C H A P T E R 1

Promise of University-Community Partnerships

Collaborative processes, or bottom-up approaches, have not been tried extensively. When tried, many have not truly been bottom-up. One thing that distinguishes a bottom-up approach from a top-down approach is the scope of the project and sources of funds. Most of the failed, top-down approaches have employed large amounts of federal money and minimal local investment and have been geographically extensive, covering large sections of cities or regions. Bottom-up strategies are narrowly focused from an areal perspective, often concentrating on a single neighborhood or part of a neighborhood. While seed money may come from a federal program, there is usually a significant local investment component (25% or more), which gives local governments, nonprofits, and neighborhood groups more ownership of the program and its processes.

Neighborhood residents must, in concert with others in the community, reach out and form partnerships with those who can help revitalize their neighborhood. A broad-based coalition must be assembled to address problems; we can no longer be categorical in our approach. The categorical grant programs of the past have not been as effective as their developers had hoped. A holistic approach is required. The individuals working in the coalition must believe that they have the power to make a difference and to find, through themselves or their partners, people who can wield the necessary power to carry out their plans. Finally, these plans must be developed and carried out at the lowest level. If there is not a significant commitment by all parties, especially residents, then the effort will fail. If the plans are being directed from afar, then history shows that change will be either fleeting or non-existent.

Neighborhood planners working within the confines of an overall city plan are under a tremendous amount of pressure to remake the neighborhoods that comprise the cities. Attractive, safe, desirable, convenient neighborhoods in conjunction with economic opportunities and residents who can seize them may be the only things that can stem the tide of emigration from the cities to

1

suburbia. Scholars almost forty years ago were not optimistic about the future of cities. According to Dahl (1967):

> Our cities are not merely non-cities, they are anti-cities—mean, ugly, gross, banal, inconvenient, hazardous, formless, incoherent, unfit for human living, deserts from which a family flees to the greener hinterlands as soon as job and income permit, yet deserts growing so rapidly outward that the open green space to which the family escapes soon shrinks to an oasis and then it too turns to a desert. (p. 964)

Inner-city communities have severe problems with crime, homelessness, joblessness, illiteracy, drugs, and a host of other challenges. One might have thought that graduates from our outstanding professional schools, armed with the research of our social scientists, could have done more to help our government agencies and community organizations reduce the incidence of poverty, illiteracy, and stunted opportunity. Since these results have not occurred, it is fair to ask whether our universities are doing all that they can and should to help America surmount the obstacles that threaten to sap its economic strength and blight the lives of its people (Bok 1990, p. 6).

J. Martin Klotsche, former chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, provides an appropriate frame of reference for this discussion of university involvement in the community. Klotsche (1966) writes:

> Our society is irretrievably urban. Since our cities are here to stay, the time is at hand to take a new look at them. It is urgent that a major effort be made to reshape them. This will require serious reflection, and positive action. In all of these matters the urban university can play a central role. It can, in fact, become the single most important force in the re-creation of our cities. (p. 128)

Several cities, acting as laboratories of innovation, have proven programs that help revitalize inner-city neighborhoods. Universities can play important roles in partnership with the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. As the late Ernest Boyer (1990) noted, "[T]he work of the academy must relate to the world beyond the campus" (p. 75). Stukel (1994) states:

> The ideal of the urban university rolling up its sleeves and getting involved in urban affairs will spread because it is a tremendous opportunity to deal with real issues—crime, taxes, the economy, and elementary and secondary education—the issues that are on people's minds every day of the year. This will generate public and political

support, which will be increasingly necessary in this era of diminishing resources. And it will actually be doing some good for this country. (p. 21)

University involvement in urban affairs is not a new idea. Forty years ago President Johnson provided a vision of university-community partnerships at a speech to open the University of California at Irvine. He argued that universities should try to provide answers to the pressing problems of the cities "just as our colleges and universities changed the future of our farms a century ago" (Klotsche 1966, p. 51). Six months later, President Johnson addressed Congress and urged universities to replicate their success with helping farms by addressing the needs of the city. He stated:

> The role of the university must extend beyond the ordinary extension type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university should be brought into play. (Klotsche 1966, p. 60)

Noted educational leader Clark Kerr (1968), in an address to the New York City Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, asked those assembled:

> Cannot the intellectual resources that created the new age of science now tackle the equally explosive problem of our cities? The threat is as real and the obligation surely as great. The university can come increasingly to aid the renovation of our cities, and in return the university can be inspired by the opportunities and strengthened by the participation. (p. 14)

During the ensuing period many creative, bold, and innovative university-community partnerships were developed. These efforts had mixed results. Cities continued to be overwhelmed by a whole range of social, political, and economic forces. Even today, the same problem remains. As much of the literature on the cycle of poverty indicates, urban issues are complex and interdependent. Because of this, initiatives that are not comprehensive in scope do little more than provide temporary relief. Recent federal programs have recommitted the federal government as a central player in facilitating urban/university partnerships (Gilderbloom 1996, p. 7). For example, in 1993, the U.S. Department of Education's Urban Community Service Grant Program funded twenty-three colleges and universities to ". . . work with private and civic organizations

to devise and implement solutions to pressing and severe problems in their urban communities" (U.S. Department of Education 1992, p. 1).

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has taken strides toward increasing university involvement in addressing urban needs. According to former Secretary Henry G. Cisneros, the five-year Community Outreach Partnership Centers (COPC) demonstration program awarded grants to institutions of higher learning " . . . to establish and operate centers for multi-disciplinary research and outreach activities in cooperation with community groups and local governments" (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 1994a, p. 5). Schools such as the University of Illinois at Chicago, Yale University, Marquette University, Northwestern University, the University of Alabama at Birmingham, Marshall University, Duquesne University, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and the University of California at Los Angeles performed some exciting revitalization efforts under the auspices of HUD's COPC program (Cisneros 1995, p. 14; Stegman 1995, p. 98). Now that the federal government has provided incentives for universities to fulfill social obligations, there is no excuse for higher education not to respond. "As Oscar Handlin observed, our troubled planet 'can no longer afford the luxury of pursuits confined to an ivory tower. [. . .] [S]cholarship has to prove its worth not on its own terms but by service to the nation and the world'" (Boyer 1990, p. 23).

