

A Project Pericles® White Paper  
© January 2017

# **Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement: Five Approaches to Institutionalizing Civic Engagement**

Garret S. Batten, Project Pericles  
Adrienne Falcón, Carleton College  
and  
Jan R. Liss, Project Pericles



Project Pericles, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1910, New York, NY 10176  
[www.projectpericles.org](http://www.projectpericles.org) [projectpericles@projectpericles.org](mailto:projectpericles@projectpericles.org)

© 2017 Project Pericles, Inc. This work may be reproduced and redistributed, in whole or in part, without alteration and without prior written permission, provided all copies contain the following statement: “© 2017 Project Pericles, Inc. This work is reproduced and distributed with the permission of Project Pericles.”



To Eugene M. Lang, whose vision, leadership, passion, and support have enabled Project Pericles, and civic engagement more broadly, to grow and thrive. As he said in 1999, “The philosophy of liberal arts is the philosophy of a democratic society in which citizenship, social responsibility, and community are inseparable. An educated citizenry is the essential instrument for promoting responsible social action and community well-being.”

Through our programs and this white paper, we dedicate ourselves to bringing Gene’s creative ideas to life. We appreciate the generous and ongoing support of the Eugene M. Lang Foundation.

With deepest appreciation, we thank Eugene Lang for being ahead of the times and encouraging so many to help make the world a better place.



## **About Project Pericles®**

Project Pericles is a not-for-profit organization that encourages and facilitates commitments by colleges and universities to include and promote social responsibility and participatory citizenship as essential elements of their educational programs. Founded in 2001 by philanthropist Eugene M. Lang, Project Pericles works directly with its member institutions that, as Pericleans, individually and collaboratively foster the civic engagement and related learning experiences of students in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community.

Periclean colleges and universities across the country implement curricular and co-curricular activities that promote student understanding of civic problems and responsibilities and their capacity to “make a difference.” Particularly significant in this regard have been three signature programs -- Civic Engagement Course (CEC) Program™, Periclean Faculty Leadership (PFL) Program™, and Debating for Democracy (D4D)™. Individually, collectively, and institutionally, these programs involve students, faculty, administrators, staff, trustees, alumni, and community members in a growing range of socially oriented enterprises and collaborations. By hosting annual meetings of presidents, faculty, and students, Project Pericles helps Pericleans share ideas and best practices to advance civic engagement as a primary element of higher education.

## **Pericleans and Their Programs**

Project Pericles is an expanding national consortium, currently consisting of 32 colleges and universities. As a Periclean, each college and university develops a comprehensive civic engagement program. Building on existing activities, the program reflects institutional characteristics and traditions – curricula, resources, student body, faculty interests, location, social concerns, alumni, and community relationships. Individually and cooperatively, Pericleans seek to engage the resources of the entire academic community in responding to the needs of society. Each institution has a campus-appointed Periclean Program Director who oversees its program. Programs include curricular and co-curricular activities in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community. Together, they provide students with a foundation for civic and social involvement.

## **The Periclean Commitment**

Periclean Programs share these fundamental characteristics:

### *\* Formal Institutional Commitment*

Each Periclean Board of Trustees commits its institution to prepare students for socially responsible and participatory engagement as part of its educational agenda. To that end, each Board establishes a formal board committee or sub-committee.

### *\* Constituency Involvement*

Periclean Programs invite the participation and contributions of all constituencies, recognizing that each— students, faculty, administrators, staff, trustees, alumni, and community members— has equity in fulfilling the institution’s commitment.

### *\* Collaboration/Cooperation*

Project Pericles facilitates collaboration and cooperation among Pericleans. It encourages Pericleans to build relationships with other educational organizations and invites the exchange of information.

## **Acknowledgments**

Project Pericles and its Periclean colleagues are grateful to the Eugene M. Lang Foundation and The Teagle Foundation for its generous support of *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement* and to the Rockefeller Brothers Fund for hosting our July 2014 convening at The Pocantico Center of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Thanks to the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) for hosting our January 2016 convening. Special thanks to Judith R. Shapiro, Loni Bordoloi Pazich, and Desiree M. Vazquez Barlatt, as well as Richard L. Morrill, Annie W. Bezbatchesko, and William M. Sullivan, all of The Teagle Foundation.

Most of all, we thank our founder and Board Chair Emeritus, Eugene M. Lang, for his vision, leadership, and tremendous support of Project Pericles and our programs.

Deep appreciation to our outside reviewers Linda C. DeMeritt, Richard Ekman, Donna Heiland, Ariane Liazos, Lauren McGrail, and Michael Zimmerman.

We are grateful for the contributions of our Board Members: the late Alison R. Bernstein, David A. Caputo, Janet S. Dickerson, Richard Ekman, Neil R. Grabois, Richard Guarasci, Arthur E. Levine, Michael S. McPherson, and Harris L. Wofford. We appreciate the guidance of our Presidents' Council, most notably Chair Richard Guarasci, President of Wagner College, and Vice-Chair Steven G. Poskanzer, President of Carleton College. We thank our colleagues Christine Martin and Elisabeth Weiman.

We give special thanks to Barbara Holland, who served as a consultant to Project Pericles as we designed the initial survey and implemented the mapping/survey process. Her guidance, insight, and wisdom helped this project become much more than we initially imagined.

We thank Ben Berger, Associate Professor of Political Science and Executive Director, Eugene M. Lang Center for Civic & Social Responsibility at Swarthmore College, who along with Garret Batten and Jan Liss, interviewed the program directors on participating campuses.

We appreciate the support of the presidents, provosts, faculty members, staff, students, and community partners of our member institutions. We deeply value the important work that our Periclean Program Directors and colleagues have invested in *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement*. They inspire us on a daily basis.

### **Periclean Colleges and Universities**

Allegheny College \* Bates College \* Berea College \* Bethune-Cookman University  
Carleton College \* Chatham University \* Dillard University \* Drew University  
Elon University \* The Evergreen State College \* Goucher College \* Hampshire College  
Hendrix College \* Macalester College \* Morehouse College \* New England College  
The New School \* Occidental College \* Pace University \* Pitzer College  
Reed College \* Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute \* Rhodes College  
St. Mary's College of Maryland \* Skidmore College \* Spelman College  
Swarthmore College \* Ursinus College \* Wagner College  
Whitman College \* Widener University \* The College of Wooster

## Table of Contents

<b>Dedication</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>About Project Pericles®</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgments/Periclean Colleges and Universities</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>I. Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Introduction and National Context</b> .....	<b>3</b>
A. Brief History of Project Pericles .....	6
B. Participating Campuses .....	7
C. <i>Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement: Project Overview</i> .....	8
<b>III. Survey Results and Mini-Grant Projects</b> .....	<b>10</b>
A. Approach One: CESR as a Requirement – Achieving Breadth .....	11
i. Multi-Course Sequence .....	14
B. Approach Two: Intensive Programs – Civic Scholars.....	17
C. Approach Three: CESR Pathways – Choice and Visibility .....	19
D. Approach Four: Certificates .....	23
E. Approach Five: Entrepreneurial/Open Choice Model .....	25
<b>IV. Survey Design and Goals</b> .....	<b>26</b>
A. Survey Teams and the Value of Mapping .....	29
<b>V. Convening, Catalyst for Change, and Work on Campuses</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>VI. General Observations: Common Approaches and Strategies</b> .....	<b>34</b>
A. Movement Toward Greater Coherence .....	34
B. Increasing CESR Courses Through Faculty Development .....	35
C. Role of the Civic Engagement Center .....	36
D. Fellowships.....	37
E. Commitments to the Community.....	38
<b>VII. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendix A: Memo to Campuses Participating in the Mapping Process (June 10, 2013)</b> ..	<b>49</b>
<b>About the Authors</b> .....	<b>52</b>
<b>Board of Directors/National Board of Advisors</b> .....	<b>54</b>
<b>Presidents’ Council/National Office</b> .....	<b>55</b>



## I. Executive Summary

Project Pericles is a national consortium of colleges and universities that promotes civic engagement and social responsibility in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community. Since its founding in 2001, Project Pericles has witnessed the transformative effect that Civic or Community Engagement initiatives have had at all levels of its member institutions—impacting students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, and community members.

Reflecting the development of the national field of civic engagement, three major initiatives highlight Project Pericles' growing influence:

- The Civic Engagement Course (CEC) Program™, 2004-2009, encouraged the development of more than 100 courses incorporating civic engagement across a wide range of disciplines on Periclean campuses.
- The Periclean Faculty Leadership (PFL) Program™, beginning in 2010, cultivates select faculty members to model civic engagement pedagogy, to promote civic engagement on their campus and in the local community, and to engage in public scholarship.
- *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement*, 2013-2016, has spurred member institutions to **inventory**, **map**, and **strengthen** civic engagement across the curriculum.

*Creating Cohesive Paths* represents Project Pericles' most comprehensive initiative to date. Having advanced academic civic engagement at the level of individual courses and individual faculty leaders, Project Pericles sought to understand and promote intentional, coherent curricular organization in order to institutionalize civic engagement. All three Periclean initiatives have the same goal: to advance civic engagement education through innovations at once accessible, dynamic, economical, and replicable.

*Creating Cohesive Paths* supported a three-step process by which participating campuses first mapped curricular and co-curricular civic and community engagement on their campus and then shared insights from what they learned at a national gathering. Second, after receiving input from Project Pericles staff, who proposed five models for organizing civic engagement, campus leaders discussed and learned about initiatives on other participating campuses while developing action plans for their institution. Third, based upon the mapping experience and the action plans, campuses strengthened existing programs and developed new approaches based on information drawn from their own campuses as well as from the lessons learned from their fellow Pericleans. To support these efforts, they submitted mini-grant proposals for initiatives to enhance their approaches to civic engagement. Work carried out as part of the action plans and mini-grants served to expand and/or institutionalize civic engagement.

This kind of intentional research activity with a goal of improving programs is not unique in the field (note the process involved with Carnegie Community Engagement Classification).<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, it consistently yields numerous insights into emerging innovations, none more

---

<sup>1</sup>New England Resource Center for Higher Education. "Carnegie Community Engagement Classification." Nerche.org. [http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92](http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92). See page 27 for a discussion of survey design.

exciting than the practice of **curricular mapping**. Furthermore, Project Pericles' emphasis on relationships and learning from others, which supported the process all along the way, contributed significantly to the experience. The collegial and supportive relationships between participating campuses played an important role in terms of sharing information and collaborating on developing improved programming.

Mapping involves reflection to identify essential elements in civic or community engagement followed by a careful inventory of those elements across the curriculum and co-curriculum. Each participating Periclean institution, under the guidance of a team that was brought together frequently by the Project Pericles Program Director, mapped the current state of civic or community engagement on its campus with the goal of identifying all courses and co-curricular activities with a civic engagement component. Through their collection of information, including syllabi from relevant courses and meaningful co-curricular programs, leaders on campus could take stock of their offerings, take note of lacunae, and take steps to fill the gaps or re-envision ways to meet student interest and need. Campuses were also better equipped to advise students on curricular pathways that incorporate civic engagement and social responsibility while also serving students' diverse curricular needs across a wide range of disciplines in the fine arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

Mapping produces rich data not only about *where* civic/community engagement resides but also about *how* its components are grouped, related, and managed. Using the collected mapping data, Project Pericles identified five common approaches or models that participating institutions employed to organize their campus activities:

- Civic Engagement and Social Responsibility (CESR) Requirement
- Civic Scholars Programs
- Pathways Approach
- Certificates
- Entrepreneurial/Open Choice

Several of these approaches share elements of centralized stewardship, while others rely on more decentralized efforts. This white paper describes and assesses these approaches to civic engagement, suggests "best practices," and proposes lessons drawn from a diverse range of colleges and universities.

In the field of civic engagement and higher education, there are many calls for greater institutionalization. To achieve this goal, there must be a movement away from the episodic, away from reliance on the individual professor or single community partner, to approaches that are coordinated and sustainable. Not to take anything away from the herculean efforts made by many individual professors or community partners, but they cannot be expected to maintain this work in isolation. The five models described in this white paper provide guidance for conceptualizing the organization and integration of civic engagement across the institution.

“Educating for democracy is difficult and ambitious since it is simultaneously a set of concepts, a series of practices and a pattern of commitment and human agency.”<sup>2</sup>

“...We need to move beyond our old assumptions that it is primarily the students’ responsibility to integrate all the disparate parts of an undergraduate education. We must fully grasp that students will learn to integrate deeply and meaningfully only insofar as we design a curriculum that cultivates that; and designing such a curriculum requires that we similarly plan, strategize and execute integratively across the boundaries within our institutions.”<sup>3</sup>

## II. Introduction and National Context

Through *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement*, Project Pericles led a three-year initiative to reimagine the organization and integration of civic/community engagement across the undergraduate experience. On 26 participating campuses, teams inventoried, mapped, strengthened, and developed more cohesive curricular and co-curricular programs incorporating civic engagement. While supporting faculty leadership and curriculum development, the ultimate goal of the project was to promote an **intentional** approach to civic engagement that prioritizes coherent program design and the diffusion of civic engagement throughout the undergraduate experience. Participating campuses made significant improvements to their academic programs ranging from creating certificates to transforming their advising systems to developing new campus-wide approaches to civic engagement.

This white paper examines the design and structure of curricular and co-curricular programs for Civic Engagement and Social Responsibility (CESR) at the undergraduate level.<sup>4</sup> We present a typology of five different approaches to organizing this work, and then discuss issues that faculty, administrators, and staff may wish to consider in designing new programs or enhancing existing ones. We provide useful and actionable concepts, ideas, and practices, with bulleted takeaways.

While the field of higher education and community engagement has been around for over a century both in the United States and more broadly in the world, efforts to prioritize and promote these forms of practice have taken on new urgency in recent decades.<sup>5</sup> With the Wingspread

---

<sup>2</sup> The Teagle Foundation (2012).

<sup>3</sup> Bass (2012).

<sup>4</sup> We use the term civic engagement and social responsibility (CESR) in this white paper. As an organization with a diverse membership, we use a broad and inclusive formulation, recognizing that each campus defines and implements its own understanding of these terms. For some campuses, this work is synonymous with civic or community engagement. For others there is a broader definition that includes social responsibility and in other cases social justice.

<sup>5</sup> Global University Network for Innovation (2008 and 2014); Tapia (2012); Stanton et al. (1999). See Sigmon for a visual historical timeline of the development of community engaged learning in the United States. While it does not address the present, the book provides a sense of the many forms these practices have taken beginning in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (1999: 249-257).

declaration in 1999 and other developments of the period, what some call a social movement within the university was launched to reinvigorate broader public involvement and the public purpose of institutions of higher education in the United States.<sup>6</sup> More recently, these calls have taken on a new urgency. In his 2011 Imagining America Conference plenary speech, David Scobey stated, “Higher education faces a sea change in its intellectual, institutional, technological, and economic organization.”<sup>7</sup>

At the same time, Scobey and others in the field recognize the development of many new efforts that challenge traditional academic structures and expectations and offer what the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has described as High Impact Practices.<sup>8</sup> These high impact practices include first-year seminars, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative assignments, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, community-based learning, internships, and capstone courses and projects. Since its inception in 2001, Project Pericles has been involved with nurturing community-based learning and civic engagement that frequently utilizes multiple high impact practices.

