

HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



2022

Anti-Elitism and the Civic Purposes of Higher Education

Articles

Maria Farland

Scott Peters

Katy J. Harriger and Jill J. McMillan

Derek W. M. Barker

David W. Brown

Kara Lindaman, B. Da'Vida Plummer,
and Joseph Scanlon

Afterword

David Mathews

Additional Reflections

Harry C. Boyte, Joni Doherty, Sara A. Mehlretter Drury,
Mathew Johnson, and Timothy J. Shaffer

Editors: Derek W. M. Barker and Alex Lovit
Managing Editor: Renee Ergazos
Formatting: Long's Graphic Design, Inc.
Copy Editor: E. Ray Walker

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 © 2022 by the Kettering Foundation

ISSN 2469-6293 (print)

ISSN 2471-2280 (online)

HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



2022

CONTENTS

Derek W. M. Barker and Alex Lovit	Anti-Elitism and the Civic Purposes of Higher Education (Foreword)	1
Maria Farland	Academic Professionalism and the New Public-Mindedness (with an introduction by Joni Doherty)	6
Scott Peters	The Civic Mission Question in Land-Grant Education (with an introduction by Timothy J. Shaffer)	15
Katy J. Harriger and Jill J. McMillan	Public Scholarship and Faculty Role Conflict (with an introduction by Sara A. Mehlretter Drury)	29
Derek W. M. Barker	Five Emerging Practices in the Scholarship of Engagement (with an introduction by Mathew Johnson)	37
David W. Brown	The Public/Academic Disconnect (with an introduction by Harry C. Boyte)	48
Kara Lindaman, B. Da'Vida Plummer, and Joseph Scanlon	Ivory Tower or Town Square? Anti-Elitism and the Civic Purposes of Higher Education (an Interview)	54
David Mathews	More than Academics Talking to Academics about Academe (Afterword)	64
	Contributors	67

THE CIVIC MISSION QUESTION IN LAND-GRANT EDUCATION

Scott Peters

In 2009, I began a doctoral program at Cornell University. I wanted to study and work with Scott Peters to understand and explore the role of higher education in democracy. It's not an exaggeration to say that Peters' scholarship has been a leading influence informing how I approach questions about the relationship between institutions and communities, expertise and democracy, and the role of education and communication within such settings.

During the early stages of my program at Cornell, I came to truly appreciate the scholarly attention Peters has long given to what might otherwise be forgotten annals of the land-grant story. While browsing the bookshelf in his office, I discovered my own interest in current challenges and opportunities regarding the civic mission of land-grant universities by exploring and understanding the past. In the 1940 USDA Yearbook of Agriculture, titled *Farmers in a Changing World*, M. L. Wilson, an agricultural economist and champion of extension's role in communities, published a chapter titled "Beyond Economics." In that chapter, Wilson wrote, "We only admit the truth when we recognize that our economic problems are moral problems." I recall sitting with Peters in his office, reading that essay, and being drawn to the nuance and tensions that existed in other eras that also spoke to our own. Like Liberty Hyde Bailey and W. H. Jordan, whom Peters references in his article, Wilson's commitments highlight the importance of learning from those Peters calls "modern-day prophets."

Of particular relevance, the following article by Peters explores "the civic challenges and issues we face in this nation [that] reach well beyond economics." The economy is important, but it is only one aspect of what we should consider when we think about our shared civic life. Writing about how land grants have a "special commitment not just to economics but also to *democracy*," Peters draws from the rich history and contemporary practice of universities and individuals committing to public scholarship and seeking to articulate its practical application. He asks how "a scholar's work of constructing and communicating knowledge might contribute to community building, to public problem-solving, to public creation, and to the process of coming to public judgment on what ought to be done (not just what can or might be done) to address important public issues and problems." In a rich way, Peters invites us to think about higher education's multifaceted and nuanced role in public decision-making—especially if, as he argues, issues "must not simply be viewed as a technical or economic matter, but as a political and/or ethical matter involving rights, power, justice, and moral principles."

— Timothy J. Shaffer

In his groundbreaking book, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Ernest Boyer asked: “Can America’s colleges and universities, with all the richness of their resources, be of greater service to the nation and the world? Can we define scholarship in ways that respond more adequately to the urgent new realities both within the academy and beyond?”¹

While these questions are relevant for all sectors of American higher education, they hold an especially deep significance for the nationwide system of land-grant colleges and universities.