There are, however, many who have believed that the university should remain aloof and apart from the larger society in which it exists. They believe the academy should be a place for contemplation and a search for truth. They believe in knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Some of these historical figures such as John Henry Cardinal Newman and current figures are discussed in Bok (1990), Cisneros (1995), and Kerr (1972).

Literature Review

There is not a vast body of literature on university-community partnerships. In fact, there has been little effort to rigorously evaluate the successes and failures of partnership ventures (Harkavy and Wiewel 1995; Nyden and Wiewel 1992). "The academy has not yet devoted much thought to the study of partnerships and to its role in the social, political, and economic environment" (Harkavy and Wiewel 1995, p. 12).

The urban university is a much different entity than a business or government agency. The role or position of the university is unique in the pantheon of urban organizations. Many in the metropolitan university do not understand a crucial fact that Ruch and Trani (1995) make so well: "Metropolitan universi-

ties are not simply *in* the city but *of* the city, and the importance of activities with their surrounding environment is central to the life of the institution" (p. 231, emphasis added). Too often, the university has forgotten its foundation in the affairs of its community. Hathaway, Mulhollan, and White (1990) and Perlman (1990) make the same point in slightly different ways.

Universities play a variety of roles in their communities. They are economic entities, players in both the intellectual and cultural lives of the community, and they have the potential to touch all aspects of community life (Johnson and Bell 1995, p. 193). As an economic entity, Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, formed a redevelopment corporation around its medical school that invested over $100 million in capital improvements in its neighborhood (Porter and Sweet 1984, p. 58). In Philadelphia, "the University of Pennsylvania is the largest private employer and education is the largest single industry" (Hackney 1986, p. 136). Early on, universities were cultural bastions, a means of transmitting the fruits of Western culture; they helped rapidly growing cities by contributing "to the development of the city and to the quality of life of a new and impoverished citizenry" (Hackney 1986, p. 137). These are just a few examples. There are also roles that are more traditionally associated with the university, such as research, which has been a hallmark of the major American university. "While the conduct of sophisticated research is a distinctive characteristic of a research-intensive university, this research informs and takes place within a framework of teaching and service; the three types of academic activity are integrated and intertwined" (Greiner 1994, p. 319).

Higher education has played a role in many research endeavors with entities outside the academy. This has been documented in a variety of sources. The following are just a few of the many examples. Illman (1994) discussed the role of the National Science Foundation in furthering basic university research in key commercial sectors such as chemicals, biotechnology, and software development. Horowitz (1990) also discussed the research partnerships in higher education and the funding of research. Individual colleges and universities and businesses have also joined together for mutually beneficial purposes. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1993) discussed the cooperative program between IBM and the University of California at Los Angeles for data processing research and development. Lissner (1980, p. 320) discussed the efforts of City University of New York administrators to establish urban research centers at various system campuses. Winthrop (1975) provided information on the establishment of interdisciplinary programs at colleges and universities to help "meet community needs" (p. 245). These ventures do not always result in solutions to community problems, and the solutions seem to come from a different type of venture.

The history of university involvement in community problems is a different story. The university has taken a directive role or provided a limited

contractual service rather than working in true partnership with other entities. One example is found in Medoff and Sklar's (1994) work. They discuss the role that planning students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology played in providing limited, one-time planning services pursuant to a contract with an educational agency. The following discussion captures the essence of the partnership literature.

An Overview of University-Community Involvement

The role of the university in the life of the city has changed over time. Before World War I, Hackney (1986) notes that:

> Universities were also starting to expand, although opinion as to their proper purpose was still divided between those for whom they appeared as a haven for pure research and knowledge and others who saw the value of academic institutions as vehicles for promoting a liberal culture that might soften the rough edges of a society absorbed in commerce and industry. (p. 137)

One of the earliest attempts made by a university to take an active role in a community partnership was in Boston. "In 1954, with a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Boston College School of Business started a series of Citizen Seminars in an attempt to initiate a new partnership between the city's closely knit Yankee business elite and its upwardly mobil [*sic*] Irish politicians" (Squires 1989, p. 38). University-community relationships have been marked by feelings of distrust, disinterest, and disdain (Kysiak 1986; Perlman 1990). The role of some universities in urban life has changed over time. Universities have moved from a detached dispenser of knowledge to an intimate economic partner without abandoning their central mission of education. This has not been easy, quick, or painless for the universities or their communities.

University involvement in the community has been wide-ranging in scope, but there has been little agreement on the nature of the players, their proper roles and responsibilities, and their impact on communities. In fact, according to Kerr (1972):

> "Involvement in the life of society" has grown greatly. The campus has even been drawn to the "city hall," and the predicted "Pandora's box" may well have been opened. How to serve the city, as the rural community has long been served, is now a perplexing problem for many campuses. New pressure groups are insisting that knowledge

really be for "everybody's sake." The campus still debates involve-
ment while strong elements in society insist upon it. (p. 132)

Urban universities are markedly different from their land-grant counter-
parts. Land-grant universities were founded pursuant to the Morrill Act signed
into law by President Abraham Lincoln in 1862 (Kerr 1972, p. 46). They were to
provide a variety of technical and economic development services to large areas
of the countryside and open higher education to a broad cross section of the pop-
ulace. The initial goal of the land-grant university was to focus on economic de-
velopment and lift the countryside out of poverty and move the region into a
more competitive stance vis-à-vis the urbanized areas. "The original land-grant
universities did a masterful job on agriculture and engineering. American farm-
ers are the most efficient and productive in the world, and students from all over
the world come to this country to study engineering and science" (Stukel 1994,
p. 19). Wallerstein (1969) makes the same point. Urban universities have typi-
cally had a more restricted mission from both areal and functional perspectives.
Their goal was to not only focus on training knowledge workers but to enhance
the social, cultural, and intellectual life of the community that chartered it or in
which it was founded. Currently, many urban universities provide an economic
development component to their community; however, it is usually limited in
scope and application, unlike its land-grant counterpart.

