



HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



2013

Editors	David W. Brown
	Deborah Witte
Copy Editor	Joey Easton O'Donnell
Art Director/Production	Long's Graphic Design, Inc.
Cover Design, Illustrations, and Formatting	Long's Graphic Design, Inc.

The Kettering Foundation is a nonprofit operating foundation, chartered in 1927, that does not make grants but welcomes partnerships with other institutions (or groups of institutions) and individuals who are actively working on problems of communities, governing, politics, and education. The interpretations and conclusions contained in the *Higher Education Exchange*, unless expressly stated to the contrary, represent the views of the author or authors and not necessarily those of the foundation, its trustees, or officers.

Copyright © 2013 by the Kettering Foundation

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.



HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



2013

CONTENTS

Deborah Witte	Foreword	1
Thomas Bender	Reconstructing America's Public Life: An Interview	5
Harry C. Boyte	Reinventing Citizenship As Public Work: Civic Learning for the Working World	14
Thomas Ehrlich and Ernestine Fu	<i>Civic Work, Civic Lessons: Two Generations Reflect on Public Service: An Interview</i>	28
Martín Carcasson	Rethinking Civic Engagement on Campus: The Overarching Potential of Deliberative Practice	37
Nicholas V. Longo	Deliberative Pedagogy and the Community: Making the Connection	49
Edith Manosevitch	The Medium Is the Message: An Israeli Experience with Deliberative Pedagogy	60
Sean Creighton	Today's Civic Mission for Community Colleges	69
Alex Lovit	<i>Real Social Science: Applied Phronesis</i> Edited Bent Flyvbjerg, Todd Landman, and Sanford Schram	78
David Mathews	Engaging the Work of Democracy	83

DELIBERATIVE PEDAGOGY AND THE COMMUNITY: MAKING THE CONNECTION

By Nicholas V. Longo

It is becoming increasingly apparent that higher education is struggling to reinvent itself in the face of new challenges—from shrinking public expenditures and unsustainable tuition prices to economic uncertainties and loss of democratic commitment. Yet these challenges also present remarkable opportunities for innovation, experimentation, and civic purpose—and a broader look at where these new ideas and practices are likely to emerge. Questions about the future of higher education have been taken up in multiple settings over the past few years, culminating most recently in a report issued by the American Association of Colleges and Universities, *A Crucible Moment*. The report boldly calls for institutions of higher education to act as “sites for learning and practicing democratic and civic responsibilities” (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement 2012).

While large-scale change in higher education has historically been slow to develop, new practices for publicly engaged pedagogies that value different ways of knowing are emerging. A diverse array of public deliberation programs and courses has been initiated at colleges and universities, and as a result, a growing network of centers for public life is leading conversations on public issues—including the role of higher education in society—through National Issues Forums and other types of deliberations. The efficacy of public deliberation at resolving complex issues has led to its elements being incorporated into domains beyond the public policy or political sphere. One of the most prominent of these areas is education; specifically, deliberation as an integral part of pedagogy. David Mathews defines *deliberative politics* as the integration of deliberative decision making with public action (Mathews 2012). *Deliberative pedagogy* integrates deliberative decision making with teaching and learning.

Public deliberation is joined by more widespread publicly engaged practices—such as service learning and community

engagement—that help to educate for civic responsibility through reciprocal partnerships that take place outside the walls of campus. According to the Higher Education Research Institute, 65% of college freshmen reported that their campuses offered opportunities for community service or community service learning (Butin and Seider 2012). This is not all that surprising given the growing infrastructure on campuses to support community-based learning. There are centers of service learning and civic engagement on up to 94 percent of colleges and universities that belong to Campus Compact, a national coalition that helps to support the integration of civic and community-based learning (Campus Compact 2008), along with college majors, minors, and a new career track for directors of community education.

But these publicly engaged practices—democratic deliberation and service learning/community engagement—too often take place in isolation. New ways of knowing through publicly engaged pedagogies often simply mirror the silo mentality that permeates more traditional models of teaching and learning. And yet there are civic engagement programs and practices that attempt to bridge these pedagogical divides: namely, *deliberative dialogue that connects with education in the community*.

