

HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



2018

Editors: Derek Barker and Alex Lovit
Copy Editor: Joey Easton
Formatting: Long's Graphic Design, Inc.

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.

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 © 2018 by the Kettering Foundation

ISSN 2469-6293 (print)

ISSN 2471-2280 (online)

HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



2018

A Note of Appreciation

David Brown has not just been an editor of *HEX* since 1994. He is also its cocreator, together with former Kettering Foundation program officer Deborah Witte. The *Higher Education Exchange*, as readers will know, is a publication whose purpose is to facilitate a conversation in higher education about the role of academe in democracy, particularly the role of students as actors and producers.

David was ideal as an editor of the journal because he brought to the work an astonishing breadth of experience, both inside and outside the academy: from serving as deputy mayor of New York City under Mayor Ed Koch to teaching at Yale's School of Management and New School's Milano Graduate School, and serving as president of Blackburn College. His perceptive insights were evident in the interviews he conducted, which were regularly published in *HEX*. And he undoubtedly drew on what he learned from the *Exchange* in his own books, including *The Real Change-Makers: Why Government is Not the Problem or the Solution* and *America's Culture of Professionalism: Past, Present, and Prospects*.

His most recent contribution to Kettering's work has been to help launch a new initiative in higher education to cultivate a greater civic and democratic understanding of professionalism. We are deeply appreciative of David's many contributions to this journal and to Kettering's research. We are pleased to have Derek Barker, who is leading Kettering's studies of democracy and higher education, continue on as coeditor of the journal. And we welcome Alex Lovit as coeditor; he is leading Kettering's research on teaching deliberative democracy through historic decisions.

David Mathews

CONTENTS

Derek W. M. Barker	Learning to Strengthen Democracy, Democratically (Foreword)	1
Harry C. Boyte	Public Achievement: The Work of Building Democratic Culture	5
Joni Doherty & Alice Diebel, with Joseph Hoereth, David Hoffman, Marla Kanengieter-Wildeson, Windy Lawrence, David E. Procter, Norma Ramos, & Lisa Strahley	Centers for Democratic Public Life: Learning as a Deliberative Democratic Practice	17
Lorlene Hoyt	Reflections on Advancing University Civic Engagement Internationally	29
John J. Theis, Carrie B. Kisker, & Alberto Olivas	Deepening Deliberation in Community Colleges: Reflections on Our Research	39
Nicholas Longo & Marshalita Sims Peterson, with Derek W. M. Barker	Learning to Teach Democracy (An Interview)	51
Alex Lovit	A Loss of Public Purpose: How Will Higher Education Respond?	61
David Mathews	A Question of Culture	68
	Contributors	76

CENTERS FOR DEMOCRATIC PUBLIC LIFE

Learning as a Deliberative Democratic Practice

Joni Doherty and Alice Diebel, with Joseph Hoereth, David Hoffman, Marla Kanengieter-Wildeson, Windy Lawrence, David E. Procter, Norma Ramos, and Lisa Strahley

For more than 25 years, the Kettering Foundation has partnered with a large number of organizations to foster the development of centers for democratic public life. Based on what Kettering and the centers have learned over the years, the ways in which the deliberative democratic practices are understood and used have continuously evolved. Most of the centers convene deliberative forums and many develop their own issue guides. All are involved with strengthening a deliberative democratic ecology that fosters collective learning through practices that include deliberative decision-making, identifying resources, and acting in complementary ways with other individuals and groups. While maintaining a relationship with these practitioners, Kettering recognizes and affirms their independence, which has led to a diversity of interests and work. There is no single model.

The Kettering Foundation's internal directory currently lists 110 centers for democratic public life; most are at higher education institutions and some are community based. Their organizational structures vary. Many might more accurately be described as spheres of activity rather than as discrete organizational units. Some are comprised of a few faculty members from one department; others are independent institutes with their own offices, staff, and budget. Some are involved in a wide array of activities; others may only hold a few forums each year. Sometimes the work is primarily with students and colleagues in curricular, cocurricular, and/or extracurricular programs; other centers focus on working with their institutions to realize their civic mission and are primarily community centered.