In recent decades, new networks have emerged to support the development of practices on campus that develop students as civically engaged learners. Some of these, such as Campus Compact and AAC&U’s VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) initiative, work at the national level with a broad cross section of institutions of higher education in a range of areas. Others have a more disciplinary or area focus, such as Imagining America (which brings together the arts, humanities, and design) or Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibilities (SENCER) and Community Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH). While many of these associations include a broad range of institutions of higher education, Project Pericles stands out for its predominant focus on liberal arts colleges and universities and its creation of an intentionally small group, which enables members to build deep relationships. By virtue of its size and commonality of purpose among its members, it has created an intellectual space for campuses to share their strengths and their challenges through dialogue and annual meetings, as well as to collaborate on major initiatives like *Creating Cohesive Paths*.

As the field of civic and community engagement has grown and developed, its emphasis has shifted. Early authors of comprehensive texts described how best to start programs, courses, and projects.<sup>9</sup> While some of these efforts continue, increasingly scholars are seeking to understand from research what is happening in the field and its implications for student, faculty, and community partner learning.<sup>10</sup> In brief, a movement that started with individual practitioners or

---

<sup>6</sup> Boyte and Hollander (1999).

<sup>7</sup> Scobey (2011).

<sup>8</sup> Kuh (2008).

<sup>9</sup> Jacoby (1996); Jacoby (2014); Cress et al. (2013).

<sup>10</sup> The findings of this research can be found in new journals that have emerged in recent decades, such as the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (<http://compact.org/resource-posts/4998/4998/>) and the International Journal of Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement. (<http://journals.sfu.ca/iarslce/index.php/journal>).

leaders on particular campuses has swelled over the past few decades to create an entirely new field of study and practice with potential for transforming higher education in the United States. With significant growth in the field, many leaders have raised questions about how best to support and sustain these efforts. Many have called for the institutionalization of these practices.<sup>11</sup> By institutionalization, they mean that these efforts move from being at the periphery to the core of what the institution sees as its purpose, as evidenced by “mission, promotion, tenure, hiring; organization structure; student involvement; faculty involvement; community involvement; and campus publications.”<sup>12</sup>

Over time, various tools have been designed and developed to support colleges and universities seeking to institutionalize this work. A short list of these would include the Holland Matrix (1997), the Furco Rubric (2002), and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships Classification (2006).<sup>13</sup> AAC&U has created a series of rubrics to examine and evaluate civic engagement and social responsibility projects.<sup>14</sup> More recently, Carnegie, through its revised Community Engagement Classification, has developed a tool to assess the institutionalization of efforts.<sup>15</sup>

The efforts of Project Pericles parallel these national developments in the field of civic engagement and higher education. With *Creating Cohesive Paths*, Project Pericles expanded its focus from the individual course or individual faculty leader to questions about how civic engagement is integrated and structured across the curriculum and in the community. In the evolution of the first two white papers authored by Project Pericles, one can trace the development of the overall field of civic engagement from promoting the work of individual courses to identifying key faculty leaders to asking colleges to incorporate civic engagement in courses and programs throughout their campuses.<sup>16</sup>

However, in addition to asking individual campuses to complete an extensive mapping exercise of civic engagement in their curriculum, Project Pericles also intentionally emphasized relationship building throughout *Creating Cohesive Paths*. In 2003, Barbara Jacoby found that “service learning is all about partnerships.”<sup>17</sup> In her 2014 book, *Service-Learning Essentials*:

---

<sup>11</sup> Furco and Holland (2009).

<sup>12</sup> Holland (2009).

<sup>13</sup> Holland (1997); Furco (2002); for Carnegie Classification see New England Resource Center for Higher Education. “Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.” Nerche.org. [http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92](http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92). See Holland for a more comprehensive analysis of increasing efforts towards “documenting, evaluating, and measuring the impacts of an institution’s civic agenda” (2014: 19-20).

<sup>14</sup> AAC&U. “Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric.” AACU.org. <https://www.aacu.org/civic-engagement-value-rubric>.

<sup>15</sup> Holland (2009); Driscoll (2014). Prior to 2010, colleges had been able to apply for classification under either Curricular Engagement or Outreach and Partnerships or both. For the 2010 classification, colleges applied under the single classification and Carnegie adopted this revised title. See New England Resource Center for Higher Education. “Previous Community Engagement Classification Cycles.” Nerche.org. [http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=1477:community-engaged-campus&catid=914:carnegie-foundation-classification](http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1477:community-engaged-campus&catid=914:carnegie-foundation-classification).

<sup>16</sup> Liazos and Liss (2009); Berger and Liss (2012).

<sup>17</sup> Jacoby (2003: 267).

*Questions, Answers, and Lessons Learned*, Jacoby found relationships to be even more essential.<sup>18</sup> If relationships are key, how can they be utilized to promote civic engagement within individual campus communities and also to foster collaboration between different colleges and universities? This is part of what Project Pericles set out to explore with *Creating Cohesive Paths*.

More specifically, Project Pericles wove the building of relationships into the entire process. On each campus, teams were formed to conduct the mapping exercise and complete the survey. Afterward, representatives from each participating college convened at The Pocantico Center of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund for three days of discussion about experiences, findings, and future actions and plans connected to the mapping process.<sup>19</sup> Finally, campuses were invited to submit proposals for mini-grants to implement projects that addressed gaps identified and lessons learned from the mapping exercise, during multiple campus-wide conversations, and at the convening. This intentional focus on relationships and next steps, with a collaborative mind-set, sets *Creating Cohesive Paths* apart from other current forms of assessment-based efforts to improve campus practices.

Below is a more detailed description of the process, followed by findings from the mapping. This white paper offers readers tools for conducting a mapping exercise on their campuses. It also describes a variety of approaches and programs for civic engagement at colleges and universities that are committed to engagement as a core institutional practice. Finally, it contributes to research on higher education and civic engagement by proposing a five-part typology for understanding the organization of civic engagement at liberal arts colleges and universities.

#### A. Brief History of Project Pericles

In 2001, recognizing the need for higher education to rediscover its public purpose and to educate young people for engagement with broader communities and the world, Eugene M. Lang founded Project Pericles, a national consortium of primarily liberal arts colleges and universities. Project Pericles encourages and facilitates commitments by member institutions to include social responsibility and participatory citizenship as essential elements of their educational programs in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community.

To implement its mission, Project Pericles created a series of programs and projects. Some, like Debating for Democracy (D4D)™, focus directly on student participation, while others seek to develop deeper institutional commitments and involvement by integrating civic engagement into the curriculum.

In line with national trends seen over the past 15 years, Project Pericles began by launching the Civic Engagement Course (CEC) Program™. From 2004 to 2009, Project Pericles supported the development of over 100 individual courses that involved faculty and students combining

---

<sup>18</sup> Jacoby (2014).

<sup>19</sup> As is the case with all materials resulting from meetings held at The Pocantico Center, the views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, its trustees, or its staff.

“academic engagement with applied knowledge and social responsibility.”<sup>20</sup> Through assessment of the program, Project Pericles found five overarching Teaching Strategies “that could deepen academic and civic engagement in higher education nationwide.”<sup>21</sup> These courses echo national trends valuing courses with community-based learning, one of the five promising practices identified by AAC&U.

While individual courses create meaningful opportunities for students, Project Pericles, with support from the Eugene M. Lang Foundation and The Teagle Foundation, recognized that fostering and nurturing faculty leaders could bring about even more significant change. In 2010, Project Pericles developed the Periclean Faculty Leadership (PFL)<sup>TM</sup> Program. Participating campuses identified key faculty to apply for the program. With the help of outside evaluators, Project Pericles then selected one faculty member on each campus to receive a Periclean Faculty Leadership award. Periclean Faculty Leaders (PFL) were asked to “create a new Civic Engagement Course (CEC), organize campus-wide civic engagement activities, and serve as a civic education advocate and leader” both on campus and beyond.<sup>22</sup> Recognizing the learning and support that can occur through partnerships and dialogues, PFLs from each campus were paired with a PFL from another campus.

Through this innovation, Project Pericles expanded its approach to civic engagement on campus from the course to the faculty member and from the campus to the larger community of professional scholars. As described in the white paper, *The Periclean Diamond: Linking College Classrooms, Campuses, Communities, and Colleagues via Social and Civic High Engagement Learning*, Project Pericles expanded the Periclean Triangle to the Periclean Diamond. It broadened its focus from Eugene M. Lang’s original three Cs: in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community, to incorporate a fourth C, the community of scholarship.<sup>23</sup> In so doing, Project Pericles sought to strengthen individual campuses through faculty leadership and to build relationships across and between campuses.

### B. Participating Campuses

At the start of this current initiative, Project Pericles’ membership consisted of 29 colleges and universities.<sup>24</sup> From the member institutions, 26 colleges and universities elected to participate.

The 26 participating institutions:

**Allegheny College** (Meadville, Pennsylvania); **Bates College** (Lewiston, Maine); **Berea College** (Berea, Kentucky); **Bethune-Cookman University** (Daytona Beach, Florida); **Carleton College** (Northfield, Minnesota); **Chatham University** (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania); **Dillard University** (New Orleans, Louisiana); **Drew University** (Madison, New Jersey); **Elon University** (Elon,

---

<sup>20</sup> Berger and Liss (2012: 3); Liazos and Liss (2009).

<sup>21</sup> Liazos and Liss (2009: 9). See pages 28-29 for the learning outcomes and teaching strategies.

<sup>22</sup> Berger and Liss (2012).

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> At the end of 2016, Project Pericles membership stood at 32 campuses.

North Carolina); **Goucher College** (Baltimore, Maryland); **Hampshire College** (Amherst, Massachusetts); **Hendrix College** (Conway, Arkansas); **Macalester College** (St. Paul, Minnesota); **New England College** (Henniker, New Hampshire); **The New School** (New York, New York); **Occidental College** (Los Angeles, California); **Pace University** (New York, New York); **Pitzer College** (Claremont, California); **Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute** (Troy, New York); **Rhodes College** (Memphis, Tennessee); **St. Mary's College of Maryland** (St. Mary's City, Maryland); **Swarthmore College** (Swarthmore, Pennsylvania); **Ursinus College** (Collegeville, Pennsylvania); **Wagner College** (Staten Island, New York); **Widener University** (Chester, Pennsylvania); **The College of Wooster** (Wooster, Ohio).

This is a diverse group that consists predominantly of liberal arts colleges and also includes some research universities. Some of the college and universities are highly selective. Many have a high percentage of Pell-eligible or first-generation college students. There are two Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). They have a wide range of available resources with endowments from under \$20 million to over \$1.7 billion. While there are more campuses in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, there are campuses from Maine to Southern California. There is a mix of rural, suburban, and urban campuses.

As we will discuss, these colleges and universities have diverse approaches to civic engagement and social responsibility. However, they are united by a commitment to incorporating civic engagement into the undergraduate experience, most importantly in the curriculum. They have all spent considerable time and resources to incorporate civic engagement into the work of the college or university. These schools do not represent a random selection of campuses. In fact, they are members of Project Pericles precisely because of their commitment to civic engagement.

### C. Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement: Project Overview

Over the 16 years since the founding of Project Pericles, engagement opportunities for students on member campuses, and in higher education in general, have grown exponentially. During this period, undergraduate education has experienced a wonderful proliferation of civic engagement opportunities including courses, community-based learning opportunities, civic scholars programs, civic engagement centers, alternative spring breaks, and a myriad of other programs and opportunities. However, there has not always been the time nor the resources to reflect upon how disparate courses and programs can be fully integrated across the undergraduate experience. As positive as these initial steps were, they did not proceed under a comprehensive umbrella that would create, as Randy Bass has recommended, a curriculum that “integrates deeply and meaningfully.”<sup>25</sup> To achieve such a purposefully integrated curriculum, a further step was needed, leading to the next major Periclean initiative, *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement*.

With support from the Eugene M. Lang Foundation and The Teagle Foundation, work commenced on the project in 2013. The initial goal was to gain an accurate picture of how civic

---

<sup>25</sup> Bass (2012).

engagement programs were organized on the 26 participating campuses as a necessary prerequisite for discussions about how one might want to shape programs. Using a survey instrument developed by Project Pericles, colleges and universities spent six months conducting an inventory of all curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular opportunities that incorporated civic engagement on their campuses and in their communities.

The second phase of the initiative involved intensive discussions of the findings, individually and collectively, from the campuses' inventories of all of their civic engagement opportunities. This entailed conversations among team members on individual campuses, a review of all material by Project Pericles staff, discussions between different campuses (they were paired by Project Pericles), and extensive conversations at a July 2014 convening held at The Pocantico Center.

During the third phase, participating campuses used the information gathered to strengthen the organization and structure of civic engagement programming. This work was facilitated by action plans that were created at the July 2014 convening and through mini-grants to 16 of the campuses that Project Pericles provided thanks to support from The Teagle Foundation. Finally, Project Pericles held a concluding convening at the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) in January 2016.

One goal of the project was to better understand what civic engagement opportunities were already available to students on the 26 campuses and how these opportunities were organized. Questions that informed our thinking included:

- Were there common threads in the organization of civic engagement programs?
- Could one even talk about curricular programs or were they really individual courses?
- Were there programs, courses, and areas of expertise that were known only within departments or divisions, but not widely recognized across the campus?
- What was the role of civic engagement centers on campus? What impact did they have on campus and on the organization of programming?

Moving beyond a basic understanding of the range of approaches to civic engagement, our goal was to integrate, expand, and strengthen civic engagement opportunities and programs for students on our campuses.

- Key Goals for *Creating Cohesive Paths* include:
  - Use the knowledge gained from mapping to:
    - Further enhance existing programming for civic engagement and social responsibility (CESR).
    - Develop new courses and opportunities that address current gaps.
    - Ensure that sequences of courses have clear learning outcomes that build upon and support one another.

- Create clear avenues for students to integrate civic engagement and social responsibility into their courses of study, including certificate programs, formal minors, introductory seminars, concluding capstone seminars, thematic pathways with links to courses and co-curricular activities, and programs of study for majors in all disciplines (fine arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences).
- Increase and promote awareness of and participation in civic engagement opportunities through these newly articulated avenues among students in a wide range of disciplines, and increase awareness among advisors and professors of these opportunities.

