses college, career, and civic life. Furthermore, problem-solving experiences in the volunteer setting can advance development along the several fronts of Conley’s Four Keys to College and Career Readiness, which are cognitive...
strategies, content knowledge, learning skills and techniques, and transition knowledge and skills (Darling-Hammond, Wilhoit, & Pittenger, 2014).

Civic engagement, as a form of experiential education, has emerged as a learning opportunity that offers many of the competencies that can lead to favorable employment outcomes, such as field knowledge and experience and organizational socialization (Eyler, 2009). Because of current economic upheaval caused by technology, global competition, and workforce changes, many employers from various fields require much more from their entry-level employees (Ramson, 2014). New hires must possess sophisticated core competencies (e.g., tools from civic engagement experience acquired in secondary schools) to help safeguard employers’ viability.

Service learning, another dimension of civic engagement, can facilitate a college-bound mentality among students of color and students from low-income backgrounds (Cress, Burack, Giles, Elkins, & Stevens, 2010). However, while research indicates benefits in the long-term, opportunities for civic engagement, generally, are not evenly appropriated by class or ethnicity, making the pathways to secured employment more uncertain (Flanagan & Levine, 2010).

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

(RQ1) Did 10th graders who performed unpaid volunteer/community service work from 2002 through 2004 have a higher likelihood of attaining employment in 2012?

(RQ2) Did 10th graders who performed unpaid volunteer/community service work from 2002 through 2004 with a particular service organization have a higher likelihood of attaining employment in 2012?

For the second research question (RQ2), this study examined eight types of community organizations: (a) youth, (b) educational, (c) conservation/environmental, (d) school/community service, (e) political club, (f) church/church-related, (g) community center/social action, and (h) hospital/nursing home.

Methods

The research questions at issue addressed employment outcomes, which were treated as dichotomous variables. Logistic regression is the most appropriate analytical approach for dealing with binary outcome variables (Thompson, 2006). Using SPSS, the authors conducted two separate logistic regression analyses to investigate if volunteering in high school increased the likelihood of future employment and if volunteering in high school with a particular type of organization increased the likelihood of future employment. A review of the literature recommended the inclusion of additional demographic predictor variables (i.e., gender, ethnicity, family composition, and socioeconomic status) to provide a more comprehensive picture of additional influences on successful employment outcomes and the propensity to volunteer.

Data

The present study utilized data from ELS 2002 conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.). Over 15,000 10th graders within 750 schools were randomly selected by ELS 2002 as a nationally representative sample in 2002. Respondents were first interviewed in 2002 (base year) and then during follow-ups in 2004, 2006, and 2012. Respondents who stayed in school would have been in the 12th grade in 2004 and approximately 26 years old in 2012.

In the base year, respondents received cognitive achievement tests and a self-administered questionnaire that inquired about the students’ demographic and family information, school experiences and activities, plans for the future, and “beliefs and opinions about self” (Ingels, Pratt, Wilson, Burns, Currivan, Rogers, & Hubbard-Bednasz, 2007, p. 19). In the first follow-up, respondents provided high school transcripts, took a mathematics assessment, and completed another questionnaire containing similar items to the base year (e.g., updated demographic and family information; school experiences and activities; how students spent their free time; plans and goals for the future; and involvement with community, family, and friends, Ingels et al., 2007). In the third and final follow-up, respondents provided updated education information (e.g., postsecondary transcripts) and completed a self-administered questionnaire. The content of this questionnaire included information about their educational/vocational status and experience, financial information (e.g., income and student loan information), future goals for education/vocation, family status, community/civic involvement, and “life values” (Ingels, Pratt, Alexander, Jewell, Lauff, Mattox, & Wilson, 2014, p. 16).

Researchers from ELS 2002 based the majority of questionnaire items from the base year to
the third follow-up on the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 for the purpose of longitudinal comparison (Ingels et al., 2014). They also updated items to address education policy changes as well as to incorporate theoretical changes and advancement (Burns, Heuer, Ingels, Pollack, Pratt, Rock, Rogers, Scott, Siegel, & Stutts, 2003). To establish content and construct validity, the questionnaire in ELS 2002 underwent revisions according to feedback from experts in the field and relevant literature (Ingels et al., 2014). Additionally, in the third follow-up questionnaire, researchers field-tested new items and those of “critical importance” through cognitive interviews (Ingels et al., 2014, p. 14). Reliability estimates (i.e., alpha coefficients) from the base year and first follow-up questionnaire scale items ranged from “a low of \( r = .80 \)...to a high of \( r = .93 \)” (Burns et al., 2003, p. 76). In the third follow-up, a Cronbach’s alpha for scale items ranged from 0.8 to 0.9 (Ingels et al., 2014).

The current study derived variables of interest from the base year data, first follow-up data in 2004, and third follow-up data in 2012. More specifically, information regarding the respondents’ volunteer or community service activity—both the presence or absence of such activity as well as the specific type (e.g., youth, service, church, school, civic, or social action groups)—was drawn from the first follow-up data. The researchers in the present study derived the outcome variable, obtaining future employment, from the third follow-up data. Additionally, important student demographics identified in previous research (Larson, Wilson, & Mortimer, 2002; Morrow-Howell, 2006; Spera et al., 2013) came from either the base year data or the first follow-up data. Those demographics included student gender, ethnicity, family composition, parents’ highest level of education, and family income. A description of the main variables of interest to this study is provided in subsequent paragraphs.

**Employment status.** In the third follow-up, respondents answered a series of questions related to their employment status. Questions inquired whether or not they engaged in the following: full- or part-time work; the military; post-secondary education including 2-year, 4-year, graduate, professional, technical, trade, and vocational schools; or caring for dependent children or adults. Originally, the responses included five categories outlining the amount of work in which the respondent engaged. From these categories the researchers created a dichotomous variable to represent whether the respondent was employed or not employed. This variable served as the outcome variable in the analyses. For the present data analyses, unemployed individuals acted as the reference group (employed=1 and not employed=0; see Figure 1).

**Performed unpaid volunteer/community service work.** Students responded to a yes or no question as to whether or not they had engaged in volunteer or community service within the previous two years (2002–2004). If students responded yes, they provided information regarding the types of organizations with which they volunteered. Adolescents who did not volunteer served as the reference group in the analyses (yes=1 and no=0; see Figure 2).

**Specific type of organization.** Students who reported engaging in unpaid volunteer or community service work specified which type(s) of organizations through a yes/no response. The questionnaire included eight different organizations (e.g., youth, service, church, school, civic, or social action groups). For the present data analyses, students who did not volunteer served as the reference group.
Results

The first research question (RQ1) investigated whether or not volunteering in high school related to future employment. The results showed that on average, adolescents who volunteered had 31.5% greater odds of future employment \((p<.05)\) as compared to the odds for adolescents who did not volunteer, holding all other predictors constant (see Table 2).

The second research question (RQ2) sought to determine whether or not volunteering with a specific type of volunteer organization in high school related to future employment. The results indicated that volunteering with particular types of community organizations related to the odds of obtaining future employment. Specifically, this study found that volunteering with an educational organization increased the odds of future employment by 22.9% \((p<.05)\). Volunteering with a school and/or community service organization increased the odds of future employment by 26.4% \((p<.05)\). Finally, volunteering with a community center and/or social action group increased the odds of future employment by 18.1% \((p<.05)\) (see Table 3).

Several covariates also provided results of note. For RQ1, students who were male \((OR=1.272; p<.05)\), White (reference group), whose parents completed four years of college \((OR=1.144; p<.05)\), and who were from a higher income family \((OR=1.050; p<.05)\) were more likely to obtain employment, holding all other independent variables constant. Similar findings emerged for RQ2. Students who were male \((OR=1.274; p<.05)\), White (reference group), and from a higher income family \((OR=1.052; p<.05)\) were more likely to obtain employment, holding all other independent variables constant (see Tables 2 and 3).

Discussion

The relationship between volunteering and future employment is consistent with extant literature showing that volunteer service can relate to employment outcomes (Spera et al., 2015). In addition to affirming this relationship, the paper addresses a gap in the literature by examining adolescent volunteering while exploring the influence of the type of community organization on future employment. The relationship between volunteerism and increased odds of future employment also complements a study by Matthews, Dorfman, and Wu (2015), which found that college graduates who participated in service-learning courses received higher starting salaries as well as their first raises quicker than graduates who had not engaged in service learning.

Academic behaviors—specifically self-monitoring skills (e.g., time management, goal setting, perseverance, and collaboration)—are another dimension of college and career readiness that are among the least assessed in the literature (Lombardi, Seburn & Conley, 2011). Balancing school work with other commitments, such as volunteering, is a measure of persistence that can contribute to postsecondary success (Lombardi et al., 2011).

In considering how schools can support deeper student development, Darling-Hammond et al. (2014) urged the adoption of a broader definition of college and career readiness that encompasses skills such as "critical thinking, problem solving, communication, creativity, and the ability to learn" (p. 13). Adolescent volunteerism can accomplish many of those learning objectives. In fact, as Pittman (2010) asserted, while schools play a decisive role in shaping educational outcomes, they are part of a larger community-wide ecosystem in which there are “people, organizations, and experiences outside of school that play equal and sometimes more powerful teaching roles whose contributions need to be acknowledged, aligned, and supported” (p. 14). Based on this research, it is possible that volunteer experience may merit recognition alongside academic benchmarks for college and career readiness, such as problem solving and self-monitoring behaviors.

### Table 1. Predictor: Type of Service Organization (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service Organization</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organization</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation/Environmental Group</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Club/Organization</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Church-Related Group</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/Nursing Home Group</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Community Service Organization</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center/Social Action Group</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Organization</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Students specified type via yes/no responses to eight different organizations.
Limitations

It is important to consider several limitations. First, these data provided no information as to the type of volunteer work completed, frequency of volunteer activity, or whether or not volunteering was a required activity. It should also be noted that the ELS 2002 data set was derived from cluster samples in selected geographic areas around the United States. Additionally, the logistic regression models in this study did not account for the disparate impact of the 2008 recession in these geographic areas, which may have influenced employment outcomes. Similarly, the geographic location of future employment is not known, nor is the duration of employment.

Future Research

These limitations notwithstanding, this analysis has several implications for areas of future research. The first is to understand how volunteerism can relate to future employment—namely, to understand how the influences of human capital, social capital, and a nascent professional network may influence the likelihood of a successful job search. Exploring the depth and breadth of volunteer experiences that can best prepare high school students for successful futures in post-secondary education and the workforce can provide additional insight into these questions, as well as understanding in involvement with particular service organizations related to future employment. Despite these favorable factors, it also will be important to attend to: (a) the fact that racial and ethnic background also were statistically significant predictors in this study; and (b) the related questions of why and how to account for markers of implicit bias that may influence employers, despite job applicant participation in volunteer service.

With a continuing emphasis on college and career-ready graduates, future researchers also should consider the extent to which volunteering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Slopes</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.241*</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.197*</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.264*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-.531*</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>-.376*</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Parent Family</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years of College</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years of College</td>
<td>.134*</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.049*</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed Volunteer Service</td>
<td>.274*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1.315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Slopes</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.242*</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.186*</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.274*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-.538*</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>-.371*</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Parent Family</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years of College</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years of College</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.051*</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with Youth Organization</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with Educational Organization</td>
<td>.206*</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with Conservation and/or Environmental Group</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with School and/or Community Service Organization</td>
<td>.234*</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with Political Club and/or Organization</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with Church-Related Group</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with Community Center and/or Social-action Group</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with Hospital and/or Nursing Home Group</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
in high school can contribute to personal and professional development, successfully obtaining employment, and job satisfaction once employed.

**Conclusion**

The findings linking adolescent volunteerism with future employment buttress the call to integrate volunteerism into public education efforts, at least in high school, and potentially along the P–20 continuum (along with other indicators of student readiness and success). Beyond the question of student preparation, the present study also surfaces troubling questions around hiring practices. In the present study, non-white race/ethnicity resulted in a lower likelihood of employment. This raises questions around markers of implicit bias that may influence employers, as well as the possibility that participation in volunteer service might increase the likelihood that students of color will obtain future employment. As researchers continue to consider how to reimagine equity and challenge persistent racial and economic inequality, exploring the impact of volunteering in high school and beyond may well have powerful implications for realizing new pathways to educational equity and future economic mobility.
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Generating Equity-Oriented Partnerships: A Framework for Reflection and Practice
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Abstract
Research that links action across multiple scales of practice is particularly relevant for organizing consequential social change. The aim of this article is to present an evaluation framework to support community-based researchers in generating methods of engagement that can expand opportunities for non-dominant community members across scales of practice. Drawing on a five-year community-engaged research project, this article presents a framework outlining five dimensions of a community-engaged research trajectory: (1) establishing partnerships; (2) developing trust; (3) working with diverse linguistic practices; (4) planning for different forms of action; and (5) outcomes and dissemination. This is developed as a formative evaluation tool intended to be used throughout the research collaboration to inform the iterative process of learning collaborations and design work.

Introduction
An enduring concern for researchers working with communities regards developing research designs and practical tools that are relevant to community members while also contributing to theory. In doing this complex work, researchers and practitioners can develop collaborative methodologies that value community practices and move beyond paradigms oriented toward fixing or replacing community-based ways of knowing and being (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). These collaborations can lead to powerful forms of knowledge production and social transformation (e.g., Bang, Medin, Washinawatok, & Chapman, 2010; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Wang & Jackson, 2005). There is also a risk, however, that they can undermine community knowledge and practices, reproducing inequities (Camacho, 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Zavala, 2013). Given these hazards, we need to attend to the highly contextualized—geographically, culturally, historically, and institutionally—nature of social change and how this affects practices of community engagement, collective action, and learning.

University researchers and community members must negotiate competing pressures such as academic pressures to publish, community organizations’ grant and funding cycles, and community needs for action-oriented results and timely deliverables. Despite rigorous theoretical grounding, these collaborations often fail or do not realize their full potential when local knowledge and values are not integrated into the endeavors (Lissenden, Maley, & Mehta, 2015). In other words, good intentions and academic theories are insufficient to produce productive partnerships (Easterly & Easterly, 2006).

As researchers and community members engage in collaborative work aimed at addressing historically entrenched community-based challenges and informing widespread systemic change, there follows a pressing need to develop methodological tools that can work toward ensuring that the emerging research practices promote equity. Mehta & Mehta (2011) identify the main challenges involved in doing this type of work as designing, implementing, and evaluating change grounded in activity systems as opposed to interventions imposed from outside of the activity system; taking projects to scale; engaging marginalized stakeholders in the collaboration; and managing systems of power and privilege so as to ensure equity. We developed our framework as a response to these challenges and to offer a practical tool—a community-engaged framework—that can support researchers in orienting their work around equity.

What equity means to different participants in community-engaged research varies. Equity is historically situated, culturally shaped, and always politicized. There is no predetermined endpoint for equity; rather, it is a fluid and shifting aim. Given that perspective, community-engaged partnerships that strive for equity need to be responsive and alert to the dynamics of equity and inequity when they emerge. Our view on equity is founded upon a commitment to the organization of greater opportunities for people from non-dominant...
backgrounds to determine their own social futures. Importantly, work for greater equity is not only about gaining access to current structures of power, it also involves transforming those structures to facilitate more liberatory and just goals (Philip & Azevedo, 2017). We thus refer to the process of pursuing greater equity as equity-oriented work, acknowledging that this work is ongoing.

To support researchers to design collaborations that are oriented toward greater equity, we share insights that we have gained from a five-year community-engaged research project that emerged from our collaboration with a local non-profit focused on food justice. Our research collaboration has been oriented around the design of a methodological approach that emphasizes working toward solutions for problems that are significant to the conduct of community members’ everyday lives. Our methods incorporate the iterative documentation, design, and refinement of learning found in Bang, Medin, Washinawatok, and Chapman, 2010. Building on our systematic analyses of diverse qualitative data sources generated as part of this project, we have developed an evaluation framework that we hope can be used reflectively to orient community-engaged research partnerships toward equity.