This essay grew out of a conversation among a group of center directors who are also faculty members. They committed to integrating deliberative democratic principles and practices into their work with students, both on

campus and in the community. Since deliberative democracy is not limited to a single field of study, it is relevant to an array of disciplines. This discussion generated insights about the challenges and benefits of integrating deliberative democratic practices into their teaching, research, and civic work. The work of the centers housed in colleges and universities is grounded in some basic

Deliberative democracy principles and practices put citizens at the center.

theory and practice of deliberative democracy, as is used in communities, but the faculty also describe particular chal-

lenges of introducing collaborative practices into universities, where they can conflict with traditional hierarchies of expertise between faculty members, students, and the broader public.

A Deliberative Democratic Ecology

Deliberative democracy principles and practices put citizens at the center. The term “citizens” is defined here not legalistically, but as individuals who work together to address a public problem. These practices include ongoing collective learning; naming issues in terms of what people hold dear; identifying possible actions for addressing these issues, including weighing trade-offs; making decisions deliberatively; identifying resources; and working together in complementary ways that recognize the strengths different parts of the community (individuals, organizations, and institutions, including governmental entities) can bring to bear on issues of common concern. Sometimes these practices coalesce, as in more formally structured deliberative forums; at other times the practices are used in ways that are more improvisational or informal.

The six faculty are from various institutions, including land-grant and research universities, community colleges, and a private liberal arts college. Faculty members represented various disciplines, including public administration, communication studies, community economic development, education, and urban planning. Participants have all been involved in research and learning exchanges with Kettering. Some focus most heavily on building capacity for deliberative democracy by working with students, while others are involved with building capacity for citizens to work democratically in communities. All are well grounded in ideas concerning the ecology of deliberative democracy.

Deliberative democracy is part of a growing civic-engagement movement in academic institutions. Sometimes that movement is co-opted by concerns about public relations—a somewhat self-serving effort by the academy to build

town-gown relationships or recruit students. Often outreach takes the form of service to the community, which can leave people in dependent positions. But the faculty in this conversation see the community not as a bundle of needs to be served, but instead as a complex network of interactions that they may join. These faculty recognize that citizens need to be at the center of public life.

The “ecology of democracy” is a metaphor describing the complex and interconnected parts of any community that must find ways to exist together in a place. The ecology includes citizens, living their family lives; organizations, both large and small, loosely structured and formal; and significant institutions that provide service and governance structures, such as public schools, governments, colleges, and the media. The community is the place where people decide what their lives will be like within this ecology, and they can decide more or less deliberatively and democratically. Community-based decisions about how to educate and socialize the next generation, and how to maintain safety, prosperity, and health are the core of ecological work. The faculty in our conversation were trying to encourage an eco-friendly path to decision-making by facilitating citizen deliberation, encouraging collective choice, and cocreating actions and resources that will work for the benefit of the whole. The ecology recognizes that individualism puts citizens in competition or at cross purposes, rather than in collaboration and coproduction of the common good. The common good is decided collectively and can be a shifting and changing vision of what it takes for human flourishing.

In our conversation, we quickly realized that these centers were thinking of deliberative democracy as a radical act. David Procter, who directs the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy at Kansas State University, said that talking together to make important decisions doesn't seem as though it should be controversial, but it was among many of his colleagues. Earlier in his career, he and his colleagues studied political advertisements and speeches. He said it felt like they were working for the wrong team. They shifted their focus to what citizens were saying and, as a result of that change, developed an institute that makes it more likely that citizens will discuss these issues with one another. He believes it is important for faculty and institutional actors to listen deeply to these conversations and craft their approaches to addressing issues with these citizens in mind.

The “centers” work with Kettering through learning exchanges that focus on public deliberation. Through their work, they have changed the democratic practices of their communities, both in the academy and among citizens. All

of these centers use forums to support public deliberation about challenging issues so that people might make sound choices. The centers learned how to listen to citizens as they name their concerns, frame options to address those concerns, deliberate and choose a course of action that uses resources from all parts of the community, and learn together so the work of community constantly evolves. It is a creative and iterative set of practices, and when used to build the capacity for stronger and ecologically sound democracy, the work is transformative.