Connecting deliberative pedagogy and the community is not entirely new. It draws upon historical efforts—such as those developed by the Highlander Folk School during the civil rights movement—led by educators such as Myles Horton, Septima Clark, and Bernice Robinson. Among the significant contributions of Highlander are processes that were used in the “learning circle” method, which empowered people by democratizing the decision-making process. This, for Horton, was integrally tied to education. He argued that learning and decision making are inseparable. “People learn from making decisions,” Horton explains, “and making decisions helps them learn” (Horton 1973, 245). Thus, Highlander involved students in naming, framing, and ultimately acting on the issues that mattered most to them.

This insight can be seen in practice in higher education today. Deliberative pedagogy in the community is more than a unique type of deliberative practice. It also illustrates the emergence of a new approach to teaching and learning. This more collaborative



approach to teaching and learning—in part the result of increased diversity, new technologies that promote transparency and collaboration, and the civic experiences of the millennial generation—offers a new educational paradigm. It moves us beyond a shift from “teaching-to-learning” toward a model of “collaborative engagement” where knowledge is more genuinely co-created through reflective public action. The shift toward collaboration also helps us to see the potential for deliberative pedagogy to illuminate the civic dimensions of teaching and learning in a time of rapid transformation in higher education.

Talking Outside the Classroom

Throughout our nation’s history, education has been linked to the promise of democracy. Deliberative pedagogy is often used as a vehicle to make this connection in higher education, as it spans many domains—connecting communication studies with civic learning and combining new approaches for teaching and learning with productive possibilities for multicultural education.

Deliberative pedagogy most often occurs inside the boundaries of the classroom. For instance, a faculty member might use public deliberation to help students understand the nature of public policy choices, to develop skills in group communication, or to understand a specific public issue such as immigration, the federal debt, or education reform. These approaches to public deliberation tend to be not only important examples of civic learning, but also engaged teaching and learning. Yet confining education to the classroom can be constricting, as it overlooks the many assets of community and community institutions for learning. “The American tendency to equate education and schooling and make schools the instrument for satisfying our wants and alleviating our malaise takes attention from our circumstances,” writes John Goodlad. “We bet on schools, leaving the contextual circumstances unaddressed” (Goodlad 1997, 41). This applies not only to K-12



schooling, but also higher education. Schooling and communities are inextricably linked; solutions to the problems in each must be addressed by harnessing the many talents in the entire “ecology of education” (Cremin 1976).

A growing number of educators are recognizing the power of the community for civic learning, drawing upon the educational philosophies of such pioneers as Jane Addams, John Dewey, Elsie Clapp, Myles Horton, and Lawrence Cremin. These educators have found that thinking more broadly about where learning takes place unleashes a vast set of resources for learning; it also allows education to be more connected to democratic revitalization.

Education in the community is active learning that takes place outside of, but often connected with, the classroom. It involves more than a short-term community service project; it means intentionally putting education in the context of long-term community building efforts. It is most often place-based, using a collaborative, integrated, problem-solving approach. The role of community more often gets recognized as part of student internships, practicums, international immersion, and especially service learning courses in higher education; yet there is also a strand of education in the community that includes public deliberation (which, it is important to note, is where deliberative politics is most likely to take place). In a growing number of courses and programs, for instance, students are involved in public deliberation in community-based settings that go well beyond any introduction to deliberation. Today, students are involved in a variety of deliberative projects that ask them to take leadership in their local communities. And these practices of deliberative pedagogy, which involve reciprocal community partnerships, are also powerful models that begin to challenge traditional notions of politics, engagement, and education. Deliberative pedagogy in the community connects—and transforms—deliberative dialogue and community engagement by attempting to create space for reciprocal conversations, grounded in real-world experiences, which lead to public judgment and collective action.

A Promising Practice in Higher Education

Providence College’s Feinstein Institute for Public Service is experimenting with deliberative pedagogy in the community with the development of the PC/Smith Hill Annex, which draws explicitly

on the examples set by Myles Horton and other historical models such as Jane Addams at Hull House and the social settlement house movement. The Annex is a 1,000 square-foot storefront leased by Providence College from the Smith Hill Community Development Corporation, a long-time partner of the college's Feinstein Institute.