Created through the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, the land-grant system is composed of 106 institutions, located in all 50 states plus the District of Columbia and several US territories.²

It includes many of the nation’s top research universities, 17 historically Black institutions, and 30 Tribal colleges that were given land-grant status in 1994. It also includes the federal Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES). With a budget of almost \$1 billion for fiscal year 2001, CSREES works to “advance a global system of research, extension, and higher education in the food and agricultural sciences and related environmental and human sciences to benefit people, communities, and the nation.”³

CSREES involves more than 9,600 local extension agents working in 3,150 counties, 3 million volunteers, 5.6 million youth involved in 4-H projects and programs, and more than 9,500 scientists conducting research at 59 state agricultural experiment stations.⁴

Here is a system with an amazing wealth of resources, a strong public mission, and a tradition of scholarship that responds to realities outside the academy. But here also is a system that could, in Boyer’s words, be of greater service to the nation and world. The need to be of greater service was a central theme of a series of six reports published from 1997 to 2000 by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities.⁵

In the final report in the series, the commission wrote:

We believe that our institutions serve not only as agents of this democracy, but also as its architects—providing bridges between the aims and aspirations of individuals and the public work of the larger world. To that end, we commit our institutions to wide-ranging examinations of our civic and democratic purposes through curricula and extracurricular activities, socially engaged scholarship, civic partnerships, and community-based learning and research.⁶

Taken together, Boyer’s challenge and the Kellogg Commission’s reports bring a new level of attention to the civic mission question in land-grant

education. The question is not whether or not land-grant institutions have a civic mission. No one would argue that they don't. Rather, the question is, What exactly is this mission, and how—through what kinds of work—should it be pursued?

In recent decades, the dominant answer to this question has often been framed almost exclusively in terms of economics. As I discovered while I was living in Minnesota

during the 1990s, politicians from both parties used the same image when proclaiming their support for the University of Minnesota, a world-class research university that also serves as the state's land-grant institution. The university

The question is not whether or not land-grant institutions have a civic mission. No one would argue that they don't. Rather, the question is, What exactly is this mission, and how—through what kinds of work—should it be pursued?

is important, they all agreed, because it functions as the “economic engine” of the state.

Economics is important, but the civic challenges and issues we face in this nation reach well beyond economics. Our civic aspirations reach beyond economics as well. However materialistic and individualistic this nation has become, the ideas (and ideals) of democracy and citizenship have not yet been abandoned. We still aspire to be citizens in a democracy, not just consumers in the marketplace. If land-grant institutions are to be of “greater service” not only in addressing our civic challenges but also in contributing to the realization of our civic aspirations, their civic mission and work will need to involve more than economics.

In constructing an answer to the civic mission question in land-grant education that includes but reaches beyond economics, we need to do two things. First, we need to gain some historical perspective in order to give us a better appreciation of how central the connection between democracy and land-grant education has been. Second, we need to shift the discussion of civic mission away from abstract generalizations that float above and apart from the complex realities of our lives and communities. A broader view of our civic mission and the work it will take to pursue it can't be found apart from these realities. It can be found only by immersing ourselves in them.

Democracy and Land-Grant Education

The civic mission question in land-grant education is linked to the long-standing view that land-grant institutions have a special commitment not just to economics but also to democracy, expressed in terms of the institutions' approaches to education and the ends they aim to achieve. From the late 19th century through the World War II period, a robust civic rhetoric in the speeches and writings of administrators articulated this commitment. For example, at the 45th annual convention of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities held in 1931, W. J. Kerr, president of Oregon State Agricultural College, declared that it was the "ideal of democratized education in the United States that led to the founding of the land-grant institutions." Kerr argued that while land-grant institutions might have helped to advance individual opportunity for social and economic mobility, and while they might have made contributions to increasing the material wealth of the nation through the application of science to agriculture and other fields of work, in his view there were "other values, even more important [which had resulted] from the work of these institutions." These were the "intangible benefits that enter into the thought and ideals of the people, leavening the whole lump of civic and social life." Kerr declared that these benefits were "undoubtedly the larger and loftier contribution of the land-grant institutions to the states and the nation."⁷

The historical literature is filled with speeches and papers that echo Kerr's view of the connection between democracy and land-grant education. A review of this literature is important, but to bring the civic mission question

We need to shift the discussion of civic mission away from abstract generalizations that float above and apart from the complex realities of our lives and communities.

in land-grant education to life in today's world, we need to view it in relation to specific public challenges and issues. Although we can look in any number of areas of work for specific examples, it's especially fitting to look to agriculture since agriculture is (and always has been) a key area of focus in land-grant education. In looking to agriculture, we can ask: What public issues and challenges does agriculture involve that might help us see and understand the civic mission and work of land-grant education? Furthermore, is there a way of framing such challenges so that faculty, staff, and students from the full range of disciplines and

departments of land-grant universities—not just the agricultural sciences—might find a role in addressing them?