Faculty, administrators, and students associated with these centers built new networks of interaction by crossing disciplinary lines, institutional barriers, and community sectors, and by creating new intersections for public work. Most were initiated by faculty members who started self-created centers and then built support over time within their institutions and through a network of organizations. Through these circles of engagement across various lines, they have each become a steward of a place. Part of that stewardship means building the capacity of others to engage democratically. Capacity building might include students or community members, or students and citizens together. Whatever the approach, they move democratic practices outward, in, and through the ecology of democracy.

Decision-Makers and Knowledge Producers

In deliberative democracy, citizens, institutions, and communities work in complementary ways, and the unique and essential contributions of each are recognized. The central position of citizen as decision-maker and knowledge producer is not how most people think about their roles in addressing public problems. Also, citizens, including students, are too often perceived by elected officials, administrators, and educators as inadequately informed and incapable of making thoughtful decisions about controversial issues.

David Procter is familiar with the apprehension experienced by many academics when they begin using these practices to address community problems. When he first began convening deliberative forums, colleagues said things like, “Oh, man, this is going to be terrible!” and, “It’s just going to get out of control.” At the beginning, he was “super-nervous,” but things turned out well. “It makes a difference when you start off by asking people to speak from personal experience, when you agree on a set of ground rules, when it’s not an either/or choice. There are very, very few times where things have gotten really crazy.” His conclusion? “People can be very reasonable and thoughtful given the right structure of the conversation.”

Windy Lawrence's experience echoes Procter's. She told of a time when a new provost at the University of Houston-Downtown, who was not familiar with the work of the Center for Public Deliberation she directs there, said to her, "If you can get through discussing immigration, you will really have proved your center." Lawrence recalls, "Of course, [the forum] went well. That's something that isn't surprising."

David Hoffman, cochair of the Civic Forum at the City University of New York, agrees that the source of these productive outcomes lies in the structure of the conversation. Most public sessions use debate-like formats, where individuals state

their positions and then make arguments to defend them. In contrast, in deliberative forums participants share personal narratives that establish how the issue affects them in their daily lives.

"Beginning with a personal narrative," he observed, "draws people into the conversation and opens up the richness of

the topic in a way that just stating a position can't really do. If you're arguing the affirmative or the negative on a particular policy, you don't see all the ways that it intersects with people's lives."

The use of deliberative democratic practices influences how people relate to each other and to issues, and also deepens their understanding of the role of citizens. As Lawrence reflected on her work in Houston over the past 10 years, she noted:

One of the things that has been eye-opening to me is the way people understand politics differently after the experience of public deliberation.

One of the things that we are adding to this notion of politics is that politics is the ability to understand, to learn, and to navigate systems.

Public spaces are increasingly elusive because they only come into existence when political activity occurs. They are the places where "I see myself," observes Marla Kanengieter-Wildeson, whose work is diffused across the university and the curriculum at St. Cloud State (and not within a center per se). It is where

"Beginning with a personal narrative draws people into the conversation and opens up the richness of the topic in a way that just stating a position can't really do. If you're arguing the affirmative or the negative on a particular policy, you don't see all the ways that it intersects with people's lives."

individuals are in relation with others and in the work of creating “the world.” The world, as defined by Hannah Arendt, is the very fragile public space where all are free to propose and debate actions for the common welfare. Public spaces in a democracy affirm the value of the individual and the community because they come into existence when citizens communicate and work together with

Public spaces in a democracy affirm the value of the individual and the community because they come into existence when citizens communicate and work together with others as equals for the common good.

others as equals for the common good. This kind of political activity is also a source of creativity. Engaging in political activity in a public space, with all of its unpredictability, is, according to Arendt, how individuals become fully human.

The retreat from public spaces is not a new phenomenon. It was a concern for Arendt in the years following World War II. She warned against the intrusion of the private—where things are hidden and hierarchies are secure—and the social into what she called the space of appearance, or the public space. Forty years ago, the political theorist Hanna Fenichel Pitkin also pointed out the threat to public work. She wrote:

By almost all the available evidence, we are witnessing a widespread turning away from public life. . . . The possibility that public participation might be intrinsically rewarding, a fulfillment of our nature rather than a burden, is pursued by almost no one.¹

Today, the withdrawal to the private and the social continues, and opportunities for interaction with others in a noncommercialized public space are increasingly rare.