The Roles of the University in the Community

Before discussing the roles of the university in the community, it is help-
ful to investigate the ultimate ". . . purpose for which it exists—the advance-
ment of learning" (Klotsche 1966, p. 19). This is echoed by Hackney (1986),
who says, "the university's primary contribution to the betterment of the human
condition comes through education and the creation of new knowledge"
(p. 136). The roles of the university can be framed around its raison d'etre.
One of the principal challenges in analyzing community partnership prob-
lems is the lack of a consistent, generally accepted paradigm in the urban affairs
field (Friesema 1971, p. 10). Even today, the same problem remains: universities
are seeking a role, unsure of what the community needs or wants from its intel-
lectual center. What is the proper role of the university in urban affairs?
Many have tried to define the role of the university in the urban environ-
ment. The producers (faculty) are rewarded for three different things: teaching,
research, and service. Service is a common feature of most definitions of a role
of the university. "The university as producer, wholesaler, and retailer of knowl-
edge cannot escape service" (Kerr 1972, p. 114). The following are three

representative samples from the literature. Hester (1970) described three roles: ". . . serving the people and institutions of the city, doing research in the problems of the city, [and] using the city as a teaching laboratory [. . .]" (p. 89). Stukel (1994) notes that the primary role of the university is to provide an education to the people; however, they are also being asked "to apply their research expertise to the very real, day-to-day problems of the city [. . .]" (p. 19). Cisneros (1995), after reviewing literature from John Henry Cardinal Newman (isolation of the university in the search for truth) to John Dewey, "who emphasized that school and society are one" (Cisneros 1995, p. 6), said:

> The American university embraces both the research and the service dimensions. The American university is supposed to focus on building character, promoting general education, and developing civic responsibility; it best serves society by producing competent, self-reliant adults who form a solid core of involved citizens. [. . .] In the broadest sense, the American university system functions to preserve, disseminate, and advance knowledge for the improvement of society. [. . .] [T]here is general agreement that the American university is designed to encompass the broad range of human knowledge and is dedicated to the preservation and advancement of that knowledge to help make the world a more civil and decent place. (p. 7)

While Secretary Cisneros's view is expansive, the literature indicates that there are three different roles for the university in its community that are distinct from its historical primary mission of teaching. The three roles for the community at large include: (1) a facilitator or an unbiased third party; (2) an equity partner or an action partner in ventures; and (3) a technical resource. The first two are not widely discussed in the literature, since the university is now growing into these roles. The third is most common and is discussed at length in a variety of publications. Each of these roles will be discussed briefly.

The University as Facilitator

One of the greatest obstacles to urban revitalization is political partisanship: the games people play (Farbstein and Wener 1993, p. 96; Peirce and Guskind 1993, p. 2). So many entities play political games because of power, money, status, or other concerns, that it is difficult at times to determine where anyone stands on a particular issue. "The city is [. . .] a uniquely political universe of its own" (Bookchin 1986, p. 6).

There is a need for honest brokers[1]—those organizations whose integrity is unquestioned and who can remain unbiased throughout a decision-making

process. There are several examples of universities becoming involved as process facilitators rather than being a part of the outcome. Their neutrality was an asset to an overarching community goal. Klotsche (1966) notes that, "The university can provide a common meeting ground for the divergent elements of the community [. . .]" (p. 30).

Mazey (1995) describes Wright State University's role as a facilitator in the CHALLENGE 95 strategic plan process in Dayton, Ohio. The community was developing a plan to make itself competitive with other regions. "The two main threats to the economic development of the Miami Valley were identified as 'turfism,' i.e., promoting the self-interests of one political entity over another, and lack of leadership" (p. 196). The community had a difficult time finding someone or some organization that did not have an economic interest in self-promotion and could remain neutral—an honest broker. It turned to Wright State University to provide that service, and

> [President Mulhollan] demonstrated the university's commitment to a regional agenda and ensured the university's independence of any one particular entity in formulating and facilitating the plan. The latter point is extremely important, because the university's neutrality was an asset throughout the process. As a neutral entity, the university was able to minimize the political turf battles that could have destroyed the process. The university faculty and staff continually had to emphasize that the threats and competition were not within the region but rather with other regions. (p. 203)

This is an excellent example of the university playing the role of the honest broker. The community could rely upon Wright State's independence, and the administration ensured that independence through its internal processes.

The University of Louisville (the "University") played a similar role, albeit on a smaller scale, in helping organizations in the city of Louisville to try to determine priorities for grant opportunities to help revitalize inner-city neighborhoods (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 1994b). The University brought varied segments of the community together for hundreds of hours of meetings. These people determined program priorities for grant opportunities. The University continuously provided information and sought feedback to make sure that all parties understood priorities and could "buy-in" to the decisions being made. The University played a similar role in its Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods (SUN) initiative in the Louisville Enterprise Zone. By working with a number of different organizations, the University developed a proposal that addressed human and economic development, home ownership, community design/urban planning, and crime prevention. The University played this role in

grants that it would administer, and other grants were to be administered by the city or nonprofit agencies.

Charles Diggs, deputy director of the city of Louisville's Department of Housing and Urban Development, noted, "People have a mind-set that the university can be outside the process and mediate." There are some who would take issue with this characterization and believe the university cannot step "outside its box." Dr. Donald C. Swain, president emeritus of the University of Louisville, in a separate interview with the author, summarized the thoughts of many: "The university is a neutral ground to help people find common ground."

The University as an Equity Partner

Revitalizing our communities is an expensive proposition. There is no single institution or business that can afford to turn around the inner city. Shore ". . . propose[s] that each American city try to form a consortium of a few corporations, housing developers, and institutions of higher education, health, the arts, and social services together with all levels of government" (1995, p. 502). Others have also described this equity role (Goldstein and Luger 1992; Kysiak 1986; Cisneros 1995). These investigators recognize the crucial role that universities can play in the revitalization process.

There are many instances, particularly since the "go-go" decade of the 1980s, where the university has stepped outside its traditional role of service to take an equity interest in a venture that produces funds, goods, services, or other vendible outputs. While there have been many consulting arrangements between the university faculty and business and industry, this new role goes beyond that. It is institutional rather than individual. The university has a financial stake as an investor in the outcome of a venture rather than helping facilitate a process as described in the preceding section. Following are a few examples of the university in this equity partner role.