Keith Morton of Providence College, who spearheads the project, describes it as "a space for community and campus to come together." The Annex hosts courses open to students and community members; potluck dinners and book clubs; breakdance, exercise and street art programs; strategic planning meetings of partner organizations; education and support groups for people contending with a variety of challenges—any configuration that will bring campus and community into dialogue. The expectation is that over time the co-creation of this shared space will facilitate campus and community "getting to know one another as neighbors." Morton concludes: "Our deep hope is that these conversations will help the people and institutions articulate and realize what it is that they find most meaningful" (Battistoni, Longo, and Morton, forthcoming). As part of the PC/Smith Hill Annex, the Feinstein Institute is partnering with College Unbound, an experimental college for nontraditional college students, and several high schools and community-based organizations to offer courses around the theme "The City and . . ." The annual course, which is offered each fall semester, provides space for intergenerational conversations and reflective practice around the city of Providence. The first course in the fall of 2011, *The City and Its Youth*, examined the theme of youth and youthwork. The subsequent course, *The City and Its Storytellers*, focused on capturing neighborhood-based storytelling in Providence. Future themes being considered include *The City and Its Arts*, *The City and the World*, and *The City and Its Future*.

Overcoming Challenges

While this initiative offers a compelling example of the potential link between deliberation and community engagement, there are also challenges when asking college students to take real responsibility in the community. Unlike Highlander, for instance, the above example is located within the confines of university education, which is built upon numerous artificial constructions

. . . there are also challenges when asking college students to take real responsibility in the community.

of time. Students take classes measured in credit hours, courses are offered in terms, schedules change each semester until students amass enough hours at the university to graduate. These ways of thinking about time grow out of a scientific conception of learning. John Tagg (2003) suggests that common conceptions of time in higher education result in a limited “time horizon.” That is, students and teachers think they will have to live with the consequences of their actions at school for only a brief time.

In one example of this limited time horizon, J. Herman Blake tells a story of trying to see if some of his college students could intern at Highlander. Blake had been at Highlander, knew Myles Horton, and was aware of Highlander’s work with communities. Thinking this would be an ideal learning experience for his students, he asked Horton, then still director of Highlander, if his students from Santa Cruz could come and do internships at Highlander. “Yes,” Horton replied, “we will be glad to have them, provided that they stay with us for two years” (quoted in Wallace 2000, 133). This was not a commitment many students in higher education could make.

Others have raised related challenges about the role of student leadership in the community. For instance, an early pioneer in the service-learning movement, Richard Cone offers a challenge that empowering students in campus-community partnerships means giving ownership of civic engagement efforts to the most transient and least experienced of those involved in the partnerships. The ethical dilemma that Cone shares is the uncertainty as to “how to engage students in a way that they acquired a sense of humility and a respect for those they ‘serve.’” Cone questions the privilege associated with many students in institutions of higher learning, who he fears “would use their service experiences to acquire skills and knowledge they could use to further disenfranchise those already disenfranchised” (Cone 1996, 21). In giving students more responsibility for leading deliberation in the community, do we run the risk of increasing their sense of privilege and shifting control of the learning even further away from the community? These challenges can be overcome, however, by applying the heightened expectations that come from what Richard Battistoni has termed a “sustained, development, cohort” approach that prepares and supports students

to be engaged democratic citizens in community settings (Mitchell et al. 2011). Battistoni and his colleagues describe the impact of multi-year programs such as the Public and Community Service Studies major at Providence College, the Citizen Scholar Program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and the Public Service Scholars Program at Stanford University—all of which have existed since the mid-1990s—on the formation of civic identities and effective campus-community partnerships. These programs each contain four fundamental principles that help produce students with an enhanced civic identity and the skills necessary for relational, action-oriented leadership, which include student voice, community collaboration, engaged scholarship, and a commitment to reflective practice. Furthermore, when community partnerships are thought of as long-term, reciprocal relationships, space is opened for experimentation, mistakes, and flexibility as both sides of the partnership see themselves as dedicated to the long haul.