The Challenge of Sustainability

The central challenge in agriculture today is the challenge of facilitating sustainability (or “sustainable development” as it is often termed). While sustainability is a contested concept, there is a fair amount of agreement that it includes some balanced or integrated attention to economic, environmental, and social concerns. An example of a concise definition of sustainable development that incorporates all three of these concerns can be found in Minnesota state law. In 1996, the Minnesota legislature passed a statute that defined sustainable development as “development that maintains or enhances economic opportunity and community well-being while protecting and restoring the natural environment upon which people and economies depend.”⁸

While statements such as these enjoy wide support, the difficulty comes in figuring out how to pursue them in specific places, in relation to specific things. As Jules Pretty writes in his superb book on the sustainability challenge in agriculture, “In any discussion of sustainability, it is important to clarify what is being sustained, for how long, for whose benefit and at what cost, over what area and measured by what criteria.”⁹

Pretty adds that answering these questions is difficult not only because it’s difficult to determine what the relevant “facts” are but also because it involves “assessing and trading off values and beliefs.” In other words, the sustainability challenge in agriculture is not merely a technical challenge; it’s also a political and cultural challenge.

In order to understand what the sustainability challenge in agriculture might suggest for the civic mission and work of land-grant institutions, we need to look at a specific, real-world example. Let’s consider an example from Rice County, Minnesota.

Over an eight-year period (1989 to 1997), this rural county located about 40 miles south of the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area was embroiled in a highly contentious battle over whether and how it should regulate feedlots, which are buildings designed for the confined feeding, breeding, raising, and holding of animals. In the Rice County case, the animals in question were hogs.

The battle over the regulation of feedlots in Rice County began in February of 1989, when Kent Holden, a Rice County area landowner and part-owner of a family farm corporation called Holden Farms, applied to the

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for a permit to construct and operate a 4,730 hog commercial feedlot on 438 acres of farmland. Existing state and local regulations and zoning laws at the time did not require public notification of or input into the construction of facilities like Holden's. Residents of the Circle and Fox Lake area of Rice County, located one mile southwest of the site of the new feedlot, learned of Holden's plans only after construction began. Several of them were alarmed and angered by the project. They formed a group called the "Forest Township Agri-Lakes Association" in order to "preserve and enhance the quality of life in Forest Township." They declared themselves in opposition to the construction of the Holden facility, spoke out against the lack of public input and notification, and vowed to take legal action to stop the new feedlot from being built. They held public meetings to discuss the situation, which attracted as many as 150 area residents.

In a letter to the editor of the *Northfield News*, a spokesperson for the Agri-Lakes Association declared that they were opposed to the construction of Holden's feedlot because they believed that "this operation, located 80 to 100 feet in elevation above two nearby recreational lakes with minimal land area for waste disposal, poses serious threats to surface water quality due to run-off and to groundwater quality due to leaching. At risk are Circle and Fox Lakes, Wolf Creek and other streams, wetlands, springs, and residential wells." The group sent petitions to Rice County commissioners requesting changes in county zoning ordinances to restrict large-scale commercial feedlot operations. They wanted the county to require new or expanding feedlot operations to obtain conditional use permits, and they wanted local residents to be informed in advance of such operations and to be allowed a formal channel for voicing their concerns.

Meanwhile, the *Northfield News* weighed in with its views on the issue. In an editorial titled "Tolerance Needed," the editors described the conflict over the Holden feedlot as a "classic clash of farm and rural nonfarm interests. It speaks to the increasing influence of the metro area and the slow shift in the county's identity." They noted that while agriculture no longer received a "united front" support in the county, it was still the county's biggest industry. They pointed to the fact that Rice County produced more than \$70 million in agricultural products in 1987, almost two-thirds of which were livestock or livestock related. Expressing confidence in the judgment of state officials that Holden's plan posed no threat to lake quality, they declared that "nonfarm rural resident and lakeshore dwellers" should "exhibit some tolerance and understanding" for their neighbors who have a "right to farm."

After many twists and turns in the story and years of public debate and study, the Rice County Board voted in August of 1996 to adopt a restrictive feedlot ordinance that was described in the press as “one of the most aggressive steps yet taken by a local Minnesota government in the effort to curb corporate farm growth and feedlot development.” Depending on which side of the issue a member of the county stood, the ordinance was viewed as either “anti-agriculture,” a “social experiment,” which was “not justified on any economic or scientific basis,” or as a prudent, “well-researched and well-documented” measure that will help protect the environment while allowing for “sustainable” economic growth and development.