Kysiak (1986) describes two examples of university-community partnerships that had their beginnings in poor relationships between the university and community. His examples are the relationships between Yale and New Haven, Connecticut, and Northwestern University and Evanston, Illinois. As Kysiak points out, both universities were founded before the cities in which they are located. In addition, they have international reputations and, as they grew, "found themselves increasingly removed from the mundane administrative and political issues of city life that developed over time" (p. 49). They became isolated, cut off from the problems and deterioration around them (Boyer 1994).

As discussed in the preceding section, one of the biggest problems in the relationships between these universities and their cities was fiscal pressures. The cities needed more tax revenue and looked to the universities as sources of

income. The universities, however, thwarted the cities at every turn. The situation escalated until outside parties stepped in to mediate and find a way to resolve what was fast becoming a crisis.

In Evanston, the city administration, university, and local businesses formed a nonprofit development corporation: Evanston Inventure. In addition, Northwestern University also joined the city in establishing a research park. Yale took a similar path and joined with the city and one large local business to form a research park. Yale also started building apartments and other facilities in New Haven as a way to do some good and secure its own real estate investments. "Both universities wanted to [. . .] stabilize the neighborhoods around them [. . .] creating an atmosphere of development that would enable them to expand their research and development partnerships with the private sector" (Kysiak 1986, p. 53). In both cases, most of the profits from these ventures will be reinvested in the partnership. However, both nonprofit organizations have for-profit, spin-off businesses that could net the universities significant income over time. They are helping to improve the economic position of the communities in which they are located. In addition, they have opened up opportunities and markets for their faculty and students through these ventures.

Kysiak makes a very interesting point about these developments. All partners are doing what they do best. None is trying to move outside their own expertise to make things happen. The universities offer "land, buildings, cash, and expertise [. . .]" (p. 57). Businesses offer their management expertise and ability to market the enterprise to the economy at large. The city provides "public improvements, some funding for the operating corporation, and support for some of the peripheral activities. In addition, its power of eminent domain allows the complete site to be pulled together, an absolute necessity for marketing purposes" (p. 58).

There are other instances of university participation in economic ventures. For instance, "Rutgers put its art school and a gallery into a defunct department store and brought a new medical school downtown, alongside an addition to the downtown hospital that the county built" (Shore 1995, p. 502). Perlman (1990) discusses the role of Suffolk University in helping revitalize a shopping district in Boston in partnership with the city, local businesses, and residents. Stukel (1994) discusses the role of Marquette University in reshaping the built environment of Milwaukee by expending over $9 million in partnership with local business and industry to revive the area around the university.

The University as a Technical Resource

The university has long been a repository of technical expertise that has been lacking elsewhere. Grigsby and Corl (1983), in discussing this topic, said,

"Whether federal, state, and local governments have the will, knowledge, and understanding necessary to develop such [redevelopment] plans and implement them is the question. On the whole, we think they do not have these qualities at the present time" (p. 97). From another point of view, former HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros (1995) notes:

> We at HUD know that Washington cannot pay for everything, should not regulate everything, and must not mandate everything. The Department's role is to marshal resources from all sectors of society and bring them to bear on these priority problems. HUD should catalyze, facilitate, mediate—and get out of the way [. . .]. (p. 13)

There have always been questions about how practical that knowledge was and whether it could be turned to an economic or a public good. The literature contains a number of references to the varied technical roles of the university. The types and extent of these roles are presented next.

RESEARCH

The university is a vital source of expertise in a variety of fields. Research is one of the most visible and least understood outputs of universities. There are those who dismiss this valuable work as the product of a select number of people who look at problems of no consequence to most of society and write about it for a small audience with neither the power nor interest to do anything with it! In the words of Bengtson, Grigsby, Corry, and Hruby (1977), "[A]nother academic study was to be conducted [. . .] by white, ivory tower researchers—a study which would bring few if any benefits to the people" (p. 82). A former governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Honorable Wallace Wilkinson, referred to this as the publication of research results in "itty bitty journals" that no one ever reads. In actuality, many university research products, especially those in the basic sciences and some in the social sciences, result in profitable applications by business and industry.

In the 1960s, the Ford Foundation funded numerous grants for universities to provide technical assistance to their communities (Ford Foundation 1965, p. 111; Bender 1988, p. 284). The foundation hoped to improve the quality of life in various communities across the country. The types of services were typified by Florida State University providing applied research and consulting services to local governments.

Friesema (1971) expressed a concern about pushing too far past research and into advocacy. He believes that the more action oriented the research, the poorer the theoretical development (p. 5). He does not think that is a reason to

shy away from action-oriented research; it is something to be cognizant of in developing programs. He cites the problems associated with programs designed to train municipal professionals. However, others have sounded a clear warning about taking research beyond the walls of academia and moving into applications (Eulau 1968).

There are many uses for university research. A synopsis follows of some of the more interesting applications from the literature.

Hall (1989) discusses the value of universities focusing their planning schools on providing "feasible solutions" to the problems of the city (p. 282). Gilderbloom and Mullins (1995) also discuss the possibility of universities focusing and directing their planning programs on the problems of the inner cities.

Former HUD Secretary Henry G. Cisneros (1995) described the high-technology research efforts of American universities and their ties to businesses. He noted:

> [In fiscal year 1993], inventions developed at 117 of the Nation's leading research universities produced some $242 million in royalties and a total of 1,307 new patents, often directly benefiting local companies. For example, faculty at the University of Pennsylvania have made approximately 90 invention disclosures per year for the past 3 years, resulting in many collaborative research and license agreements with Pennsylvania businesses. (Cisneros 1995, p. 8)

Cisneros and others (i.e., Kysiak 1986) discuss the role of research in advancing economic agendas, as discussed in the preceding section.

Bengtson et al. (1977) discuss the role of university research in helping key decision makers by conducting policy-oriented social service research. They looked at aging in American society in one research project. An outgrowth of their research project was an interesting discussion of the conflicts among affected stakeholders in the community they were studying. This was another application of the politics described in Stone and Sanders' (1987) work on regime paradigm theory.