These goals continue to orient us as we undertake the work of strengthening civic engagement programs on the participating campuses and sharing our knowledge with others. Our commitment to reaching all students in all disciplines has grown over the course of the project. If we believe that civic engagement should be an essential element of the undergraduate experience, then we must advocate for approaches that reach all, not just some, undergraduates.

### **III. Survey Results and Mini-Grant Projects**

The following sections discuss both the five general approaches to structuring CESR that we found through the survey process, as well as projects and mini-grants undertaken in response to the survey findings. Rather than separate out the survey findings and mini-grant projects, we are weaving descriptions of the two together. Many of the mini-grants and projects incorporated one of the five approaches revealed during the mapping process.

All of the campuses in the project have a strongly articulated commitment to civic engagement and social responsibility (CESR). However, their implementation of this commitment varies widely. On some campuses, a number of entrepreneurial professors have forged a wide array of stand-alone courses incorporating CESR, while other campuses have developed highly structured, multi-year CESR programs. The review of all 26 programs reveals five general approaches to integrating CESR into the curriculum and co-curriculum:

- CESR Requirement
- Civic Scholars Programs
- Pathways Approach
- Certificates
- Entrepreneurial/Open Choice

In this paper, we have selected a few institutional cases to illustrate the five general models of organizing CESR courses and activities. Many campuses incorporate one or more of the models. One common approach is to create a CESR requirement. The second approach is to create a specialized and distinct program for a cohort of students as civic scholars. In the third model, the pathways approach, thematic topics like education/access, food/sustainability, and health are

used to organize civic engagement programming. A fourth approach is through civic engagement certificates. Finally, a fifth approach is an entrepreneurial/open choice model. In these situations, classes are developed largely independent of one another and are generally not part of a program or campus-wide CESR strategy.

#### A. Approach One: CESR as a Requirement – Achieving Breadth

Incorporating a CESR requirement into a college or university’s general education or distribution requirements is an effective means of ensuring broad exposure and participation. Integration into these frameworks guarantees that all students will incorporate at least some CESR work into their college experience. In terms of the potential for achieving breadth of exposure to CESR—defined as the percentage of the student body reached—this approach offers some significant advantages.

Implementing a CESR requirement necessitates a sustained commitment by faculty to the value of integrating CESR goals into these classes and a commitment by the institution to provide sufficient resources to support the classes. It also dramatically alters the supply/demand dynamic for CESR courses on campus by creating a regular demand for the courses, thereby alleviating a possible need to recruit students for CESR courses and activities and also increasing equity of participation.

Eight campuses (Allegheny College, Hampshire College, Hendrix College, Pace University, Pitzer College, Rhodes College, St. Mary’s College of Maryland, and Wagner College) have some form of CESR requirement for graduation. The requirement varies in form from campus to campus. Some colleges and universities utilize a general requirement, others require a specific first-year course, and still others mandate a sequence of courses. This model requires a system to track and record student enrollment in CESR courses. Most of the campuses also use their civic engagement centers and a course designation or review strategy to certify which courses meet their requirement.

Pace requires one Civic Engagement and Public Values (CE) course for graduation. It offers over 100 approved CE courses drawn from every school/college at Pace. Pace writes, “during the 2012-13 academic year, there were 114 CE sections running across its Manhattan and Pleasantville campuses. These CE courses all have a required service learning component and include a minimum of 20 hours of community service. The CE designation is a signature and foundational requirement of the Pace Core Curriculum.”<sup>26</sup> In order to receive the CE designation, each course must be vetted by the Dyson School of Arts and Sciences curriculum committee. They are also assessed by Pace’s Center for Community Action and Research. Pace notes, “faculty who develop new CE courses or retool existing courses to incorporate the pedagogy of service learning into her/his course are eligible to apply for a Pace Project Pericles Faculty grant.”<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Pace University, personal communication with the authors (December 2016).

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

Rhodes and St. Mary's both include a civic engagement requirement as part of their core curriculum. At Rhodes, the course must encourage engaged citizenship, participation in the local community, and the application of academic knowledge. St. Mary's has an "Experiencing Liberal Arts in the World" requirement. "The purpose of the requirement is for students to bridge the gap between the academy and the world beyond."<sup>28</sup> The requirement can be fulfilled through study abroad, a credit-bearing internship, or a service or experiential learning class. Starting in the fall of 2016, Allegheny has a required Civic Learning course as part of revised general education/distribution requirements.

During the mapping period, Pitzer had a general CESR requirement that could be fulfilled with "one full-credit course that involved either community service, community-based field work, or a community-based internship."<sup>29</sup> There were 31 CESR courses offered across 11 departments, including two that were offered as first-year seminars. Pitzer described these as Social Responsibility courses and left their designation largely at the discretion of individual faculty members. Other academic options included an independent study or a study abroad program involving a community-based internship or community service. Pitzer also offered the option of fulfilling its CESR requirement through 45 hours of community service completed during a single semester.

As part of an ongoing strategic plan, Pitzer revised its requirement after the mapping process, replacing the one-course Social Responsibility graduation requirement with a two-course Social Justice requirement. The new requirement includes both a Social Justice Theory course and a Social Responsibility Praxis course as well as revised learning outcomes and criteria. This is being coupled with "a systematic college-wide process for programmatic assessment of student learning outcomes."<sup>30</sup> The new requirement "adds rigor and structure to the ways in which we fulfill our stated commitment to social responsibility, community engagement, and intercultural understanding."<sup>31</sup>

Hampshire, Hendrix, and Wagner are notable in that they have developed programs with sequential courses that begin in the first year of study and span multiple years. At Wagner, all students are required to complete three learning communities as part of the Wagner Plan. One learning community is taken in the first year and includes two courses, a reflective tutorial, and an experiential learning component of three hours per week at one or more sites. The final learning community is taken in the senior year and includes a course, a reflective tutorial, and a senior project involving applied learning with a 100 hour experiential component. The emphasis in the senior year is on using disciplinary knowledge for "real world applied practice."<sup>32</sup> While

---

<sup>28</sup> St. Mary's College of Maryland (2013).

<sup>29</sup> Pitzer College (2013).

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Pitzer College (2015).

<sup>32</sup> Wagner College. "The Wagner Plan." Wagner.edu. <http://wagner.edu/academics/undergraduate/>.

not all of the Wagner learning communities involve CESR, the approach does introduce CESR elements during the first year and then builds on this in subsequent years.

Hendrix has a first-year seminar requirement called *The Engaged Citizen*. “This course seeks to illuminate the multiplicity of possible interpretations of engaging as a citizen through interdisciplinary team teaching...”<sup>33</sup> These courses also have an engaged or applied component in which students apply academic course content to understanding current social and political issues and community engagement. Some, but not all, of the courses have a community-based learning component. “Images of Politics and Society,” team taught by an art professor and a political science professor, uses photography and readings in political theory and current affairs to explore contemporary issues of power, governance, and politics. While the course involves several photography assignments on the campus and in the community, the bulk of the CESR work involves classroom activities.

After their first-year experience in *The Engaged Citizen* program, Hendrix students go on to participate in the required Odyssey Program, which is designed to promote active learning. Students are required to complete a minimum of three Odyssey experiences from six different categories: artistic creativity, global awareness, professional and leadership development, service to the world, undergraduate research, and special projects. These Odyssey experiences may include courses, pre-approved activities, or projects individually designed by students or faculty. One of the four learning goals of the Odyssey Program addresses CESR. “Increased awareness of one’s responsibility for linking action and understanding in the effort to respond effectively ‘to the social, spiritual, and ecological needs of our time.’”<sup>34</sup>

The Odyssey Program is supported by 12 Odyssey Professorships for faculty that last from one to three years and include up to \$25,000 per year to develop projects related to the Odyssey categories. “Many of the faculty-student research projects or programs that deepen global awareness of students’ service to the world directly align with the campus learning goals around civic engagement and social responsibility.”<sup>35</sup> Projects include partnerships with the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission to examine microbial diversity, research into rural sustainability in the Mekong Delta, an economics project to study world poverty using state-of-the-art methods from the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development, and a multi-year anthropology project examining Mexican immigrants in central Arkansas.

Hampshire has a similar approach to Hendrix. In Hampshire’s case, students have a first-year requirement with an additional requirement that is fulfilled in the second or third year of study. These requirements are sequential and build on one another. In the first year, students complete a Campus Engaged Learning Requirement (Cel-1). “The Cel-1 must involve collaborative learning, take place on and/or directly enhance campus life, add up to a minimum of 40 hours of

---

<sup>33</sup> Hendrix College. “The Engaged Citizen Program.” Hendrix.edu. <https://www.hendrix.edu/theengagedcitizen/>.

<sup>34</sup> Hendrix College (2013a).

<sup>35</sup> Hendrix College (2013).

work, and include systematic documentation and written reflection on the learning.”<sup>36</sup> Community Engaged Learning (Cel-2) is a similar requirement, but includes work with communities “in and outside the College.” Cel-2 was developed out of an original community service requirement and now includes serious and ongoing reflections on learning goals, community needs, and “the process of developing and implementing projects that address both.”<sup>37</sup>

CESR learning goals and outcomes are also included in the curriculum through additional avenues. Besides the Cel requirements, Hampshire students must also complete a Multiple Cultural Perspective requirement. One of the five distribution areas includes Power, Community, and Social Justice. First-year students are required to take a course in four out of the five distribution areas. Approximately 30 out of over 200 courses per semester are included in the Power, Community, and Social Justice distribution.

Many of the 12 core values of Hampshire also touch on its CESR focus and emphasis. These include engagement with one’s community and the wider world, active democracy, social justice, sustainability, and a caring community. It is interesting to note that Hampshire – a college that prides itself on allowing its students to develop their own programs of study – has institutionalized a rigorous CESR requirement beginning in the first year of study. However, it has done this in a way that hews to the spirit of its educational philosophy and offers students a great deal of latitude. After the initial first-year seminar, Hendrix also offers its students choices in fulfilling their three Odyssey requirements. In addition to the flexibility, both programs emphasize active student engagement in which students are encouraged and empowered to design their own programs of study, actively engage with communities, and reflect on all of these experiences.

#### i. Multi-Course Sequence

Requiring a sequence of two or more courses is likely to foster a richer learning experience. It signals to faculty and students that the institution takes CESR seriously and is willing to devote significant resources to implementing it. Hampshire, Hendrix, Pitzer, and Wagner have all developed requirements that incorporate multiple courses or independent study. Course sequences also give students more time to reflect before and after their community-based experience. Students need time prior to the experience to reflect on their positionality and to think about the intersections between academic and community/local knowledge.

As part of its mini-grant, Hampshire focused on both student reflection and training. Part of the interest in reflection stemmed from a feeling that a lot of student work was not visible to the Hampshire community. The mini-grant articulated a need to “map” student work in addition to

---

<sup>36</sup> Hampshire College (2013).

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

the CESR opportunities at Hampshire. To raise the visibility of student work, Hampshire held a series of mapping, reflection, and e-portfolio workshops.

“We began with the concepts of creating an inventory, collecting an inventory, collecting artifacts, and mapping experiences. Students were paired and asked to interview each other as they reflected on their inventory. During this reflection, students compared artifacts they chose to include, making new connections and meaning. Students were shown e-portfolio templates and began creating their own e-portfolio plans in small groups.”<sup>38</sup> Another goal for Hampshire’s mini-grant was to create “more mechanisms for common preparation and continuation of the work.”<sup>39</sup> This was accomplished by offering Praxis Workshops for students that allowed the students to “come together to discuss theory and practices and to think through the core issues within campus-community partnerships work: the role of students in communities, creating mutually beneficial projects, providing a way to sustain projects and relationships with community organizations, and beginning to think about intersecting issues of power, race, class, and gender.”<sup>40</sup>

As part of its mini-grant, Elon University focused on the importance of student reflection while undertaking community-based learning projects. Elon published *More Than Just a Trip*, a book of student reflections on the ethical implications of their work as part of an alternative spring break. The book will be used for discussion by Elon students participating in future alternative spring break projects and will be available for use at other colleges. “*More Than Just a Trip* will provide the basis for an ongoing and ever more rigorous reflection and writing program related to Alternative Spring Breaks and, critically, each group of students who participate will be actively adding to and passing down the wisdom gained by their cohort. Put colloquially, instead of discovering the wheel over and over again, our students will be able to stand on the shoulders of those who came before them and in turn provide useful insights for the next generation.”<sup>41</sup>

Returning to requirements, we noticed a trend in which many campuses have adopted or are moving toward a system in which faculty members submit their courses for review prior to receiving a CESR designation. Such a review process seems preferable as it offers some assurances about quality, learning goals, and outcomes. It also may serve as an entry point for discussions between faculty members about how the campus is addressing CESR opportunities. In their discussion of the new requirement, the Pitzer team specifically mentioned moving away from a system in which faculty designate their own courses.

If new requirements are being implemented, it is worth giving consideration to the institution’s ability to deliver appropriate courses and experiences and community partners’ ability to absorb the increased number of students. Is the demand for new community-based experiences going to

---

<sup>38</sup> Hampshire College (2015).

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Elon University (2015).

overwhelm community partners? How are the community's needs being assessed and who is involved in these conversations? What can be done to improve or expand relationships with community partners? How are faculty members' concerns being addressed? Are all departments on board? What kind of outreach needs to be done with faculty members?

Many colleges and universities used at least part of their mini-grant for professional and course development workshops for faculty. With its mini-grant and matching funds from the college, the Pitzer team offered a series of workshops in preparation for the new requirement and conducted outreach to encourage STEM faculty members to offer courses that would fulfill the requirement.

As part of the work supported by its mini-grant, Hendrix held a faculty development workshop for faculty members teaching its first year course, *The Engaged Citizen*. The full day workshop focused on the “logistics and ethics of working with community partners.”<sup>42</sup> The day included panels with representatives from the “local service, advocacy, and governmental sectors, a panel on the ethics of community engagement, and visits to three local non-profits.”<sup>43</sup>

It should be noted that the word “requirement” need not connote an onerous commitment or rigid design. In constructing learning experiences, colleges “require” students to do many things but they do not necessarily call them “requirements” as much as they create intentionally designed classes and sequences that steer students to particular experiences that they cannot avoid.<sup>44</sup> For example, institutions that place many CESR components in major and minor core courses or popular electives will reach nearly every student without having to label it as a formal requirement – students simply will be exposed to CESR.

The benefits of a requirement approach ensure success when required activities and classes are of the very highest quality and rigor. Psychologically, students may consider formal requirements as a hurdle to leap and without sufficient cognitive challenge may not gain the deep learning the requirement is meant to deliver. So, commitment to a requirement is powerful, effective, and efficient and must be grounded in rigorous design and delivery.

#### **Takeaways:**

- **Requirements are an effective means of ensuring that all students participate in CESR during their undergraduate education. They achieve greater breadth, in terms of reaching students, than most other approaches.**

---

<sup>42</sup> Hendrix College (2015).