No other issue in Rice County during these years generated anything close to the controversy and attention as this did. Nearly 400 news articles, editorials, opinion pieces, and letters to the editor related to the issue were published in the county’s two local newspapers over the course of the battle. Numerous public hearings were also held, many of which were contentious, attracting large numbers of concerned and often angry citizens. Citizens’ groups on both sides of the battle were formed, lawsuits were filed or threatened, and piles of data and studies were collected and produced to support each side’s views. The battle ended or harmed lifelong friendships, split families, polarized county government, and heightened tensions, disagreements, and uncertainties over the direction of development in the county.

The story of the battle over the regulation of feedlots in Rice County raises a host of complex, interrelated issues and questions not only for the citizens of the county and the rest of the state of Minnesota but also for the nation as a whole.

Everywhere communities are being faced with similar challenges: how to engage citizens with conflicting values and beliefs in the public policymaking process; how to respond to shifts in demographics; how to protect the environment while also pursuing economic growth and development; and how to respond to the growing pressures, anxieties, and changes brought about by an increasingly competitive global economy.

Is there a practice of scholarship that stands scholars with the public in addressing matters of public importance and, if so, what are its dimensions, dynamics, challenges, and promise?

Several times during the course of the public debate over regulating feedlots, the idea was put forward that the responsibility for making a decision should be turned over to scientific experts who were thought to be able to objectively determine what the “facts” were with respect to the issues involved. In one opinion piece published in the *Northfield News*, a farmer who opposed the county’s desire to limit feedlots argued that the whole debate really just boiled down to a “technical question.” Therefore, he wrote, the correct solution could come from only “unbiased people with technical expertise.”¹⁰

This view was put forward at various times by people on both sides of the conflict. It stood at odds with a different view, also put forward by persons on both sides, that stressed the idea that the regulation of feedlots must not be viewed as simply a technical or economic matter, but as a political and/or ethical matter involving rights, power, justice, and moral principles.

The Civic Mission Question

With this brief sketch of a real-world example in mind, let’s return to the civic mission question in land-grant education. For the University of Minnesota in particular, what might the Rice County example suggest? The work that needed to be done in this case was the work of coming to public judgment about what ought to be done with respect to the regulation of feedlots. How could or should University of Minnesota faculty, staff, and students contribute to this work?

Here is where we can begin to see the value of an idea that has been discussed in past issues of this journal: the idea of “public scholarship.” Introducing the idea of public scholarship encourages us to ask how a scholar’s work of constructing and communicating knowledge might contribute to community building, to public problem-solving, to public creation, and to the process of coming to public judgment on what ought to be done (not just what can or might be done) to address important public issues and problems. At the broadest level, we can ask: Is there a practice of scholarship that stands scholars with the public in addressing matters of public importance and, if so, what are its dimensions, dynamics, challenges, and promise?

In the Rice County case, there was an incredibly complex mix of issues embedded in the feedlot regulation challenge that provided opportunities for public scholarship across a broad range of disciplines. In the short term, there was a need for knowledge about the economic, technical, environmental, health, civic, and ethical dimensions and implications of feedlots, along with a need for a workable process that would help people with sharply different

perspectives and interests come to public judgment about what regulation, if any, should be adopted. But the feedlot challenge also raised or revealed a host of long-term issues and questions involving the future of agriculture, the nature of development, and the health and vitality of the county's public life.

Was there any public scholarship that was done in this case that proved useful in addressing these short- and long-term issues and questions? My answer to this question is short and simple: I don't know. In this case, and hundreds like it across the country, no one has intentionally asked the civic mission and work question, or else it hasn't been asked in such a way as to give us insight into the public dimensions of the scholarship that may have taken place. Because of this, what we "know" about civic mission and work in land-grant education is, for the most part, undocumented and untheorized. This leaves us with a flat and somewhat vague answer to the question about how land-grant faculty, staff, and students might contribute to cases such as the one in Rice County. This answer is roughly as follows: Research faculty and graduate students contribute through conducting scientific studies on specific issues or questions, and extension educators contribute by translating the findings of these studies into understandable language and bringing them to the decision-making table, along with occasionally playing a "neutral" facilitating role at public forums.