There is a split in academic and nonacademic circles about the usefulness, applicability, and need for research. "[I]n leading universities, research is valued over teaching, and pure research gains more respect than applied research aimed at solving problems in the real world" (Bok 1990, p. 50). This situation is likely to remain as long as academic rewards systems are set up to encourage scholarly as opposed to applied research. When equal weight is given to service and action-oriented research, the debate may either cease or be reduced. It will depend, to a great degree, on what is being valued in the academic marketplace.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

A traditional role for the university through its liberal arts curriculum is that of cultural memory. It is responsible for passing on from one generation to the next a method of critical thinking and an appreciation for the heritage of the literature, art, and beauty of Western culture. Cisneros (1995) notes this traditional role of the university "to preserve, disseminate, and advance knowledge for the improvement of society" (p. 7). He goes on to note the positive impacts of professional training (i.e., teachers, engineers, doctors, lawyers, etc.) on society as a whole in addition to the broad liberal arts education provided to others.

Perlman (1990) presents a differently focused view of the education and training roles. In addition to the initial training that professionals obtain through their undergraduate years, Perlman discusses the continuing education role of the university in modern society. It is a way of getting out into the community without a full-fledged commitment to be a major external player. The university can help these individuals hone and maintain their skills while seeking assistance from these very groups in the training of their current student body and in seeking funds and donations for the institution. It is a reciprocal relationship, each getting something from the other.

There is another view of the city, and that is one of a classroom. This goes back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the "Chicago School" of sociologists at the University of Chicago (Glaab and Brown 1983, p. 244). They looked at the city as a laboratory, a place to experiment. Popenoe (1969) presents a twist on the role of the university in education. He discusses the need "to bring the community to the classroom, and new and relevant knowledge to the community" (p. 145). Hester (1970) makes a similar point that the university needs to make use of the "'living laboratory' that surrounds the classroom" (p. 89). Bartelt (1995) expressed concern with the "laboratory" attitude. He noted that "[universities] have viewed their surrounding communities as objects of investigation, specimens of quasi-anthropological interest, from which institutional and personal reputations can be extracted, with little being returned in kind. It is unusual for schools to see communities as true partners in joint revitalization efforts" (p. 16). Ruch and Trani (1995) state that "[t]he boundaries between the classroom and the community can be made permeable, and the extent to which the flow of ideas and people is accelerated is to the mutual benefit of both" (p. 233). Stukel (1994) also investigates the educational opportunities afforded those in the health care field, for example, in being trained in an urban locale. In an unbroken line of thought, John W. Shumaker, former president of the University of Louisville, succinctly stated this view:

As a metropolitan research university, the University of Louisville must invest in making this community a better place for all of its citizens. This community has become for us an extended classroom, an extended laboratory for bridging the gap between theory and practice. We cannot achieve our full promise as a metropolitan university unless and until Greater Louisville is able to realize its full potential. Our future as a university thus remains intertwined with the future of the people and institutions of Greater Louisville and the Commonwealth.

A vital community is one in which all citizens are well educated, healthy, adequately housed, economically productive, and safe. The University of Louisville will continue to play an important role in helping our city, county, and metropolitan areas throughout the Commonwealth attain this kind of vitality. [. . .] We should approach this special component of our mission with an entrepreneurial spirit. We must have the courage to take responsible risks—and to learn from our failures as well as triumph in our successes. We assume this responsibility not in a prescriptive way—but as a partner. Our philosophy must be one of cooperation, collaboration, and responsiveness. (Shumaker 1995, p. 13)

BUSINESS INCUBATOR

Universities, particularly through their schools of business or management, can provide a great deal of expertise to the entrepreneurial sector of the community. Many schools are now providing some type of business incubator (Stukel 1994; Ruch and Trani 1995; Kysiak 1986). In this role, the university provides a number of different services, either on its own or, more often, in conjunction with others, to nurture small businesses. Lyons and Hamlin (1991) state:

The purpose of an incubator program is to promote the success of small businesses by helping them minimize overhead, find necessary financing, avoid typical managerial pitfalls, and ultimately, move out into the world to function on their own. This support is offered in the first two years of a new firm's existence, the most crucial period in its ultimate survival. (p. 118)

The types of services offered in an incubator vary. The following discussion briefly covers the types of services offered through university-affiliated incubators.

One approach to university involvement in business incubators is called the "proof-of-concept" funding (Tornatzky et al.1996). Often a faculty member or

outside inventor has an idea but needs funds to make a working prototype to obtain development funding. A number of programs provide this assistance, including the Georgia Research Alliance, consisting of five colleges and universities, Iowa State University, the University of Arkansas, the University of British Columbia, and others. Boyer (1990) notes that a university president "often controls discretionary funds that can work as 'pump primers' for creative projects" (p. 78).

Another vital service that university-affiliated incubators provide is access to cutting-edge technology. As Kerr (1972) states, "Sometimes industry will reach into a university laboratory to extract the newest ideas almost before they are born" (p. 89). Faculty in the more esoteric sciences such as genetic engineering can be a tremendous knowledge source. As Tornatzky, Batts, McCrea, Shook, and Quittmon (1996) note, there can be problems when the incubator and university are too closely integrated—especially "if the culture and organizational practices of the latter impede the former" (p. 41).

University incubators also provide a number of other services to start-up businesses. These services can include-low cost office or production space and shared services (e.g., clerical or reception services, access to equipment), managerial assistance and mentoring programs, business planning and marketing assistance (e.g., research, testing), reduced-cost legal services, and access to low-cost capital (Lyons and Hamlin 1991; Tornatzky et al. 1996). Schools view this as an opportunity to actually create economic opportunities in the community, to engage faculty in "real world" problems, and to provide students with opportunities to deal with actual problems and seek employment opportunities.

OTHER SERVICES

An innovative program at Northwestern University in the 1970s was the Community Service Voucher Program (Pitts 1977). It was a cooperative venture funded by state and federal sources that allowed specific nonprofit organizations to purchase services from the university. The organizations had accounts and were allowed to purchase any service the university, could offer. They purchased a variety of services from across the university including work by the sociology, economics, management, social work, and architecture departments. They included items such as multiviewpoint policy analysis and economic analyses of proposals.