**Developing a Grounded Empirical Evaluation Framework**

The framework presented in this article was generated through analysis of empirical data sources from a long-term community-engaged research project called Learning in the Food Movement (Teeters & Jurow, 2018; Teeters, Jurow, & Shea, 2016). In this project, we partnered with a local non-profit organization that employed community health workers, called promotoras, to work with community members to improve access to nutritious food and healthcare resources. With the promotoras and the non-profit founders, we engaged in ethnographic (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007) and design research (The Design-Based Research Collective, 2003) to understand and enhance their community development efforts and to develop tools, such as workshops and a software application, aimed at enhancing the non-profit’s professional practices.

Our research allowed us to consider how participatory research can be empowering and when it can further marginalize populations that have historically been excluded from research and policymaking. Learning in the Food Movement brought together professors and graduate students in the University’s School of Education and the Institute for Technology Development, community partners at the non-profit, local community members, and city officials. This diverse group of collaborators was a design feature aimed to facilitate learning and change across scales of practice (e.g., the individual, neighborhood, city, and larger region).

The evaluation framework we present emerged from the documentation of our process and analysis of our research approach and outcomes (Charmmaz, 2006). Our research collaboration involved ethnographic data collection conducted over five years, including semi-structured interviews with participants, focus groups with promotoras, participant observation, and the writing of field notes in residents’ homes and backyards, at the organization’s office, in city meetings, and at community events. By design, we focused on problems that mattered greatly to the organization and community. Examples of some of our co-designed interventions include professional development workshops for promotoras, mediated conversations aimed at problem solving between the non-profit directors and the promotoras, and teatro (theater) as a means to instigate social reflection and change (Boal, 1997) focused on addressing organizational tensions, the design of a tablet-based application to streamline the promotoras’ data collection, and workshops aimed at enhancing the promotoras’ capacities for using new technologies for data analysis.

**A Framework for Generating Equity-Oriented Research Partnerships**

We developed an evaluation framework (see Appendix A) to support researchers and community members in generating methods of engagement that could further equity. This tool was designed for use throughout the research collaboration to inform the iterative process of learning collaborations and design work.

The framework has five dimensions representing a fairly common community-engaged research trajectory. The dimensions are (1) establishing partnerships; (2) developing trust; (3) working with language differences; (4) planning for action; and (5) outcomes and sustainability. We identified these domains based on a review of the literature on community engagement in non-dominant communities (Boyer, 1996; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Stoeccker, 2013), interviews and focus groups with community-engaged researchers, and our own empirical research. This review process directed us to dimensions of community-engaged research with which
researchers and community members struggle to navigate relationships of power and privilege. With regard to each of these dimensions, we discuss activities in which researchers and community members can engage to develop a more equitable design and research process. We refer to these collaborative activities as “strategies for collaboration.” Using the suggested strategies as points for reflection, community members and researchers can identify indicators of success, barriers faced, and innovations implemented.

Establishing Partnerships

Under which circumstances and with whom university researchers should engage in partnerships is a subject of rich debate (see for example Camacho, 2004, Zavala, 2013). Moving away from historical distinctions of researcher and researched, community-engaged researchers aim to generate partnerships that are mutually beneficial and address problems grounded in the community. Some argue that one has to be of the community to do research with the community, while others argue that this emic approach cannot produce objective insights (Erickson, 1997; Headland, Pike, & Harris, 1990). Others question the very notion of objectivity altogether (Harding, 1993). Although we recognize these tensions, we suggest that discussions should move beyond questions of membership and objectivity to questions of compatibility determined by the potential for the partnerships to establish new forms of valued social organization.

The framework we propose suggests that to assess compatibility and to initiate partnerships, university researchers should engage in ethnographic work. Ethnographic research can help researchers understand the social and historical organization of community work. This research entails engaging in participant observation, analysis of artifacts, and interviews with members of the community. Before stakeholders come together to discuss the partnership's aims and research questions, ethnographic research can help researchers (and sometimes community members themselves) appreciate a community’s history, social organization, value structures, and work flows. For example, in the Learning in the Food Movement project, we observed and interviewed stakeholders, organizations, political leaders, and activists involved in the local food movement (Jurow, Teeters, Shea, & Van Steenis, 2016). This broad context gave us a way to situate the work of our partner organization and understand the ways in which this organization was a compatible partner. We were able to determine that compatibility because the non-profit shared a similar focus on equity and a desire to design a social change process that leveraged community members' cultural repertoires.

During this process of ethnographic investigation, a central aim should be to generate relationships that enable all parties to envision contributing to and benefiting from the partnership. It is critical to include the perspectives of multiple and diverse stakeholders so as to appreciate the different meanings of the practices being studied and/or transformed. From this point, partners should critically consider how proposed activities and questions can support new pathways along which people, practices, and tools can travel, as well as new dispositions toward equity-oriented action.

Developing Trust

Community-engaged research brings together people from different social positions, generating working relationships that are often asymmetrical in terms of access to financial, intellectual, and health resources. It is therefore imperative that these collaborations are premised on trusting relationships. Building on our prior research, we draw attention to the power of relationships de confianza (of trust) as a way of facilitating equity-oriented partnerships grounded in mutual trust (Teeters & Jurow, 2018). Relationships de confianza describe particular kinds of relations between partners, relations that prioritize empathy, action, and commitment to each other. They provide a valuable foundation for generating collaborative visions for greater justice.

Establishing relationships de confianza requires the development of mutual trust, respect, and commitment. Mutual trust involves putting human connections before a research agenda. In our work with promotoras, we centered interpersonal relationships not for strategic reasons, but for reasons of understanding, politicized caring, and solidarity (Vakil, de Royston, Nasir, & Kirshner, 2016). Although we employed traditional methods of data collection such as interviews, co-design sessions, workshops, document analysis, collaborative meetings, and participant observations, much of the time that we spent together was off the record. We engaged as participants, collaborators, and friends, frequently putting away our audio recorders and notepads so as to hear, and share, the more vulnerable stories that constitute our realities. Developing this genuine sense of trust and vulnerability is essential to the design of culturally appropriate research (Foley & Valenzuela, 2005).
Our regular meetings naturally flowed into our personal lives, and together, we commiserated over the loss of family members, health challenges, and personal/professional concerns. In these times, we engaged as friends and colleagues, recognizing that many of these stories were not intended for research purposes. As Tuck and Yang (2014) write, “there may be language, experiences, and wisdoms better left alone by social science” (p. 233).

Establishing mutual respect involves developing standards of collaboration where the aims are grounded in the needs, desires, and visions of the participants. Upon establishing shared goals of the collaboration, researchers and participants can develop work protocols that outline the aims, parameters, and distribution of tasks. The distribution of tasks should be done so as to not overburden any one person while making sure that all perspectives are adequately represented. Moreover, division of tasks should explicitly take into account and leverage participants’ diverse and unique forms of expertise. Developing relationships de confianza involves both mutual engagement in shared tasks as well as strategically dividing labor along areas of interest, expertise, and availability of time. This attention to the division of labor and to the knowledge that is privileged helps to “guard against power imbalances” (Henrick, Cobb, Penuel, Jackson, & Clark, 2017, p. 6).

Moreover, we suggest that establishing relationships de confianza necessitates a commitment, which refers not only to engaged listening, but also to following through with action. Action can take multiple forms. The imperative element is that the nature of the action and its impact be agreed upon by all participants. When negotiating the terms of the action, it is helpful to consider the ways that different forms of capital can be leveraged by different stakeholders. For example, the researchers could leverage the networks via the university to access financial and intellectual resources, as well as social groups by which to expand participants’ networks. Community practitioners could leverage their knowledge of the local community, including things such as local skills, social networks, and cultural values and customs.

Working with Language Differences

Language differences are often viewed as barriers to engaging in partnerships across groups from different cultural, racial, and national backgrounds. Although we acknowledge the importance of linguistic competence, we also recognize that fluency were requisite for partnership for all community members and university members, community-engaged research would often not be conducted among groups with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In 2015, the United States census reported over 350 languages that were actively spoken within the United States (U.S. Census, 2015). This great diversity of languages should not mean that we should restrict our partnerships to communities speaking the most common languages spoken in the U.S.—reported to be English, Spanish, and Chinese (U.S. Census, 2015), but rather, that we should develop strategies for leveraging linguistic diversity as a resource and maintain standards of integrity for translation and verification of meaning.

When we refer to language, we also recognize that linguistic diversity encompasses variance due to factors such as dialect (national and regional variations of the same language) and domain (field specific technical terminologies and formal/informal codes) (Arrazattee, Lima, & Lundy, 2013). Translation, therefore, may be appropriate within a monolingual group. For example, there may be a need to explain field specific (e.g. medical, technology) jargon to a lay population. Or to explain cultural relations within a community to an academic audience. Translation, in this sense, refers to the creation of a shared and inclusive understanding amongst all participants.

We advocate for an asset-based view of language diversity. Embracing language differences can allow for people to express themselves in a variety of forms, to use words that may capture ideas that do not exist in other languages, and to be intentional about the words they do use. Developing strategies for working with language differences—to see linguistic variation as an asset rather than as a deficit—is a key part of building equitable partnerships across diverse groups. Language is constructed through social processes and bound with culture (Vygotsky, 1986). In this sense, language is “constitutive of thought and meaning, where meanings shape reality and are inscribed according to changing cultural and social situations” (Venuti, 2000, p. 6). The inclusion of diverse languages necessarily implies a diversity of epistemologies. When designing for practices and tools intended to become consequential across scales of practice, including diverse linguistic groups, an asset-based approach helps ensure that the designs can move across social, temporal, and geographical scales and become meaningfully incorporated into social practices and structures.
When partnerships bring together participants from diverse linguistic backgrounds, partnerships should employ practices of translation. Yet, translation, in of itself, is laden with power dynamics (Lui, 1999; Niranjana, 1992). Unidirectional translations risk misinterpretations and distortion of meaning as the original words are presented in the second language. This situation can often result in the dominance of one epistemology at the expense of another. One way to mitigate this issue is by employing two-way translations, where the original passage or statement is translated into the second language, and then the translation is translated back into the original language to verify accuracy, meaning, and understanding (Mignolo & Schiwy, 2003). This approach is important in both written language as well as spoken language.

Though translation is an important consideration in multi-dialectal research partnerships, we do not suggest that language be privileged as the only method of communication. Linguistic differences provide partnerships with a valuable opportunity to expand repertoires of communication. Multi-modal expression, such as artistic representations, digital representation, diagramming, and the use of representational models can encourage participants to think deeply and critically about problems of practice, values, and imagined futures than could be done via words alone (Brazg, Bekemeier, Spigner, & Huebner, 2010; Conrad & Kendal, 2009).

For example, in our collaboration with the promotoras, when we were initially learning about how the promotoras viewed their work, we provided them with colored clay. After a written reflection of their work, they then made a clay representation of how they related to their work. In Figure 1, a promotora (lay Hispanic/Latino trained in health care) represented her work by depicting a tree sprouting two new trees. She explained that like the tree, a promotora has to first establish roots in the community. From these roots, she then spreads her work, cultivating new practices.

This visual representation supported the promotora’s verbal explanation of her relationship with her professional practices. Creating clay sculptures provided promotoras multiple ways to express their sentiments. The clay representations varied significantly among participants, allowing everyone to see the different perspectives that existed within the group. This form of sharing knowledge helped to minimize the risk that epistemologies are translated solely through the perspective of the translator.

Engaging in role play and non-verbal action can similarly facilitate reflection and communication. For example, acting out real and imagined experiences can serve as a form of play that can reveal points of re-organization and new forms of participation (Hornsby-Miner, 2007). Within role play and simulations, drawing attention to body language and expression can reveal important points of misunderstanding, discomfort, frustration, or accordence that may extend beyond the interpretation of words (see Boal, 1997). Moving beyond a reliance on verbal communication can facilitate the imagination of new dynamics, surfacing new possibilities, and potentially disrupting unproductive patterns of engagement.

**Planning for Action**

The notion of planning for action elicits important questions regarding the very nature of action. What counts as action? Could the planning for action be the action in and of itself? Could the process of engaged listening be the action? Who defines action and how is it counted as consequential? We aim to break apart notions of action, suggesting that seemingly inconsequential ways of participating, such as engaged listening, could be enough to open up new ways of participating. At the same time, more traditional modes of action, such as organizing a group of people to engage in a shared task or to design a tool, may also count as valuable action. Our intent is to encourage expansive notions of what action is and in the process, to encourage university researchers to think about ways to engage in meaningful and empowering strategies of collaboration.

Regardless of the nature of action, decisions around partnership activities and engagements should be made from a corpus of information,
including details regarding participants’ values, forms of expertise, desired outcomes, and current work systems. This information can be used to identify focal outcomes and methods by which to achieve these outcomes. The methods employed should leverage participants’ backgrounds and forms of expertise, strategically synthesizing them with new tools that extend in desired directions.

In our partnership with the promotoras, the non-profit leadership initially approached us with the idea that we could help them generate a curriculum to support and train new promotoras. We knew that to accomplish this task, we would first have to learn about the promota model. We researched the historical use of the model, shadowed promotoras in their work, co-designed workshops aimed at articulating the model, conducted semi-structured focus groups and interviews with the promotoras, the non-profit co-founders, and community members, and engaged in participant observations. Through this inquiry process, we learned that the promotoras’ work was dynamic. Therefore, a curriculum, in terms of a bounded, static tool, was not most useful. Instead, the promotoras needed a tool that could support them in accessing resources and documenting practices, while accounting for the emergent nature of their work. It is thus that our design of “a curriculum” took form in the design of a tablet-based software application that allowed the promotoras to gather, document, and analyze data on their own practices. This example shows how the collaborative activity was rooted in a community-engaged need and how its manifestation evolved through the process of ethnographic data collection and analysis. The result was a more meaningful and sustainable product.

**Outcomes and Sustainability**

Like action, we suggest an open-ended approach toward defining valued outcomes. Outcomes can be tangible (e.g. the design of new technology) or intangible (e.g. recognition of invisible work via engaged listening). Regardless of the nature of the outcomes, they should be agreed upon and benefit diverse stakeholders. If the outcomes are intangible or less concrete deliverables (such as new participant structures), it is important that the value and objective of the outcomes be mutually established and defined.

Two significant tensions of community-engaged research involve timelines of deliverables and actual products. Academic research involves long cycles of data collection, analysis, writing, peer review, and revision. This process can take years. In such cases, by the time the academic research cycle concludes, findings and published articles are no longer relevant to pressing problems of community work. Community members and organizations need more immediate feedback and reports that can fit into grant cycles and local press releases. Therefore, not only should the timeline be adjusted, but the deliverables should be differentiated, identifying valued outcomes for community members and organizations. These deliverables can support and even parallel the academic writing and representation process, but need to be developed on a timeline and in a format relevant to stakeholders (Franz, 2009, 2011).

In considering outcomes, we must also consider the sustainability of these outcomes. When designing for the sustainability of desired outcomes, it is important to consider how both the technical and the social infrastructure of the focal activity system are being supported. In our collaboration with the promotoras, one of our designed outcomes was the aforementioned software application. In this work, our tangible outcome was a tablet-based application to support the promotoras’ data collection and analysis. However, an intangible outcome was increased agency for the promotoras to document and analyze their own professional practices and to gain greater facility with technology. To build the promotoras’ agency alongside their technical capacity, we incorporated their expertise in community organizing and urban agriculture and wove this knowledge throughout the design of the tool. We were intentional about scaffolding the technology development so as to apprentice the promotoras into design, use, and maintenance of the product. This eventually resulted in the promotoras taking over the creation of new forms and taking on the responsibility of updating and maintaining the technology. Moreover, as we built the technology, we worked with the non-profit to ensure that organizational structures were in place to support the promotoras’ expanding agency (Teeters, 2017). This example illustrates how outcomes can incorporate tangible tools (the tablet-based application) and intangible structure (enhanced participant agency). Moreover, we share this example with the aim of illustrating the importance of attending to technical and social infrastructure simultaneously to build the capacity that can result in sustainable change.
Conclusion: Moving Toward Equity

As community-engaged researchers, we need relevant and sensitive tools of accountability that can facilitate social change. The framework we have described in this paper is a step toward this goal. We believe this framework can support the development of more equitable social interactions with community partners. The aim of this framework is to support researchers in being intentional about design decisions so as to not replicate historical patterns of marginalization and oppression. There is a pressing need for community-engaged researchers to strive for greater transparency of goals, methods, and values. With this aim at the forefront, we conclude with a set of practical suggestions for moving forward with this framework as a guide for collective work toward equity:

Engage in broad ethnographic research to understand community values and practices. If we want to understand what is consequential to communities, it is necessary to spend time investigating people's views on what matters, when it matters, and for whom it matters. Conducting interviews and engaging in long-term observation in multiple settings, the basic tools of ethnography, can help us grasp how people construct meanings for themselves and others. These practices can allow researchers to see moments of tension in a community, which can then become the impetus for social transformation (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998). Engaging in ongoing ethnographic research further supports empirical recognition that communities shift through time and this dynamic matters significantly for our definitions of equity.

