HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE
The Higher Education Exchange is founded on a thought articulated by Thomas Jefferson in 1820: I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

In the tradition of Jefferson, the Higher Education Exchange agrees that a central goal of higher education is to help make democracy possible by preparing citizens for public life. The Higher Education Exchange is part of a movement to strengthen higher education’s democratic mission and foster a more democratic culture throughout American society. Working in this tradition, the Higher Education Exchange publishes case studies, analyses, news, and ideas about efforts within higher education to develop more democratic societies.
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The Kettering Foundation’s research has been focused on putting the public back into the public’s business for more than thirty years. Its entire research agenda has this notion of public politics at its core. In this same vein, some questions that have recently been useful to Kettering researchers as the foundation focuses on its work with institutional actors—especially higher education and its relationship with the public—have emerged. They include:

- Why doesn’t higher education see the public we see?
- How can higher education learn to see the public? and
- How can the public become more visible to higher education?

One answer to these questions, we have found, is that higher education isn’t looking for what we’re seeing. Instead, higher education is accustomed to seeing and relating to many publics. They see students and their parents as one public, focused—much like clients—on a return-on-investment metric. They see the university faculty as another entity, who, when thinking of service to community, often want to do research on a community not with a community. They also see the neighborhood or community around the university as another public, usually an adversary, rarely a partner. This isn’t the public—or publics—that Kettering sees.

What Kettering sees in its work with citizens is a public-in-action, or citizens acting in concert together to solve problems and make decisions about their future. This is the public we hope to make visible to community institutions, including higher education.

Increasingly, there appear to be exceptions to this sort of blindness to the public on the part of higher education. Stories from those who are committed to and wrestle with making the public more visible fill this issue of the Higher Education Exchange.

HEX coeditor David Brown contributes two interviews with well-regarded scholars from the higher education universe. The first, with Thomas Bender of New York University, reveals Bender’s fear that Americans are no longer self-constituted, a quality that he believes is fundamental to a public. Nor does he think we view ourselves as a collectivity; instead he asserts that citizens live in
isolated enclaves. As to what this bodes for the future of the public, Bender suggests that we are on the cusp of a cultural transformation.

The second interview, with Thomas Ehrlich, a faculty member in the Stanford School of Education, and Ernestine Fu, currently working toward a PhD in engineering at Stanford, concerns the writing of their coauthored volume, Civic Work, Civic Lessons: Two Generations Reflect on Public Service. The book provides a multigenerational approach to understanding civic work. While Ehrlich has had a long career of public service, even he was surprised to learn from Fu about the hundreds of ways students engage in civic work today. Before his writing partnership with Fu, he clearly was not seeing the public that these civic-minded students represent. He learned through Fu that the type of civic work done by students is vastly different from his own public policy and political work early in his career. Fu sees this difference as a new form of youth activism—what she characterizes as youth social entrepreneurship. She describes this process as looking at a civic problem that needs solving and then exhausting the possibilities that may work best to solve the problem while remaining consistent with core values. She gives the reader a glimpse into a new view of students as civic or public actors.

Sandwiched between the two interviews is an essay by Harry Boyte. Boyte defines and describes three kinds of citizenship as public work: community-building, or the collective labors of solving public problems and building and sustaining shared resources in communities; vocation and civic professionalism, or callings to careers filled with public purpose; and democratizing public work—work that deepens and expands democracy. For Boyte, the public is not only visible, but also interactive, collaborative, and filled with purpose.

Martín Carcasson provides a first-person account of his efforts to make the public visible through his work with college students. He situates his work within the concept of wicked problems and suggests a role for higher education in creating students who can apply different modes of thinking and argument to public or wicked problems. Carcasson sees deliberation as providing a venue in which the public can have a hand in decision making, without acquiescing to experts or advocates. Higher education, he argues, is unable to make the public visible because of the expert approaches to
decision making. He outlines three persuasive reasons why engaging in deliberative practices is good business for higher education and the public.

Nick Longo, in the essay that follows, presents the emerging theory of deliberative pedagogy that seeks to connect college students to community through the curriculum. Building from the seminal works of John Dewey, Jane Addams, and the Highlander Center, the new institute for public service at Providence College is experimenting with providing a space for community and university members to come together around meals, conversation, and coursework. Longo asserts that deliberative pedagogy opens opportunities for deliberation and incorporates political themes into community engagement projects. These efforts can lead to public action becoming an ongoing part of the process of public deliberation on real-world problems in a community, fostered by higher education. This focus on public action, he suggests, is a result of a public creating itself.

Edith Manosevitch writes of deliberation in Israel. Juxtaposing a student-led deliberative forum with a traditional panel conference with political candidates for public office, she finds that the deliberative forum demonstrates the value of constructive public debate in her country. Manosevitch maintains that as a deeply divided society Israel needs ways to close the gap between its right- and left-wing ideologies. Deliberation, she asserts, may be one way to begin to close that gap. Students who participated in both the traditional panel presentation and the deliberative forum reported later that they would be interested in joining another deliberative forum. Not surprisingly, no one wanted to repeat the uproar that had accompanied the panel presentation. While deliberative pedagogy in a university setting is just now emerging in Israel, Manosevitch’s research shows its promise. What deliberation can do to make the public more visible in Israel is just beginning to be explored.

An essay by Sean Creighton follows. In his research on community colleges, Creighton identifies the inability of higher education to see the public as a function of the relationship most universities have with their community. When the relationship is primarily seen as the university acting upon the community, the public becomes opaque or worse, invisible. Creighton asserts that
until community colleges learn to embrace the idea that citizens have a role in decision making, citizens will remain clients, not collaborators. He believes that community colleges in particular can learn how to build bridges between campus and community that will promote civic and citizen engagement. But for now, they do not see these civic skills as central to the community college learning experience.

The review by Alex Lovit presents the most recent book from Bent Flyvbjerg. In *Real Social Science: Applied Phronesis*, Flyvbjerg and his coeditors demonstrate the rich possibilities of approaching academic work through the use of the concept of phronesis, or practical wisdom. Following on his previous volume, *Making Social Science Matter*, Flyvbjerg has collected responses to and applications of phronesis in this volume. The many authors share a commitment to the production of research that contributes to society’s practical knowledge. Through a combination of both theoretical and applied essays on phronesis, Flyvbjerg and his coauthors suggest “phronetic social scientists are explicitly concerned about public exposure, because they see it as one of the main vehicles for the type of social and political action that is at the heart of phronesis.” A careful read of this volume may offer further clues for understanding the public’s role in knowledge and wisdom development.

David Mathews rounds out the volume by reminding *HEX* readers of the crucial importance of the public’s point of view as colleges and universities put engagement and service learning projects into practice. He encourages universities to go a step beyond current practices to reinforce the work citizens do in building their communities. He restates the six democratic practices that have influenced the research of the Kettering Foundation and that characterize the work citizens do. He ends with an invitation to *HEX* readers who are also involved in this work to share their stories and experiments.
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