There are many problems with this answer. First, it encourages us to frame the solutions to situations like the one in Rice County in only technical terms. But the case in Rice County involved far more than narrow technical questions, as important as those were. It also involved a host of civic and cultural issues and questions. A larger framing of this case would help capture these dimensions and thus put it in the context of the challenge of sustainability. And this would have the additional benefit of inviting faculty and students from nonagricultural departments and disciplines—for example, the arts and humanities—to imagine a role for themselves in the work, something that is not encouraged with a narrow technical framing.

A second problem with the answer is that it doesn't say anything about how faculty and graduate students should focus and conduct their technical research: for example, how they should construct and pursue their research questions or what measures or standards or criteria they should employ for evaluating the policy implications of their results. Another related problem is that it sharply limits the role of extension educators, viewing them mainly as neutral information providers and meeting facilitators. These roles are important, but insufficient. Extension also has a key role to play in the complex political

negotiation and organizing work that is inescapably embedded in situations like the one in Rice County. This work must be placed inside our view of what extension work should involve, as it was, with much success, in the early decades of extension's history.

In addition to these problems, the default answer to the civic mission and work question is silent about the deeply important matter of what, if anything, faculty, students, and extension educators should stand for or be committed to as they engage with others in addressing public issues. Should they be committed to the "facts," as science reveals them to us? Should they be committed to advancing the economic bottom line? Should they stand for the environment? Should they stand for the principle of democracy and for the civility, integrity, and vitality of the democratic process? Or is their real challenge to somehow stand for all of these together?

This line of questioning eventually leads to a broad, overarching question: What is the central aim or purpose of land-grant education? While the answer to this question is and always has been a matter of debate, a perspective has run throughout the history of land-grant institutions that sees it as having something to do with democracy. To understand the essence of this perspective, I want to turn to a few passages from the old civic rhetoric of administrators that are particularly instructive in relation to the Rice County case.

In his presidential address at the 25th annual convention of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations in 1911, W. H. Jordan, who served as director of the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station from 1896 to 1921, said the following:

It has been reported, though I do not credit the statement, that a member of an agricultural college faculty once declared that the business of his institution was to bring about the production of more hogs at greater profit. If this remark was made, what a spectacle it pictures! It places the hog at the pinnacle of educational aspiration, with the man as a lesser figure.¹¹

A few years later, Liberty Hyde Bailey, who served as dean of the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University from 1903 to 1913, clarified the core principle behind Jordan's statement. In his classic book published in 1915, *The Holy Earth*, Bailey wrote:

It is not sufficient to train technically in the trades and crafts and arts to the end of securing greater economic efficiency—this may be accomplished in a despotism and result in no self-action on the part of the people. Every democracy must reach far beyond what is commonly known as economic efficiency and do everything it can to enable those

in the backgrounds to maintain their standing and their pride and to partake in the making of political affairs.¹²

Bailey's words from 1915 help us see the inadequacy of an answer to the civic mission question that is framed exclusively around economics. It also helps us see the historical roots of the call put forward in 2000 by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. The commission's call for land-grant institutions to "serve not only as agents of this democracy, but also as its architects," is a call for the renewal of a civic mission that is not just about enhancing economic growth and efficiency, but also about the enhancement of the political "standing and pride" of the common people. This mission can't be achieved solely through the delivery of neutral technical services. It must be pursued through public work efforts that join together the talents, intelligence, wisdom, and creative energies of a broad range of people acting as citizens of a vibrant democracy committed to the commonwealth. To see land-grant education not as a neutral service but as public work is to see it in light of its best tradition. The renewal of this tradition is one of the most important tasks we face.

Approaches to Renewal

There will be many avenues for pursuing the civic renewal process in land-grant education. I want to briefly point to three of them. First, it is important and useful to create a vehicle at specific institutions that provides visibility to the civic mission question and a meaningful way for faculty, staff, students, and others to engage in exploring it. Such a vehicle has been created at the University of Minnesota, where a Civic Engagement Task Force has been established by the Office of the Provost. The task force is charged with strengthening the university's civic mission across the full range of its activities and making practical proposals for institutionalizing civic engagement as a continuing priority. Through public forums, working groups, and seed grants for new initiatives, the task force is helping to dramatically increase the seriousness and scope of the university's intentional commitment to civic engagement. This approach can, and should, inspire similar efforts at other institutions.

There is another approach to the renewal process that should not be overlooked. Following one of the key organizing principles that civil rights leader Ella Baker promoted, we must find, learn from, and support those who are already working, in this case, those who are already doing the work of public scholarship.¹³ We must do this not merely to celebrate or acknowledge those who are doing this work, but to learn from them the lessons that will help us deepen and expand it.

Fortunately, there are some good models to draw from that will help us follow Baker's principle. In my own work, I am drawing heavily from an approach developed by John Forester, chair of the Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell.