Cultivate relationships of politicized care and committed action. Relationships are the basis for organizing equity-oriented social change (Teeters & Jurow, 2018). Seeing each other as people with dignity and agency in the face of oppressive structures is fundamental to progressive social action (Espinoza & Vossoughi, 2014). We can begin to cultivate relationships of politicized care, which involves recognizing that transformation of inequities is necessary to support humanizing relationships, by engaging in each other's worlds through ethnographic involvement. The next step, however, demands that we plan for action with our community partners that leverages their social and historical practices to develop sustainable and culturally relevant change. Doing this work together can demonstrate our commitments to each other and help us appreciate both the obstacles and motivations for social change.

Embrace linguistic and representational diversity as a way to gain deeper appreciation of partners' perspectives and values. Appreciating the humanity and agency of our community partners requires recognizing their multiple ways of making sense of their worlds. Talk and writing are often privileged as the primary ways that people interpret their experience. This view has roots in Western, male, and Eurocentric perspectives on valued knowledge, which obscures other ways of knowing, learning, and becoming (Medin & Bang, 2014). This perspective can obscure the variety of ways people communicate, collaborate, and generate new configurations for a better world. As researchers, we need to be intentional about which languages we use to do our work and what discourse practices we use to center some perspectives and marginalize others.

Practice critical reflection on goals and methods with humility and generosity. Doing equity-oriented work means that we are working toward a goal that is not predetermined or static across time and space. Moving in this way requires a disposition toward responsiveness and improvisation and this rests upon a strong sense of appreciating not knowing and not having all of the answers. In order to ensure that we are making progress toward greater equity, however, we must reflect critically on our actions and stay open to how we might need to change, step aside, and make room for others to step up.

We make these suggestions to facilitate the development of equity-oriented partnerships. We think that attending to these issues can advance our understanding of what equity means for diverse communities and how researchers could work with them to achieve greater justice. Simultaneous to doing this practical work, we also believe that research on our partnership practices will support more effective designs for equity. One research task involves writing design narratives that present stories of the evolution of equity-oriented partnerships. What were the initial goals that focused the partnership? How did these shift over time? Why? What new goals emerged? Systematically documenting the partnership's development could
support us in articulating the motivations and values behind our joint work. A second necessary area for investigation should focus on building an empirical basis of what works and what hinders equity-oriented partnerships. This situated knowledge of how equity-oriented partnerships function could then advance our collective capacity for creating consequential change. We hope that the framework we have presented in this article can facilitate this important and ongoing work.
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### Domain: Establishing Partnerships

1. Brokering relationships. 2. Identifying problems relevant to stakeholders. 3. Determining/negotiating roles

### Strategies of Collaboration

1. Brokering relationships: a) Ethnographic work is used to assess compatibility. b) Diverse stakeholders are considered in partnership. 2. Identifying problems relevant to stakeholders: a) Problems of practice are negotiated after ethnographic research. i. Researchers’ perspectives from diverse stakeholders and represent those to decision-makers. ii. Research aims link practices across scales of practice. 3. Determining/negotiating roles: a) Researchers and participants negotiate roles and expectation prior to initiating research. b) The research roles and methods used are sensitive and appropriate to the various communities (literacy, language barriers, cultural sensitivities).

### Evaluation of each domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Barriers Faced</th>
<th>Innovation Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Domain: Developing Trust

1. Establishing mutual relationships. 2. Developing confidence

### Strategies of Collaboration

1. Establishing relationships of mutual benefit: a) Practitioner’s forms of expertise are acknowledged and leveraged. b) The research/community team generates space for authentic and engaged listening. 2. Developing Confidence: a) Researchers engage in off the record listening. b) Researchers follow through with plans of action

### Evaluation of each domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Barriers Faced</th>
<th>Innovation Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Domain: Working with Language Differences


### Strategies of Collaboration

1. Translation: a) Two-way translations. b) Cultural, content, and technical elements accounted for. c) Boundary practices are created to broker cultures and content areas. 2. Multi-modalities: a) Multi-modal engagement is employed. b) Meaning checks are implemented. 3. Triangulation of meaning: a) Meaning is co-created. b) Understandings are checked for validity

### Evaluation of each domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Barriers Faced</th>
<th>Innovation Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix A: (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Planning for Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Ethnography. 2. Collaboration. 3. Activities to serve multiple purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies of Collaboration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Ethnography: a) Designs are grounded in participants’ historical practices and lived experiences. b) Participants’ knowledges, values, and expertises are central to the design process. 2. Collaborative: a) Barriers to community participation are identified and addressed. b) The research design process includes community members in every stage. 3. Activities serve multiple purposes. a) Activities are embedded in existing activity system. b) Activities should draw on theories and research on learning practices and equity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of each domain</th>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Barriers Faced</th>
<th>Innovation Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Outcomes and Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies of Collaboration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Opportunities for feedback: a) Include the community’s perspective and contributions in the results of the research. b) Engage in iterative cycles of analyzing results with community members. 2. Practices across scales: a) Outcomes transform interactions across geographical space. b) Outcomes transform interactions across social groups. 3. Sustainability: a) Outcomes transform interactions across time. b) Participants adopt interventions and take responsibility for their continued implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of each domain</th>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Barriers Faced</th>
<th>Innovation Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhancing Global Citizenship Through Service Learning: Implications for Capacity Building With Youth

Christopher A. Curtis

Abstract
The purpose of this paper is to bring attention to the potential that non-governmental organizations have in facilitating youth development and enhancing global citizenship. This can potentially be accomplished by utilizing international service learning as a means of capacity building. Non-governmental organizations that educate youth about community development or civic engagement are particularly capable of implementing such methods. This paper describes the benefits of enhancing global citizenship in youth through service learning and the potential of this work for capacity building and community development. An illustration of this process is provided through a description of Global Potential (GP), an organization that provides international service-learning opportunities to high school students in New York City. This paper also elucidates GP’s journey toward becoming a learning organization in order to expand and better serve its target population. Lastly, the implications of expanding and replicating service-learning programs are discussed.

Introduction
Community development through capacity building has been an effective method for changing communities for the better. The existing literature includes many examples of how capacity building has been beneficial, particularly when working with vulnerable populations. For instance, studies show the utility of capacity building with the elderly (Austin, McClelland, Sieppert, & Perrault, 2012), people living with disabilities (Nord, Timmons, & Lavin, 2015), and those living in poverty (Arellano, Balcazar, Alvarado, & Suarez, 2015; Pawar & Torres, 2011). Because capacity building is a multifaceted approach with varying and flexible methodologies (Harrow, 2001), community workers have some leeway in determining specifically how they engage their target population.

Working with youth can be an effective way to develop communities, especially communities that have a history of disenfranchisement and marginalization. Focusing on youth development as a means of capacity building can have lasting positive effects on their communities (McKay, Sanders, & Wrobleski, 2011), and there are a number of ways to effectively engage youth. Regrettably, youth are easily disempowered and overlooked due to power differentials associated with age, race/ethnicity, and class among other demographic differences (Evans, 2007; Gillborn, 2015; McMurrey, 2014). However, enhancing global citizenship in youth is a way to educate them about their role in society, increase their capacity to influence change, and encourage them to become civically engaged members of their communities. These specific objectives can be accomplished through programs that seek to enhance global citizenship in youth through international service learning (Hartman & Kiely, 2014).

Due to the advent of the digital age, people from around the world are connecting in ways that were inconceivable before the start of the 21st century. The resulting increased capacity for community and economic development in a global context has created opportunities for work related to youth development, enrichment, and civic engagement through service learning and cultural exchange. What makes this increased capacity important is that xenophobia and “otherization” stand to be diminished following exposure to varying worldviews (Giles & Eyler, 1994; Keen & Hall, 2009; Seider, Rabinowicz, & Gilmore, 2011). The impacts that cultural exchanges can have on youth development are promising in that they prepare youth to interact with a world that is becoming increasingly diverse. With that in mind, international service-learning participation gives youth the chance to develop a sense of global citizenship by experiencing an unfamiliar culture with the intent of humanizing and serving those who are supposedly different, an experience that could potentially yield a number of benefits for them and their respective communities (Giddings, 2003; Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Keith, 1994; Kiely, 2005).

Presently, there are multiple working definitions of global citizenship in the existing literature across various disciplines (Lough & McBride, 2014; Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013). Snider,
Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013) conceptualized the idea of global citizenship as “awareness, caring, and embracing cultural diversity while promoting social justice and sustainability, coupled with a sense of responsibility to act” (p. 1,600). Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013) expounded upon this definition by illustrating how each aspect of this definition applies to a global perspective. For instance, within their conceptualization, social justice is rooted in attitudes toward the equitable treatment of all humans, and responsibility to act is viewed as an obligation to work toward the betterment of the world (Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013). The emphasis placed on social justice and a sense of responsibility to be civicly engaged has implications for work currently being done with youth to ensure that they become well-rounded, civic-minded adults (Mitchell, 2007). Service learning, particularly international service learning, could potentially demonstrate ways in which youth can be groomed for becoming global citizens (Hartman & Kiely, 2014). The successes of these programs support their development and replication in other regions, which would also inform methods of capacity building centered on youth.

The purpose of this paper is to bring attention to the potential that non-governmental organizations have in facilitating youth development and enhancing global citizenship. This can be accomplished by utilizing international service learning as a means of capacity building with youth. Non-governmental organizations that educate youth about community development or civic engagement are particularly capable of implementing such methods (Crabtree, 2008). The aims of this paper are met by discussing youth development as a form of capacity building. The benefits of enhancing global citizenship in youth through international service learning are also discussed. An illustration of this process is provided through a description of Global Potential, an organization that provides international service-learning opportunities to high school students in New York City. This paper also elucidates Global Potential’s journey toward becoming a learning organization in order to expand and better serve its target population. Lastly, the implications of expanding and replicating international service-learning programs are discussed.

Capacity Building through Youth Development

The literature has yet to provide a definitive conceptualization of what capacity building is (Simmons, Reynolds, & Swinburn, 2011). Harrow (2001) explored the various ways that capacity building has been applied theoretically and in practice. She concluded that “[r]ather than regard capacity building as an a-theoretical notion, it can be seen as a notion, which is theoretically homeless; but for which some temporary accommodation can be found…” (p. 226). At first glance, this vagueness may seem limiting, but when considering how nuanced and involved the process of capacity building can become, it is understandable that capacity building remains such a vague concept. Even though capacity building is conceptually broad, there are common elements that have been constant in its application, particularly when it comes to understanding power (Diamond, 2004; O’Hare, 2010; Pawar & Torres, 2011; Richards-Schuster & Dobbie, 2011) and inclusivity (Arellano et al., 2015; Checkoway, 2013).

For this paper, McKay, Sanders, and Wrowbleski’s (2011) conceptualization of capacity building is most appropriate. They maintain that “[c]apacity building is about expanding possibility, potential, and access to power” (p. 17). What makes this conceptualization so fitting is the acknowledgment of existing dynamics related to power within communities. Capacity building is a process that seeks to ensure that all community members have an opportunity to be involved in decision-making (Checkoway, 2013; Finn & Checkoway, 1998). What is key here is an acknowledgment that the involvement of all stakeholders from every corner of a community is critical for lasting positive change (Pawar & Torres, 2011). The understanding that all community members have value manifests in the way that practitioners engage that community. To accomplish this, the experiences of community members should be understood. In other words, community workers must collaborate as partners working with community members to acquire the change being sought as opposed to working for the community to bring about change or commandeering the process in some way.

It should be noted that capacity building is not a foolproof endeavor free of pitfalls and shortcomings. It is risky to assume that all communities are monolithic and that members want the same outcomes (Pawar & Torres, 2011). Additionally, it is naïve to assume that all community members are invested or even interested in bringing about the same changes (Shirlow & Murtagh, 2004). Given the size and diversity of opinion within most communities, the best practitioners can do is to respect the self-determination of each community member, ensure that there is an opportunity for all involved to be heard, and work to resolve any conflicts as they arise. Once efforts have been made to understand the realities faced by members of the community, it becomes possible to assist them in finding solutions that address concerns
that have been raised by building upon identified strengths (Altschuld, Hung, & Lee, 2014; Austin et al. 2012; Pawar & Torres, 2011).

Many of the strengths in disadvantaged and marginalized communities can be found among their youth. Unfortunately, these youth are often disregarded or undervalued, mainly receiving attention when they are perceived to be disruptive (Evans, 2007). In that regard, engaging youth through service learning as a means of capacity building within underserved communities can serve a dual purpose. Firstly, youth development programs can empower and enrich a vulnerable population in ways that allow them to thrive. Youth are given an opportunity to see themselves as valuable resources instead of individuals in a state of perpetual need. Secondly, youth development programs can aid in community development and capacity building by tapping into one of the community’s most viable resources, their youth. Capacity building as a process is very much aligned with the tenets of asset-based community development. Kretzmann and McKnight (1996) explained that communities more often benefit when they are viewed from a perspective of strengths and potential as opposed to one of need and deficiency. In order for this to occur, the skills, knowledge, and insights that community members possess must be acknowledged and utilized to facilitate positive change (Preece, 2016). The idea of shifting the onus of community change to its members by assessing the community’s capacity for growth is rooted in the understanding that “community development takes place only when local community people are committed to investing themselves and their resources in the effort” (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1996, p. 25).

International service-learning programs that teach youth about civic engagement, community development, and capacity building empower youth to, in turn, work with communities in a way that helps those communities to find their voice and make positive changes. By encouraging youth and educating them on how to be active members within their respective communities, they become well-equipped to facilitate capacity building processes apart from the program as a result of their experiences.

McKay, Sanders, and Wroblewski (2011) wrote about the utility of capacity building through service learning with youth. Not only did they explicate the micro, mezzo, and macro implications of capacity building, they also demonstrated that youth are fully capable of contributing to their own development as well as becoming change agents in their own families, peer groups, and communities. What is important about this realization is that youth become empowered to become active members of society with the confidence and knowledge to aid in resolving issues that impact their communities and others. Programs that increase global citizenship are especially useful in achieving this objective in that youth are shown that they have something to contribute to society while experiencing first-hand the global contexts in which many issues exist (e.g., poverty and health disparities).

Enhancing Global Citizenship through International Service Learning

International service learning blends academic instruction and community-based service in an international context (Crabtree, 2008; Hartman, Paris, and Blache-Cohen, 2012). Several studies have shown the benefits of youth (i.e., adolescents and emerging adults) involvement in international service learning (Banks & Gutiérrez, 2017; Kiely, 2005; Lui & Lee, 2011; Niehaus & Crain, 2013; Pless, Maak, & Stahl, 2011). The effect of international service learning on participants has been evidenced in how they saw themselves and the world around them (Hartman & Kiely, 2014). Youth who have taken part in international service learning have also demonstrated an evolved understanding of poverty and the socioeconomic conditions that perpetuate it (Crabtree, 2008); reconsidered their career path as a result of their participation (Liu & Lee, 2011); and shown an increased commitment to community service and civic engagement (Niehaus & Crain, 2013). The findings of these different studies fit within the conceptualization of global citizenship posited by Snider, Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013) to varying extents. This is apparent because they each relate to some level of awareness, caring, embracing cultural diversity while promoting social justice, and/or a sense of responsibility to act. All of these qualities readily lend themselves to capacity building, thus making youth who view themselves as global citizens fit to lead and participate in such processes.