Kanengieter-Wildeson reminded us of the dangerous erosion of public space and the importance and fragility of “face-to-face presence” that forums offer students. Deliberative forums and other “invitational places” developed by Kanengieter-Wildeson and her colleagues are “spaces where students can be present to one another in a thoughtful and open way.” The diverse perspectives prompt individuals to stop and think. Deliberative democratic practices, including deliberative pedagogies, prompt people to think, and to think deeply. This is an activity that cannot be assumed. As Arendt has observed, “A life without thinking is quite possible; it then fails to develop its own essence—it is not merely meaningless; it is not fully alive.”²

Complementary Expertise

Deliberative democratic practices challenge the culture of expertise in higher education in two ways. First, because the culture and modes of deliberative democratic interaction in communities differ from how public problems are approached in academia, faculty are challenged to adapt the familiar methodologies of their disciplines in order to work in complementary ways with citizens and community organizations. Second, deliberative pedagogies utilize democratic approaches to teaching and learning, and also alter relationships between faculty and students.

Expertise rests not only on the knowledge associated with a discipline, but also the practice of it. Practices associated with deliberative democracy invite scholars to practice their discipline differently. That can create tension, since, as they learn to adapt these practices to their own work, academics who are deeply immersed in their field's content and methodologies are put into situations where they are the novices rather than the experts.

Last year, the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy at Kansas State began a civic-engagement fellowship program with a cohort of faculty who were interested in incorporating deliberative practice into their various disciplines. They met five times over the course of the year in sessions that ranged from two hours to a full day. But even at the end of the program, there was still nervousness on their part about taking the leap to this new way of working. David Procter reflected on the project, noting:

They weren't as confident as we hoped that they would be. They were all willing to give it a shot. They talked about how they were going to restructure their approach to teaching to incorporate more deliberative democratic work into their courses. But it struck me how all of them were still very nervous about the kinds of things that we had talked about. They came from different disciplines. They didn't have the vocabulary even though they were familiar with deliberative forums and had, in some way or another, worked with communities. But they seemed really tied to their particular disciplines. They were trying to get their heads around what we were saying and figuring out how it might look in their particular work.

Lisa Strahley, coordinator of the SUNY Broome Community College Center for Civic Engagement, compares the experience to riding a bicycle: "The first time you try it, you're wobbly. But with practice and confidence in yourself, it becomes easier. There's a sense of caring that causes us to worry. A certain amount of nervousness is healthy." It speaks to how powerful this culture of the expert is, especially in the academy. David Procter concluded:

We've spent our entire lives learning from our particular perspective. When we start talking about doing things a little differently, it feels radical. This is a really important insight, at least for me. I've often thought about this culture of the expert in higher ed as being one centered around content: "I know this stuff, and you don't. Therefore, you should listen to me." Now I also realize that part of this power of the expert is not just the content knowledge but the how-to-do-it-ness of different disciplines.

In contrast, Kanengieter-Wildeson questioned the strength of this culture:

I want to say I'm not an expert. I'm continually learning. When the questions come up from colleagues about my work in deliberative democracy, I think, "Hmm, I'm not sure how to answer that." Faculty want certain answers. "Well, how can I do this in my class?" I will give them information and materials but I am also trying to emphasize the flexibility of these practices.

Joseph Hoereth, who directs the Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement at the University of Illinois at Chicago, warned against underestimating the persistence of the culture of expertise. He believes deliberative democratic approaches are often seen as an inferior way of communicating. "It's just really hard to break from the notion that if a faculty member has some important work to share, the best way is through a traditional academic talk." In his experience,

[Most colleagues believe] the best way to learn about a topic or even to "discuss" an issue is through some sort of faculty presentation. If you try to do something that varies from that, it's often viewed as a light take—somehow not as in-depth—and that doesn't help students understand the structural roots of the issue. There's a tension between folks who understand the need to bring people together to talk about a contentious policy or political issue and folks who feel like what we need to be doing is educating the students about their work and the way they've done it and approached it.