Forester and his students have spent much of the past decade developing hundreds of richly detailed "practitioner profiles" of planners in an effort to

To see land-grant education not as a neutral service but as public work is to see it in light of its best tradition.

understand and encourage participatory planning processes. His recent book, *The Deliberative Practitioner*, is a masterful analysis of the lessons gleaned from these pro-

files. In several different projects, I am adapting Forester's approach and applying it to the work of land-grant faculty and extension educators.

For example, recently I had graduate students in a course I teach on community education and development create practitioner profiles of Cornell Cooperative Extension educators, focusing on specific examples of their work. These profiles, which are edited transcripts of tape-recorded interviews, gave the class a window into the fine-grained nuances of extension educators' civic work. They also gave extension educators, extension administration, and campus faculty a previously unavailable window into Cornell's civic practice. I have hopes that the profiles we develop over the next few years might provide lessons for improving and expanding this practice.

In another project, supported by the Kettering Foundation, I'm working with a team of colleagues to build a practical theory of public scholarship in land-grant education, drawn from a close analysis of practitioner profiles and case studies from seven land-grant institutions. [This study was later published in 2005 by the Kettering Foundation.]¹⁴ We will use what we learn as a resource for the ongoing work of organizing faculty, staff, students, and community members in new public work initiatives.

Finally, in the face of the fact that the task of civic renewal in land-grant education is something of a long shot, cutting as it does against the grain of an academic culture that leans heavily in another direction, there is a need to take a prophetic stance, that is, a stance that draws inspiration and authority from the best vision of what land-grant institutions have stood for, while being mindful of why this vision has never been fully achieved. One thing we will need for this task is new historical research devoted to developing a deeper

understanding of our civic heritage. I suspect that a deeper understanding of this heritage will teach us that the pursuit of a civic mission in land-grant education has always been difficult, that there have always been abundant reasons to doubt its prospects. But it will also reveal to us our prophetic figures, the Liberty Hyde Baileys of our history, who stood firmly for the land-grant idea's democratic aims and took a leap of faith in what might be accomplished, despite the odds.

If the contemporary movement for civic renewal in land-grant education is to grow and bear fruit, it will do so because of the faith and works of our modern-day prophets. We needn't wait long for them to appear. They're already at work, in small and large ways here and there, all across the country. Let's support and learn from them.

The author would like to acknowledge gratefully the insightful and helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this paper provided by Margo Hittleman, Harry C. Boyte, Peg Michels, Nick Jordan, Maggi Adamek, and Heidi Haugan.



NOTES

- ¹ Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1990/1997), 3.
- ² Land-grant institutions are members of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities. See the association's website <https://www.aplu.org> for more information.
- ³ "About CSREES," <http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/about/csreesa2.htm#is> (accessed on November 8, 2001).
- ⁴ Statistics drawn from the CSREES website, <http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/about/csreesa2.htm#is> (accessed on November 8, 2001).
- ⁵ The commission's reports are posted at <https://www.aplu.org/projects-and-initiatives/economic-development-and-community-engagement/past-projects/Kellogg%20Commission%20on%20the%20Future%20of%20State%20and%20Land-Grant%20Universities>.
- ⁶ Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities, *Renewing the Covenant: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement in a New Age and Different World* (Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 2000), 24. In this passage the commission is drawing from Harry C. Boyte and Elizabeth Hollander, *Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University* (Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation, 1999).
- ⁷ W. J. Kerr, "The Spirit of Land Grant Institutions," in *Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual Convention of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities* (Burlington, VT: Free Press Printing Co., 1932), 90, 101.
- ⁸ Minnesota Statutes, Section 4A.07.
- ⁹ Jules N. Pretty, *Regenerating Agriculture: Policies and Practice for Sustainability and Self-Reliance* (Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press, 1995), 11.

- ¹⁰ Vern Koester, "Farm-Environmental Issues Demand 'We' Approach," opinion piece, *Northfield News*, October 7, 1994.
- ¹¹ W. H. Jordan, "Presidential Address" in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Convention of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, 1911* (Montpelier, VT: Capital City Press, 1912), 47.
- ¹² Liberty Hyde Bailey, *The Holy Earth* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 41.
- ¹³ Ella Baker was one of the most important leaders in the American Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s. For excellent discussions of her work, see Charles Payne, *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Joanne Grant, *Ella Baker, Freedom Bound* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1998); and Mary Field Belenky, Lynne A. Bond, and Jacqueline S. Weinstock, *A Tradition That Has No Name: Nurturing the Development of People, Families, and Communities* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).
- ¹⁴ Scott Peters et al., *Engaging Campus and Community: The Practice of Public Scholarship in the State and Land-Grant University System* (Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press, 2005).