Despite research that has linked international service learning to conceptual aspects of global citizenship, the findings of studies that investigated a more direct link between service-learning experiences and a sense of global citizenship are mixed. For instance, Miller (2014) found that the more countries a student visited, the higher their likelihood of viewing themselves as global citizens with the power to help solve the world’s problems. Horn and Fry (2013) also produced findings that supported the idea that study-abroad programs with service-learning pedagogies can cultivate personal growth, cognitive engagement, and social capital that culminates in
active global citizenship. Conversely, Hartman and Kiely (2014) conducted a comparative case study of three international service-learning programs and found that participants, mentors, and community partners struggled with the construct of global citizenship and what it means. These conflicting results could at least partially be attributed to the inconsistent conceptualizations of global citizenship present in the literature (Hartman & Kiely, 2014).

Each of these studies has in common the acknowledgment of the contributions that youth can make in solving society’s problems. However, youth are often excluded from the discourse around how society functions (Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapo, & Sheblanova, 1998; Goodwin & Young, 2013). This exclusion is particularly true for minority youth (Camino & Zeldin, 2002; Evans, 2007). To date, studies that specifically explore the impact of service learning on underserved, minority youth are limited (Curtis, 2016). Even less is known about how international service learning affects youth development and global citizenship in this population. In fact, much of the existing literature on international service learning focuses on the realization of privilege and the acquisition of cross-cultural competence in college students, which is definitely important. Yet little attention has been paid to the effect these experiences have on marginalized youth who are most likely to experience overt structural oppression and institutional bias at home. This is problematic in that service-learning opportunities are traditionally provided without accounting for existing structures of oppression (Kinloch, Nemeth, & Patterson, 2015). Investigating the experiences of these youth has great potential to illuminate their potential to positively impact communities both locally and abroad. After all, people who have experienced inequity in economic, social, and cultural spaces are well-suited to understand and identify structures of oppression and the needs they create (Clayton, Hess, Hartman, Edwards, Shackford-Bradley, Harrison, & McLaughlin, 2014).

Research that supports the development of global citizenship in marginalized youth is needed because “[y]outh development skills and strategies that emphasize youth voice and civic engagement have become essential tools for change and transformation in contested spaces where disparities produce societal failure to thrive” (Schneider-Munoz & Politz, 2007, p. 32). Hartman (2016) stated that evidence-based approaches are necessary in order for service-learning practitioners to build capacity, undo stereotyping, and maximize student and community member outcomes. Furthermore, research would help meet a need for the development of social and organizational structures that allow youth to successfully transfer newly acquired skills and worldviews to their home communities (Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Pless et al., 2011). The implications of such research could point the way to new approaches to community development and capacity building that activates and takes advantage of the talents, insights, and energy of young people.

A Case Example: Global Potential

Global Potential is presented here for two reasons. The first reason is to demonstrate the ideas mentioned previously in practice within the context of the existing literature. Recall McKay and colleagues’ (2011) conceptualization of capacity building, which entails expanding possibility, potential, and access to power. The second reason is to illustrate how a non-governmental organization can instill a sense of global citizenship in marginalized youth and create opportunities for positive youth development through international service learning.

The mission of Global Potential is to transform “youth from underserved communities through education, service learning, and cultural exchange into globally competitive leaders of positive change in their lives and communities” (retrieved from http://www.global-potential.org/new-page-2). This particular service-learning program works primarily with underserved and marginalized youth to increase their civic knowledge and enhance their global citizenship so that they may become change agents in their communities. Intensive training, mentorship, and service learning with an emphasis on community capacity building are utilized to help the program achieve its mission. Global Potential was co-founded by three social workers with a desire to aid marginalized youth in finding their voice by giving them opportunities to learn about the world around them and how they can help to change it for the better. The organization was created with the intention of providing youth a skill set that would enable them to assist foreign communities in finding their collective voice and develop the ability to help improve their home communities. By engaging youth in this way, the volunteers and staff at Global Potential treat youth as a valuable resource worthy of refinement as opposed to a powerless group in constant need.

Global Potential’s program is implemented through three phases over the course of approximately 17 months. In the first phase, youth attend weekly workshops that focus on educating them about civic engagement, cultural competence, global preparedness, social entrepreneurship, community service and development, and advocacy. This phase employs
a critical pedagogy that encourages participants to be active learners, while encouraging them to work toward change in their community (Sprague Martinez, Reich, Flores, Ndulue, Brugge, Gute, & Peréa 2017). It is during this phase that youth are led to think critically about social, economic, and political systems, becoming co-learners with other participants and facilitators alike as they are encouraged to find their voice and critically assess their place in the world. Facilitators create spaces for youth to be proactive in their learning as they reflect on lived experiences, ask questions, and challenge one another in a safe environment. This more inclusive approach to learning gives youth the opportunity to consider multiple contexts associated with social issues (Matthews, 2014). Engaging these youth in a dialogical learning process that emphasizes issues of equity and social justice results in their being primed to engage new and foreign communities in meaningful ways.

In the second phase of the program, youth participate in service-learning projects locally or abroad (e.g., the Caribbean, Africa, or Central America) for up to six weeks. It is in this phase that youth work with communities to address concerns identified by their members. Asset-based community development with the host communities often takes place at this time as students enact what they learned during the first phase of the program. Youth work with communities to identify and mobilize strengths by including community stakeholders in the development and implementation of the projects (Kramer, Amos, Lazarus, & Seedat, 2012). This approach allows youth and community members to equally take ownership of the process as they engage in shared problem-solving starting with the expertise and insights present within the community (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1996).

In the third phase of the program, mentorship and facilitated group discussions afford youth the opportunity to critically assess their positionality and examine social, economic, and political systems from a global perspective engendered by their recent experiences abroad. This phase of the program is critical in that scholars have noted that participants often return from international service-learning experiences without any formal or structured reintegration that helps them to process the subsequent impact on their worldview (Crabtree, 2008; Hartman & Kiely, 2014). With the assistance of mentors and staff, participants channel the knowledge, skills, and experience acquired during the first two phases into service-learning projects that will benefit their home communities. Participants often remain in contact with their host communities once they have completed the program. Many youth have gone on to partner with their host communities on other projects or remained involved in the work that began during their initial visit. For instance, in 2012, two Global Potential participants completed a service-learning project in Haiti. That experience led them to co-found a nonprofit organization in response to needs they observed. In 2015, this youth-led organization began working with the community in Terre Froide, Haiti. The community members of Terre Froide expressed a need to build a local school. As a result, a collaborative effort between the youth and the community was launched to meet that need. Both youth continue to work with the community in Terre Froide, returning each year to help community members realize their goal. After years of community partnerships, the school opened in fall 2017. This anecdotal account illustrates how youth can use the skills that they acquired as Global Potential participants to engage in social entrepreneurship, fundraising, and community development.

Each expected outcome associated with participation in Global Potential (e.g., increased self-efficacy and civic knowledge in youth) stems from the program’s mission. The intention is for youth to graduate from the program as high functioning, well-informed, civically minded individuals with a desire to give back to their communities. More specifically, they aim to instill a strong sense of what it means to be a global citizen by increasing their communication skills, academic and social efficacy, self-esteem, leadership skills, life satisfaction, and cultural competence. The idea is that individuals who develop these skills will not only be better equipped to handle personal challenges, but will also be more likely to push for meaningful change at a mezzo and macro level (i.e., within organizations and the larger society).

The mission of Global Potential and the outcomes anticipated for each participant in the program are very much aligned with the conceptualization of global citizenship put forth by Snider, Reysen and Katzarska-Miller (2013). The mission of the program and the curriculum being implemented with the participating youth are driven by the idea of enhancing global citizenship through youth development. Awareness, caring, embracing cultural diversity while promoting social justice and sustainability, and a sense of responsibility to act are all concepts that participating youth learn about at some point during their time in the program.
Global Potential is currently making strides toward becoming a learning organization by developing a more research-driven program evaluation that will help them to identify which aspects of the program are in line with their mission, and which aspects can be strengthened to increase their efficiency. Once this revised process of program evaluation is firmly established, Global Potential will be more adaptable as an organization. As a result, they will increase their capacity for growth and replication. Research on the work with youth happening at Global Potential can provide an example of capacity building and community development that is multifaceted and has far-reaching implications for improving service provision to this population in a way that increases civic engagement in underserved youth while simultaneously enhancing their sense of global citizenship. Furthermore, the research being conducted at Global Potential is important because “empirical studies connecting international experiences to global citizenship are rare...” (Lough & McBride, p. 457). What research has been done on youth service programs in general, to date, has been inconsistent (Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Lakin & Mahoney, 2006; Kiely, 2005).

Considering the existing literature that explores the benefits of having a sense of global citizenship and research that leads to the development of organizational infrastructures that support pathways to that end become critical (Camino & Zeldin, 2002). These infrastructures would include international networks of service learning that would facilitate the exchange of ideas on how to address local problems from a global perspective. Ideally, the resulting international service-learning experiences generated by these networks would incorporate a combination of civic education, cross-cultural immersion and relationship building, community development, shared inquiry for problem-solving, and meaningful learning experiences rooted in critical reflection (Crabtree, 2008). Even though the potential of international service learning has only recently begun to be investigated (Horn & Fry, 2013), organizations like Global Potential can serve as an example of how to support youth development and enhance global citizenship through service learning.

Conclusion

Society has become increasingly globalized both socially and economically in the 21st century. The shift in how communities around the world connect has made the idea of global citizenship more tangible and realistic, although there is currently no consensus on what constitutes global citizenship in the existing literature. Researchers have, however, made connections between service-learning programs and a sense of global citizenship (e.g., Keen and Hall (2009), highlighting the potential benefits associated with program participation and the implications for youth development and civic engagement. Yet, little research exists that explores how international service learning geared toward enhancing global citizenship in youth can be used in capacity building efforts, particularly in youth from underserved, marginalized communities.

Considering all the benefits associated with participating in international service-learning programs, it would seem that the skills developed by youth would be effective in initiating community engagement that extends beyond participation in two ways. That is, program participants can potentially become change agents in their home communities as a result of taking part in an international service-learning program. Also, these youth become empowered to assist other communities in capacity building, which would possibly be due to their enhanced sense of global citizenship. Global Potential is an example of a non-governmental organization that seeks to enhance global citizenship in underserved, marginalized youth through international service learning with the intent of empowering participants to become active, civically engaged members of their respective communities. Through research, Global Potential seeks to fortify its mission and grow as a program to increase its impact on youth, especially those from marginalized communities.

Capacity building through youth development is a worthy endeavor for any profession geared toward community development, social service, or social justice. For instance, the pursuit of enhanced global citizenship for youth present in the literature and exemplified by Global Potential is embodied in the International Federation of Social Work (IFSW) statement of ethical principles, particularly the principle of social justice. The five components of social justice put forth by IFSW are: challenging negative discrimination, recognizing diversity, distributing resources equally, challenging unjust policies and practices, and working in solidarity.

One must be caring and aware in order to challenge negative discrimination. It is not possible to embrace cultural diversity without first recognizing and respecting ethnic and cultural diversity. Promoting social justice and sustainability calls for an equal distribution of resources. Challenging unjust policies and practices would not occur if people did not feel an obligation to act. Lastly, global citizens by most accounts are inclusive and believe in working in solidarity.
The alignment of global citizenship's conceptualization with the IFSW statement of ethical principles shows that extracurricular service-oriented programs aid in the development of a global civil society (Schneider-Muñoz & Politz, 2007). Additionally, capacity building that respects the rights and voice of the communities being impacted calls for these same values to be held constant. What remains is a need to develop a consistent, interdisciplinary understanding of what it means to be a global citizen. Furthermore, there is a lack of empirical evidence linking international service-learning experiences to a sense of global citizenship (Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Lough & McBride, 2014). Fortunately, research and practice are coming together in a way that will help to better understand how to conceptualize global citizenship and the most practical means of achieving it.
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Leadership Education for College and Career Readiness: The CAMP Osprey Mentoring Program
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Abstract

This article describes a program that combines meaningful community-based experiential learning for collegiate students with leadership-based mentoring, delivered either face-to-face or virtually, that helps K–12 students see college as an option for their future. The CAMP (Collegiate Achievement Mentoring Program) model is a partnership between institutions of higher education and K–12 schools, in which collegiate student mentors are paired with children in high-poverty K–12 schools to improve leadership and career-readiness skills for collegiate mentors and leadership and college-readiness skills for mentees. The CAMP model has positively impacted the academic and social outcomes of more than 1,500 student mentors and mentees in four states. This article describes the genesis, development, process, and outcomes of the CAMP Osprey program at the University of North Florida as a model for other educational institutions to replicate and adapt to meet the needs of their students. The program is readily replicable and is notable among mentoring models because it is based on leadership development and can be delivered virtually.

Introduction

Nationally, the number of effective student-centered resources and support structures available to at-risk K–12 students is declining (Corbett, Wilson, & Williams, 2002; Darling-Hammond, Zielinski, & Goldman, 2014). In contrast, the need for authentic, experiential service-based learning is increasing as a method for addressing recruitment and retention of college students (Kuh, 2008). To address both national concerns, CAMP Osprey provides a forum for collegiate mentors to learn leadership skills and teach them to K–12 students through a comprehensive mentoring partnership. Collegiate mentors and K–12 mentees engage in small group mentoring and participate in immersive on-campus events while mentors and mentees develop and practice the leadership skills needed to become college and career ready. CAMP Osprey at the University of North Florida (UNF) is based on a framework that has been implemented at the University of Florida’s Collegiate Achievement Mentoring, known as CAMP Gator, and North Carolina State University’s CAMP Pack (Ohlson, 2009). With each iteration, the CAMP program has adapted to meet the diverse leadership and learning needs of its partners.

CAMP Osprey is a partnership among university entities; public school systems; individual schools, principals, and teachers; and most importantly, the collegiate mentors and K–12 mentees themselves. All of the partners participate in collective leadership of the direction and operation of the program. Literature regarding the aspects of our mentoring model follows.

Mentoring in an Educational Context

Mentoring is an effective strategy to prepare students to advance from secondary to post-secondary educational institutions (DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002; Tierney, Grossman, & Resch, 2000) or the workplace. Mentoring serves the interests and needs of mentees, mentors, community organizations and businesses (Klinge, 2015; Pidgeon, Archibald, & Hawkey, 2014), and helps mentees develop and hone their mental tools, enhance academic skill sets, and prepare for the complexities of life (Klinge, 2015). Mentees view advice and instruction from mentors as validation of what was taught at home and school, and they apply that learning to the workplace and community. For mentors, the relationship with their mentees allows for sharing of failures and successes, which are imperative for learners to formulate their understanding of the complexities of life (Dobrow, Chandler, Murphy, & Kram, 2012; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Klinge, 2015).

Virtual Mentoring

Most mentoring research has concerned face-to-face mentoring, but virtual mentoring has received recent attention. In some of the earliest research, Knouse (2001), exploring videoconferencing technology for communication between mentor and mentee (Bierema & Merriam, 2002), discussed how members of a virtual team could mentor one another. As technology developed, NASA’s Digital Learning Network (DLN) incorporated technology into an innovative Virtual Visits (VV) program, which employed
subject matter experts to e-mentor K–12 students on the DLN’s website (Long & Close, 2012), thus meeting K–12 students’ increasing need to access mentors who were experts in various fields of study.

Virtual mentoring has been shown to build relationships and foster collaboration between individuals in remote locations (Bierema & Merriam, 2002). In addition, virtual mentoring was found to be an effective tool for training and learning new skills (Seabrooks, Kenney, & LaMontagne, 2000; Ohlson & Froman, 2012). A powerful aspect of virtual mentoring is that the cultural baggage and stereotypes that accompany race, gender, and social class become less obvious in a virtual forum and make mentoring the focus, allowing for better communication and collaboration (Bierema & Merriam, 2002). For example, harnessing videoconferencing tools such as virtual field trips, file uploads, and the chat/text feature can engage auditory, visual, and kinesthetic learners, as well as both introverts and extroverts with varying levels of comfort speaking/collaborating in groups.