Deliberative pedagogy in the community also seems to offer an opportunity to address criticisms leveled against deliberative dialogue and community engagement, respectively. For instance, one criticism of deliberative dialogue is a version of the old adage “all talk, no action”—or as Myles Horton explained, “All you do is sit there and tell stories” (Horton & Freire 1990, 99). In advocating for the importance of including public work in deliberative civic engagement, Harry Boyte explains:

Deliberative democracy, welcome as it is, is not enough. Alone, it all too easily takes on a hortatory, idealized quality that separates out an abstract “public sphere” of communicative consensus from real world politics built upon negotiation, bargaining, messy compromise and also creative work to what was once termed, in American history, the commonwealth. (Boyte 1995)

Similarly, critics point to the seemingly apolitical nature of community engagement. This can be seen in the language and framework of service learning, the most common form of community engagement, with its emphasis on “serving needs” and addressing community “deficiencies” (McKnight 1995). Many forms of community engagement also fail to recognize the nature of politics and power. Boyte contends that service routinely “neglects to teach about root causes and power relationships, fails to stress productive impact,

Many forms of community engagement also fail to recognize the nature of politics and power.

ignores politics, and downplays the strengths and talents of those being served” (Boyte 2004, 12).

Deliberative pedagogy in the community opens opportunities for deliberation to incorporate political themes into community engagement projects as students become involved in reflective conversations with a diverse set of stakeholders; and, likewise, this collaborative practice opens opportunities for community engagement to incorporate more public action as an ongoing part of the process of public deliberation as students get involved in real-world community settings.

Toward Collaborative Engagement

“Deliberative democracy challenges academic institutions at every level: from the nature of teaching and the character of the extracurricular program to the very meaning of scholarship,” writes David Mathews (Mathews 2009, 13). Deliberative democracy also offers higher education an example of the type of civic innovation needed for colleges and universities to address the complex challenges facing communities.

Almost twenty years ago, Barr and Tagg articulated an important conceptual shift in teaching and learning—from an Instructional to a Learning Paradigm—that is taking shape across the landscape of higher education. This moves campuses from institutions that exist to provide instruction to institutions that exist to provide learning. With the learning-centered approach, they write, the college’s purpose serves “not to transfer knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learning that make discoveries and solve problems” (Barr and Tagg 1995, 15). And yet as a growing number of campus programs make clear, when deliberative pedagogy takes place outside the classroom, it recognizes an essential aspect to the learner-centered paradigm that is often invisible: the community.

In looking at Providence College’s example of deliberative pedagogy in the community, it seems we may be seeing the emergence of the next paradigm that goes beyond the more linear teacher-learner dichotomy still dominant even among the most well-intentioned adherents to the learning paradigm. The next generation of engaged

teaching and learning, it would seem, will more fully incorporate the ecology of educational opportunities available to students in a global and digital world, including community and community institutions. Building on these insights, the Next Generation Engagement Project sponsored by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education has begun to argue that reciprocal, co-creative engagement is the foundation for a new framework for teaching and learning, what might be termed “collaborative engagement.”

The emergence of this new collaborative paradigm is partly the result of significant cultural transformations, especially the advent and adaptation of innovative technologies that have revolutionized the ways in which people communicate, work, and learn. This idea, however, also echoes the writing from educational figures, such as John Dewey, who believed that knowledge and learning are most effective when people work collaboratively to solve specific, real world problems. “Thinking,” he wrote, “begins in . . . a forked road situation, a situation which is ambiguous, which presents a dilemma, which poses alternatives” (Dewey 1910, 11). But to really be immersed in these kinds of forked-road situations with others most often requires going outside the boundaries of the classroom, involving the community as reciprocal partners and co-educators.

This approach means not only recognizing new places for learning, but also recognizing the need for new connections to be made. Thus, in order to fully develop and implement a new paradigm for teaching and learning, we need to be, well, even more collaborative. This asks us to practice collaborative engagement by breaking the disciplining silos that engulf even reform movements in higher education, a call for connecting academic learning with community engagement and deliberative dialogue. In short, we need to do even more talking—and collective acting—in the community.

REFERENCES

- Addams, Jane. *Twenty Years at Hull House*. New York: Penguin Classics, 1998 (Original work published in 1910).
- Barr, Robert, and John Tagg. “From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm in Undergraduate Education,” *Change*, (November/December 1995):13-25.
- Battistoni, Richard, Nicholas Longo, and Keith Morton. “Co-Creating Mutual Spaces for Campuses and Communities: Feinstein Institute for Public Service.” In Plaut et al. (eds.), *Asset-based Approaches to Community Engagement in Higher Education*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Campus Compact.