A question central to this work is how to incorporate expertise and facts with public action based on the things that people hold dear. Even those whose disciplines rely heavily on data, such as scientists, and whose disciplines are based on an expert model have discovered that they need to be interested in this question. The intersections between factual information, personal experiences, and things that people hold dear are important because they not only affect possible actions for addressing an issue, but even how the problem is defined.

Deliberative Pedagogy

Deliberative pedagogy is an approach to education designed to prepare students to develop the attitudes and skills needed to effectively make thoughtful decisions with others as they work together to address problems that are ethical, rather than technical, in nature. It builds on changes that date back to the 1990s, when some in higher education began to “create environments and experiences that allow students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves and to become members of communities of learning that make discoveries and solve problems.”³ Deliberative pedagogical approaches ask students to “undertake a process of discovery . . . and work alongside teachers to engage in reflective, often transformational, dialogue in which they gain self-awareness and discover multiple possibilities for collective action.”⁴ Faculty and students “take on roles and responsibilities to both teach and learn from and with one another.”⁵

The challenge posed by these practices to the way expertise is understood and employed has the potential to open up new pathways for learning and change the nature of faculty-student relationships. The evolution of David Hoffman’s approach to teaching is an example of this, where the “sage on the stage” gives way to the “guide on the side.” “My first years in teaching were done in the traditional way,” he remembers. Hoffman says:

Students gave speeches and then I made critical comments about the speeches. Especially with first- or second-term undergraduates, it was a very uneven power situation. Over the years I have structured my courses more and more in ways that didn’t put me in the center. I think I’ve succeeded now. And after the students respond to the other students, there’s still a place for me. But it feels like I’m no longer in that position of somebody who’s supposed to be the expert on everything that every student is talking about or on the best way of presenting the case. And I like that. Students also begin regarding each other differently. They have the authority to think together, and they have the authority to critique each other.

Deliberation differs from critical thinking because it extends beyond factual analysis. Past experiences, personal beliefs, priorities, and things that are held dear, such as being treated fairly or having the freedom to do as one wishes or concern for the well-being of others, also need to be weighed as people work toward decisions about what to do. David Hoffman notes:

One of the problems with actually getting down to that deeper level is that we tend to constellate, to cluster facts that are in harmony with values that are often unarticulated. We have most of our disputes about matters of

fact, but there's usually a value question behind it. A lot of times, the thing valued is never clearly stated, much less do we see what other things we value that might be in conflict with whatever is being prioritized.

Although her colleagues sometimes admonish her, saying, "students are not your equal," Lawrence believes there is value in questioning the customary roles of faculty and student. Once she began dismantling this hierarchy, she found it was "hard for me to see myself as above the student when I am learning just as much, if not more, from them as they are from me. That's not just a cliché."

The shift from expert-centered teaching to student-centered learning places more responsibility on the students. When faculty ask, "so what do you think of this?" it can be a unique experience for students. Learning, then, becomes about so much more than what can be put into their minds. Lisa

"[It was] hard for me to see myself as above the student when I am learning just as much, if not more, from them as they are from me. That's not just a cliché."

Strahley pointed out that teaching informed by deliberative democratic ideas involves "offering material [in a way] that they can chew on it and think about it and analyze it and question it. It is what makes deliberative democratic

practice in the classroom so rich." It is not an "add-on," but rather a different way of teaching and learning.

Conclusion: Learning as a Democratic Practice

As this conversation demonstrates, faculty associated with centers for democratic public life think critically about what they are doing, and they are developing a shared language and understanding of deliberative democracy. Central to this is the recognition that learning is a democratic practice. Learning is at the center of the Kettering Foundation's research. Kettering has learned as much from these centers as the centers have learned from the foundation. The 30 years of relationships among the centers and Kettering have led to changes we cannot always see clearly unless we take the time to talk together, much like deliberative democratic practice itself. The iterative practice of talking, acting, and refining theory and meaning, done inclusively and democratically, models what the authors hope to see in institutions of higher learning.

The authors also understand that deliberative democratic theory and practices challenge the culture of expertise that currently exists and the hierarchies that it generates. Doing so begins to reveal the assets that citizens (including students) can bring to bear on the most pressing problems of our time and the challenge of living well together. In a democracy, living well together depends on citizens who have the ability to communicate and the willingness to think, make judgments, and act with others. This can only occur in a public space, a kind of democratic ecology that the centers seek to foster. Deliberative democracy is the antidote to the ongoing retreat from the public space.