Community-Based Experiential Learning

Higher education institutions that focus on community-based learning are increasingly being recognized (Lee, Kane, & Cavanaugh, 2015). Community-based learning serves as a valuable experiential learning opportunity that can take the form of projects in the community, structured activities, volunteerism, and assorted methods of engaged learning (Mooney & Edwards, 2001). An added benefit of community-based learning is that such engagement can extend outside the context of course content (Cavanaugh, 2006; Lee, Kane, & Cavanaugh, 2015). Appropriately structured projects provide students with opportunities to apply academic skills and knowledge to needs of the community, and a critical aspect of such projects is the opportunity for students to reflect on their experiences and make meaning of them (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Lee, Bush, & Smith, 2005; Lee, Kane, & Cavanaugh, 2015). Such opportunities allow “ideal time for students to use critical thinking skills to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate what they have learned” (Lee, Bush, & Smith, 2005, p. 12). Such academic experiences can serve as catalysts for lifelong learning and professional development (Lee, Kane, & Gregg, 2016).

Mentoring as a Catalyst for Collective Leadership

In many educational settings, lack of resources prompts stakeholders to look to collective support from a variety of sources (Bryan, 2005). Collective leadership is based on the belief that those closest to an issue are best qualified to effect systemic and sustainable change. Participants in the collective leadership process form a developmental network that functions as the nexus for service and learning objectives. Success in collective leadership and developmental networks hinges on an understanding of the intra- and interpersonal dynamics that make relationships work (Fullan, 2007). Collective leadership lends itself to identifying, initiating, developing, and sustaining developmental networks to implement community-based initiatives. The necessity of collective community leadership through developmental networks is best synopsisized in the African proverb: “If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together.”

Genesis of the CAMP Model

Designing, implementing, and evaluating a new collegiate mentoring program presents many challenges. Being prepared for such challenges can make development of a program quicker and smoother for everyone involved. Depending on the community, the stakeholders involved, and the type of mentoring program and its stage of development, different challenges may arise. The development of CAMP Osprey at UNF benefited from the author’s experience with prior programs at the University of Florida’s CAMP Gator and NC State University’s CAMP Pack (Ohlson, 2009).

CAMP Gator

At the University of Florida, CAMP Gator operated between 2008 and 2014, with a one-year hiatus in 2011–2012. The program was based on a leadership curriculum, with students in a leadership course serving as mentors as an integral part of their course curriculum and embedded experiential learning. CAMP Gator began as a face-to-face program, with virtual mentoring added later to accommodate demand. In five years of operation, over 300 mentors served more than 1,100 students in grades four–nine in seven partner schools. Because UF is located in central Florida, the partner schools were primarily suburban and rural. Data demonstrated a remarkable improvement in public speaking, goal setting, and leadership skills for collegiate mentors (Ohlson, 2009; Ohlson & Quinn, 2010), including a 72% decrease in suspensions, 13% increase in GPA, and 22% increase in attendance for K–12 mentees (Ohlson, 2009; Ohlson & Quinn, 2010).
The strategies learned at UF, including the use of a leadership curriculum embedded throughout the mentoring process, along with the addition of virtual mentoring, are foundational elements of the current, CAMP Osprey program at UNF.

**CAMP Pack**

CAMP Pack operated for one academic year, 2011–2012. Student athletes and student leaders served as mentors in a leadership-based (but not course-based) volunteer program that was entirely face-to-face, and which served just one elementary school. The 50 fourth and fifth grade mentees were students at the AB Combs Leadership Magnet School in Raleigh, and the group represented diversity in terms of racial, socio-economic, and academic achievement levels. Even in the short time that the program was in existence, mentees improved attendance by 18% and GPA by 5%. Extracted from this iteration of the CAMP model was the importance of developing a strong relationship with a school, in this case, a single site where we could focus on design, implementation, and evaluation efforts when resources were limited.

**Development and Implementation of CAMP Osprey**

CAMP Osprey was launched at UNF in fall 2015 with mentors drawn from a leadership course. Initially, all mentoring interactions were face-to-face. As the program developed, student athletes and student leaders were added to the mentoring team (2016–2017), and virtual mentoring was added to accommodate more distant schools. CAMP Osprey differs from its predecessors in the diversity of the K–12 partners, which include rural, suburban, and urban; high-poverty and affluent; and charter and traditional public schools. The program processes and details are described in the sections that follow and summarized in Figure 1.

**Mentor Selection & Training**

**Leadership mentor selection.** Initially, all of the mentors were students in an Introduction to Leadership course that is the foundational course in UNF’s Leadership Minor, housed in the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) in partnership with the Taylor Leadership Institute. The course is taken by students from a variety of majors, and the students in the course are more ethnically and racially diverse (52% nonwhite) than those in any other courses within COEHS (29%) and UNF (33%) as a whole. Students who enroll in the designated section understand that leadership mentoring is a required and graded component of the course.

**Collegiate mentor training.** For students enrolled in the foundational Introduction to Leadership course, leadership mentoring constitutes a substantial portion of the course curriculum. The first phase of the course teaches students the characteristics of effective leadership and leadership best practices from seminal texts such as Covey’s (1989) *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* and Kotter’s (1996) *Leading change*.

**Leading change.** Topics of study during the course include preparing a personal mission and vision, aligning actions with values, finding one’s voice and strengths, time management, and workplace etiquette, including appropriate dress and behavior.

Early in the course, mentors participate in eight hours of face-to-face training with the course instructor, specifically focused on best practices for leadership mentoring and the practicalities of mentor-mentee interaction. Outlines and deliverables of weekly mentoring sessions are laid out in a written mentoring guide (Ohlson & Buenoño, 2018).

The training program is unique in that mentors not only learn important leadership skills, but also teach them to their mentees, thereby reinforcing their own learning. Student athletes and volunteers not enrolled in the course receive a condensed version of mentor training. Mentors are trained in student and school safety strategies to ensure the well-being of the program and all participants.

**Partners Site and Mentee Selection**

Partner schools are selected based on a variety of criteria including proximity to UNF (for
our face-to-face mentoring component), age of students (grades four to eight have seen the largest gains based on previous iterations of the model, Ohlson, 2013) and investment in the program as demonstrated by the commitment of at least one staff member who will help monitor the mentoring sessions and serve as a dedicated liaison between the university and each school site.

The three iterations of the CAMP program have had over 30 partner schools in four states. More than 70% of all K–12 mentees are from high poverty households and 64% are from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds. In the 2016–2017 academic year, UNF partnered with schools in its home county of Duval (FL), in addition to St. Johns and Miami-Dade (FL), rural schools in Flagler and Putnam (FL) and Wake (NC) counties, and Milford Independent School District (TX).

The individual K–12 students who participate are selected by their teachers and school administrators because they are perceived to have potential, but to be at risk of underachieving based on personal difficulties. For example, a student who was doing well academically before her parents went through a divorce or a star athlete who is struggling academically would be candidates for inclusion. Mentoring matches between mentor and mentee and the academic performance of both are monitored by school and CAMP Osprey staff through monthly “check-ins” (described in the next section) to ensure the process is having the greatest impact on students.

Not every school is a fit for the program, and schools have been asked to leave the mentoring network based on the fidelity of our process and the level of support necessary. For example, we no longer offer mentoring services to a school because they did not provide adequate learning space, opting to place our students in a crowded hallway which proved unfavorable to both virtual and face-to-face mentoring. Other schools have failed to provide sufficient supervision of mentoring sessions and effectively communicate schedule changes. We first attempt to address such situations with open communication, but with continued issues, we must put the safety of the students and fidelity of the program first and end the mentoring partnership with that school.

Weekly Mentoring Sessions Based on Leadership Curriculum

**Face-to-face mentoring.** Weekly mentoring sessions take place at the partner schools and last for 60 minutes, with each mentoring group consisting of one collegiate mentor and two or three K–12 mentees. Mentoring sessions are supervised by K–12 staff and, when possible, by a member of the UNF program team. Activities are scripted in the mentoring guide and focus on leadership development and college and career readiness skills. The mentoring sessions use a leadership development curriculum based on Covey’s *7 Habits of Highly Effective People* (1989) and a best practice mentoring guide developed by a cadre of mentors during the nine years of the program (Ohlson & Buenano, 2018). Mentoring sessions consist of relationship building, a leadership activity, establishing and monitoring the achievement of personal goals, creating time management plans, and learning life skills and college and career readiness.

Working together, both collegiate mentors and K–12 mentees create personal mission statements and leadership portfolios. From learning how to prioritize daily activities and properly shake someone’s hand, to modeling positive behaviors, mentors and mentees develop strong, meaningful relationships.

**Virtual mentoring.** When possible, the mentoring sessions are face to face, but when distance is a factor, for example with rural partner schools, mentoring meetings take place via videoconferencing and follow the same structure as face-to-face sessions. With the support of UNF’s Center for Instruction & Research Technology and Cisco Technologies, collegiate mentors and K–12 mentees in distant partner schools communicate in real-time, share files using Google Drive and Dropbox (based on district preference) and participate in virtual field trips facilitated by a UNF faculty or staff member who travels to the partner school. In the first semester of virtual mentoring (spring 2016), to accommodate technology limitations, as many as 10–12 mentees might be present in one mentoring session, facilitated by four to six mentors. In the second academic year, a single mentoring session was limited to two mentors and four to six mentees, with the two groups alternating in their use of the connection. Expansion to virtual mentoring increased the total number of mentees, as well as access for high-need student groups. When virtual mentoring was implemented, the percentage of mentees and the numbers of Latino and high-poverty rural mentees increased by 44%, 29%, and 38% respectively.
On-Campus Outings

Periodically, when distance is not a prohibitive factor, K–12 mentees come to UNF for activities such as talking to a faculty member, participating in a soccer or art clinic, or having their mentor show them a lab, a residence hall room, or the lazy river or climbing wall. Leadership development is as comprehensive as possible; for example, campus visits have at times been preceded by mentors taking their mentees shopping for clothes so they can look professional and feel comfortable on campus. Such campus visits are important because when students gain familiarity with a college campus, there is an increased likelihood that they will consider going to college (King, 2012), and perhaps consider UNF as a future collegiate home. Such recruiting also benefits UNF as it seeks to expand its reach to underrepresented communities. At the end of the semester, the collegiate mentors and the K–12 mentees together present their leadership portfolios at the K–12 mentees’ school.

Program Assessment and Evaluation

Throughout the CAMP Osprey mentoring process, stakeholders from each partner school, including administration and teachers, participate in monthly planning meetings where they have the opportunity to offer suggestions, feedback, and ways that the program could be improved. CAMP Osprey program staff attend these planning meetings as a means to learn from and with the adults who know the student mentees in hopes of creating the most advantageous leadership opportunities. For example, one school adapted their mentoring activities to incorporate an entrepreneurship theme while another school asked to include more writing within the activities to address student learning needs. In addition, these meetings also allow for robust data collection and analysis to determine program effectiveness and needed adaptations. This sharing of information and outcomes has also resulted in the CAMP Osprey model being recognized with numerous awards, grants, publications, and presentations based on the program outcomes and process of implementation.

The long-term goals of UNF’s CAMP Osprey are to increase UNF student graduation rates and to increase the likelihood that at-risk youth will attend college. Desired outcomes for collegiate mentors are development and application of leadership skills, and improved personal outcomes (academic, athletic, etc.) as college students. Desired outcomes for K–12 mentees are improved academic achievement, attendance, and discipline in their current school settings. To examine the alignment between the intended goals and program outcomes, we examined a variety of variables for mentor and mentee on an ongoing basis and use these results to continuously improve the model.

In its first year (2015–2016), 25 CAMP Osprey collegiate participants mentored 50 K–12 children in the local (Duval County, FL) public schools. In its second year (2016–2017), 40 mentors worked with 75 mentees in nine schools, face-to-face in Duval and St. Johns (FL) and virtually in Miami-Dade, Flagler and Putnam (FL) and Wake (NC) County schools. The diversity of participating schools (urban and rural; regular public and charter schools; mainly high-poverty but one [St. Johns] relatively affluent) and the growth in participation show that we are beginning to address our goals of increased participation and diversity of both students and partner schools.

Mentor results. At the end of the spring 2017 semester, collegiate mentors were asked to respond with up to five answers to a single question: “How have you grown because of this leadership mentoring experience?” The survey was administered to both the mentors enrolled in the leadership class and those from the athletic teams. All 98 mentors responded to the survey. Content analysis on survey responses (Figure 2) revealed that the most frequently mentioned words were as follows: leadership (35 mentions); positive (31), listen better and collaboration (17 each); learn (9); goals and grown (8); involvement (7); and community and patience, (6 each).

Reflections included in the mentors’ leadership portfolios provided insight into mentors’ experiences. One mentor identified the value of relationships by stating:

Figure 2. Most Frequently Mentioned Words
Having a mentor, someone you can ask questions about whatever, someone you can trust in, is really important in this society because that person will help you be successful in every area of your life. I learned that I don’t have to be perfect to be a mentor. I just have to be supporting and help them be the best leader that they can be. I hope that in the future my mentees can achieve that. That would be a dream come true.

The value of the ability to positively influence was also recognized. One mentor said, “Knowing that we can have an influence on kids and knowing how cool they probably think it is means a lot to us. It really does make a difference.” Another mentor articulated that the positive influence was a two-way street, noting:

Seeing my mentee’s success and talking to her about her goals led me to become more confident in my abilities. I am not as scared to speak up in class or on the track. I also have a new understanding for varying communities, as this was an exposure vastly different from my hometown.

Appreciation of diversity was another theme. Using Covey’s (1989) 5th Habit “Seek first to understand, then be understood” (p. 247–248) as the foundation of this leadership development theme, students were immersed in learning about many of the challenges facing the students in our partner schools including high poverty, excessive mobility in the migrant farm populations within the rural context, and the school violence that often permeated the school environments with our urban school partners. Another essential element in this process was the mutual learning and understanding that took place when our UNF students were required to immerse themselves in the learning environment of their mentee. Therefore, the college students were able to see the school, classrooms, and even the surrounding neighborhood of their mentee. One mentor shared that:

My students were of all different ethnic, social, political, religious, and economic backgrounds. They have developed an understanding that they are functional citizens in our community and they are capable of much more than they are told…. I have learned that although we all come from different backgrounds, if we work together as a community, we can all succeed. Before this program, I never knew how a normal student like me could make such an impact in my community but I now know that I can, one mentee at a time.

The impact of CAMP Osprey on the collegiate mentors is possibly best conveyed by the words of one mentor who stated:

I walked out of this program a completely different person from who I was when I walked in. I will never forget the memories I made there and how much I learned about not only myself, but also what I want to do with my life. This mentoring program has helped me grow as a person and has absolutely made me a better person. I can’t wait to continue on with this program and further mold myself into the leader I want to be.

Collegiate mentors self-reported increased leadership acumen and enhanced ability to apply leadership principles including an improved ability to manage their time, an increased awareness of ways to work with others (including those from different cultures), and a stronger understanding of how to define and work toward goals that align with their interests and passions. It is too early to assess impacts on UNF collegiate mentors with respect to academic and career outcomes, but we expect to see effects on grades, retention rates, graduation rates, and continuing involvement in community outreach. Future data will hopefully continue to show that students learn how to be leaders most effectively by showing and doing rather than merely writing and reading in a class. 

Mentee results. Both virtual and face-to-face-mentored groups demonstrated improvement in attendance (8%) and GPA (3%), with no significant difference in the magnitude of the gains between the two groups in the first year of CAMP Osprey. However, substantially more of the virtually mentored students (9%) improved their GPAs in the second year, compared to the face-to-face-mentored students (4%). These gains, compared to their face-to-face-mentored peers, were based on the student comfort level using technology and communicating in a virtual environment compared to a face-to-face setting (Barnwell, 2014; Ohlson, Ehrlich, Lerman, & Pascale, 2017).
Mentee reflections were collected from their leadership portfolios. The credibility of mentors, simply by virtue of their position being “educated” college students, was attested by one mentee who stated, “They’re in college so they can tell you what to look forward to and how hard you have to work [to succeed].”