- Boyte, Harry. *Beyond Deliberation: Citizenship as Public Work*, Civic Practices Network, 1995, <http://www.cpn.org/crm/contemporary/beyond.html>, accessed September 6, 2013.
- . *Everyday Politics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- . *We the People Politics: The Populist Promise of Deliberative Public Work*. Dayton: Kettering Foundation Press, 2011.
- Butin, Dan, and Scott Seider. *The Engaged Campus: Certificates, Minors, and Majors as the New Community Engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Campus Compact. “Service Statistics: Highlights and Trends of Campus Compact’s Annual Membership Survey, 2008.” *Campus Compact*, <http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/2008-statistics1.pdf>, accessed September 6, 2013.
- Cone, Richard. “Michelle’s Quandary.” In *Community Service in Higher Education: A Decade of Development*, edited by Richard Battistoni and Keith Morton. Providence, RI: Providence College, 1996, 21-22.
- Cremin, Lawrence. *Public Education*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Daynes, Gary, and Nicholas Longo. “Jane Addams and the Origins of Service-Learning Practice in the United States.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning* 11, no. 1 (Fall 2004): 5-13.
- Dedrick, John, Harris Dienstfrey, and Laura Grattan, eds. *Deliberation and the Work of Higher Education*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press, 2008.
- Dewey, John. *How We Think*. New York: D.C. Heath & Co., 1910.
- Gastil, John, and Peter Levine. *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-first Century*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2005.
- Glen, John. *Highlander: No Ordinary School*. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1996.
- Goodlad, John. *In Praise of Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1997.
- Harriger, Gary, and Jill McMillan. *Speaking of Politics: Preparing College Students for Democratic Citizenship through Deliberative Dialogue*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press, 2007.
- Horton, Myles. “Decision Making Processes,” in *The Myles Horton Reader: Education for Social Change*, edited by Dale Jacobs. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2003 (original work published 1973).
- Horton, Myles, and Paulo Freire. *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations on Education and Social Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.
- London, Scott. *Doing Democracy: How a Network of Grassroots Organizations is Strengthening Community, Building Capacity, and Shaping a New Kind of Civic Education*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation, 2010.
- Longo, Nicholas. *Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2007.
- Mathews, David. “Ships Passing in the Night?” in *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 13, no 3. (2009): 5-16.
- . “Foreword,” in *Democratizing Deliberation: A Political Theory Anthology*, edited by Barker et al. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press, 2012.
- McKnight, John. *The Careless Society: Community and its Counterparts*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
- Mitchell, Tania, et al. “Educating for Democratic Leadership at Stanford, UMass, and Providence College,” in *From Command to Community: A New Approach to Leadership Education in Colleges and Universities*, edited by Nicholas Longo and Cynthia Gibson. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press, 2011.
- The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2012.
- Nabatchi, Tina, et al. *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Saltmarsh, John. “Changing Pedagogies,” in *Handbook of Engaged Scholarship: Contemporary Landscapes, Future Directions*, Vol. 1, edited by Hiram Fitzgerald, Cathy Burack, and Sarena Seifer. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2010.

- Smith, Mark. "The Possibilities of Public Life: Educating in the Community," in *Education and Community: The Politics of Practice*, edited by Garth Allen and Ian Martin. New York: Cassell Education Series, 1992.
- Stein, Jerome. "Youth Development in Context: Education in the Community," in *The University and the Community: Renewing the Relationship*, edited by Jerome Stein and Nicholas Longo. Minneapolis: Center for 4-H Youth Development, University of Minnesota, 2001.
- Stoecker, Randy, and Elizabeth Tryon. *The Unheard Voices: Community Organizations and Service Learning*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 2009.
- Tagg, John. *The Learning Paradigm College*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing, 2003.
- Wallace, John. "The Problem of Time," in *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, no. 1, (2000): 133-142.

CONTRIBUTORS

Thomas Bender is University Professor of the Humanities and professor of history at New York University. He identifies himself as an intellectual and cultural historian, and his writings range over the history of intellectuals and city culture, the academic disciplines and academic culture, and most recently, the relation of cities and nations to global history. In all of these topics the definition and role of community and public culture play an important role.