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> These insights are provided by Barbara Holland who consulted on *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement* and who contributed to an earlier version of this white paper that was used to frame discussions at the 2014 convening at The Pocantico Center of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Holland refers to these “intentionally designed classes and sequences as ‘soft requirements.’”

- **Reflection and training should be built into all community-based learning experiences. Reflection should occur prior to community-based work, as well as after the experience.**
- **Multi-sequence requirements of two or more courses foster richer learning experiences. CESR sequences allow more time for reflection and the integration of theory and praxis.**
- **To ensure consistency and quality, CESR course designations should be made by a civic engagement committee, a related curriculum committee, or civic engagement center staff. CESR designations should be made through an institutionalized process with clear guidelines, rather than on an ad hoc basis by faculty members teaching CESR courses.**
- **When implementing a new requirement, faculty development workshops are helpful and will likely be needed to populate new requirements with courses.**
- **When developing a new or revised requirement, consideration must be given to the capacity of community partners to work with additional students.**

#### B. Approach Two: Intensive Programs – Civic Scholars

Civic Scholars programs provide an intensive program for a select cohort of students. The Bonner Scholars model is the most recognized national model of this kind, with 61 campuses currently hosting Bonner Scholars programs. These programs offer scholarships for service to low-income students who are selected on the basis of financial need and demonstrated leadership or commitment to community engagement. Once selected, these students then participate in a four-year developmental model of civic engagement.<sup>45</sup> Advocates for the Bonner program strongly believe in this model and have actively promoted it as a national model. For them it is a clear way that civic engagement can move beyond the individual to a more collective and meaningful impact. As three Bonner leaders write when describing how the movement for civic engagement can grow and strengthen, “We must *move beyond the course-based glass ceiling* of community engagement toward deeper, developmental, community engagement, engaging a broader range of students and practices.”<sup>46</sup> While their model also incorporates course and policy work, Bonner cohorts focus on the co-curricular whereas the Periclean model explored here emphasizes coursework as a central component of the cohort experience.

Some of the Periclean campuses have Bonner programs, but those described here are different for their clear connection to the academic development of students. The design of the Periclean colleges’ cohort model commonly employs a group project that focuses the work and activity for each new, entering cohort. It is this cohort approach, with shared coursework and projects undertaken as a group, that differentiates the civic scholars model from other CESR models and approaches. Unlike majors that may provide some flexibility in terms of course selection and time of enrollment, these specialized programs largely prescribe both the courses and their

---

<sup>45</sup> For more on the Bonner Scholars programs see <http://www.bonner.org/nationalnetwork/>.

<sup>46</sup> Hoy, Johnson, and Hackett (2012: 179, italics in original).

timing so that all members of the cohort are simultaneously taking the same courses as well as working on the same projects.

Two Pericleans, Drew University and Elon University, have highly developed scholars programs for a subset of their students. Elon's Periclean Scholars program started with the induction of the first cohort in 2003. According to Elon's survey, "The program is unique in that it is a cohort based, multi-year, multi-disciplinary service and engaged learning academic program that recruits select current first-year students who demonstrate a clear interest in and an ability to make a long term commitment under the mentorship of a faculty person who guides them through their three years as Periclean Scholars."<sup>47</sup>

Each cohort of Periclean Scholars is comprised of approximately 30 students. The program is selective, accepting between 50% and 75% of applicants depending on the year. Starting in their second year, the Periclean Scholars take a credit bearing seminar together each semester. As a group, they develop a service project. Many of the seminars are focused on the development of their service project. Their senior year includes a January term travel course to their region of study. Cohorts have undertaken projects in Appalachia, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Mexico, Namibia, and Sri Lanka. Projects have included HIV/AIDS awareness, pediatric malnutrition, rural development, environmental education, and the empowerment of adolescent girls.

Elon also has a Civic Engagement Scholars program with required courses and local service projects in contrast to the Periclean Scholars program that most often has an international focus and a three-year cohort model. The Civic Engagement Scholars program is open to all students. Civic Engagement Scholars are required to choose either "Social Issues and Problems in the Local Community (Sociology)" or "The Art and Science of Human Services" and complete a two-semester seminar in which they develop and implement a community engagement proposal in conjunction with a community partner. Additional co-curricular requirements include a service trip and 40 hours of additional community service.

The Drew Civic Scholars program is organized as a scholarship program with awards of \$5,000 per year. Drew reports that, "It is the highest yielding scholarship program in the college, and retains students from their first to sophomore years at 10 to 12 percentage points higher than the general student body."<sup>48</sup> As at Elon, Drew's Civic Scholars program employs a cohort model with students taking seminars together and also engaging in service projects. The Drew program requires a minimum of 100 hours of community service per year. In the first year, the students take a seminar on community service and also a "year-long workshop class in which they plan and implement a team-based civic project."<sup>49</sup> The second year includes a 70-hour two-credit internship and three skills workshops. During their junior year, scholars participate in Leadership Teams that are responsible for helping to run the program. In their final year, as part of a senior

---

<sup>47</sup> Elon University (2013).

<sup>48</sup> Drew University (2013).

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

civic project class, they undertake a project with a service, research, or advocacy focus. Topics have included sexual assault, Syrian refugee crisis, environmental impact of bottled water, and air quality.

These specialized programs offer a select group of students a highly focused CESR experience over the span of their college experience. From a design perspective the programs offer a series of sequential courses in which students build competencies while also engaging in group community-based learning/service projects. In addition to the CESR exposure, students also gain experience designing, organizing, and managing extensive group projects.

Most CESR courses offer opportunities to cultivate important career skills. In addition to critical thinking skills, these courses develop the ability to relate academic knowledge to real world problems and the ability to work with a diverse range of individuals. Civic scholars programs with their extended projects offer opportunities to develop the ability to work effectively with others and practice leadership skills. Students also have the opportunity to work over an extended period of time on tangible projects that allow them to demonstrate their problem-solving skills to employers. This aspect of CESR is something that deserves more attention, especially as an example of how the liberal arts can emphasize their utility in terms of career readiness.

#### **Takeaways:**

- **CESR courses and programs develop important career skills, including leadership skills, the ability to work as part of a group, the ability to work respectfully with a diverse range of partners, and active listening skills.**
- **CESR cohort models provide spaces and experiences for students to work collaboratively and over longer periods of time. The model utilizes high impact practices identified by AAC&U.**
- **By working on projects over time, cohorts are able to develop skills for reflection and a more nuanced and complex understanding of real world situations.**

#### C. Approach Three: CESR Pathways – Choice and Visibility

Some colleges and universities are exploring pathway models for organizing CESR activities for students. Pathways are typically organized around issue areas or themes such as education/access, food/sustainability, health, and human rights and humanitarianism. By design, they are interdisciplinary in nature, bridging departmental silos and helping students learn different perspectives on important issues. To varying degrees, the pathways present or organize courses, co-curricular opportunities, internships, student groups, and community partners under a single theme.

Pathways models can help campus CESR development in a variety of ways: 1) they can be thought of as a means for a college to make its commitment to community engagement visible to students, 2) they can help faculty understand how their courses may be linked with other courses,

3) they can provide a vehicle through which campus partners can come together, and 4) they can help students engage in work with greater meaning and potential for social change. They also offer opportunities for thoughtful and reflective collaboration among community partners, departments, faculty, staff, and students, as well as alumni.

Carleton College and Macalester College are two of the colleges currently offering and developing pathways. It is interesting to note that these are campuses with active civic engagement centers but without a CESR graduation requirement. Even without CESR requirements, we found that the colleges achieved high levels of CESR participation. By graduation, 90% of Carleton students have taken a CESR course. At Macalester, some 47% of students take a CESR course each year. This is made possible by the fact that the college annually offers approximately 100 CESR courses of which 70% have a community-based learning component.

Carleton is in the processes of developing a series of pathways. They are working with faculty, community partners, and the Career Center “to build organically on identified student passions and connect them with internship and career exploration opportunities.”<sup>50</sup> The Carleton Center for Community and Civic Engagement staff members conceptualize the work on three levels: the institutional level where the pathways model is utilized as a method for organizing work; the issue level which pulls together different stakeholders (faculty, community partners, students) based on a shared concern; and the student level where meaningful CESR opportunities are made available and visible to all students.<sup>51</sup> At the second and third levels, they emphasize the degree to which pathways provide an opportunity to cross multiple boundaries – between departments, between campus and community, and interpersonally.

This effort to focus on particular issue areas with pathways for students is an exciting manifestation of the college’s commitment to CESR. It is a moment where collaborative approaches to social justice issues can evolve in conjunction with developing meaningful CESR opportunities for students. “We are seeking to provide opportunities for students that cross the Carleton boundaries in ways which are meaningful and through which students genuinely interact with others in ways which change the lives of all involved.”<sup>52</sup> The goal is to support students in developing meaningful lives after they graduate from Carleton.

Macalester describes its approach as academic concentrations that “offer coherent pathways for students to fulfill general education and major requirements around a central set of inquiries or interdisciplinary areas of study.”<sup>53</sup> The concentrations in Urban Studies and in Community and Global Health both include integrative senior capstone experiences. Given that internationalism

---

<sup>50</sup> Carleton College (2013).

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Macalester College (2013).

and civic engagement are core values of a Macalester education, it is not surprising that study away/abroad is another element that Macalester builds into its pathways or concentrations.

Approaches to the organization of pathways vary between the two colleges. At Macalester, pathways are noted on student transcripts and thus have a more formal organization. In this way, Macalester's model could be seen as a new form of institutionalization of the field whereby increasingly majors, minors, and certificates are being developed at a range of institutions across the country.<sup>54</sup> Carleton is in the process of enhancing and refining its pathways model. What is clear is that the pathways model is open to varying degrees of organization and structure. Pathways can simply be collections of courses and co-curricular opportunities on particular topics that a civic engagement center catalogues or they can be a series of sequential courses with cumulative learning goals and integrated co-curricular offerings.

The pathways approach proved popular among colleges and universities participating in *Creating Cohesive Paths* and several campuses decided to adopt pathways as one of their approaches to CESR. For their mini-grant project, Carleton College and Goucher College formed a partnership to learn from each other and build on each other's strengths. The Center for Civic and Community Engagement at Carleton is using new technology and developing surveys for enhanced tracking of students and assessment of learning outcomes. Carleton is using the data to refine its approach to pathways and improve its outreach efforts to increase participation and persistence in civic engagement programs, projects, and courses.

Goucher's project will fundamentally transform the way the college provides student advising. They are developing a multi-layered system for student advising referred to as "Illuminated Pathways." This "on-line system will allow students, faculty, and staff to build individualized pathways by searching for courses, co-curricular, and extra-curricular [options] using key words or concepts.... Illuminated Pathways will be the Goucher developmental educational framework which demonstrates the ways in which high impact practices lead to holistic outcomes and performances for all students."<sup>55</sup> Illuminated Pathways will help students craft more coherent courses of study while focusing on their passions. It will also aid and support student reflection on the design of meaningful courses of study.

This collaboration between Carleton and Goucher epitomizes the strengths of Project Pericles. Consortium members collaborate, gain insight, and support one another, while respecting each other's unique characteristics. While learning from Carleton, Goucher is developing a pathways model that works within its own campus culture and in many ways strengthens that culture by providing a thoughtful way of designing individual courses of study.

Like Carleton and Macalester, Swarthmore College has developed several pathways and used its mini-grant to conduct research into what draws students to particular pathways and what courses

---

<sup>54</sup> For more on this see Butin and Seider (2012) that describes the development of these new forms of institutional recognition and practice.

<sup>55</sup> Goucher College (2015).

and skills students make use of while engaged in these pathways. One of its goals is to highlight the diverse range of courses and skills students tap into when undertaking civic engagement projects.

Chatham University, similarly to Goucher, pursued a web-based approach to making CESR opportunities more accessible to students. This was initially envisioned as an isolated advising tool for accessing CESR opportunities. However, there has been interest in using it for a “reinvigorated team advising approach where students would work with both academic and career advisors.”<sup>56</sup> Chatham now has a four-year plan for each student with integrated advising and career development.

The work of Chatham’s team was incorporated into the university’s strategic plan. Chatham recently revised its three mission initiatives to include Engagement and Responsibility. The new website “offers a clear picture both literally and figuratively for students and their advising team of how to meet the ambitious academic, personal, and career goals of the Engagement and Responsibility mission.”<sup>57</sup>

Pathways are an excellent place to start if an institution is interested in strengthening students’ CESR opportunities. They do not necessarily require new resources. One way to start is to see what topics or issues are of particular interest to students, faculty, and community members. As an example, topics might include community health, sustainable energy, or K-12 education. A review of courses, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, and college-community partnerships that might be relevant to the particular topic should be carried out in order to determine if there are enough resources to offer a pathway on a chosen topic. The next step is to pull together opportunities and present them in a way that is visible and accessible to students. This could be as simple as a list on a website, handout, or poster. Faculty and staff need to communicate with students about the pathway and publicize the available opportunities. Adding coherence to what is already available makes the offerings more accessible to students.

One of the appeals of a pathways approach is that it allows campuses to work with the courses, co-curricular opportunities, and community partners that are already present. It makes sense to develop pathways initially from themes that are already of interest on the campus and in the community. A significant part of developing a successful pathway is bringing together existing constituencies for collaboration such as community partners or faculty members who may have an interest in linking their work with the pathway.

While pathways can play to existing strengths or existing interests among students and/or faculty, this is a flexible model and the threshold for establishing a themed pathway is fairly low, perhaps with only a few courses and co-curricular or extra-curricular opportunities. With this scaffolding in place, additional components and courses can be added or developed.

---

<sup>56</sup> Chatham University (2015).

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

Drew University provides a good example of how pathways can be offered based on existing resources. With an already strong Civic Scholars program, Drew wanted to develop programming that would expose more students to the civic engagement opportunities on campus and in the local community. It conducted a review of potential topics of interest and of existing resources and developed three pathways described as “thematic clusters”: “Feeding the Hungry, Feeding the World” (food and sustainability), “Leadership for the Future,” and “Combating Disease.” Relying on existing resources, Drew was able to develop these thematic clusters over the course of a summer.

**Takeaways:**

- **Pathways are an accessible approach to CESR. They allow institutions to leverage existing courses, programs, and partnerships.**
- **Since they may initially rely on existing resources, pathways can be organized quickly. Depending on the institution, any approval process is likely to be less onerous than for a certificate or minor.**
- **Pathways may simply start out as collections of courses and co-curricular opportunities that are grouped and listed for students.**
- **Pathways may also be more complex and structured with linked and sequential courses and community-based experiences.**
- **Pathways are a means for articulating/making visible the institution’s commitment to CESR to students, faculty, staff, and community partners.**
- **Pathways help faculty see how their courses can be linked to courses in other departments and encourage interdisciplinary collaboration.**
- **The thematic nature of pathways fosters campus and community collaboration based on shared concerns and needs.**

D. Approach Four: Certificates

Dan Butin addresses the need for new programmatic forms for civically engaged higher education institutions: “For without ‘academic homes’ such as ... certificates, minors, and majors ... it becomes difficult to develop and sustain safe spaces for critical reflection and action over extended periods of time.”<sup>58</sup> Occidental College and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) are creating certificate programs for civic engagement to highlight civic engagement opportunities on and off campus and to recognize the commitment and work of students.