The recognition of improvement was pointed out by one mentee who stated, “I’m going to miss CAMP Osprey. My grades have gone up since I joined you guys and I am a better leader now.” Another mentee shared a similar notion: “I feel more confident when I talk to adults and my teachers because of CAMP Osprey, and I’ve been doing better in school and getting in trouble a lot less.” An additional aspect of recognized improvement was conveyed by a mentee who reflected:

I see how my classmates treat each other better than they did before and I think we all get along better in school because our mentors have been working with us on how to be more positive about ourselves and others.

The notion of increased optimism about the future was shared by one mentee: “I’ll be sad when I don’t see my mentor every week anymore because she taught me about what I can look forward to in college and we talked about the things I can start doing now to help me get there.” Another mentee expressed gratitude for being included in the program: “I was so glad I was picked for this program because it has helped me a lot to grow and be a better leader and student all around. Thank you CAMP Osprey!”

In CAMP Osprey, teachers and principals reported that K–12 mentees demonstrated improvements in attendance (7% decrease in excessive absences), behavior (4% decrease in suspensions), and academic achievement (9% gain in student GPA) (Ohlson, Lerman, Theobold, & Jamison, 2017). Future examination of factors such as attendance, retention, graduation rates, and college attendance rates are expected to help schools at all levels inform their organizational policies and practices.

Lessons Learned

With the benefit of hindsight over three iterations of CAMP programs, we offer these suggestions for success. In our experience, a mentoring program is more likely to achieve its goals if it incorporates some key features.

Get support from as many sources as possible. The first CAMP program in 2008 coincided with a period of austere educational budgets and many contended that there was not enough money to start a new initiative. We embedded the mentoring activities in a college course and reduced travel costs by partnering with schools close to campus and virtually mentoring more distant schools. Strait (2009) pointed out that service-learning efforts can be adapted to online formats in order to keep up with changes in higher education and offered best practices for using Service-eLearning. In our case, we implemented a virtual strategy to help address economic issues by making use of IT resources from our university. We also successfully coordinated with the admissions office to arrange campus visits by arguing that this program serves as a powerful college recruiting tool.

Because we needed additional resources that were not available at the university, we reached out to various organizations for sponsorship. In collaboration with our development office, to avoid overlap communicating to potential donors, we reached out to potential sponsors based on alignment with their business areas. For example, a local fitness center sponsored the T-shirts for an on-campus tennis clinic and a local restaurant sponsored a healthy-eating session in collaboration with the collegiate health and nutrition faculty. These funding strategies harnessed university resources and helped to meet the changing needs of the students to ensure a seamless, meaningful, experiential learning program for the students both on and off campus (Lima, 2009).

When reaching out for sponsors, we also asked that these business leaders take part in the program by speaking to our collegiate mentors on the power of leadership in their own life or business. This strategy proved to be an exponentially effective process as the financial resources helped with our immediate needs, but the leadership lessons shared by these community and business leaders helped to inform our collegiate mentors for future successes.

Positive branding. Initially, many university, school district, and community stakeholders suggested that there was no need for a mentoring program because one was already available in the community (e.g., Big Brothers, Big Sisters, a nationwide nonprofit mentoring program). We researched mentoring programs and found numerous ways that they could be improved, including increased accountability for the mentors (with mentoring linked to a course grade); clear
mentoring goals, outcomes, and activities (embedded in a leadership curriculum); and shared on-campus experiences to build relationships. We assessed the program, and used the program website www.camposprey.org and social media to communicate its impact using our Twitter site https://twitter.com/UNF_CAMP_OSPREY. We started small and then celebrated the leadership and learning outcomes achieved by students.

**Adaptability.** Planning and implementing a program can take years. In a university setting, students and others involved may not be around long enough to help in the entire process. We worked with college faculty and advisors to create an efficient process to train mentors and maintain the fidelity of their leadership development. To accommodate the schedules of K–12 mentees and staff, we sought their input and developed customized schedules for mentoring sessions, including before and after school and the ever-popular working lunch.

**Less is more.** For CAMP Pack, we initiated the program in just one K–12 school. Although the program did not continue due to the departure of the director (see the next item), this program displayed a high fidelity of implementation and was the easiest for staff inexperienced in the program to manage. In contrast, when the UNF program expanded from three to 12 K–12 partner schools, supervision of the programs at individual schools suffered and the model was not always implemented according to the original concept. For those starting their own program, consider starting small with one to three sites and refine the process to meet the unique needs of each site, while constantly communicating the impact of the program to school and community stakeholders. As the process is adapted, then expansion may take place, ensuring the fidelity of the process, products and outcomes can be maintained with the human and financial resources.

**Plan for succession.** At both UF and NC State, when the program director left the university, the program disintegrated. The program budget and staffing model must include an adaptable and comprehensive succession plan for the program to continue after its initial champion moves on (Charan, 2005).

**Plan for assessment.** Funders, supervisors, and potential publication venues will all want to see evidence of efficacy. We recommend meeting with an assessment professional at the beginning of the planning process to ensure that data needed to demonstrate effectiveness will be consistently collected.

**Incorporate and maintain a high degree of structure.** An intentional curriculum for mentor training and the mentoring sessions; clearly defined outcomes for each mentoring session; and close monitoring of fidelity of implementation to ensure consistent structure, schedule, and format of each session are key to achieving program objectives. The curriculum of mentor training and the mentoring session should regularly reinforce, through program design and activities, leadership lessons such as time management, consistent communication, and goal setting. Although a successful program could focus on different content, leadership lends itself beautifully to the development of desired education, career, and life skills on the part of both mentors and mentees.

**Engage students and build relationships.** An initial mistake we made was focusing on content to the exclusion of student engagement and mentor-mentee relationships. K–12 students, especially in virtual mentoring sessions, often became passive observers as leadership content was “delivered” by their mentors. Collegiate mentors are not experienced teachers and need to be explicitly coached in leading engaging student-centered activities and relationship building. A balance must be struck between structure and content fidelity on the one hand, and engagement activities on the other. We improved engagement by reducing the length and increasing the number of mentoring sessions (from one 45-minute session per week to two 30-minute sessions, divided into 10-minute blocks); adding a requirement for hands-on learning and movement in every session; and reducing the maximum number of participants per virtual session (from 12 to eight mentees, facilitated by two mentors). Relationship building strategies include learning and using names; reporting each week on progress on individual weekly goals; and requiring mentors to document and encourage the successes of each of their mentees.

**Incorporate campus visits.** In order to achieve the program objective of motivating K–12 students to consider attending college, campus visits are a hugely important and successful motivational tool. From an initial schedule of one campus visit per semester, we have increased to two to three visits per semester. These collegiate visits have included such activities as a campus scavenger hunt, question-and-answer sessions with college faculty, financial aid seminars with admissions staff, campus dorms tours, classroom visits, soccer and tennis clinics with college athletic coaches, public speaking training sessions in collegiate lecture
halls, nature hikes with science faculty, attending sporting events, and eating in the college dining hall. It is imperative that communication and collaboration between various departments take place prior to these visits to ensure compliance and mutually beneficial outcomes with admissions, enrollment students/academic services, and athletics. For example, our admission department has been instrumental in coordinating aspects of the campus visits as we are helping to bring underrepresented populations to campus, thus meeting their need of outreach to these students and their schools.

When considering the costs for these meaningful events, one strategy we implemented was sharing the responsibility using a collaborative approach. For example, we now ask that schools arrange for their own transportation to and from their K–12 school which helps offset costs and eliminates the issues related to legal liability during transportation of students. Once on campus we have sought the support of dining services, the admissions office, the instructional technology department, athletics, and even various faculty to support the program in terms of time or resources including campus tours, classroom visits, athletic training clinics and technology demonstrations. Ultimately, this serves to meet the community outreach and engagement goals of the university in a way that is controlled and manageable for all involved.

Conclusion

Exemplary academic programs teach students content and allow students the opportunity to put this content and their skills into action (Storch & Ohlson, 2009). The CAMP Osprey curriculum focuses on student-centered leadership training, experiential learning opportunities, and a cycle of engagement between mentors and mentees. The model creates a learning environment in which theory and practice are integrated, allowing students the opportunity to teach and practice the leadership theories and techniques learned in class. CAMP Osprey requires collegiate student mentors to complete a comprehensive leadership and personal development curriculum that includes the development of personal mission and vision statements, goal planning journals, and strategies to bring out the best in themselves and others. Such experiential learning opportunities help a student determine what they hope to achieve after graduation and obtain the skills, motivation, and opportunities to reach those goals (Storch & Ohlson, 2009).

CAMP Osprey collegiate mentors are diverse in terms of gender, race, age, sexuality, majors, and career interests. More than 52% of mentors and 84% of mentees have been from underrepresented groups, and are reflective of the demographic groups that are sorely needed in today’s workforce and on college campuses. For 56% of collegiate mentors, this was their first experience working with high-poverty schools in which minorities are the majority. The CAMP program facilitates learning and collaboration between diverse groups in terms of age, ethnicity, gender, and income and embraces the notion of synergy within a leadership context. The demographics of the student mentors may also help address a need for minority students in the fields of education, public service, and leadership. On a national level, the number of educators whose racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds match those of their students is declining (Ingersoll & May, 2011). By developing a flexible, student-centered program that introduces the field of education, CAMP Osprey may increase minority recruitment into the field.

To overcome geographic and financial barriers faced by high-poverty urban and rural partners, CAMP Osprey harnesses virtual leadership mentoring via videoconferencing technology available on the college campus to host weekly mentoring sessions. Collegiate mentors who participated in virtual mentoring articulated an initial lack of understanding of the challenges facing high-poverty, rural students. Many collegiate mentors shared that the virtual mentoring experience, which gave them access to distant partners, exposed them to the stark realities, including poverty, that face many communities beyond the city of Jacksonville. The virtual mentoring component of CAMP Osprey also provides a model for collaboration, demonstrating the power of technology to connect student leaders regardless of geographic and logistical barriers.

The CAMP Osprey program provides a replicable model for other collegiate learning environments. Because leadership development is applicable across disciplines, this collegiate mentor model is highly replicable. Participation is not limited to students in a particular course and can involve students who are meeting requirements in other courses and accruing extracurricular service hours for sports, Greek organizations, etc. Students either register for course credit or volunteer, so there is no cost for mentor time. The relatively low costs can be supported by donations (for example, clothing for campus visits provided by a local clothing
retailer), and the campus and K–12 schools’ technology resources and students’ own technology are adequate for the virtual interaction. The major cost is for an adequate administrative structure, primarily a program director. Additional staffing can consist of graduate students or college staff. The model has been equally successful across a wide variety of K–12 school settings.

The challenges shared here illustrate the complexities organizations face when looking at design and implementation strategies. Our use of a leadership curriculum, comprehensive mentor training, face-to-face and virtual mentoring, and student progress monitoring emerged from a trial and error process that helped to make our program more efficient, cost-effective, and replicable across different educational contexts and regions. As a low-cost initiative that benefits students at all levels from a variety of backgrounds, CAMP Osprey serves as an exemplar for those searching for ways to forge learning community partnerships to enhance academic excellence, student engagement, and equity in K–20 settings.

References


Ohlson, M., Lerman, J., Theobold, J., & Jamison, R. (2017). The virtual pathway to college and career readiness. In P. Resta and S. Smith (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 1,727–1,731). Austin, TX: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education.


About the Author

Matthew Ohlson is an assistant professor in the Department of Leadership, School Counseling and Sport Management in the College of Education and Human Services at the University of North Florida. He is also the faculty coordinator at the Taylor Leadership Institute.
Living Learning Through Community Partnerships: Students’ Voices

The contributions to this issue’s Student Voices section of JCES remind us of the powerful effect that lived experience has on learning. Despite the differences in the contexts they write about, the authors of both articles describe the insights gained through the opportunity to put into motion the academic content of their university education within the community space. Ultimately, these insights inspire broader realizations about their role in society, as well as the nature of knowledge and the research enterprise.

In the playfully titled “‘Twas a Thursday in Class,” Pentecost, Willis, and Jenkins take on the serious subject of intimate partner violence and sexual assault. The undergraduate students’ voices speak to how a service-learning opportunity at a community agency broadened their experience of a human sexuality course by providing the context for translating skills gained through training into implementation of practice. In the end, the authors attest to how this expanded learning context achieved their self-expansion, as they re-evaluate what “being helpful” means and come to understand the importance in their development of navigating both pain and joy.

Susnara, Morgan, and Curtner-Smith also playfully use swimming as a metaphor to help the reader grasp the important role played by their community-based partnership. In “Perceptions of a Sport-Based Youth Development Program: Swim to the Top,” these authors attest to the crucial pairing of physical education and academic enrichment, while providing reflection on the connection between our own lives and learning and that of others whom we aim to serve. This reflexivity, as they discover, is a critical element of research, one most appreciated through the kinds of interaction community-based activity construes.

As you read these articles, we invite you to consider, if you have a teaching affiliation at a university, how you might provide these kinds of engaged learning and research experiences for your undergraduate and graduate students. And, if you are reading with a community affiliation, consider how the context of your work might bring substance to the otherwise constrained content of the university classroom. If we bridge to each other, we help students feel learning as living.

Dr. Katherine Bruna
Iowa State University
Associate Editor, Student and Community

Dr. Linda Pei
Iowa State University
Student Associate Editor, Student and Community
Twas a Thursday in Class…

Victoria Pentecost, Alexis M. Willis, and Dusty D. Jenkins

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to describe a service-learning partnership between a human sexuality class and a community agency that assists those affected by intimate partner violence and sexual assault, and the benefits of the service-learning experience from the viewpoints of two of the students.

Unfortunately, it is not hard to say that intimate partner violence (IPV) and sexual assault are prevalent in college populations. For instance, one study found that 30–34% of relationships in three samples of American college students involved some form of physical violence over the course of one year (Straus & Ramirez, 2007). Likewise, young women are reported to have an elevated risk of sexual victimization compared to adult women of other ages, and college men have a much higher rate of experiencing sexual violence than non-college men of the same age (Sinozich & Langton, 2014). The public should keep in mind, however, that it is estimated that most incidents of sexual victimization go unreported to law enforcement (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Thus, a college campus is not necessarily a safe space when it comes to IPV or sexual assault.

Recently in our undergraduate honors human sexuality class we were given the option to learn about IPV and sexual assault via a service-learning partnership with a local family crisis center. Students from our class chose to work in support roles to assist those impacted by IPV or sexual assault, to help with prevention efforts, or to do both. We were trained by and worked with a local family crisis center whose mission is to educate and to assist those affected by IPV and sexual assault. The hope was to increase students’ knowledge of important topics related to class (i.e., IPV and sexual assault), and to offer real-world learning experiences that would be valuable for students when later applying for jobs or entrance into graduate school. The next sections describe how two students in the class, Victoria and Alexis, benefited.

Victoria’s Reflection

My name is Victoria Pentecost and I was a sophomore psychology major, minoring in criminal justice, when I took this class. I chose to do the support and prevention roles because I want to eventually be a counselor for victims of sex crimes. The service learning, in the curriculum of our human sexuality class, really helped. We not only read about important topics, we were able to see it firsthand and fight for awareness and for victims by being involved on campus and in the community. In the beginning, I was nervous and unable to clearly pin down what skills I had as a new college student to offer to our community partner. But I went through training and started actually doing service, and I began to realize what I could do as a part of the crisis center’s team. I learned what risk factors are, how we can minimize risk factors, what rape culture is, how it affects both men’s and women’s lives, how to communicate with a recent sexual assault survivor, and so much more. Because of the service learning, I now feel so much more confident and prepared to talk about these issues than I would just learning about them in a textbook and class. As part of service learning, we had conversations with leaders on campus and in the community on how we can actively change things—and that is something I never would have gotten in a traditional classroom setting.

The service-learning experience allowed me to transfer skills I had learned to a wider audience. For instance, I was able to become the service officer in the local chapter of a national service-based organization, and translate skills that I had learned, such as honing in on the needs of the local community, and being able to establish and maintain connections with community leaders. Finally, some of the most personally impactful outcomes of the service-learning class are that I have been able to identify toxic/abusive attitudes among myself and others, and have been able to meaningfully contribute to classroom and friendly conversations on these topics. As an aspiring counselor, getting practice in encouraging others to seek healthy change is an invaluable asset.