Deliberative democracy is the antidote to the ongoing retreat from the public space.

HEX 2018 CENTER CONTRIBUTORS

Joseph Hoereth

Director, Institute for Policy & Civic Engagement
College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs
University of Illinois at Chicago

David Hoffman

Associate Professor, School of Public Affairs
Cochair, New York Civic Forum
Baruch College, City University of New York

Marla Kanengieter-Wildeson

Professor of Communication Studies
Department of Communication Studies
St. Cloud State University

Windy Lawrence

Associate Professor, Communication Studies
Department of Arts & Humanities
Director, Downtown Center for Public Deliberation
University of Houston-Downtown

David E. Procter

Director, Institute for Civic Discourse & Democracy
Professor, Communication Studies
Kansas State University

Norma Ramos

Director of Engagement & Partnerships
Institute for Policy & Civic Engagement
College of Urban Planning & Public Affairs
University of Illinois at Chicago

Lisa Strahley

Professor, Early Childhood & Teacher Education
Coordinator, SUNY Broome Community College Center for Civic Engagement
SUNY Broome Community College



NOTES

- ¹ Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, “Justice: On Relating Private and Public,” *Political Theory* 9, no. 3 (August 1981): 327, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191093> (accessed April 27, 2018).
- ² Hannah Arendt, *The Life of the Mind* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), 191.
- ³ Robert Barr and John Tagg, “From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education,” *Change* 27, no. 6 (1995): 12-15, as quoted in *Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Civic Engagement*, edited by Timothy J. Shaffer, et al. (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2017): xxv.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, xxv.

REFERENCES

Arendt, Hannah. *The Life of the Mind*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978.

Barr, Robert, and John Tagg. “From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm.” *Change* 27, no. 6 (1995): 12-15.

Betz, Joseph. “An Introduction to the Thought of Hannah Arendt.” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 28, no. 3 (Summer, 1992). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40320369> (accessed April 27, 2018).

Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. “Justice: On Relating Private and Public.” *Political Theory* 9, no. 3 (August, 1981). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191093> (accessed April 27, 2018).

Schaeffer, Timothy, et al., eds. *Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Civic Engagement*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2017.

CONTRIBUTORS

DEREK W. M. BARKER is a program officer at the Kettering Foundation. With a background in political theory, he works primarily on research concerning the democratic role of higher education institutions, philanthropy and nonprofit organizations, journalism, and the professions. Barker is the coeditor (with Alex Lovit) of Kettering's *Higher Education Exchange* and has contributed to other Kettering publications, including the *Kettering Review* and *Connections*. He is the author of *Tragedy and Citizenship: Conflict, Reconciliation, and Democracy from Haemon to Hegel* (SUNY Press, 2009) and articles appearing in the academic journals *Political Theory*, *New Political Science*, and *The Good Society*.

HARRY C. BOYTE is a public intellectual and organizer. He founded Public Achievement and cofounded with Marie Ström the Public Work Academy. He holds the title of Senior Scholar in Public Work Philosophy at Augsburg University. Boyte is the author of 11 books, including *Awakening Democracy through Public Work* (Vanderbilt University Press, 2018). His articles have appeared in more than 150 publications, including the *New York Times*, *Political Theory*, and the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. In the 1960s, Boyte was a field secretary for SCLC, organized by Martin Luther King Jr., and subsequently did community organizing among low-income white residents in Durham, North Carolina.

ALICE DIEBEL is a senior associate with the Kettering Foundation. As a previous program officer with the foundation, Diebel helped initiate its centers for democratic public life research in 2011.

JONI DOHERTY, a program officer at the Kettering Foundation, has a long-standing interest in discourse ethics and how the arts and humanities can inform deliberative democratic practices. She directs research on the centers for democratic public life and is involved with learning exchanges with higher education institutions, humanities councils, libraries, and museums. Doherty was previously the director of the New England Center for Civic Life at Franklin Pierce University and taught in the American studies program. Doherty earned a BFA in painting at the University of New Hampshire, an MA in cultural studies at Simmons College, and a PhD in philosophy and art theory from the Institute for Doctoral Studies in the Visual Arts.