RPI has created a certificate in “Civic Responsibility” that is designed to prepare students to “‘apply science to the common purposes of life’ to address 21<sup>st</sup> century grand challenges.”<sup>59</sup> Requirements for the certificate include 16 course credits from designated classes; participation in “forums, colloquies, and selected readings and reflection activities;”<sup>60</sup> and a capstone project.

---

<sup>58</sup> Butin and Seider (2012: 6).

<sup>59</sup> RPI (2015).

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

Students and advisors use an online portfolio to document accomplishments and track progress toward completion.

Occidental College's Partnership for Community Engagement—a joint project of the Center for Community Based Learning, the Office of Community Engagement, and the Urban & Environmental Policy Institute—is developing a "Civic and Community Engagement" certificate program. During the first year of this two-year project, the Partnership convened advisory groups of faculty, community partners, and students. It rolled out certificate models early in the second year.

Wagner College had a certificate program at the start of the initiative. However, as part of its action plan and mini-grant, it worked on the establishment of a minor. The Wagner Civic Engagement Certificate never caught on with students due to scheduling conflicts and students' perception that it lacked "long-term value." As opposed to the certificate, the minor is listed on a student's transcript giving it "value" on the job market. The Director of the Civic Engagement Minor at Wagner noted that the minor "gives students the opportunity to take classes across disciplines and departments while developing a breadth of knowledge from various but related fields."<sup>61</sup> Key components of the certificate were incorporated into the minor including a leadership course and a lab requirement. "This new minor includes six courses—which are spread across disciplines—and two labs which require students to intern/volunteer with local organizations for 100 hours (for each lab) in addition to participation in a number of selected campus events."<sup>62</sup> The minor was approved by the faculty in April 2016.

Establishing a certificate program is a more complex and involved undertaking than establishing a pathway. Certificates inhabit a middle ground between pathways and minors/requirements. Before launching a certificate program, faculty and staff need to agree on and codify criteria for earning the certificate. In most cases, the proposed certificate program needs to be approved by the appropriate committees on campus. And the courses or activities that will lead to the awarding of the certificate need to be in place and available to students. The successful implementation of a certificate requires a great deal of work both administratively and programmatically. The additional administrative layer makes the creation of a certificate a more involved and lengthy process.

#### **Takeaways:**

- **Certificates are common on some campuses and offer a format that is familiar to faculty and students alike.**
- **Certificates are one way to organize CESR offerings to make them more accessible to students.**

---

<sup>61</sup> Wagner College, personal communication with the authors (December 2016).

<sup>62</sup> Wagner College (2015).

- **Before attempting to design a new certificate program, serious consideration should be given to the amount of time that will be required to satisfy the administrative requirements of the particular institution. This may vary significantly from college to college.**

#### E. Approach Five: Entrepreneurial/Open Choice Model

On many campuses, there are a large number of CESR courses that are offered as part of the overall curriculum without a specialized program. By generating a large number of courses, the colleges and universities manage to reach a greater percentage of their students. On some campuses, individual faculty members or groups of faculty members in particular departments have been the main impetus behind the development of CESR courses. In other instances, there is strong support for the development of CESR courses either from a civic engagement center or from the administration. This model enables faculty to develop projects and programs that meet their needs and to respond to the interests of students and community groups.

There was a definite trend towards greater institutionalization among many of the campuses participating in *Creating Cohesive Paths*. While the initiative was designed to foster greater institutionalization and was successful in doing so, this trend appears to have started prior to the initiative. Especially on campuses without formalized programs or approaches, faculty and staff were coming to the realization that there were limits to what individual professors working with community partners could accomplish. Part of this is an issue of scalability. As demand grows for CESR opportunities, it becomes increasingly difficult for individual faculty members to address without some coordination on the part of the college or university.

At the time of the mapping survey, Allegheny College self-identified as a campus with an entrepreneurial model through which individual professors developed CESR courses largely independently of their colleagues.<sup>63</sup> Allegheny faculty members are clearly committed to CESR. They have developed over 40 community-based learning (CBL) courses, and approximately 37% of the 2013 graduating class took at least one CBL course prior to graduation. In order to create greater cohesion and organization among its CESR courses, the college created the Allegheny Gateway to “integrate curricular and co-curricular initiatives in the areas of global learning, civic engagement, and diversity.” Coordination through the Gateway is expected to lead to greater sustainability of courses and projects. This represents a significant push by the college to both coordinate and institutionalize CESR programming.

During the survey period at Goucher College, four sections of its required first-year seminars (Frontier Course) had a CBL component with others incorporating CESR elements with a focus on contemporary issues of social concern. This combines the high-impact practices of the first-year seminar with CBL and has the advantage of introducing CESR during the first year of college.<sup>64</sup> This first-year experience is reinforced in a campus environment where “global

---

<sup>63</sup> As noted earlier, Allegheny also instituted a civic learning requirement during the course of this project.

<sup>64</sup> Kuh (2008).

citizenship” is one of the general education goals and students are required to have a study abroad experience.

New England College is in the process of introducing an emphasis on civic engagement and the natural environment throughout its entire curriculum. New England is coupling this with a series of engaged pedagogical principles and practices that stress engagement with the real world, problem-based learning, and community-based learning. This broad commitment should result in the spread of CESR courses throughout the curriculum.

At Bates College, faculty in collaboration with the Harvard Center for Community Partnerships developed over 50 CBL courses for a total of over 75 CESR courses. These CESR courses are offered across 23 different departments. Each year, approximately 65% of Bates students take a CESR course, many of these with a CBL component. The Harvard Center itself offers several different student fellowships designed to develop students’ “knowledge of community-engaged research theory and practice while moving their community-engaged research projects forward.”<sup>65</sup>

The Bates example demonstrates that it is possible to have successful CESR programming without a pathway or specific requirement. Bates has created a culture of engagement. It should be noted that the Harvard Center is very active on campus and in the community. The center represents a clear commitment to and institutionalization of CESR. In many ways, the presence or absence of a strong civic engagement center represents a distinct variable outside of the five ideal types presented in this white paper.

#### **Takeaways:**

- **In an effort to institutionalize CESR programs, colleges and universities are shifting away from the Entrepreneurial/Open Choice model.**
- **The Entrepreneurial/Open Choice model may work well on a small scale. Without a coordinating structure, this approach is hard to scale.**
- **Strong civic engagement centers are a key component for campuses with Entrepreneurial/Open Choice approaches. These centers often play important coordinating functions.**

#### **IV. Survey Design and Goals**

When Project Pericles launched the *Creating Cohesive Paths* initiative, we were aware that other instruments for assessing the institutionalization of civic engagement existed in the field. In this particular case, we sought to support a process on each campus of building institutional commitment for gathering data by promoting the use of a team to lead the effort. Project Pericles staff and our consultant, Barbara Holland, developed the questionnaire and survey matrix that were used for data collection. While developing the material, we worked closely with a group of

---

<sup>65</sup> Bates College (2013).

program directors from participating campuses. The final version of the questionnaire reflected their considerable input, demonstrating the relational emphasis at every stage of the process.

One goal in designing the survey was to gather as much information as possible about the organization of civic engagement and social responsibility courses and programs from the participating colleges and universities. A second goal was that the process of data gathering itself would facilitate reflection and discussion on the state of civic engagement and social responsibility education and would lead to the discovery of best practices that could be shared with others, as well as new opportunities to strengthen the coherence and logic of courses and programs. A third goal in designing the survey was that participation would help prepare campuses to apply for Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification—a process that many campuses, in fact, successfully completed. Berea College and Elon University, as well as other colleges, mentioned that the processes complemented each other and that conducting the mapping helped when completing the Carnegie application and President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll.

The survey is divided into two parts. The first part consists of 17 questions about the scope and organization of CESR activities (see below for more details on how CESR is conceived by Project Pericles). The second part is a matrix in which campuses listed information about all CESR courses and co-curricular activities they offer. In the first section, the questionnaire poses a broad range of questions designed to generate a robust description of the organization and administration of CESR programs. Questions asked for reflection on evidence of institutional commitment to CESR, the organization of specific units responsible for managing and tracking CESR programming, and policies regarding tenure and promotion.

In question number two, the survey asks respondents to:

“Please describe any organizational units (offices, centers, etc.) that have responsibilities associated with the leadership, coordination, support, or management of curricular and co-curricular strategies related to the achievement of CESR learning and development outcomes.

For each unit, please describe:

- a. Number of staff
- b. The scope of work in regard to CESR activities
- c. The title of the unit leader
- d. The organizational role to which this unit reports
- e. Does the Project Pericles Program Director on your campus have a role in any part of this infrastructure? If so, please describe. Please list the various roles of the Project Pericles Program Director on your campus.”

The campuses detailed responses to these types of questions gave both the campus and Project Pericles a very good sense of how CESR was administered and organized on particular campuses. The survey went on to ask questions about the role of advising, specific learning outcomes and goals utilized, and the nature of any organized CESR programs such as certificates or minors. Summative indicators about student participation were also included. The first section concluded with open ended questions designed to elicit further reflection. Question 12 asks, “If relevant at your institution, please provide a few examples of the ways in which professors involve students in research and/or undergraduate research that may relate to CESR.” And continues by asking respondents to reflect on their most promising curricular and co-curricular practices for CESR.

The survey matrix asks for information about all regularly offered courses with a CESR component, as well as all CESR co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. In addition to the name of the course, respondents were asked to identify if it was required, the instructor, the primary year of enrolled students, the frequency with which the course was offered, and whether or not there was a community-based learning component. In addition, they were asked to provide any available information about CESR learning outcomes associated with the course.

The survey for *Creating Cohesive Paths* asked teams on each campus to consider as CESR any courses incorporating a combination of specific learning outcomes and teaching strategies associated with civic engagement (see below). Both the learning outcomes and teaching strategies are detailed in the Project Pericles white paper *Civic Engagement in the Classroom: Strategies for Incorporating Education for Civic and Social Responsibility in the Undergraduate Curriculum* and come from an analysis of our Civic Engagement Course (CEC) Program.<sup>66</sup> We worked from an inclusive conceptualization of CESR. As a result, courses did not need to have a community-based learning component to be considered CESR courses.

Common CESR learning outcomes:

1. “Ability to recognize and view issues of social concern from multiple perspectives and to formulate and express an informed opinion on these issues.
2. Ability to relate academic materials to their practical applications regarding issues of social concern.
3. Motivation and capacity to utilize these abilities to take action in the community.”<sup>67</sup>

Five teaching strategies used to deepen civic engagement learning:

1. “Develop novel approaches to research papers and projects that enable students to relate their coursework to real world problems and increase student accountability.

---

<sup>66</sup> Liazos and Liss (2009).

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.: 6-8.

2. Use exercises that enable students to empathize with individuals working for social and political change.
3. Provide opportunities for private and public reflection that connect coursework with civic engagement experiences.
4. Design collaborative and student-led projects that help students learn to work with diverse individuals and groups.
5. Expose students to differing opinions and approaches to help them view issues from multiple perspectives and relate coursework to multiple contexts.”<sup>68</sup>

Campuses were also encouraged to add their own learning outcomes or goals to the three suggested by Project Pericles. As always in this kind of large endeavor, there was variety in the courses that campuses chose to include, with some campuses emphasizing applied or community-based learning courses and others including a broader range of courses.

#### A. Survey Teams and the Value of Mapping

Building institutional support for large campus-wide projects like *Creating Cohesive Paths* is important for success. In this case, it was also critical because one of the goals was to use the survey data to enhance existing programs or develop new approaches. Project Pericles’ structure and approach to member colleges and universities aided this process because it is designed to build support with multiple constituencies within the institutions.

Project Pericles has a unique structure, in that it works with presidents, provosts, deans, Project Pericles Program Directors, faculty, staff, students, community members, and alumni. In short, Project Pericles engages all constituencies that can impact civic engagement in the classroom, on the campus, and in the community. With these preexisting relationships, Project Pericles is in a strong position to seek buy-in for campus-wide programs such as *Creating Cohesive Paths*. Before we submitted a proposal to The Teagle Foundation, we consulted our presidents, provosts, and Project Pericles Program Directors. At the start of the process, we actively engaged these constituencies to help shape the project and to build buy-in on the participating campuses. Our presidents and program directors provided feedback on the draft proposal during their annual meetings in 2012.

In August and September of 2013, each campus formed a team and identified where and how it would focus its information gathering to best meet the needs of the overarching initiative within the context and experience of its individual campus. The process of building institutional support for this project significantly helped the campus-based teams that needed to gather comprehensive data. Because the mapping was part of a more extensive project with action plans and mini-grants, teams knew that their mapping efforts were part of a larger endeavor seeking to improve campus practices and programs.

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.: 9-20.

As has been noted in the field, one of the largest challenges in assessment is obtaining data that is meaningful and useful. Through the process, some campuses realized the need to develop more comprehensive data and information tracking systems.<sup>69</sup> Project Pericles assisted the teams in their data gathering by informing institutional leaders including the presidents, deans, and provosts about the project. This laid the groundwork for institutional support as team members sought to track down available information. Project Pericles and Dr. Holland brainstormed with the campus-based teams about different ways to gather the information. The ability to talk through the mapping process with others proved useful.

The composition of teams varied from campus to campus, often included were provosts, deans, registrars, department chairs, directors of institutional research, Project Pericles Program Directors, faculty, staff, and students. For example, Bates College had a core team of three people from its Harvard Center for Community Partnerships: Director, Assistant Director, and an AmeriCorps VISTA representative. An additional 34 people participated in the data collection process. The group included deans, other senior staff, athletic coaches, faculty members, and students from a variety of groups. This was one of the largest teams, but it gives some idea of the seriousness with which campuses approached the project. This is one area in which gaining buy-in before we launched the project paid significant dividends. Project Pericles staff and Holland were also available for consultations during the survey process and campuses availed themselves of these opportunities.

Campuses took different routes to collecting the requested material, especially on courses and co-curricular activities with a CESR component. Collecting data on all CESR courses proved time consuming and labor intensive. Generally, campuses took one of two approaches. Either members of the survey team reviewed the course catalogue and syllabi on their own to determine if there were CESR components in particular courses, or they requested this information from department chairs or individual professors. In some instances, the process was simpler because the college had already developed a CESR designation that the registrar used to identify these courses. In all cases, the decision about what counted as a CESR course was ultimately made by the survey team members on each campus. Project Pericles provided guidelines, as described above, but decisions about what was in or out were made at the campus level.