Alexis’s Reflection

My name is Alexis M. Willis and I chose to...
work on the service-learning project because I always wanted to work with victims of abuse. I was a junior majoring in psychology with a minor in child development and family living, and I believed that working on the project would help me to solidify my career path. I must say that the training with our community partner for the project was initially difficult. For instance, it was the first time I had learned about the full process of a rape kit. Moreover, I was disheartened to hear from our trainer that it might take up to two years for the survivors of an assault to get the results of the rape kit in the state in which we reside. However, through the training I learned so much more than I had ever anticipated.

One thing I did was promote prevention efforts through numerous campus events. Some of those events included hosting a self-defense class for women, and handing out information about IPV and sexual assault resources to students. Yet perhaps most impactful for me was the bulletin board we set up in the Department of Psychology, which aimed to get information about sexual assault and the campus resources out to students. We created an interactive bulletin board, using “Love Should” posters that were collected during self-defense classes, and also left blank ones for students to take, write their answers on, and tack back on the board. The posters said, “Love should _____.” We thought the posters would be eye catching and also make people stop and contemplate what they believe love is. One of the biggest impacts was when in just a few days after putting up the board, I walked by to see that the board was completely filled with posters of people’s ideas of what love should and should not be! Seeing it so completely filled after only a few days made me feel proud, because it was something that made an impact by getting people discussing important issues.

In addition to promoting prevention, I also served in an on-call support position. The first weekend I was on call I felt both excited and scared. I questioned my abilities to actually provide support to an individual who had gone through a traumatic experience. By the end of the weekend, I had not been called out, and I was a little disappointed that my training had not been put into use; but more so, there was just immense relief to know that no one in my area needed help because of a sexual assault that weekend.

I continued to volunteer with the community agency after the course ended, and my experiences with the agency opened the door for me to do a summer internship with another local agency. I also branched out to work with other campus organizations to help spread awareness about sexual violence. I have now graduated from college and will continue my journey of working with a rape and suicide crisis center in my hometown, while also pursuing a master’s degree in social work. Overall, through service learning I gained a better understanding of what it truly means to be helpful and giving, and how I want to better my community and the world around me. I also realized in hind-sight that I had originally signed up for service learning thinking that I would make a difference in someone else’s life, but the truth is I came out of it a better and more understanding person of the world around me and the people in it who are striving to make it a better place.

**Victoria and Alexis’s Creative Reflection**

At the end of the semester, we did classroom presentations about our service-learning experiences. Our professor encouraged us to be creative. Because we had been working side-by-side all semester in our service-learning roles, we decided to work together on our presentation, and to our professor’s delight, we took her up on her suggestion to get creative! We wrote a short story to the rhythm of “Twas the Night Before Christmas,” and upon closing, we provide the (slightly more polished) version here. We hope that others are inspired to know that there is a real need for help in the fields of IPV and sexual assault prevention, and to know that while making a meaningful impact on others and learning about important issues, there is still room for having fun!

**Ch. 1 – A Chance of a Lifetime**

Twas a Thursday in class, and all through the room, the students were buzzing, “who, who, who?”

there were guests in the corner, strangers to us,
but our professor said, that these we could trust.

We listened with wonder, looking for someone to work under
As they told us the story of the Family Crisis Center.
Immediately we knew, we didn’t want to work with just one, but two!
A lesson from our mentor:
When you help others, you help yourself, too!
Ch. 2 – It Doesn’t Take a Rocket Scientist (but maybe a SANE Nurse)

Paperwork, paperwork, paperwork we sifted through
Confidentiality agreements needed our signatures too!
Quinn gave us facts about all that they do
As we finished training, she said, “and now, it’s up to you!”
Then we met with Lissy, and that was a long training
It was important, yet mentally draining.
We explored lots of ways someone can be hurt
And that it definitely is not always someone in a skirt
We signed up and set out
Updated our calendars too
Ready for anything, and to help more than a few

Ch. 3 – Working with Quinn

The SAVE Coalition
To serve is its mission
So, for volunteer ideas we were fishin’
Dr. Jenkins stepped in, and helped with our woes
A board on the wall (we could only reach on our tip toes)
It came out great
The impression we left was everlasting
So many people caught
The message we were broadcasting
We learned a lot, too, on freshman recruitment day
Even if it started rough, the two of us got tough and put our worries away
Quinn let us go free, initially we were scared
From the ups to the downs, only smiles we bared
We set up a table, flyers in hand
We found students who were willing to take a stand
They pledged alongside us (for a gift, well earned)
After talking with us, there was so much they learned
Throughout all this, there was but one true obstacle
Scary parents that we later found comical
All in all, they left knowing their kids would be safe and could stay
And they were encouraged to come back, and live the SFA Way

Ch. 4 – Working with Lissy

Waiting in anticipation
We were tempted with evasion
But when no call came through
We found ourselves sad and blue
There was celebration in safety
Yet somehow we felt, that without a call under our belts,
Our experience was hazy
In the end, we were grateful. The opportunity was given
And after this is done we will continue the mission

Ch. 5 – Lumberjacks Make Great IPV and Sexual Assault Educators

As we look back and reflect
A few things we could not neglect
The lessons we taught
And the stigma we fought
Were nothing compared
To the excitement we shared
The moral of service learning?
Making a difference is hard
But it gets your spirits burning!

---

1 Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner
2 One of our agency supervisors
3 Another agency supervisor
4 Sexual Assault Violence Education, a volunteer group of concerned community members hosted by the Family Crisis Center
5 Our university’s root principles of respect, caring, responsibility, unity, and integrity
6 Our school mascot
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Perceptions of a Sport-Based Youth Development Program: Swim to the Top

Daniela Susnara, Holly Morgan, and Matthew Curtner-Smith

As a child, I learned to swim before I was a successful walker. Despite stumbling around the house on my tippy toes, my parents described me as a fish from the time that I could toddle to the pool. Swimming pools, oceans, and lakes…water, has always been a huge part of my life. Moving to a region where in-ground pools were uncommon and the closest beach was almost four hours away was a shock to me. Despite this change, I never stopped to think about what implications this lack of available resources might have on the surrounding community. While memories of grade school swim lessons with classmates extend to compulsory swimming lessons with classmates in high school, I was completely taken aback to consider the lack of swim experience and opportunities for children. Teaching swimming to elementary students in the community through an undergraduate field experience was the first overwhelming moment when I began to realize that some children may lack the exposure I was fortunate enough to experience.

After my first opportunity to teach swimming I was astonished by the improvements students made in only four or five lessons. I was hopeful other students could see this same success just through exposure, regardless of their incoming swimming abilities. Many participants, despite their age, entered the program at a very low swim level with very little confidence in or around the water. Watching a child’s face when they overcame an obstacle or a fear in the water became one of the most rewarding parts of the program to me. Students always had the same expression when this happened. First, a look of shock; it looked as if the student almost forgot what they were working to accomplish. Next, the student was overcame with the biggest smile; you could almost see the weight of anxiety and fear being lifted off their shoulders. And last, they would look to their teacher or to their peers. This last experience is where a positive and safe swim culture was created, and hopefully what students bring with them back into the community. Students received a tremendous amount of support and encouragement from this created summer camp community. Often, this new feeling of comfort and ease is an uncommon feeling in the pool setting for these participants.

When most children think about summer, ideas that come to mind are vacation, sun, ice cream, swimming…maybe even the beach. Unfortunately, for children in at-risk communities these daydreams might never become realities. When the weather warms up and the school year ends, children in at-risk communities are often left with limited resources once after-school programs go on hiatus. Youth development programs (YDPs) that run during the school year, but more importantly during the summer, were created to eliminate some of the increased risk occurring between the months of May through August. Petitpas, Van-Raalte and France (2017) highlight the positive outcome of YDPs. Youth development programs can play a role in the acquisition of skills, attitudes, and values that enable youth who are particularly at-risk to cope with the negative factors in their communities. Swim to the Top appealed to me because it reached children who are likely to have the least exposure to swimming and water safety. Similar to our summer program, Swim to the Top, some YDPs are centered around sport and physical activity; these are known as sport-based youth development programs (SBYDPs). Most SBYDPs are focused on and have been shown to have some success in promoting life skills, attitudes, and values, and encouraging athletic competence and improved self-esteem in the sporting environment (Anderson-Butcher, Iachini, Riley, Wade-Mdivanian, Davis & Amorose, 2013). During the Swim to the Top SBYDP, the three authors had the opportunity to work with at-risk children and youth throughout the summer. As the lead author, I served as the graduate assistant of the program, worked with the children and instructors, and collected data, while the co-authors served in programmatic and advisory roles.

Learning how to swim not only can save a life but can also provide knowledge of water safety
principles, enhanced fitness, and increased social, emotional, and psychological wellness. In addition, swim instruction provides potential for children and youth to gain a sense of accomplishment and with increased opportunities in which to socialize (Berukoff & Hill, 2010). Swimming instruction may also, of course, decrease the number of deaths that occur due to drowning (Storm, Williams, Shetter, Kaminisky, Lowery, Caldas, & Winch, 2017). Unfortunately, swim instruction is not as available in some parts of the United States as in others, thus leaving many children without the benefits explained previously. In order to improve this state of affairs, some SBYDPs have focused on swimming. The research reported in this paper was part of a larger study aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of our SBYDP focused on swimming, which also included a number of enrichment and physical education components. The purpose of this research was to examine the effectiveness of the SBYDP from the participants’ perspectives.

The program consisted of 116 participants who were children and youth aged 4 to 14 years who attended our SBYDP titled “Swim to the Top.” Ninety-nine percent of the children and youth were African American and came from predominantly low socio-economic backgrounds. As mentioned previously, upon entering the program, the majority of the children were classified as weak or non-swimmers. Prior to participating in the study all the participants and their parents signed consent and assent forms in congruence with the university’s requirements for conducting research with human subjects. To protect their anonymity, the children and youth were assigned fictitious names.

The SBYDP in which the children and youth participated was the result of a community-based partnership between The University of Alabama and various local agencies including the YMCA, Parks and Recreation Authority, and two school systems. It took place over the course of one summer month in a local community center and adjacent swimming pool on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. The central component of the SBYDP was swimming instruction provided daily during 70-minute lessons by 10 well-qualified undergraduate and graduate physical education students from the university. Swimming instruction class sizes were small and between four and six students. In addition, children and youth participated in daily 70-minute sessions devoted to physical education in which the goals were to promote motor skill acquisition, leisure education, personal and social development, cognitive development, and health-related fitness, and academic enrichment in which the goals were to enhance leadership, science and reading skills, and knowledge of nutrition. The physical education component was taught by two more physical education students and the enrichment component by two local teachers. Children and youth were grouped by age (i.e., 4–6 years, 7–9 years, and 10–14 years) and rotated through the three components of the program each day.

Through the use of non-participant observations, informal interviews, and a series of focus group interviews, data was collected to determine children and youth perceptions of the program. After analysis of the data, it was concluded children and youth perceived the SBYD program positively. Further, as a result of the program, participants gained improved water confidence and swimming skills, an enjoyment for academic enrichment and physical education was observed, and the opportunity to learn was provided throughout the program. Results, specifically those related to swimming, were personally the most meaningful to witness. My upbringing and appreciation for water sports has led me to heavily value water safety and skills. I found the improvement in water confidence and swimming skill most insightful and rewarding because I saw many students who entered the program with fear or a false sense of skill and only four weeks later overcame barriers of panic and acquired improved swim skills. I count it a defining experience to observe these improvements.

When teaching a child to swim, there are many approaches teachers can take. First, they might try to teach the child to kick, or to float. Sometimes a teacher will go straight to putting a child’s face in the water, teaching the new swimmer how to blow bubbles or hold their breath. A teacher might even go straight to a stroke like breaststroke, introducing a “frog kick” which is easier for some children. As a current graduate student involved in multiple forms of research, I believe that learning how to swim has many parallels to the world of the researcher. Much like the beginning phases of swimming instruction there are many ways you can conduct research, and while there is rarely a “wrong” way, there will always be ways people prefer. This early learning curve was something I felt I would only learn to overcome through experience, much like swimming. Working through Swim to the Top, a community-based partnership, I was given the opportunity to gain the experience of working with many different people. While working with others I was very fortunate to be included in many aspects of the research planning—from helping decide managerial aspects, such as
gaining consent, to conducting focus group and formal interviews. I became very familiar with parts of qualitative research and was given the opportunity to learn some of the “pros and cons” of doing tasks one way instead of another, much like learning the “frog kick” before the “flutter kick.” Through this experience it was encouraging to observe many different people, from community members to researchers, working toward one goal in their own way, everyone participating with the same goal, to provide the best summer experience for all children and youth in attendance.

While some might argue one way of learning to swim or research is better than others, I believe any introduction or experience is better than none. Working through a community-based partnership provides research experience to all parties involved from the community to the researchers. Without experience, one is unable to form his or her own realistic ideas or expectations on a subject, much like the children who entered the program with a false sense of their swim ability. Seeking out and becoming involved in new experiences might be easier for graduate students in comparison to the participants in this study. There are many ways to conduct research and include the community throughout the process. Discovering how to make these connections is ultimately up to the research team. But like jumping into the deep end, learning how to make these connections is often a risk worth taking. Research opportunities with community involvement should not be overlooked. These experiences should be encouraged and celebrated.
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Instructions to Book Reviewers

Book reviews published in JCES are intended to speak to a wide range of issues relevant to the scholarship of engagement. Reviews of books within the social sciences, natural sciences and math, medicine and health, the environment, law, business, philosophy, religion, and the arts and humanities are encouraged. All book reviews submitted to JCES should provide readers with a broad overview of the book, but should go beyond description to discuss central issues raised, strengths and limitations of the text, and current issues of theory and practice raised by the book that are germane to the subject matter and engaged scholarship. Book reviews should introduce readers to literature that advances knowledge, provides practical advice, disseminates best practices, and encourages conversation and dialogue. Faculty members, administrators, staff members, students, and community partners are invited to offer their interpretations of the literature. If you are interested in writing a book review for JCES, please contact Drew Pearl (andrew.pearl@ung.edu) for a current list of books available to review. Reviewers are also welcome to suggest titles.
Embracing Opportunity: Engaging Higher Education through Community Engagement

Reviewed by Hunter Phillips Goodman
University of Dayton


There are moments in history that afford the opportunity to look critically at where we have come from and where we are going in light of the needs of our current times for a civically engaged populace. At a time when students at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida mobilized young people, families, mothers, fathers, community members, legislators, and leaders of all ages to come together across the country, how can we inspire and empower more young people to engage now as local citizens and change makers in the democratic process? How are the systems and opportunities we provide in college critical components to student empowerment as civic and community leaders?

Over the last 30 years, the field of community engagement within higher education has evolved in structure and substance, with the development of centers and organizational synergy for the work within colleges and universities, and with our community partners. Our shared field of civic and community engagement has developed best practices that have come from institutions developing methods, systems, and structures built on their institutional culture, needs, and surrounding community. Now is the right time to capture our best practices in one place for practitioners of all levels of experience from those entrenched in the work to those beginning through practice, pedagogy, research, and leadership application.

In *Engaging Higher Education: Purpose, Platforms, and Programs for Community Engagement*, Marshall Welch challenges us to look at the purpose, platforms, and programs for community engagement within higher education and how they are influencing shared learning and sustainable change both in the academy and in our communities. Welch takes the reader on a thorough exploration of the purpose (the why) behind the work, the platforms and systems used (the what), and example programs in place across the country for community-engaged learning, scholarship, and application (the how). Through the journey, Welch challenges us to reflect on and understand the systems and structures within higher education and community engagement that empower our students as the next generation of civic leaders.

There are three stated aims in the book: 1) provide valuable insight to current practice through the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement; 2) equip center directors and campus leaders to integrate the practices into their institutional work; and 3) empower graduate students as the next generation of engaged leaders and scholars. In addition to its stated goals, the book is a deep dive into the history and development of community engagement in higher education. It provides an important, necessary refresher of the substantive thought that has shaped the work and defined its development. The lessons, framed in pedagogy and practical frameworks for change, are applicable for and accessible to the practitioner.

