

Community Engagement and Spanning Boundaries:

A Case Study of Jesuit Anchor Institutions

A Dissertation presented to

the Faculty of the School of Education

at Saint Peter's University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

By

Nicholas A. Chiaravalloti, J.D.

2017

Dedication

I would like to thank my family for all their patience, support, and love during this project. . It is never easy returning to school midcareer to receive another degree. . However, it was made possible because of the unconditional support of my continuous compass, my wife Nancy, and our sons, Agostino (AJ), Nicholas (Nico)m and Joshua. . You mean the world to me and I hope you guys recognize that if you work hard, it's never too late to achieve your goals.

I want to thank my parents, who have always encouraged me to learn more and to never give up. . I also want to thank all the administrators, staff, and faculty members at Saint Peter's University who made it possible for me to continue in the program even when I had periods of doubt. . A special thank you to Dr. Joseph V. Doria, Jr., whose gentle pressure and consistent encouragement allowed me to carry on.

Finally, a genuine thank you to Kona and Divi, two man's best friends who tolerated long nights of listening to my frustrations because I knew they would never tell anybody!

Acknowledgements

This would not have been possible without the support of the Education Department of Saint Peter's University. . The staff and faculty attempted to make the entire process clear and painless.

Dean Joseph D. Doria, Jr encouraged me for years to consider pursuing a Doctorate of Education. . Serving as my mentor, he truly understood the challenges I faced in this process.

Thank you to Dr. Maureen Blue and Dr. Anna Cicirelli, Directors of the Doctor of Education program at Saint Peter's University. . To all the faculty members who challenged yet supported my efforts, especially Dr. Blue and Dr. Mildred Mihlon, who in that first semester helped someone who had not sat in a class in nearly 20 years learn how to sit behind a desk rather than stand in the front of the room.

Also, thanks to Dr. Virginia Bender, who has always been a source of information on the important topic of this dissertation. . Special thanks to Dr. Eugene Cornacchia, President of Saint Peter's University, and Dr. Marylou, President of Notre Dame of Maryland University, who in the beginning of this process provided so much support for the endeavor.

Finally, thank you to my Dissertation Committee—Dr. Doria, Dr. David Surrey, and Dr. Joseph McLaughlin – who through humor provided the pressure needed to compete this process. . Your words of encouragement and unique humor equally served to motivate and levitate this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	7
Problem Statement	11
Research Questions.....	13
Significance of the Research Study	13
Research Methodology	14
Definition of Key Terms.....	16
Summary.....	18
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	19
History of Community Engagement.....	19
Current Trends in Community Engagement.....	32
Community Engagement Impact: Economic, Social and Cultural	35
International Trends in Community Engagement.....	36
Boundary Spanning Theory	37
Anchor Institutions.....	40
Characteristics of Anchor Institutions	41
The University as an Anchor Institution.....	42

Jesuits and Education	44
The Impact of Public Policy	46
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	48
Research Design.....	49
Participants.....	52
General Population.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Data Collection	53
Ethical Considerations	54
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS.....	56
Jesuit Universities	56
Website Review	57
Survey Results	65
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION.....	77
Limitations and Further Research.....	83
REFERENCES	85
APPENDIX A. EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS SURVEY	99
APPENDIX B. INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS SURVEY	104

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Institutes of higher education have traditionally fulfilled a threefold mission of teaching, research, and service. . As a result, colleges and universities have continuously struggled with defining and redefining their role in society, including their interaction and engagement with their surrounding community. . Throughout higher education history, there have been those that support the concept, reflected in the original European colleges, that the pursuit of knowledge was in itself an end and that it was the college or university's responsibility to develop and secure that knowledge separate from the outside world. . This perspective is reflected in the thinking of Cardinal John Henry Newman—knowledge is something that needs protecting. . In the late 1880s, during the period of his founding of the University of Dublin, Cardinal Newman wrote that the role of a university is:

The high protecting power of all knowledge and science, of fact and principle, of inquiry and discovery, of experiment and speculation; it maps out the territory of the intellect, and see that...there is neither encroachment nor surrender on any side. (Newman, 1947)

However, the idea of a distinct and autonomous school within a surrounding city dates back to Plato's founding of the Academy in 387 B.C. . Plato's school was established within a corner of a garden, named after Academus who donated the land, within the walls of the City of Athens. . This concept of a sanctuary for thought and learning, protected and isolated from the outside world, continued to exist for nine

centuries (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d.). . . The original American colleges were influenced by this long tradition of academia as a separate and distinct entity within a larger community (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

Today, the majority of modern university leaders and scholars have a very different view of the role of the college within the community. . Although the idea of a protected academic environment where students and faculty can study, think, and debate issues freely continues to be the cornerstone of university life, there is also acceptance and support for the idea that colleges have a responsibility to engage with society, especially with their immediate surrounding community. . As reflected and influenced by education and social reformer John Dewey's views, the university is inseparable from society (Boyer, 1990; Bok, 1982; Kerr, 2001). . In 1990, Chancellor Charles E. Hathaway, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, summarized this understanding of the role of the modern university:

The university must not stand apart from its society and its immediate environment but must be an integral part of that society. . The university best serves itself and society by assuming an active leadership role, as opposed to its traditional stance of somewhat passive responsiveness. (Hathaway, Mulhollan, & White, 1990)

In the United States, colleges and universities were initially organized to prepare students for occupations required by society (Kerr, 2001). . In the Colonial Era, this preparation meant educating almost exclusively male students for service in ministry or public service (Rudolph, 1990). . The GI Bill and Higher Education Act of 1965 resulted in significant overall college attendance from a much more diverse student population. .