Member campuses responded to the project with a great deal of enthusiasm. Judging by reports from the campuses, the data gathering process generated significant discussion and reflection. At Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI), it provided a significant boost to plans to create a CESR certificate program. On other campuses, it generated serendipitous discussions about civic engagement between faculty and staff from different departments and divisions. Finally, on campuses with civic engagement centers, it raised awareness of the difference between efforts

---

<sup>69</sup> This issue is directly addressed in the Carnegie Classification application where campuses are asked to share whether they have processes that enable them to track information.

being led under the centers' purview versus those that were overseen by a separate entity or by individual faculty members. Many of these discussions are ongoing.

The survey process was time consuming, but ultimately proved extremely useful and productive. Many campus survey teams reported back that they were surprised by the extent of activities on their campus. In some cases, they uncovered courses, professors, and divisions undertaking civic engagement work of which they had not previously been aware. In other cases, the process helped the team connect with other offices on campus already involved in CESR work.

Undertaking an inventory was an empowering process for the faculty and staff involved. This cannot be emphasized enough. "We were so much better than we thought we were," wrote New England College, "It [mapping] helped get rid of silos [between departments] ... and made big strides in town/gown relations.... Our center is a generator and connector."<sup>70</sup> Campus after campus reported to us how helpful the process was for advancing civic engagement at their college or university. The process helped spark collaborations between different groups involved and also raised the visibility and importance of civic engagement on campus.

With the information they gathered and the time they spent reflecting on it, members of the survey teams were in a better position to engage in campus conversations about the role of civic engagement across the undergraduate experience. They were better prepared to discuss civic engagement during strategic planning, reviews of degree requirements, and discussions about learning goals and outcomes. As hoped/planned, the process did, in fact, help prepare campuses to apply for Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification and for the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll.

Colleges and universities that are committed to improving their approaches to CESR should strongly consider undertaking such a survey. Most campuses can conduct a self-survey of civic engagement programming themselves. Project Pericles, with Teagle Foundation support, provided campuses with a small stipend of \$1,800 to participate. While the support of a prestigious foundation like Teagle or a consortium like Project Pericles is helpful in gaining buy-in, campuses can certainly undertake successful surveys on their own.

A survey or mapping exercise is one way to raise the profile of civic engagement among faculty and staff, and it puts supporters of civic engagement in a stronger position to advocate for increased resources and attention. Campuses also increase their intentionality through the survey process. Thinking through how civic engagement programs are currently organized leads to discussions about potential structural improvements, further integration into the curriculum, and greater coherence.

---

<sup>70</sup> New England College (2015).

### Takeaways:

- **Conducting a survey of all activities, courses, and programs incorporating civic engagement and social responsibility (CESR) can serve as a catalyst for discussions among key constituencies. Engaging multiple constituencies is one way to start important conversations about how the college or university’s approach to CESR can be enhanced. This is an inexpensive approach with potentially high impact.**
- **A team approach is preferable. Teams may include faculty, administrators, staff, students, and community members. This is an opportunity to involve people, such as department chairs and staff from the office of institutional research, and a way to further discussions.**
- **Having the information from an inventory puts advocates of civic engagement in a stronger position when important conversations about strategic planning, the curriculum, assessment, or many other discussions arise on campus.**

### V. Convening, Catalyst for Change, and Work on Campuses

In July 2014, after all of the survey material had been submitted, delegates representing Periclean colleges and universities convened at The Pocantico Center to review and discuss findings from the *Creating Cohesive Paths* survey and to develop action plans to move civic engagement work forward on their campuses. The convening provided an opportunity to discuss the different possible approaches to organizing civic engagement programs on campus that were highlighted by the survey. “The convening helped us see where different Periclean institutions were [with regard to the organization of civic engagement].”<sup>71</sup> The New School commented that “the convening really helped us so that we did not have to reinvent the wheel.”<sup>72</sup>

Twenty-five Periclean institutions sent a delegate (provost, Periclean Faculty Leader, or program director) and they were joined by Loni Bordoloi Pazich of The Teagle Foundation, Barbara Holland (an expert on leading change in higher education and our consultant), Lauren McGrail of the Eugene M. Lang Foundation, our Board Chair Neil Grabois, and Project Pericles staff.

Prior to the convening, and building on the spirit of collaboration and relationship building, delegates from different campuses were paired as a way to foster in-depth conversation and preparation. Participants reviewed the inventory/mapping work from their partner’s institution and offered feedback to one another as a way to see how their efforts compared to one another. Delegates then spent three days at The Pocantico Center discussing approaches to CESR and brainstorming about ways to improve CESR work, including enhancing the organization and integration of civic engagement and social responsibility programs, addressing gaps, ensuring clear learning outcomes, creating effective pathways, and promoting greater awareness and participation among all students. Participants remarked on how helpful and productive they

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> The New School (2015).

found this model of partnering with like-minded institutions both to prepare for the convening and to expose their own team to other ideas and possibilities.

The mapping/inventory process served as a catalyst for deep inter- and intra-campus discussions and for significant improvements in the organization of civic engagement curricula. The July 2014 convening built on conversations generated by the survey process. The opportunity to spend three days entirely focused on the organization and integration of CESR with like-minded colleagues was tremendously valuable. It sparked a wide range of initiatives designed to expand CESR on participating campuses.

While this work addresses curricula, it goes well beyond that. It triggered a thorough examination of the way CESR courses and co-curricular activities are administered and integrated across the curriculum and campus, and positioned on the campus conceptually and in terms of the physical location of units administering CESR programs. Campuses have also been encouraged to look at how students initially become aware of and interested in courses incorporating CESR and how students understand their participation in these courses. This has been a truly collaborative learning process among all of the participating campuses.

The Project Pericles Program Director from Dillard University remarked that both the mapping and the convening played a significant role in its organization of civic engagement. It helped us “see what we were doing and what we were not doing but needed to do.”<sup>73</sup> Dillard’s participation influenced the organization of its new Center for Law & Public Interest, which serves as a one-stop place for social justice work and connects with every discipline.

After campuses completed surveys, met, and talked with each other at the convening, they developed action plans to implement changes. The action plans covered a range of topics and organizational structures, including but not limited to certificate programs, thematically organized pathways, faculty development work, and enhanced assessment and tracking. The action plans shared the goal of making CESR more visible to a greater number of students in all disciplines.

This follow-up work after the initial survey is what makes *Creating Cohesive Paths* such a unique and important model to consider for improving civic engagement practices in the field. While more and more campuses are conducting some assessment of their programs, finding the time and focus to implement needed changes based upon the findings can be challenging without additional resources.

Campuses further developed the themes from their action plans in mini-grant applications submitted in fall 2014. Project Pericles awarded 15 mini-grants to 16 Periclean colleges and universities, including a joint project between Carleton College and Goucher College. Awards

---

<sup>73</sup> Dillard University (2015).

ranged from \$3,000 to \$7,000 and were for a period of one year. These projects can be roughly grouped into four areas: develop, promote, and assess thematic pathways approaches; create civic engagement certificate programs; offer faculty and course development workshops; and support student reflection.

The mini-grant process helped individual campuses identify their priorities and the most compelling approaches and strategies. They also provided Project Pericles with information about how campuses can learn from each other. At the convening, campuses exchanged approaches and models. Participants returned to their own campuses and sought to implement programs based on what they had learned. In this way, the mini-grants provided a way for campuses to utilize knowledge and insights generated from their own mapping process and from discussions with colleagues from other campuses to promote institutional change.

## **VI. General Observations: Common Approaches and Strategies**

The previous sections described five different approaches to the overall organization of CESR programs. The section that follows provides insights that pertain to programs in general and ideas that emerged as the mapping efforts from all the campuses were considered.

### A. Movement Toward Greater Coherence

Many of the institutions that we initially labeled as entrepreneurial/open choice, as well as other institutions, are moving to more structured models that allow them to provide a set of choices for students. Campus leaders are seeking future directions with an emphasis on institutionalization.

The pathways approach was particularly popular both among campuses in the entrepreneurial/open choice category as well as among campuses that already had established programs. Berea College reported moving from open choice to pathways. Chatham University and The College of Wooster also fit in this category. Drew University, as discussed previously, elected to add pathways in addition to its already existing civic scholars program.

Seeing the need to institutionalize civic engagement, Allegheny made a number of changes in order to better address its “goal of equipping students with the knowledge, competencies, and practical skills to think and act as citizens of a diverse, complex, and interconnected world.”<sup>74</sup> At the same time, it also sought to address an “individualized and episodic approach to faculty CESR work at Allegheny.” In addition to a new general education requirement in civic learning, it also created a center, the Allegheny Gateway. The center “integrates curricular and co-curricular initiatives in the areas of global learning, civic engagement, and diversity.”<sup>75</sup> It brings together offices of Pre-Professional Advising; Career Education; Community Service and Service-Learning; International Education; Center for Intercultural Awareness and Student Success (CIASS); Center for Political Participation (CPP); Office of Undergraduate Research,

---

<sup>74</sup> Allegheny College (2013).

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

Scholarship, and Creative Activities (URSCA); and an Office of Nationally Competitive Fellowships under one roof to facilitate collaboration.

In addition, Allegheny developed a series of initiatives to assist faculty in incorporating CESR into their courses. Allegheny launched “the Gateway Network for Local Knowledge and Research (NLKR) which helps to connect community needs and interests with faculty, students, and staff at Allegheny interested in community-based research and projects.”<sup>76</sup> It provided professorships with course release time for developing new engaged courses, created a program for Teaching Assistants with expertise in civic engagement pedagogy, and worked with departments “in a pilot initiative to more closely link their courses and curriculum to Gateway initiatives.”<sup>77</sup>

One key component to institutionalization is having committees and systems in place that stretch beyond the individual. Over the course of the project, a number of colleges and universities determined that they wanted to have better coordination and supervision of CESR programming. As part of its action plan and mini-grant, Hendrix College created a, “new Council on Civic Engagement (CCE) tasked with better coordinating, tracking, and assessing ongoing CESR initiatives at Hendrix.”<sup>78</sup> This group includes, “all relevant faculty/staff engaged in civic engagement,” and now meets on a regular basis.<sup>79</sup>

### B. Increasing CESR Courses Through Faculty Development

Developing a strong cohort of faculty members who regularly incorporate CESR into their courses is a common strategy for increasing courses and co-curricular activities and the percentage of students exposed to CESR. By creating a strong faculty cohort committed to CESR, Macalester College is able to offer approximately 100 CBL courses per year. Macalester has built this cohort through multiple avenues. The Civic Engagement Center, in collaboration with the American Studies Department, offers regular summer colloquia for faculty on CESR and collaborates with the teaching and learning center on programs during the academic year. The Center also hosts faculty reading groups and provides funding for CESR course activities.

With its 12 rotating Odyssey Professors, Hendrix is developing a cohort of professors who are engaging their students in CESR opportunities. Generating and supporting an active faculty cohort holds out the possibility of diffusing CESR throughout the curriculum in a serious and meaningful way.

While most campuses already have some form of faculty development, which is widely recognized in the field as a good practice, Allegheny College, Bates College, Hampshire College, Pitzer College, Ursinus College, and Widener University incorporated faculty development workshops into their mini-grant projects. Some of the workshops were designed to

---

<sup>76</sup> Allegheny College (2015).

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Hendrix College (2015).

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

interest faculty in incorporating community-based learning into their courses. Other workshops were designed to help develop courses for specific programs. At Pitzer, workshops were used to assist faculty in teaching courses as part of the college's new requirement. In so doing, these campuses took advantage of an insight revealed by Berger and Liss, who found that to sustain and strengthen this work, it is critical for faculty to be involved with communities of fellow scholars.<sup>80</sup> Another challenge that this raises is the question of promotion and tenure and how to recognize the faculty who are developing and running CESR courses and projects.<sup>81</sup>

### C. Role of the Civic Engagement Center

The role of civic engagement centers in relationship to curricular pathways and other approaches to CESR is varied. Program sustainability requires support and coordination of activities and services. Different campuses have centers that report to different deans, although it appears that increasingly centers are reporting to the academic line, which can help with integration of civic engagement into the academic life of the campus.

For many institutions, their civic engagement center plays a central role in coordinating the CESR curriculum on campus. This includes making students aware of the opportunities, reviewing courses for inclusion in a CESR designation, working with professors to encourage the inclusion of CESR components in classes, providing faculty development opportunities, managing the logistics of community engagement, and developing and maintaining ties with community partners.

Several campuses have developed systems for tracking student participation in CESR courses, co-curricular activities, or service opportunities. Tracking of CESR courses is usually done through the registrar in conjunction with the civic engagement center. A number of campuses also track co-curricular participation. Chatham University has developed a co-curricular transcript that records a range of activities and awards including participation in civic engagement and community service. Students can utilize the transcript to supplement resumes or applications to graduate school. Dillard University also tracks CESR activities, including hours of participation, which are then listed on student transcripts. Bethune-Cookman University and a number of other campuses report plans to implement systems to track CESR participation.

Carleton devoted its mini-grant to figuring out how to comprehensively track assessment on campus in both a curricular and co-curricular form and to seek to assess student development with regard to student learning outcomes. This project emerged from the mapping and responded to the need to develop an action plan that could be worked on productively as a next step in utilizing insights gained from the mapping. It also corresponded to an area that is specifically addressed in the Carnegie Classification Process, demonstrating how work done for different larger collectives can inform each other and move the overall work of the campus forward in meaningful ways. It is in this way that the collaboration of Barbara Holland with the Project

---

<sup>80</sup> Berger and Liss (2012).

<sup>81</sup> For more on these questions see *Imagining America's* white paper by Ellison and Eatman (2008).

Pericles mapping exercise was particularly helpful. Developing this kind of tracking system is labor intensive, but in the case of Carleton it enabled them to provide direct feedback to faculty with regard to their CESR courses and student learning.

#### D. Fellowships

Through their civic engagement centers or centers for community partnerships, the participating campuses offer a wide array of fellowships and other opportunities to promote and facilitate student engagement. Bates College, Berea College, Goucher College, The New School, Occidental College, Pace University, Swarthmore College, and The College of Wooster are just some of the campuses offering student fellowships. These opportunities all take different forms but can be loosely grouped into four general categories: 1) students who receive support or employment to help with civic engagement on a campus; 2) students who receive funds for their own self-designed projects; 3) fellows who facilitate student projects developed in collaboration with community partners; and 4) students who receive specialized training and then assist faculty with their CBL courses or run service programs.