Problems of University-Community Relations

In spite of the potential good that could be done through cooperation, why is the history of community-university interaction so checkered? There is a

long list of problems associated with university-community relationships. The problems have been economic, political, and social, and they have touched many other spheres. For example, the city of Evanston, Illinois, experienced severe financial pressure in the 1970s. It tried many different "revenue-enhancing" measures but still needed more money to meet its obligations. One way Evanston tried to increase revenues was a tax on student tuition at Northwestern University. It tried this approach because the university refused to pay any fees in lieu of taxes for services it received from the city (Kysiak 1986, p. 50). This confrontation drove the city and the university to communicate with one another more from necessity than from a desire for cooperation.

Why Partnerships?

The preceding literature review provides a background on university involvement in the community. Why should the university become a partner in community revitalization efforts? Young (1995) directly and succinctly addresses this question. "A university's goal of improving the quality of life and achieving high quality research, education, and service can be enhanced by working directly with affected communities in a relationship of shared authority and responsibility and mutual respect for each other's expertise" (p. 72). She also offers five specific reasons, from the university's perspective, for university-community partnerships to come into being:

1. To overcome our own ignorance. University faculties do not have the solutions for the problems of rejuvenating urban areas. But they can offer suggestions and a rigorous method of testing their efficacy. By working together, new ideas will emerge, be tried out, fail or succeed, and generate a forum for continuing to look for new ideas.

2. To focus additional minds on urban problems, even if some of those minds lack formal academic training. Where [. . .] collective engagement occurs, groups have been able to transcend the temptation toward quick fixes and search for new integrated solutions [. . .].

3. To provide a reality check for our ideas.

4. To diminish our deserved reputation as exploiters. Events that occurred in the past remain alive and fuel the skepticism [. . .]. [The University of Illinois at Chicago's] neighbors also remember that much of an immigrant community [. . .] was bulldozed

to make room for part of our campus. These are difficult images
to erase.

5. To ensure the long-term viability of the university. We are not
going to get many future students from an impoverished, illiterate,
crime-ridden, unemployed, homeless community. Nor can the
funds to operate a university be generated from failing communi-
ties. (Young 1995, p. 72)

Existing University-Community Partnerships:
Louisville and Beyond

Urban revitalization is an immense undertaking and is beyond the scope
of any single institution to solve. Partnerships can provide a coordinated ap-
proach to solving these problems. Robert Astorino, president of the Housing
Partnership, has worked in the urban revitalization field in Louisville and else-
where. He made the following observation:

Part of the problem with solutions to affordable housing in Louisville
today is that there are so many good people with good intentions all
doing their own thing. The banks, in particular, feel that they are being
nibbled to death by ducks. I don't think that makes for a credible syn-
chronized solution. I think it makes for many wonderful small success
stories. I often wonder how much grander the success story could be
if all those ducks got together and nibbled at once. [. . .] I think that
is a real problem in Louisville. [. . .] Corporate partners are confused.
(personal interview with author)

Every university, including faculty and staff, performs many service activi-
ties for its surrounding community. This service can take a number of forms. At
the University of Louisville, for example, faculty members donate their time serv-
ing on nonprofit and corporate boards, providing data analysis services; some fac-
ulty are loaned on a temporary basis to local government entities; some help with
facilitating particularly thorny processes (i.e., local government restructuring
process), and so on. These are service activities, not true partnership initiatives, be-
cause they fail to recognize that a partnership ". . . is a relationship between indi-
viduals or groups that is characterized by mutual cooperation and responsibility, as
for the achievement of a specified goal" (Microsoft Corp. 1995). In the examples
cited previously, the University is providing something of value and is getting, at
most, goodwill in return. There is no mutuality in the relationship.

University-Community Partnerships around the Country

This section focuses on just a few of the outstanding university-community partnerships around the nation. It provides brief sketches of what is being done as well as what is working. It is difficult to find much in the literature that discusses the failures of particular programs.

As previously discussed, part of Yale's motivation for involvement with the surrounding community was the extent of its landholdings in New Haven, Connecticut (Kysiak 1986). It needed to help stabilize the neighborhood around the university to secure its holdings. The university came to realize that it was an integral part of New Haven—whither one went, the other would go. Yale set about to develop a comprehensive program addressing its relationship with its city. The program was broken down into three components: ". . . economic development, human development, and neighborhood revitalization" (Gilderbloom 1996).

Money talks. Too many universities are willing to invest "soft money" in projects (i.e., writing down overhead rates on grants, etc.). They are not generally willing to put up their own cash as part of a project. Yale invested $9 million in housing and commercial ventures in the city. "To encourage Yale faculty and staff to live in town, the university started the New Haven Home Buyers Initiative. Any university employee who works more than 20 hours a week is eligible for $2,000 per year over ten years to go toward the purchase of a home near campus" (Stukel 1994, p. 20).

Yale developed a broad-based partnership with New Haven leaders and community pacesetters in the Dwight-Edgewood-West River neighborhood for neighborhood revitalization. The following is a list of revitalization goals:

1. Establish mechanisms for collaborative financing, governance, implementation, and accountability.

2. Create or redesign open spaces to support community development.

3. Promote home ownership.

4. Promote responsible behavior by landlords and tenants.

5. Improve security.

6. Mobilize citizen engagement and opportunity.

7. Increase employment opportunities through targeted and coordinated access to job training, recruitment and placement, and development of micro-enterprise and small businesses.

8. Promote optimal development of children and youth, in and out of school.

9. Create a partnership among city departments and between them and the neighborhood to build on community policing capacity of the city to support community development.

As discussed earlier (Kysiak 1986; Stukel 1994), Yale is also investing money in a number of ventures as an equity partner or is providing venture capital to budding businesses. In addition to these initiatives, Yale is giving these entrepreneurs access to university resources to help build and sustain their momentum. The wide-ranging nature of these ventures and the willingness to use its own capital make this one of the most aggressive university-community partnerships in the country.