Reprinted from Scott Peters, "The Civic Mission Question in Land-Grant Education," Higher Education Exchange 2001, 25-37. The text has been lightly edited to conform with current Kettering Foundation style and citation guidelines.

CONTRIBUTORS

DEREK W. M. BARKER is a program officer at the Kettering Foundation and coeditor (with Alex Lovit) of the *Higher Education Exchange*. With a background in political theory, his research focuses on the democratic role of higher education institutions, philanthropy and nonprofit organizations, journalism, and the professions. Barker is the author of *Tragedy and Citizenship: Conflict, Reconciliation, and Democracy from Haemon to Hegel* and articles appearing in the academic journals *Political Theory*, *New Political Science*, *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, and *The Good Society*.

HARRY C. BOYTE is a public intellectual and organizer. He founded Public Achievement and, with Trygve Throntveit and Marie Ström, the Institute for Public Life and Work. 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*. 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 the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s organization, and subsequently did community organizing among low-income White residents in Durham, North Carolina.

DAVID W. BROWN (1937-2020) was coeditor of the *Higher Education Exchange* from 1994 through 2017 and coedited two recent Kettering publications: *Agent of Democracy* and *A Different Kind of Politics*. He taught at Yale's School of Management and the New School's Milano Graduate School. Brown is the author of *Organization Smarts*; *The Real Change-Makers: Why Government Is Not the Problem or the Solution*; *America's Culture of Professionalism: Past, Present, and Prospects*; and *Assumptions of the Tea Party Movement: A World of Their Own*.

JONI DOHERTY is a program officer at the Kettering Foundation. She conducts collaborative research with professionals working in cultural and educational institutions. These initiatives explore how to foster the disposition and skills needed for making decisions about public problems, both contemporary and historical, using deliberation. Doherty's essays have been published in *Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement*; *Deliberation and the Work of Higher Education: Innovations for the Classroom, the Campus and the Community*; and the *Higher Education Exchange*. Before coming to Kettering, she taught in the American Studies program at Franklin Pierce University and directed the New England Center for Civic Life. She holds a PhD in philosophy from the Institute for Doctoral Studies in the Visual Arts.

SARA A. MEHLTRETTER DRURY is associate professor and chair of rhetoric at Wabash College and serves as the director of Wabash Democracy and Public Discourse. Drury's research and practice focus on the intersection of rhetoric and deliberative democracy, with attention to deliberative pedagogy, argumentation, and political communication. She has received grants from Indiana Humanities and the National Science Foundation and has been a visiting research fellow at the University of Edinburgh Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and an Indiana Humanities Action fellow. Drury received her BA *summa cum laude* from Boston College and her MA and PhD from Pennsylvania State University.

MARIA FARLAND has taught at Johns Hopkins, Wesleyan, and Columbia universities and is currently an associate professor at Fordham University. She has published numerous scholarly essays on links between institutions of higher education and disciplinary expertise in relationship to literary writers such as Gertrude Stein, W. E. B. Du Bois, and Robert Frost. She is currently finishing a monograph on images of rural backwardness in US literature and culture and is coeditor of *Studies in American Fiction* (JHUP/ProjectMuse).

KATY J. HARRIGER is a professor in the Department of Politics and International Affairs at Wake Forest University, where she holds the F. Michael Crowley Distinguished Faculty Fellowship and is faculty director of the Wake Washington program in DC. She teaches courses on American politics, law, and courts. In addition to her research on deliberation and the civic engagement of young people, she publishes generally in the area of American constitutional law. At Wake Forest she has been the recipient of the Reid Doyle Prize for Excellence in Teaching, the John Reinhart Award for Distinguished Teaching, and the College Board of Visitors Faculty Leadership Award.

MATHEW JOHNSON directs the Commission on Public Purpose in Higher Education. He cofounded and codirects the National Assessment of Service and Community Engagement. He also sits on the editorial board of *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* and has been recognized as an Ashoka Change Leader by the Ashoka Foundation. Johnson formerly served as president of Albion College, as a Carnegie visiting fellow at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and as a fellow at the Doerr Institute for New Leaders at Rice University. Prior to his tenure at Albion College, Johnson served as associate dean of the College for Engaged Scholarship, as well as senior fellow and executive director of the Howard R. Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University. Johnson led the development of a transformational strategic plan and oversaw the growth and development of curricular and cocurricular programs, including Brown in Washington, the Engaged Scholars Program, the Bonner Community Fellowship, the Brown University AmeriCorps VISTA Fellowship, Community Corps, and the Royce Fellowship.