The Education in Action Program at Occidental hires and trains students to help facilitate community-based learning courses or community-based research. Student facilitators work with faculty, students in the courses, and the community partner. They assist with the development of courses, lead trainings or workshops to prepare their fellow students for work with community partners, and provide faculty with feedback on the student perspective. At Goucher, the 19 Student Leaders for Civic Action “receive specialized and ongoing training in group facilitation, community-based best practices, reflection, peer mentoring, and civic professionalism.”<sup>82</sup> These students are then responsible for managing the students participating in Goucher’s eight community partnerships. Pace’s Faculty Assistants for Civic Engagement (FACES) program, “recruits and trains students to assist faculty in the implementation of the community engagement component of their Civic Engagement and Public Values (CE) course.”<sup>83</sup> Each year, up to 20 students receive FACES stipends. “They track service hours, supervise service placements, assist in the selection of community partners, and serve as community partner liaisons.”<sup>84</sup> Subsequent to the mapping, Pace has created a Student Faculty Research Assistants program that funds students to assist faculty conducting “research related to civic engagement and CE courses.”<sup>85</sup>

Berea College’s Center for Excellence in Learning Through Service (CELTS) is one of the largest student coordinated programs. CELTS coordinates student-led community service and academic service-learning. Its “mission is to educate students for leadership in service and social

---

<sup>82</sup> Goucher College (2013).

<sup>83</sup> Pace, personal communication with the authors (December 2016).

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

justice...,” and more than 60 students help manage the program and work with local community partners.<sup>86</sup>

In addition to these programs that train students to help coordinate community service and community-based learning, other campuses offer fellowships to enable students to undertake service projects, frequently in lieu of summer employment. Bates offers a wide range of fellowships that provide support and training for undertaking community-based projects. In some instances, fellows develop their own project or volunteer with community partners either during the school year or over the summer. In other instances, students undertake fellowships designed to promote leadership skills while also supporting their student peers’ community-engaged work.

Through the Eugene M. Lang Opportunity Scholarship Program, Swarthmore offers six sophomores the opportunity to develop and implement a project that “creates a needed social resource and/or effects a significant social change or improved condition of a community in the United States or abroad.”<sup>87</sup> The college also provides fellowships for students to work with local community groups.

In 2013, through its Advising, Planning, Experiential Learning Center (APEX), Wooster started offering APEX fellowships that provide students with support to undertake summer internships or vocational programs of six weeks or more. Fellowships include “student funding, a learning contract, regular structured reflection, a final reflective assignment and evaluation, on-campus reporting, and ongoing staff support.”<sup>88</sup> Approximately 40% of the 37 APEX fellowship projects have a CESR component.

In 2013, Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts initiated a Civic Engagement & Social Justice Summer Fellowship Program. Student fellows receive a \$5,000 stipend and intern for 10 weeks with community partner organizations. In addition, fellows participate in a living-learning community that includes a weekly seminar to connect academic readings to their experiences working with community partners.

#### E. Commitments to the Community

While much of this white paper has emphasized campus mapping and transformation, community partnerships play a critical and essential role in CESR. One way to enhance campus/community collaborations is through long-term place-based efforts with multiple partners. This is a growing trend in the field of civic engagement and higher education. Many of our campuses are putting their commitment to engagement into action with extensive partnerships with the local community. Wagner College formed the Port Richmond Partnership to address needs in this economically-distressed, neighboring community. The Partnership focuses on “collaborative programs that contribute to school improvement, economic growth,

---

<sup>86</sup> Berea College (2013).

<sup>87</sup> Swarthmore College (2013).

<sup>88</sup> The College of Wooster (2013).

health care enhancement, and immigration reform.”<sup>89</sup> More than 20 community groups are participating in the Partnership that serves to shape and focus Wagner’s community engagement programs.

Widener University has a similarly deep engagement with its community of Chester, Pennsylvania. In 2006, Widener created the first university-sponsored charter school in the state. Originally designed as a K-5 school, it has since expanded to K-8. In addition to bringing needed educational opportunities to the community, the project provides multiple opportunities for Widener students to engage through curricular and service opportunities. Widener has a similarly robust initiative focused on health care.

## **VII. Conclusion**

While supporting faculty leadership and curriculum development, the ultimate goal of *Creating Cohesive Paths* is to promote an intentional approach to CESR that prioritizes coherent program design with sequential learning goals and the widespread integration of CESR programming throughout the undergraduate experience. Promoting this type of curricular reform and change is a multi-year process. Through *Creating Cohesive Paths*, Periclean campuses began important conversations about how to best integrate CESR opportunities into the curriculum and started initiatives to institutionalize this work.

The entire mapping process, as well as the action plans and mini-grants, enabled our campuses to build upon and refine their approaches to civic engagement. The mapping/survey work identified five approaches: requirements, civic scholars program, pathways approach, certificates, and entrepreneurial/open choice model. This conceptual model allowed campuses to locate their own approach within a constellation of approaches. For those in the entrepreneurial/open choice category, it has provided them with several more structured ways of incorporating CESR. Many campuses are exploring requirements, pathways, and certificates. For campuses that already utilized one of the more structured approaches, this has been an opportunity to further refine their programs, sometimes in conversation with other campuses, or to add additional components. The discussions and mini-grants enabled participating campuses to take a next step to implementing lessons learned and continuing to build relationships, a practice necessarily at the core of all civic engagement efforts.

When evaluating which CESR approaches to adopt, serious consideration should be given to institutional context and what may be possible at any given time in that context. It is worth keeping in mind that these approaches can be mutually supportive. Pursuing one approach does not preclude a second approach or connecting efforts across approaches as many campuses did through their action plans and mini-grant projects.

Thought should also be given to the number of students that can be reached utilizing any one approach. Much like the general trend towards institutionalization in the field, we have argued that civic engagement and social responsibility are so important that all undergraduates should

---

<sup>89</sup> Wagner College (2015).

have some exposure to them. With this in mind, preference should be given to approaches that have the potential to reach the largest number of students. Project Pericles promoted efforts to think comprehensively about the work of civic engagement on campus, how it can be structured to be accessible, and how to achieve participation by the majority of students.

Undertaking an inventory has been an empowering process for the faculty and staff involved. Campus after campus reported to us how helpful the process was for advancing civic engagement at their college or university. A survey or mapping exercise is an important first step in developing more coherent and integrated approaches to civic engagement and social responsibility. While it is only an initial step, there is a lot to be gained by carrying out the exercise. First, it allows multiple stakeholders to learn what is already available on a campus and in the community. Sometimes campuses are pleasantly surprised by all the existing courses and opportunities that they uncover. Making these opportunities visible to faculty members and students may expand the circle of those participating in CESR.

Second, conducting an inventory may promote collaborations between faculty and staff who have not previously worked together. It is an opportunity to exchange information and ideas with others on campus from different departments and units. It may also raise interest among faculty members who do not think of themselves as incorporating CESR into their work, but may be interested in doing so. In other words, it may serve to raise awareness about CESR on campus and in the community.

Finally, it will provide the survey team with time to contemplate how CESR is organized on their campus, discuss particular strengths, and get a better sense of where gaps exist. This is a necessary first step in thinking through how CESR may be more coherently organized and integrated throughout the curriculum. It also prepares team members to participate actively when strategic planning processes and other review processes occur on campus.

As an initiative, *Creating Cohesive Paths* stands out for its recognition of the importance of relationship building and the opportunities that it gave campuses to move beyond mapping to implement significant changes based on insights gained from the mapping process and from conversations with others campuses. Almost all mini-grant projects made use of ideas discussed at the convening at The Pocantico Center. By creating opportunities to discuss lessons learned from the mapping and then by using the findings to develop next steps, the Project Pericles effort implements what is generally recommended in the field, namely that assessment not be just for assessment's sake but in fact be used for and lead to programmatic changes.

Thanks to the generous support of The Teagle Foundation, the participating institutions, as well as additional colleges and universities, convened at the conclusion of the grant period in January 2016 at the Council of Independent Colleges in Washington, DC.<sup>90</sup> It is difficult to adequately

---

<sup>90</sup> Two Periclean campuses that were not part of the initial initiative, Morehouse College and Spelman College, participated in the convening. In addition, The Evergreen State College and Skidmore College participated. These two colleges joined Project Pericles as part of an expansion plan that was included in *Creating Cohesive Paths*. Later in 2016, Reed College and Whitman College joined Project Pericles under this plan.

capture the level of enthusiasm in the room. We had a full day of engaging conversation with delegates reflecting on their progress over the last three years, sharing what they have learned, and brainstorming about how to further this work. We met with the dual purpose of wrapping-up activities from the 2013-2016 grant period while also listening as we refine next steps for *Creating Cohesive Paths*. Much of the conversation focused on next steps and how we can leverage the expertise on Periclean campuses to advance civic engagement work among consortium members and in higher education more generally. Participants expressed interest in forming working groups focusing on substantive topics such as food security, local refugee populations, and sustainability. There was also interest in working on best practices for collaborating with community partners; certificate programs, civic scholars programs, pathways models, and requirements; tenure and promotion; and student reflection. We also discussed innovative technological strategies in development on Periclean campuses for advising students and for tracking their participation. As a first step, participants decided to develop a handbook of best practices for conducting CESR work. Campuses are eagerly contributing multiple selections for the handbook that will be available in 2017.

Looking to the future, we would like to build on the most promising approaches outlined during the mapping—requirements, pathways, and certificate programs—and to work with colleges to implement these programs in a very deliberate manner. We are particularly interested in programs that have broad appeal and that reach the majority of students. We envision working to strengthen existing programs, where campuses have already implemented one of these approaches and may need to refine or expand their approach. We also want to work with campuses who are adopting new approaches. Finally, we want to continue to increase awareness among students of CESR opportunities by working with advisors and professors, as well as with evolving technologies, so that we reach a broad range of students.

Mapping is a powerful catalyst for institutionalizing civic engagement on campus. Our experience has shown that the mapping process can be undertaken with limited resources by most campuses. With the information they can gain through mapping and the five approaches to CESR outlined in this white paper, campuses should be able to take critical steps toward formalizing and institutionalizing their approaches to civic engagement. Giving serious consideration to how CESR is organized on campus, is an important step in moving towards a more coherent, intentional, and more rigorous approach to CESR.

Over the coming years, we look forward to working with Pericleans and other campuses to strengthen their curricular programming that incorporates CESR and develop new approaches. As a consortium dedicated to incorporating CESR across the curriculum and undergraduate experience, our colleges and universities are ideally placed for meaningful collaboration. We anticipate building on the knowledge gained from *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement* and sharing our insights with others in higher education.

## **Bibliography**

Allegheny College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.

Bass, Randy. 2012. "The Problem of Learning in Higher Education," in *Educause Review* (page 32). Volume 47, Number 2, March/April.

Bates College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.

Berea College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.

Berger, Ben and Jan R. Liss. 2012. *The Periclean Diamond: Linking College Classrooms, Campuses, Communities, and Colleagues via Social and Civic High Engagement Learning*. Project Pericles White Paper.

Bethune-Cookman University. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.

Boyte, H. and E. Hollander. 1999. *Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for Community Service Learning.

Brancato, V.C. 2003. "Professional Development in Higher Education." In *New Perspectives on Designing and Implementing Professional Development of Teachers of Adults*. Ed. K.P. King and P.A. Lawler. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Butin, Dan and Scott Seider, Eds. 2012. *The Engaged Campus: Certificates, Minors, and Majors as the New Community Engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cantor, Nancy. 2003. "Transforming America: The University as Public Good." *Imagining America Foreseeable Futures* #3.

Cantor, Nancy, and Steven D. Lavine. 2006. "Taking Public Scholarship Seriously." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Volume LII, no. 40.

Carleton College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.

Chatham University. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.

- Cress, Christine, Peter Collier, Vicki Reitenauer and Associates. 2013. *Learning Through Serving: A Student Guidebook for Service Learning and Civic Engagement Across Academic Disciplines and Cultural Communities*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Dillard University. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- Drew University. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Driscoll, Amy. 2014. "Analysis of the Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement: Patterns and Impact on Institutions," in *New Directions for Institutional Research* #162: 3-15.
- Ehrlich, Thomas. 2000. "Preface." In *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, Ed. Thomas Ehrlich. Phoenix: The American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.
- Ekman, Richard. 2012. "Seizing the Chance to Teach Change: The Newest Challenge to Educating for Civic Responsibility." *University Business: Solutions for Higher Education Management*, <https://www.universitybusiness.com/article/seizing-chance-teach-change>.
- Ellison, Julie, and Timothy K. Eatman. 2008. "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University." *Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life Tenure Team Initiative on Public Scholarship*. [http://imaginingamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/TTI\\_FINAL.pdf](http://imaginingamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/TTI_FINAL.pdf).
- Elon University. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Eyler, Janet S., Dwight E. Giles, Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray. 2001. "At a Glance: What We Know about the Effects of Service-Learning on College Students, Faculty, Institutions and Communities, 1993-2000." (Third Edition). <http://www.compact.org/resources/downloads/aag.pdf>.
- Finley, Ashley. 2011. "Civic Learning and Democratic Engagements: A Review of the Literature on Civic Engagement in Post-Secondary Education." Association of American Colleges & Universities, [http://www.civiclearning.org/SupportDocs/LiteratureReview\\_CivicEngagement\\_Finley\\_July2011.pdf](http://www.civiclearning.org/SupportDocs/LiteratureReview_CivicEngagement_Finley_July2011.pdf).
- Furco, Andrew. 2002. Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education. <http://www.nationalservice.gov/resources/education/self-assessment-rubric-institutionalization-service-learning-higher-education>.

- Furco, Andrew and Barbara Holland. 2009. "Securing Administrator Support for Service-Learning Institutionalization," in *The Future of Service Learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice*. Jean Strait and Marybeth Lima (Eds.). Sterling, VA: Stylus: 52-64.
- Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI). 2008. *Higher Education in the World 3 Higher Education: New Challenges and Emerging Roles for Human and Social Development*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI). 2014. *Higher Education in the World 5 Knowledge, Engagement & Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goucher College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Guarasci, Richard. 2012. "The Crisis in Higher Education: How Civic Engagement Can Save Higher Education (Part I)," *The Huffington Post*, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-guarasci/civic-engagement-programs\\_b\\_1630919.html?icid=hp\\_college\\_featured\\_art](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-guarasci/civic-engagement-programs_b_1630919.html?icid=hp_college_featured_art).
- Hampshire College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Hendrix College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013a. Hendrix College Odyssey Guide 2013-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Holland, Barbara. 1997. "Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors," in the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 4: 30-41.
- . 2009. "Will It Last? Evidence of Institutionalization at Carnegie Classified Community Engagement Institutions," in *New Directions for Higher Education* #147: 85-98.
- . 2014. "Strategies for Understanding the Impact of Civic Learning and Teaching," in *Civic Learning and Teaching*. Ashley Finley (Ed.). Washington DC: Bringing Theory to Practice.
- Hoy, Ariane, Matthew Johnson, and Robert Hackett. 2012. "Disciplining Higher Education for Democratic Community Engagement," in *The Engaged Campus: Certificates, Minors*,

- and Majors as the New Community Engagement*. Dan Butin and Scott Seider (Eds.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 177-186.
- Jacoby, Barbara. 1996. "Securing the Future of Service-Learning in Higher Education," in *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. Barbara Jacoby and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 317-335.
- Jacoby, Barbara and Associates. 1996. *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jacoby, Barbara and Associates. 2003. *Building Partnerships for Service-Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jacoby, Barbara. 2014. *Service-Learning Essentials: Questions, Answers, and Lessons Learned*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, George D. 2008. *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lang, Eugene M. 1999. "Distinctively American: The Liberal Arts College." *Daedalus* 128, no. 1: 133-150.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. "Project Pericles: A Daring Work in Progress." *National Civic Review* 94, no. 2: 10-18.
- Liazos, Ariane and Jan R. Liss. 2009. *Civic Engagement in the Classroom: Strategies for Incorporating Civic and Social Responsibility in the Undergraduate Curriculum*. Project Pericles White Paper.
- Liss, Jan R., and Ariane Liazos. 2010. "Incorporating Education for Civic and Social Responsibility into the Undergraduate Curriculum," *Change* 42, no. 1: 45-50.
- Macalester College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. 2012. *A Crucible Moment: College Learning & Democracy's Future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- New England College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- The New School. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- Occidental College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.