The first chapter explores the history and journey of how community engagement in the academy began and how it evolved into today’s systems and structures. Starting with the public purpose of higher education and reflecting upon the pragmatic purpose; understanding the political purpose; exploring the pedagogical purpose; reflecting upon the professional purpose; and acknowledging that all five evolutions are cyclical and recurring. The second chapter acknowledges the multi-faceted nature of “engagement” in higher education and seeks to define its meaning relative to the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. It looks at what engagement is and what it is not grounded in community-engaged learning scholarship, research, and epistemology.

The third chapter explores how to move an institution to the stage of institutionalization of community engagement. Based on models of best practice and case study of institutions, the
information provides a guide, rooted in research, for the process regardless of type of institution (public, private, or faith-based). In chapter four, there are models of implementation of community engagement into all aspects of the institution. With incredible detail, practitioners will gain insight into each component of the process, models of best practice based on the institutional culture, institutional architecture for success, and steps from budgeting and strategic planning to systems and agreements.

Chapter five delves into the specific operations, infrastructure, and leadership role of community engagement centers as a binding connection across campus and in the community. It explores the varying financial models and leadership structures of centers at both private and public institutions. Chapters six through eight transition to the programs component of the book. With a deep dive into the role of students, faculty, and then community partners in engagement, the reader has practical, applied techniques and real-world examples entrenched in best practices and research. The final chapters offer the positive accomplishments of higher education’s development of community engagement as a pedagogy, practice, value, and institutionalized component of all aspects of the university’s life.

In the same spirit of candor and transparency, the negatives as well as the trends on the horizon are outlined. Welch offers projections of the future in civic and community engagement and in so doing provides a further road map for incoming practitioners. As Welch stated in the beginning, one goal was to not only empower current administrators and community engagement scholars, but also to empower the next generation of engaged practitioners, community leaders, teachers, and scholars.

Welch meets the three stated goals of the book with accuracy. This is a tremendous handbook for institutional leaders, especially administrators and center leaders, at any stage of community engagement, though the book would be best used by institutional leaders who appreciate and understand the value of the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. From a research perspective, the book is a great resource for graduate students pursuing topics related to history, context, institutionalization, or implementation of community engagement.

The appendix references other networks that have arisen out of best practice and implementation of community engagement. There are additional networks noted, like the Research University Civic Engagement Network, the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities, and The Democracy Commitment; however, Vote Everywhere and the All In Campus Democracy Challenge are examples of networks that are not explored thoroughly in the book. These, and other civically engaged networks, serve as useful reference points for taking the work beyond community engagement to civic and voter engagement for students and institutions seeking to take their community-based work to advocacy and voter action.

As we find ourselves at a point in history that affords the opportunity to look critically at where we have come from and where we are going in light of the needs of our current times for a civically engaged populous, it is important that leaders in higher education and specifically in community engagement understand the mechanics of best practice. Welch’s book focuses more on community engagement than civic engagement. However, the practices herein are fundamental to engaging our students in practices of critical questioning and action for how we engage now as local citizens and change makers in the democratic process.
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The authors of *Going Public: A Guide for Social Scientists* ask a key question in the book’s concluding chapter: “As public scholars, how do we take the work we do and make it ‘count’ in ways that are legible to academic institutions?” (p. 164). The tension between work done for the academy and work done outside it that Arlene Stein and Jessie Daniels frame is one their audience must confront if they want to do what Stein and Daniels suggest in their short, readable, and highly practical book. This is not a new tension, but new attention has been paid to it in recent years. Concepts like public engagement, public scholarship, and civic engagement are floated by professors in different disciplines as ways in which we all can, to paraphrase the book’s title, “go public.” As two professors of rhetoric and composition who have begun to do that, we review this book not for its practicality—which will vary by discipline—but for the ways in which the book rhetorically framed its central message and its implications in practice. While we fault the book at times for failures in attending to certain matters, we find the book is a good introduction to the perils and practices of “going public.”

One of the key failures was putting that last chapter at the end. It serves as the best argument for “going public;” especially if one assumes the audience for this book doesn’t see the reason for it due to narrowed institutional standards. In other words, for a group that has remained tied to academic, peer-reviewed citations as the only worthwhile assessment, the chapter makes the case for how professors can make their own case for public work. One of the chapter’s key principles for doing that—“craft a narrative about your work”—is also the key advice for writing in public that the book presents throughout.

Another key failure is a lack of discussion between the labels we mentioned above. Teaching social scientists to be storytellers and “writers” in the journalistic sense is good. But the book fails to capture the difference between merely writing journalistically and the larger embodiment of what Imagining America called in its 2008 report “Scholarship in Public” a “coherent, purposeful sequence of activities” of scholarship that “contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value” (Ellison & Eatman, 2008, p. iv). That weakness highlights another, lesser one: the attack on journalism from the authors. Daniels and Stein want to bypass the “middleman” (p. 13)—reporters—and have professors write their own stories. To make that case, the authors play on negative stereotypes of journalists—they only want “clicks,” they oversimplify academic debates, and they are not “beholden” to professional codes like social scientists (p. 12). While some (or even many) academics may believe these criticisms, the book amplifies them in order to tell scholars to write as journalists. On the one hand, the book criticizes journalism, but then spends at least two chapters telling its readers how to write as a journalist.

What is most interesting about this divide set up by the authors is that their advice on better writing that certainly applies to journalism also applies directly to social science academic writing. Yet the chapter only makes it seem like it applies to the former. One of the key successes is the chapter on the perils of “going public.” One must not only count the institutional costs, but the public costs. We live in an age of quick and sometimes ill-informed outrage, much of it directed at professors. Trolls, guns on campus, administrative backlash, and of course academics “eating their own” (p. 148) are deep issues to think about when thinking about “going public.”

The book is divided into an introduction and seven other chapters. In the book’s introduction, “So You Want to Go Public?” Stein and Daniels make their case for scholars—specifically their social scientist colleagues—to go public and use their expertise to speak to pressing issues. As Stein and Daniels state in their accessible and casual prose, “there’s a big world out there that needs to hear from us” (p. 5). They set their book...
apart from others by arguing those “rarely involve nuts-and-bolts advice about how exactly to move one’s research into public arenas” (p. 4). This animates most of their book and offers a springboard into their first chapter, “Writing Beyond the Academy.”

In this chapter, the authors offer four principles “for creating writing that can participate in lively conversations with various audiences, not just other academics” (p. 18). The third one is worth highlighting: strive for clarity and concreteness. No one would disagree that striving for clarity and concreteness is a goal worthy of op-ed columns and journal articles. But the question always present but hardly ever asked by academics who “go public” is, as Stein and Daniels point out, clear and concrete for whom? A sociologist writing of Michel Foucault’s understandings of normalization will strive for a different kind of clarity if she were to talk through Foucault at her discipline-specific conference or introduce Foucault’s theory to readers of Wired magazine, for example. When elucidating this principle of clarity and concreteness, the authors offer specific advice such as weeding out nominalizations, going for active over passive sentences, and establishing clear subjects and active verbs. Stein and Daniels even include a rich table titled “The Busy Academic’s Guide to Writing Concisely” (p. 26), which they borrow from the irreverent and hilarious twitter feed Shit Academics Say (https://twitter.com/academicssay).

In their second chapter, “Telling Stories About Your Research,” Stein and Daniels continue with sentence-level principles for tailoring argument and prose for a general audience. They also introduce a rhetorical feature that continues in later chapters: a paragraph by paragraph analysis of public scholarship. In this chapter, they walk through sociologist Ruth Milkman’s (2005) New York Times op-ed piece on organized labor. They analyze how Milkman’s paragraphs individually and collectively work as strong examples of public scholarship, suggesting they adhere to story-telling as a rhetorical feature of op-ed pieces. They conclude this chapter by arguing that writing a series of op-ed pieces provides fodder for embarking on a book-length project targeting a general audience. They tackle books in the third chapter.

In this chapter, they merge their advice on prose with their advice for navigating the sometimes-mysterious world of book publishing, from writing a proposal to connecting with an editor and publisher, to revising based on publisher and reviewer feedback. Much of the advice they offer falls in line with similar books that seek to demystify the book publishing process, such as William Germano’s (2005) indispensable From Dissertation to Book and Getting It Published, also published by the University of Chicago Press. What Stein and Daniels add to this conversation is clear guidance on the difference between the prose style for academic books and the prose style for general audiences. They write: “When writing for a general audience, be mindful of the structure of sentences, paragraphs, and chapter, and how words look on each page” (p. 81). They suggest eschewing block quotes, even direct quotes at times, and encourage writers to “let your writing breathe” (p. 81).

Throughout their introduction and first three chapters, Stein and Daniels have hinted at the role digital technologies play in public scholarship. In chapter four, “The Digital Turn,” they engage directly. They succinctly define digital scholarship as that which “encompasses the disciplines included in the digital humanities, Internet studies, and digital sociology” (p. 94). At the core, this work is “rooted in twenty-first-century practices of online publication, open-access distribution, and rigorous peer-review . . . [and] steeped in a foundational concern with the world beyond the academy” (p. 94). Taken together, digital scholarship is “transforming everyday practices of creating and accumulating knowledge” (p. 94).

Continuing with the nuts-and-bolts focus of their book, Stein and Daniels spend helpful energy walking through different digital platforms for disseminating one’s work and how to manage these platforms. They describe how to set up a web presence through registering a domain name and selecting a web host. They introduce different tools that can aid the presentation and style of your blog like piktochart.com, for infographics, and memegenerator.com for memes. They then move into specific social media platforms like Twitter, Pinterest, Instagram, and more specifically academic focused social media platforms like ResearchGate and Academia.edu. They conclude this chapter by pointing readers to sites designed to increase one’s digital literacy. Lynda.com, for example, aggregates tutorial videos on a wide-range of subjects like software development, photography, web development, and graphic design. Chapter five explains how to build an audience and how a built audience helps when a scholar interested in public scholarship pitches a story to an editor or embarks on public policy work. In this frame, the authors suggest ways to understand and write “news hooks.”
The last two chapters collectively constitute Stein and Daniels's conclusion. In chapter six, “The Perils of Going Public,” they detail challenges, pitfalls, and troublesome narratives that inevitably occur when academics wade into public issues. Some of the issues discussed include gun control, mass incarceration, and the removal of Confederate monuments on public land. We found this chapter particularly important and apt as media outlets across the political spectrum seem full of news reports of Professor X waging an unanticipated Twitter war against anonymous trolls in the wake of Professor X lending expertise or a fiery opinion on Topic Y. They offer encouraging words to readers who have “stumbled in public” or more importantly, those who have found unexpected fame through their work and, as a result, finding their work coming under ever greater scrutiny. To this second point, they speak to Alice Goffman’s (2014) dissertation turned book On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City, an immersive ethnographic study of a poor, black group of young men living in Philadelphia. Goffman, the daughter of famed sociologist Erving Goffman, lived among this group and following a soaring of praise from The New York Times, Cornel West, and many others, suddenly watched the narrative turn against her.

Ultimately, Stein and Daniels warn intrepid public scholars to “guard your privacy, know your rights—and develop thick skin” (p. 155). The final chapter offers help in tracking the effectiveness of one's public scholarship for inside the academy. Stein and Daniels remind readers to view their work through their promotion and tenure guidelines and then introduce a variety of different metrics for tracking one's work. Both ResearchGate and Academia.edu have built-in metrics for tracking data and Google Scholar can be used to track citations of one's work.

Overall the book's tone, content, and audience display well-informed authors who know what it looks like to “go public.” While there are faults, they do not overtake our judgment that this book can be helpful to any academic seeking to commit themselves to public writing. And as the book argues by its scope and detail, it requires a commitment, not merely a one-time op-ed. It requires a rethinking of the relationship between academic writing and writing outside our hallowed halls.
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The contemporary political climate in the United States is often characterized by low civility, strident partisanship, and a general unwillingness among the citizenry to continually engage in nuanced discussions about complex issues. Voter turnout in many municipal and statewide elections has been historically low, and nationwide confidence in elected officials is waning. Institutions of higher education are uniquely positioned to alleviate these societal ailments and help foster civil public discourse on salient local and national issues. Faculty members can meaningfully engage students in curricular and co-curricular experiences that cultivate lifelong commitment to democratic and civic engagement.

Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement offers a pedagogical approach designed to encourage students to explore their values, consider alternate perspectives, and challenge themselves to critically analyze societal issues. In this book, deliberative pedagogy is defined as an egalitarian democratic educational process, teaching philosophy, and way of thinking that encourages students to consider various viewpoints and move toward ongoing action as informed citizens.

In six parts, the authors provide a detailed explanation of deliberative pedagogy in a higher education context, practical case studies on how deliberative pedagogy can be used in different academic disciplines at various institutional types, reasons to minimize the authoritarian discourse that characterizes traditional classrooms, and examples of how deliberative pedagogy can equip students with the skill set and mindset they need to effectively address complex social and public policy issues. The book, with assistance from the Kettering Foundation, was written by scholars from around the world who introduced deliberative pedagogy into at least one of their respective courses. Part I provides a historical overview of deliberative pedagogy and outlines the pedagogy’s theoretical framework. The four case studies in Part II demonstrate the process a faculty member may go through to incorporate deliberative pedagogy into courses. Part II highlights examples from a first-year experience course, a political socialization course at an Israeli university, a communications course, a biology course, and a chemistry course. Part III, which also includes four case studies, explores deliberative pedagogy’s use among feminist scholars, its utility in online intercultural communication, and its role in deliberative student forums at Hungary's largest institution of higher education. Part IV focuses on public policy institutes and their use of deliberative pedagogy to strengthen the civic engagement movement. It includes an analysis of Kansas State University’s Institute for Civic Discourse and one of Spellman College’s National Issues Forum training processes. The three case studies in Part V emphasize the significant role deliberative pedagogy can play in building campus/community partnerships. Part V features deliberative journalism community projects in four countries, a community-engaged engineering course at a South African university, and student-led deliberative community discussions at a community college. Part VI provides several approaches to assessing deliberative pedagogy. It highlights a longitudinal assessment of Wake Forest University’s Democracy Fellows Program, which engages students in campus and community deliberation events. Part VI also includes an overview of the Deliberative Pedagogy Learning Outcomes Rubric and a critical discourse analysis of deliberative forums in a language teacher education program. Although faculty members are the book’s primary target audience, it has some utility for student affairs educators who wish to create co-curricular environments that help students understand the nuances of societal issues and explore implicit biases.
The book surprisingly states deliberative pedagogy should not be conflated with the greater civic engagement movement because deliberative pedagogy is concerned with democracy's role in education, the centrality of civic education and experiential learning, and deliberative democracy theory and practice (p. xxi). The book notes that deliberative pedagogy is very similar to engaged scholarship. Distancing deliberative pedagogy from the larger civic engagement movement and other experiential teaching strategies unnecessarily fragments civic renewal efforts and weakens the movement's pedagogical knowledge base. While deliberative pedagogy's philosophical placement outside of the wider civic engagement movement is debatable, the book is an excellent contribution to the civic engagement, community engagement, and public deliberation fields, builds on higher education's historic commitment to democratic engagement, complements contemporary critical service-learning efforts, and provides readers with specific examples of how to incorporate deliberative pedagogy into a course (Jacoby, 2015; Mitchell, 2008; National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). Furthermore, the book's emphasis on ways deliberative pedagogy extends the learning environment beyond traditional classroom settings, emphasizes community expertise, and encourages bottom-up teaching makes it ideal for community-engaged professionals (Dostilio, 2017).

The book effectively acknowledges deliberative pedagogy's potential challenges and limitations. Deliberative pedagogy, like service learning and other forms of experiential education, may be too time-consuming for non-tenured faculty members who need to spend the bulk of their time researching and writing. The book also recognizes that using deliberative pedagogy is a calculated, yet risky, attempt at helping students work toward achieving the public good through facilitated class discussions. Future researchers may consider exploring how to employ deliberative pedagogy on campuses where historic or contemporary rifts among students and the community make civil dialogue across differences very challenging. Additional research may also be needed to explore how to effectively address conflict avoidance during deliberative discussions.
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