KARA LINDAMAN is a professor of political science and public administration at Winona State University. Having earned her PhD from the University of Kansas, she studies the policy process and citizen engagement in wicked problems and primarily teaches courses in public administration. She is fortunate to have advised many student-citizens in public service. Since 2009, she has been the campus coordinator of the Association of American State Colleges and Universities American Democracy Project, where she is a civic fellow and has embraced numerous opportunities to work with colleagues and students as moderators and in democratic deliberation.

ALEX LOVIT is a program officer with the Kettering Foundation. He holds a PhD in history from the University of Michigan, where he studied 19th-century political history. He helps manage the foundation's research into democratic education both in K-12 schools and in higher education, coordinates research into democratic innovation in the judicial system, and is the coeditor (with Derek W. M. Barker) of the *Higher Education Exchange*.

DAVID MATHEWS served as president of the Kettering Foundation from 1981 to 2022. He is now president emeritus. He 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; The Ecology of Democracy: Finding Ways to Have a Stronger Hand in Shaping Our Future; With the People: An Introduction to an Idea; Together: Building Better, Stronger Communities; and With: A Strategy for Renewing Our Democracy*.

JILL J. MCMILLAN is professor emerita and research professor at Wake Forest University. Her early work centered on organizational and institutional rhetoric and communication. Since 2000, she has been involved with a team of Wake Forest colleagues who study deliberative democracy in higher education and have published their work in *Speaking of Politics* and *The Long-Term Impact of Learning to Deliberate*. Articles connected to this work have appeared

in *Communication Education, Diversity and Democracy, Beyond Politics as Usual: Paths for Engaging College Students in Politics*, and the *Higher Education Exchange*. The team is currently assessing the degree to which deliberative democracy principles may have diffused into their institution over the past two decades.

SCOTT PETERS is a professor in the Department of Global Development at Cornell University. From 2012 to 2017, he served as faculty codirector of a national consortium, *Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life*, which is devoted to supporting engaged learning and research in the arts, humanities, and design fields. He currently serves as coeditor of a new Cornell University Press book series, *Publicly Engaged Scholars: Identities, Purposes, and Practices*. As a historical sociologist positioned in the newly emerging field of civic studies, Peters uses narrative inquiry and analysis tools to study the public purposes and work of academic professionals and institutions. His latest book, coauthored with Daniel J. O’Connell, is *In the Struggle: Scholars and the Fight Against Industrial Agribusiness in California*. Peters received a BS from the University of Illinois and an MA and PhD from the University of Minnesota.

B. DAVIDA PLUMMER is a six-time Emmy award-winning news industry executive who joined Fellowships at Auschwitz for the Study of Professional Ethics as coexecutive director focusing on advancement and operations. She previously served in the dual capacity of assistant vice president for marketing/media and dean of the Scripps Howard School of Journalism and Communication at Hampton University. During her nine-year tenure with the prestigious HBCU, she served as an associate professor of broadcast journalism and the director of the William R. Harvey Leadership Institute while providing marketing leadership for the Hampton University Proton Therapy Institute. Plummer is a native of Nansemond County, Virginia, where she was introduced to the importance of community service through a global faith-based organization led by generations of her paternal lineage. She received her BS in journalism and MA in communications from Ohio University.

JOSEPH SCANLON is assistant professor of political science at Monroe Community College (MCC) in Rochester, New York. Dr. Scanlon’s teaching and research interests include American government, comparative politics, and international relations, with a specialized research interest in the global politics of sport. He is the coordinator of the Democracy Commitment at MCC, a campus initiative that promotes civic engagement and participation in civic education.

TIMOTHY J. SHAFFER is the Stavros Niarchos Foundation Chair of Civil Discourse and associate professor in the Joseph R. Biden, Jr. School of Public Policy and Administration at the University of Delaware. He is also director of civic engagement and deliberative democracy with the National Institute for Civil Discourse at the University of Arizona. Shaffer is author or coeditor of six books including *Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement*, *Creating Space for Democracy: A Primer on Dialogue and Deliberation in Higher Education*, and the latest book, *Grassroots Engagement and Social Justice through Cooperative Extension*. He earned his PhD from Cornell University.

Kettering Foundation

200 Commons Road, Dayton, Ohio 45459 (937) 434-7300; (800) 221-3657
444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 434, Washington, DC 20001 (202) 393-4478
www.kettering.org