- Pace University. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- Pitzer College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Rhodes College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- Rubin, Sharon. 1996. "Institutionalizing Service-Learning" in *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices*. Barbara Jacoby and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 297-316.
- St. Mary's College of Maryland. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- Saltmarsh, John and Dwight E. Giles, Jr., KerryAnn O'Meara, Lorilee R. Sandmann, Elaine Ward, and Suzanne M. Buglione. 2009. "Community Engagement and Institutional Culture in Higher Education: An Investigation of Faculty Reward Policies at Engaged Universities." In *Creating Our Identities in Service-Learning and Community Engagement*. Ed. Shelley H. Billig, Barbara A. Holland, and Barbara E. Moely. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Saltmarsh, John and Matthew Hartley and Patti H. Clayton. 2009. *Democratic Engagement White Paper*. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Scobey, David. 2011. "Civic Engagement and the Copernican Moment," the plenary address at the Imagining America, reprinted as a position paper *Foreseeable Futures #11, Imagining America*. <http://imaginingamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/FF-11.pdf>.
- Sigmon, Robert. 1999. "Appendix B: An Organizational Journey to Service-Learning," in *Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future*. Stanton, Timothy K., Dwight E. Giles Jr., and Nadinne Cruz. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 249-257.
- Sirianni, Carmen, and Lewis Friedland. 2001. *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stanton, Timothy K., Dwight E. Giles Jr., and Nadinne Cruz. 1999. *Service Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Practice, and Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Strait, Jean and Marybeth Lima, Eds. 2009. *The Future of Service Learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Sturm, Susan and Tim Eatman, John Saltmarsh, and Adam Bush. 2011. *Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Public Engagement in Higher Education* (White Paper). Columbia University Law School: Center for Institutional and Social Change.
- Swarthmore College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Tapia, Maria Nieves. 2012. "Academic Excellence and Community Engagement: Reflections on the Latin American Experience," in *Higher Education and Civic Engagement*, ed. by Lorraine McIlrath, Ann Lyons, and Ronaldo Munck. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- The Teagle Foundation. 2012. "A Larger Vision for Student Learning: Education for Civic and Moral Responsibility." The Teagle Foundation.
- Teagle Working Group on the Teacher-Scholar. 2007. *Student Learning and Faculty Research: Connecting Teaching and Scholarship*. American Council of Learned Societies, [https://www.acls.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Programs/ACLS-Teagle\\_Teacher\\_Scholar\\_White\\_Paper.pdf](https://www.acls.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Programs/ACLS-Teagle_Teacher_Scholar_White_Paper.pdf).
- Ursinus College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Wagner College. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- Widener University. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Report on Mini-Grant Activities. Unpublished Report.
- The College of Wooster. 2013. Report on Mapping Exercise. Unpublished Report.





Memo to Campuses Participating in the Mapping Process (June 10, 2013)

Dear Periclean Provosts and Program Directors,

We are delighted that your institution is participating in our *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement* project along with 26 other Periclean colleges and universities.

*Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement* begins with Pericleans mapping their existing civic engagement programs and offerings. This will be followed by a convening to discuss findings from the mapping exercise and to launch an extended conversation about best practices and innovative approaches for organizing and integrating civic engagement on campuses and in the community. Finally, participating colleges and universities will be able to apply for mini-grants to strengthen existing programming or develop new programs such as certificates in civic engagement on their campus. This project is an exciting opportunity for Pericleans to learn from each other; to collaborate in developing new, innovative approaches to civic engagement and social responsibility; and to advance civic engagement within higher education. By undertaking this work, we can strengthen our own institutions and provide important models for others.

Each participating campus is responsible for completing the questionnaire and survey of courses and co-curricular activities themselves. At the request of the Project Pericles President's Council, we are sending the survey to both the provost and Project Pericles Program Director on each campus. We encourage the provost and Project Pericles Program Director to discuss the survey before beginning work. We also encourage you to form a small team of faculty and staff, perhaps with students, to assist with the undertaking.

The questionnaire contains a series of 17 questions about the organization of programming for civic engagement and social responsibility on each campus. The survey asks for information on all courses and co-curricular activities with a civic engagement and social responsibility component.

Project Pericles developed the survey material in collaboration with a group of program directors and Barbara Holland. Dr. Holland brings many years of experience to the project and has worked with colleges and universities around the world, as well as with the Carnegie Foundation on its Community Engagement Elective Classification. Our thanks to Mary Bombardier at Hampshire College, Cass Freedland at Goucher College, Milton Moreland at Rhodes College, Cynthia Smith at RPI, Ella Turenne at Occidental College, and Paul Schadewald at Macalester College for serving on the program directors' working group.

**Barbara Holland** will continue to work on the project and will be **available for individual telephone consultations** if you wish to review your plan for data gathering or have other questions. If this is something you are interested in arranging, please email Jan or Garret so we can put you in touch with Barbara.

As we stated in our March 28 email, each participating campus will receive **\$1,800** toward its civic engagement data collection. Payment will be made in two \$900 installments. The first check will be sent once we receive re-confirmation of your institution's intention to participate in the mapping project. The second check will be payable once all material has been submitted to Project Pericles and reviewed for completeness.

Participating institutions will be eligible for a limited number of **mini-grants of up to \$7,000** to design/redesign more cohesive civic engagement programming on its own campus. They will also be eligible to send one representative to our **national convening** July 14 to 17, 2014.

**Important Dates:**

July 8, 2013      Re-confirm your college or university's intent to participate in the Phase 1 by email to [Jan.Liss@projectpericles.org](mailto:Jan.Liss@projectpericles.org) so that we can mail the first \$900.

December 16, 2013      All material submitted to Project Pericles

July 14 to 17, 2014      Convening of participating Pericleans in New York

September 2014      Applications for mini-grants due

We wish to thank the Eugene M. Lang Foundation and The Teagle Foundation for their generous support.

We are looking forward to working with you on this project. It is truly an exciting opportunity!

Please call us if you have any questions.

Warm regards, Jan and Garret

Jan R. Liss  
Executive Director

Garret Batten  
Assistant Director

Project Pericles, Inc.  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1910  
New York, NY 10176-0899  
Tel: 212.986.4496

Fax: 212.986.1662

[jan.liss@projectpericles.org](mailto:jan.liss@projectpericles.org)

[www.projectpericles.org](http://www.projectpericles.org)

About The Teagle Foundation:

The Teagle Foundation provides leadership for liberal education, mobilizing the intellectual and financial resources that are necessary if today's students are to have access to a challenging and transformative liberal education. The Foundation's commitment to such education includes its grant making to institutions of higher education across the country, its long-established scholarship program for the children of employees of ExxonMobil, and its work helping economically disadvantaged young people in New York City—where the Foundation is based—gain admission to college and succeed once there.

## About the Authors

**Garret S. Batten** is the Assistant Director of Project Pericles. He has extensive experience in higher education designing and managing multi-campus initiatives. He previously served as a consultant at the Ford Foundation, where he worked in both the Democracy, Rights and Justice Program and the Education, Creativity and Free Expression Program. While consulting at Ford, he assisted with the design and development of the Difficult Dialogues Initiative, a multi-million dollar national program focused on promoting pluralism and academic freedom at colleges and universities. He subsequently served as the Associate Director of the Difficult Dialogues Initiative at The Thomas Jefferson Center for the Protection of Free Expression, where he was responsible for supervising initiative activities and working with grantees at 29 institutions across the country. He was part of the leadership team that developed and designed *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement*. He holds a M.A. in Sociology from New York University, a M.A. in Political Science from The New School for Social Research, and a B.A. from Kenyon College.

**Adrienne Falcón** is the Director of Academic Civic Engagement (ACE) in the Center for Community and Civic Engagement at Carleton College where she is also a lecturer in the sociology department. She is the Program Director for Project Pericles at Carleton. She leads the assessment of civic engagement efforts at the college and coordinates curricular and co-curricular programming in two pathways for students and faculty, one focused on arts and humanities and the other on community development. As the founding ACE director, she has grown the program to be one that yearly supports more than 50 courses across all the disciplines. She has been involved with several grant-funded initiatives to promote science and civic engagement in higher education, including currently serving as a Co-PI on an NSF S-STEM grant to support a diverse range of students in the sciences and math who come from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds achieving success while at Carleton. She spent 2015-2016 in Ecuador on a Fulbright fellowship researching the construction of universal civic engagement efforts for all college students as mandated by the 2010 national higher education law. As a trained community organizer and a program officer at the Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, she brings a range of knowledge to her current position. She has been selected as a Blandin Foundation Community Leader and currently serves on the local board of the League of Women Voters and the Community Services Advisory Board. She received a B.A. in Latin American Studies from Carleton College and a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Chicago.

**Jan Risé Liss** joined Project Pericles as its second Executive Director in 2005. At Project Pericles she has developed, launched, and implemented the Civic Engagement Course (CEC)<sup>™</sup> Program, Debating for Democracy (D4D)<sup>™</sup>, the Periclean Faculty Leadership (PFL)<sup>™</sup> Program and *Creating Cohesive Paths to Civic Engagement*. She has senior leadership experience in management, planning, publishing, and financial development for a wide range of organizations, including The Aspen Institute, Consumers Reports, The New York Public Library, The Brookings Institution, American Express, and The Portland Art Association. The 2012 white paper, *The Periclean Diamond: Linking College Classrooms, Campuses, Communities, and Colleagues via Social and Civic High Engagement Learning* by Ben Berger and Jan R. Liss, explores insights from the PFL program. It follows the 2009 white paper, *Civic Engagement in the Classroom: Strategies for Incorporating Education for Civic and Social Responsibility in the*

*Undergraduate Curriculum*, by Ariane Liazos and Jan R. Liss. Both are available on the Project Pericles website <http://www.projectpericles.org/projectpericles/resources/publications/>. Liss serves on the Board of Directors of Project Pericles. She served on the Reed College Board of Trustees from 2009-2013 and on the Board of Directors of College and Community Fellowship from 2006-2016. She was named a Tenenbaum Leadership Initiative Fellow at Milano, The New School for Management and Urban Policy. She received a B.A. in Psychology from Reed College and a M.B.A. from the Yale School of Management.



## **Board of Directors**

**Chair Emeritus: Eugene M. Lang**, Founder, Project Pericles; Chair Emeritus, Swarthmore College; Founder and Chair Emeritus, “I Have a Dream”<sup>®</sup> Foundation

**Chair: Neil R. Grabois**, Former Vice President, Carnegie Corporation of New York

**Vice-Chair: Richard Ekman**, President, Council of Independent Colleges

**Treasurer: David A. Caputo**, President Emeritus, Pace University

**Janet S. Dickerson**, Former Vice President, Princeton University

**Richard Guarasci**, President, Wagner College; Chair, Project Pericles Presidents’ Council

**Arthur E. Levine**, President, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation

**Jan R. Liss**,\* Executive Director, Project Pericles

**Michael S. McPherson**, President, Spencer Foundation

**Harris L. Wofford**, Former Co-Chair, America’s Promise;  
former U.S. Senator

*\*ex officio*

## **National Board of Advisors**

Co-Chairs: Sen. Nancy Kassebaum Baker & Hon. Kurt L. Schmoke

David Baltimore • John Baugh • J. Herman Blake • Roger W. Bowen

Harry C. Boyte • Sen. Bill Bradley • Paul Brest

Russell L. Carson • Raymond G. Chambers • Jerome A. Chazen

Nadinne Cruz • Richard A. Detweiler • Christopher F. Edley, Jr.

Thomas Ehrlich • Jonathan F. Fanton • Nicholas H. Farnham • Ellen V. Futter

Llewellyn P. Haden, Jr. • Samuel L. Hayes III • Antonia Hernandez

Amb. James C. Hormel • Helene L. Kaplan • Gov. Thomas H. Kean

Reuben Mark • Elizabeth McCormack • Mary Patterson McPherson

Nancy B. Peretsman • Robert D. Putnam • Judith A. Ramaley

David M. Scobey • Allen P. Splete • Mark A. Vander Ploeg

## **Presidents' Council**

Chair: Richard Guarasci,\* Wagner College  
Vice-Chair: Steven G. Poskanzer,\* Carleton College  
James H. Mullen, Jr.,\* Allegheny College  
Clayton Spencer, Bates College  
Lyle D. Roelofs,\* Berea College  
Edison Jackson, Bethune-Cookman University  
David L. Finegold, Chatham University  
Walter K. Kimbrough, Dillard University  
MaryAnn Baenninger, Drew University  
Leo M. Lambert, Elon University  
George Bridges, The Evergreen State College  
José Antonio Bowen, Goucher College  
Jonathan Lash, Hampshire College  
William M. Tsutsui, Hendrix College  
Brian C. Rosenberg,\* Macalester College  
John S. Wilson, Jr.,\* Morehouse College  
Michele D. Perkins, New England College  
David E. Van Zandt,\* The New School  
Jonathan Veitch, Occidental College  
Stephen J. Friedman, Pace University  
Melvin L. Oliver, Pitzer College  
John R. Kroger, Reed College  
Shirley Ann Jackson, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
William E. Troutt, Rhodes College  
Tuajuanda Jordan, St. Mary's College of Maryland  
Philip A. Glotzbach, Skidmore College  
Mary Schmidt Campbell, Spelman College  
Valerie Smith, Swarthmore College  
Brock Blomberg, Ursinus College  
Kathleen Murray, Whitman College  
Julie E. Wollman, Widener University  
Sarah Bolton, The College of Wooster

*\*Executive Committee*

## **National Office**

Jan R. Liss, Executive Director  
Garret Batten, Assistant Director  
Elisabeth Weiman, Program Associate