The University of Pennsylvania

The Center for Community Partnerships of the University of Pennsylvania was founded on the notion that the vast range of resources of the American university, appropriately and creatively employed, can help us figure out how best to proceed. At Penn, over the past number of years, they have been working on the problem of how to create modern, cosmopolitan, local communities.

BACKGROUND

The Center for Community Partnerships was started in 1992 to achieve the following objectives: improve the internal coordination and collaboration of all university-wide community service programs; create new and effective partnerships between the university and the community; encourage new and creative initiatives linking Penn and the community; and strengthen a national network of institutions of higher education committed to engagement with their local communities.

Much of the center's work has focused on the public school as the educational and neighborhood institution that can, if effectively transformed, serve as the concrete vehicle for community change and innovation. Penn has tried to help create university-assisted community schools that function as the center of education, services, engagement and activity within specified geographic areas. Focusing on improving education and health in particular, Penn has helped develop significant service-learning programs that engage young people in creative work designed to advance skills and abilities through servicing their school, families, and community. Penn students and faculty are also en-

gaged in service learning that requires the development and application of knowledge to solve problems as well as active and serious reflection. This Deweyan approach might be termed learning by reflective doing and active problem solving.

Community Outreach Partnerships and Strategies

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

- Through the center, the university currently engages in three types of initiatives: academically based community service; direct traditional service; and community and economic development.

- The center's director reports to both the vice president for government, community and public affairs and the provost.

WEST PHILADELPHIA IMPROVEMENT CORPS (WEPIC) originated in the spring of 1985 from an honors history seminar co-taught by Penn's former president, Sheldon Hackney, and historians Lee Benson and Ira Harkavy on "Urban Universities-Community Relationships: Penn-West Philadelphia, Past, Present and Future, as a Case Study." The research of four students on the issue of youth employment resulted in a proposal to create a youth corps that would use existing agencies and resources.

- Beginning as a youth corps program, it is currently a year-round program that involves over 3,000 children, their parents, and community members in educational and cultural programs, recreation, job training, and community improvement and service activities.

- Producing comprehensive university-assisted community schools that serve, educate, involve, and activate all members of the community is the WEPIC's main goal.

Functioning simultaneously as the core building for the community and as the educational and service delivery hub for students, their families, and other local residents, it intends, ultimately, to develop schools that are open to the public twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year.

The WEPIC works in partnership with unions, job training agencies, churches, community groups, city, state, and federal agencies and departments, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) volunteers, local health institutions (including Misericord Hospital, Penn Medical Center, and Greater Philadelphia Health Action), and other community agencies and services.

The WEPIC is coordinated by the West Philadelphia Partnership—a mediating, nonprofit, community-based organization composed of institutions (including the University of Pennsylvania) and community groups—in conjunction with the Greater Philadelphia Affairs Coalition and the Philadelphia School District.

The University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) started its Great Cities initiative in late 1993. The purpose of the initiative is to channel the university's "teaching, research, and public service toward improving the quality of life in Chicago and other metropolitan areas" (Stukel 1994, p. 19). The Great Cities Initiative is a minimum ten-year commitment on the part of the University. The goal is to approach the intractable problems of the city from an interdisciplinary as well as a multiorganizational perspective in hopes of bringing all resources required to bear on the challenges confronting urban areas.

The UIC is trying to focus on being a member of a partnership, contributing what it does best rather than trying to address multidimensional problems on its own. It is taking a project focus rather than a problem focus. Rather than trying to address the overarching problem of teen crime in the city, for example, it is trying to identify projects that will make a difference in attacking a manageable piece of that overall problem. One project, Incubators for Youth, is providing young males in a housing project with training and assistance in taking advantage of entrepreneurial opportunities in the Chicagoland area. It will give them marketable business skills and provide training in self-development, self-esteem, and problem solving. Related projects are trying to improve the transition of students from an academic environment to the workforce.

The UIC has a number of other initiatives underway with community partners to improve life in its city. Some of these include improving the existing housing stock, increasing the amount of affordable housing, providing economic opportunities for businesses to work with the university, providing design and architectural services to community businesses to improve the built environment, and improving health care. All projects are being undertaken in an integrative way to ensure the best use of university resources in concert with its partners.

One of the advantages of this program over the University of Louisville's Housing and Neighborhood Development Strategies (HANDS) program is its institutional commitment. At the UIC, there is a university-wide commitment to a comprehensive partnership program. At the University of Louisville, HANDS was just one of hundreds of grants.

The systemic problems of the inner city can only be remedied through a holistic approach involving education; job placement and training; leadership; and entrepreneurship training; home ownership; community planning and design; and related programs. The cornerstones of the HANDS partnership involve attracting moderate- and middle-income families back into the neighborhood by

providing home ownership opportunities and giving residents the means to move up the economic ladder.

The University of Louisville's HANDS program has helped residents in a variety of ways. Nonprofit developers have built affordable, energy-efficient, moderately priced housing for residents with mortgage payments lower than area rents. In the first twenty-four months of operation, over 350 residents were provided with some combination of education, esteem, leadership, job training, or home ownership counseling. The HANDS program helped build economic capacity in the neighborhood by providing minority contractor and small business training as well as supporting a micro-loan program. These long-term initiatives created the sustainable development necessary for the inner-city neighborhood to be reborn.

For many inner-city residents, the American dream of home ownership, economic opportunity, work, and a good life is not possible. Good, affordable housing is essential to any family. If we want to promote family values, then we must first provide families with decent homes in which to practice those values. Vacant or abandoned lots and homes are more than empty houses. They are magnets for the urban plagues of litter, trash, rats, and drug dealers and users. They speak of a breakdown, not just of shutters and doors and windows, but of the strength that binds a community together. Faith in the American dream needs to be restored by making a commitment to renew the inner city. People without hope for a better future become destructive to themselves and others. The Russell Partnership in Louisville demonstrates a viable role for institutions of higher education and a humanistic approach to renewing a blighted inner-city neighborhood. When a partnership unites under a singular vision, lives and communities can be transformed.

Taxpayers are becoming increasingly frustrated by the lack of results produced by money spent on urban problems. Expressing this sentiment, former Ohio Governor George Voinovich said in his 1990 inaugural address, "Gone are the days when public officials are measured by how much they spend on a problem. The new realities dictate that public officials are now judged by whether they can work harder and smarter, and do more with less."