Harry C. Boyte is director of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship at Augsburg College, a Senior Fellow at the University of Minnesota's Humphrey School of Public Affairs, and visiting professor at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in South Africa. In 2012, he served as national coordinator of the American Commonwealth Partnership, a network of higher education groups and institutions created by invitation of the White House Office of Public Engagement, which worked with the Department of Education to develop strategies to strengthen higher education as a public good.

David W. Brown is coeditor of the *Higher Education Exchange* and coedited two recent Kettering publications, *Agent of Democracy* and *A Different Kind of Politics*. He taught at Yale's School of Management and New School's Milano Graduate School. He is the author of *When Strangers Cooperate* (Free Press, 1995), *Organization Smarts* (Amacom, 2002), and *The Real Change-Makers: Why Government Is Not the Problem or the Solution* (Praeger, 2012), and *America's Culture of Professionalism: Past, Present, and Prospects* (Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming in 2014).

Martín Carcasson is an associate professor in the Communication Studies department of Colorado State University, and the founder and director of the CSU Center for Public Deliberation (CPD). His research focuses on utilizing deliberative engagement to improve community problem solving and local democracy.

Sean Creighton is the executive director of the Southwest Ohio Council for Higher Education (SOCHE), a regional consortium helping universities transform their communities and economies. He has published and presented extensively on the impact of higher education, collaboration, and civic engagement. Sean earned his PhD from Antioch University, and is an elected member of the board of education in Yellow Springs, Ohio, where he lives with his wife, Leslee, and five children, Liam, Maya, Quinn, Audrey, and Juliette.

Thomas Ehrlich worked in the administrations of five presidents starting with President Kennedy, reporting directly to President Carter on foreign-aid policy. He has also served as president of Indiana University, provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and dean of Stanford Law School. He is the author, coauthor, or editor of fourteen books, holds five honorary degrees, and is a member of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. He is currently on the faculty of the Stanford School of Education.

Ernestine Fu founded a nonprofit organization that brings music to seniors, disabled people, and homeless families. She has also helped State Farm Insurance fund youth-led service projects, and is now on the committee charged with shaping a new leadership and service center at the Presidio in San Francisco. She completed her bachelors and masters degrees at Stanford University, and is currently working towards a PhD in engineering.

Nicholas V. Longo is director of Global Studies and associate professor of Public and Community Service Studies at Providence College. He is the author of a number of books, articles, and reports on issues of youth civic engagement, community-based leadership, global citizenship, and service learning, including *Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life* (SUNY Press) and a coedited volume (with Cynthia Gibson) entitled *From Command to Community: A New Approach to Leadership Education in Colleges and Universities* (Tufts University Press).

Alex Lovit is a visiting scholar at the Kettering Foundation. His research interests focus on the history of American political and civic practices, and he coordinates the Foundation's research project that takes stock of the civic renewal movement. He also works with the Foundation and external partners to develop issue guides used in deliberative forums about historical decisions. Alex holds a BA in English from Amherst College, and a PhD in history from the University of Michigan.

Edith Manosevitch is a lecturer in the School of Communication at Netanya Academic College in Netanya, Israel. She holds a PhD in communication from the University of Washington in Seattle, and has served as a research associate at the Kettering Foundation. Her research focuses on deliberation theory and practice, in particular as it relates to online deliberation and deliberative pedagogy. She serves as a board member of the *Journal of Public Deliberation*. Her writings have been published in the *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* and *New Media & Society*.

David Mathews, president of the Kettering Foundation, was secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Ford administration and, before that, president of the University of Alabama. Mathews has written extensively on Southern history, public policy, education, and international problem solving. His books include *Politics for People: Finding a Responsible Public Voice*, *Reclaiming Public Education by Reclaiming Our Democracy*, and the forthcoming *The Ecology of Democracy: Finding Ways to Have a Stronger Hand in Shaping Our Future*.

Deborah Witte is a program officer for the Kettering Foundation and coeditor of the *Higher Education Exchange*. She has earned her PhD from Antioch University and serves on the board of the Southwest Ohio Council for Higher Education (SOCHE).

Kettering Foundation

200 Commons Road, Dayton, Ohio 45459-2799 (937) 434-7300; (800) 221-3657
444 North Capitol Street, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 393-4478
6 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016 (212) 686-7016
www.kettering.org

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Bloomington, IN
Permit No. 26