LORLENE HOYT is the executive director of the Talloires Network, an international association of 385 engaged universities in 77 countries. Previously, as associate professor of urban planning at MIT, she founded MIT@Lawrence, an award-winning city-campus partnership. Her book *Regional Perspectives on Learning-by-Doing: Stories from Engaged Universities Around the World* (Michigan State University Press, 2017) demonstrates how universities can effectively mobilize their resources to create more equitable and prosperous communities while also educating civic leaders. Hoyt is a research professor in the Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, faculty member of the Tisch College of Civic Life at Tufts University, and a visiting scholar at Brown University. She holds a PhD in city and regional planning from the University of Pennsylvania.

CARRIE B. KISKER is an education research and policy consultant in Los Angeles and a director of the Center for the Study of Community Colleges. She engages in research pertaining to community college policy and practice, and regularly consults with college leaders on issues related to civic learning and democratic engagement. Kisker holds a BA from Dartmouth College and an MA and PhD from UCLA. She has coauthored two books, including *The American Community College* (Jossey-Bass, 2013) and *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System* (Jossey-Bass, 2009). In 2016, Kisker, along

with Bernie Ronan, edited a *New Directions for Community Colleges* sourcebook on civic learning and democratic engagement.

NICHOLAS V. LONGO is a professor in the departments of Public and Community Service Studies and Global Studies and a Faculty Fellow for Engaged Scholarship with the Center for Teaching Excellence at Providence College. Longo is the author of a number of books, articles, and reports on youth civic education, engaged scholarship, and deliberative pedagogy. His publications include *Why Community Matters: Connecting Education with Civic Life* (SUNY Press, 2007) and several coedited volumes, including *Publicly Engaged Scholars: Next Generation Engagement and the Future of Higher Education* (Stylus Publishing, 2016), and *Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement* (Michigan State University Press, 2017).

ALEX LOVIT is a program officer at the Kettering Foundation. With an academic background in the study of history, he assists with Kettering's experiments in deliberating about historical issues through Historic Decisions issue guides. He also works for Kettering's K-12 and higher education research and provides historical research for the foundation. Lovit is the coeditor (with Derek W. M. Barker) of Kettering's *Higher Education Exchange*.

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 Ecology of Democracy: Finding Ways to Have a Stronger Hand in Shaping Our Future*.

ALBERTO OLIVAS is executive director of the Congressman Ed Pastor Center for Politics and Public Service at Arizona State University, as well as a trainer and consultant on issues related to public participation and civic engagement in higher education. Previously, Olivas served as director of the Center for Civic Participation for the Maricopa Community College District. He served in appointed leadership positions for Arizona governor Jane Dee Hull and Arizona secretary of state Betsey Bayless, and on the Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs. Olivas is currently board secretary for the National Civic League, vice chair of the Arizona Town Hall board of directors, and serves on the board of Democracy Works, a national civic technology nonprofit.

MARSHALITA SIMS PETERSON is a consultant and researcher committed to public scholarship, deliberative pedagogy/dialogue, facilitation of National Issues Forums, and transformative action within the work of democratic practice. As founder of M.S. Peterson Consulting and Research, LLC, she is also dedicated to processes involving strategic planning, communication constructs, effective leadership, team building, and innovative processes of engagement to enhance organizational productivity. Peterson's research and work in the field of teacher education spans 38 years. She is former chair and associate professor of teacher education at Spelman College in Atlanta. Peterson has also served as a Whisenton Public Scholar and Whisenton Scholar-in-Residence at the Kettering Foundation.

JOHN J. THEIS is the director of the Center for Civic Engagement for Lone Star College-Kingwood, where he is also a professor of political science. He earned his PhD in political science from the University of Arizona. Theis serves as chair of the steering committee for The Democracy Commitment and on the board of directors of the National Issues Forums Institute. He has been involved in civic engagement work for over 20 years, founding both the LSC-Kingwood Public Achievement program and the Kingwood College Center for Civic Engagement.

Kettering Foundation

200 Commons Road, Dayton, Ohio 45459 (937) 434-7300; (800) 221-3657

444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 434, Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 393-4478

www.kettering.org