From 1978 to 1991, the HUD budget was slashed from $32 billion to $12 billion. Not surprisingly, it was during these same years that homelessness began to take on new faces: women, children, and even educated intact families. As our infrastructure deteriorated, as our affordable housing stock evaporated, as jobs moved to the suburbs, as high-paying manufacturing jobs were traded for low-paying service jobs, and as more and more people felt the sting of poverty and homelessness, Washington turned a deaf ear. The results manifested themselves in the anger, frustration, and despair expressed in urban unrest in Los Angeles and in the lyrics of gangster rap, but even these

examples are mere shadows of the much larger problems existing in our nation's inner cities.

In an era characterized by fiscal austerity and increasing social challenges, the university is a sorely needed resource. Can the university be a player in solving our most pressing urban problems? Currently, universities are in crisis: political correctness (PC) wars, shrinking budgets, declining public confidence, scientific fraud. How can universities regain public confidence? University professors need to get out of the ivory tower and back on the streets.

The coupling of fiscal austerity and increasing social challenges demands the creation of new paradigms. As we talk about reinventing government, we must begin to consider reinventing the university. In the words of former HUD Secretary Cisneros (1995):

> All of us have to take responsibility for the problems facing us today. All of us must contribute our time, talents, and resources to resolving them. Universities are not exempt. Students should have the opportunity to roll up their sleeves and get their hands dirty before they enter the job market. More attention should be placed on teaching partnership strategies and teamwork. Young scholars should be encouraged to celebrate cultural diversity.

Though visible at the highest levels of the university, the HANDS program could not claim to be a broad-based university program and has therefore not sufficiently met the needs of the community.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, faces many of the problems that old industrial cities in the Rust Belt suffered. Marquette University was seeing the community deteriorate around it. Enrollment was falling, crime was rising, and the quality of campus life was falling precipitously. As the Reverend Albert DiUlio, president of the university, said, "We could wall ourselves in or we could weave ourselves in" (Boyce 1994, p. A1). One of the unique things about Marquette that distinguishes it from other private schools, such as Yale University, discussed earlier, is its religious affiliation. It is named after a Jesuit missionary and is still run by members of the Society of Jesus. However, it had done little to assist the neighborhood or ingratiate itself with the residents in the years of its expansion (it tripled in area over a thirty year period).

The "straw that broke the camel's back" came in July 1991, when Jeffrey Dahmer, murderer and cannibal, was arrested in an apartment "just 10 blocks from Marquette" (Boyce 1994, p. A1). In late 1991, Marquette University committed $9 million to start the Campus Circle initiative to help revitalize its neighborhood, the Avenues West area. The motivations behind this initiative were pragmatic but complemented the mission and philosophy of the school's lead-

ership. The university recruited local government, businesses, neighborhood organizations, and residents in developing a comprehensive approach to neighborhood revitalization. The partnership established the following six goals:

1. Create and maintain affordable family housing for neighborhood residents by rehabbing [*sic*] existing housing and constructing new units;

2. Provide quality off-campus student housing through new construction and rehabilitation;

3. Establish walk-to-work and retirement housing for area employees;

4. Acquire and renovate buildings which do not contribute to a positive neighborhood environment;

5. Foster commercial development, both upgraded and new;

6. Advocate community involvement. (Campus Circle 1994, p. 3)

The various players brought their particular expertise to the partnership. For example, the city "established a tax incremental financing district, which provides a low-interest loan to be repaid through income created by the project" (Stukel 1994, p. 20). The university contributed many different types of technical expertise in addition to its cash endowment. Businesses were brought in for additional financing and management expertise.

What are the results? Because of the significant up-front financing and the commitment of the partners, after a couple of years of operation, Campus Circle owned and/or managed almost 140 properties, had spent almost $55 million on purchasing and rehabilitating or constructing new housing and other facilities, and started a number of human development and community improvement programs (Boyce 1994). Stukel (1994) reports that the combination of the establishment of a community-oriented policing program and crime prevention-awareness program had reduced crime by 30 percent. A fact sheet provided by the organization indicated that it had established goals for minority, women-owned, and disadvantaged business participation in its projects. Whether or not this level of effort can be sustained remains to be seen.

Marquette University is showing that a commitment to its community, a willingness to reach out to others, and an ability to rally disparate groups of people to a common cause can make a difference. If other universities would heed the call and follow Marquette's and Yale's lead by similarly investing in their urban communities, then all urban communities would be revitalized, and there would be growing economic opportunities for all.

Conclusion

The university can offer a wide variety of services to the community at large to complement its traditional roles of teaching, research, and service. These services can be offered asymmetrically (university has control) or in partnership (an environment of shared decision making and control). The primary roles that the university plays are facilitator, equity partner, and technical resource. The most common role is technical resource. The university is most often called upon to apply its expertise to help solve urban problems. "University-community partnerships offer great potential for improving the vitality of both partners. Communities have the opportunity to acquire the empowerment necessary to rejuvenate themselves. Universities have the opportunity to be active participants in a natural learning laboratory [. . .] while improving its image with its neighbors" (Young 1995, p. 77). According to Bartelt (1995):

> It is important that universities not lose sight of an important, persistent reality. In each of the efforts noted, from urban renewal to community partnerships, the essential power and asset relationships have been essentially asymmetrical: communities are largely viewed as being "in need"; in turn, they are provided for by an asset-rich (comparatively) college or university. This creates a relationship that, in times of institutional largesse, can be seen as charity, and in times of fiscal crisis, unimportant to the institution. It is not surprising to see communities approach such a relationship with suspicion, nor to see institutions of higher education questioning the imposition of yet another set of performance guidelines. It is vital for both universities and communities to grasp the nature of community development, on the one hand, and of the social context of institutions of higher education, on the other. Communities develop self-sufficiency as they are successful in amassing a resource base [. . .]. In this context, higher education is a potential resource for community development. It is not an abstract form of the "general good" that we should be addressing, but the specific needs of neighborhoods and communities that form the location and context of colleges and universities. (p. 23)