The 1960s also witnessed an expansive number of course subjects offered and an expansion of liberal arts education at universities (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Today, the student population is significantly more diverse and the subject matters are more specialized. There is increasing pressure on the American university to be more focused on preparing students for the job market. . The economic recession further intensified the pressure on universities to focus on students' postgraduation employment. . Today, they are expected to prepare students for the workplace. . At one point during the most recent recession, 4 of 10 college graduates were unemployed or underemployed (Stokes, 2013). . Job readiness appears to be "the trend of trends" (Stokes, 2013). . This trend has also emphasized the university's relationship with the surrounding community through a focus on internships, service-learning, and research programs.

The community served by the university can be broad or limited depending on the institution, its mission, and its leadership. . In an increasingly competitive environment, universities have developed and expanded their community engagement activities. . In this regard, community engagement may include the collaboration between the university and the immediate local community surrounding the university, regional, national, and even global community (Carnegie Classification, n.d.). . For example, volunteer hours spent tutoring public primary school students would certainly impact the local community. . However, research concerning clean energy could impact the global community and occur not only in campus laboratories, but also in field research throughout the world. .

This research study will primarily focus on community as reflected in perceptions of stakeholders located in the immediate surrounding city or county. . As the study researches community engagement, it will measure the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders concerning the interactions between the university and the local community.

The interaction between the university and the community includes a wide range of activities including art and cultural programs, education and social services, research projects, and even economic development projects. . In recent years, community engagement has taken on an even more important role for many universities and their community. . This transition is the result of multiple factors, including the federal government's decision to link funding to specific goals and objectives, as well as the inclusion of community engagement as a tool in the universities' enrollment management programs. For example, the University of Wisconsin-Parkside has intentionally taken steps to institutionalize university-community engagement in reaction to severe enrollment and revenue challenges (Letven, Ostheimer, & Statham, 2001). . Additionally, universities have been facing pressure from university leaders, faculty members, and/or students to respond to the needs of the surrounding community. For example, Saint Peter's University located in Hudson County, NJ, a community that is 43% Hispanic, pursued and received \$2.8 million in Title V grant funding as a Hispanic Serving Institution in order to expand educational opportunities for and improve the attainment of Hispanic students (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). . This program included engaging area high schools with high Latino populations (Saint Peter's University, n.d.).

It is not easy to measure community engagement on the part of a university. The purpose of this study is to analyze university-community engagement as perceived by both internal and external stakeholders using the *boundary spanning* theory. . Boundary spanning refers to the links or bridges between a university and society (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). . Boundary spanners are individuals who have the ability to connect people to work together (Adams, 2014). . Boundary spanners from the university and the community assist in the ability to cross lines and increase problem-solving ability through the sharing of information and perspectives (Adams, 2014).

Additionally, this study intends to explore ways in which university and public policy and procedures can better promote community engagement by four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutions in their local community. . A comprehensive review and analyses of existing community engagement programs at participating universities will be conducted through review of school websites and strategic plans. . This research is significant because university community engagement has shown benefits for both universities and local communities. . Understanding the perception of this community engagement activity and the impact of policies on community engagement will assist in developing more effective community engagement programs.

Problem Statement

As previously stated, colleges and universities fulfill a threefold mission of teaching, research, and service. . As a result, colleges and universities continuously redefine their role in society that impacts the ways they interact with their surrounding communities. . Most colleges and universities have developed a mutually beneficial

relationship with their local communities through volunteer service hours, community-based research, and service-learning courses (Suarez-Balcazar, Harper, & Lewis, 2005). . These activities provide an opportunity for faculty members, staff, and students to interact directly with members of the community. . The concept of community engagement has expanded over the past decade. . Universities and communities around the world have partnered not only on economic initiatives, but also on cultural and social efforts, in order to confront present day challenges. . These challenges often require the coordinated efforts of educational institutions, nonprofits, corporations, individuals, and governments working together for solutions. .

The Jesuit university, as an anchor institution, is in a position to play a vital role through community engagement to strengthen its surrounding regions economically, socially, and culturally. . An anchor institution is a large nonprofit with a commitment to a location. . Since it is extremely rare for anchor institutions to relocate and they tend to be large institutions, recent economic instability has increased their importance and role in the local economy (Taylor & Luter, 2013). . The clearest example of this is the economic impact of healthcare and education—so-called “eds and meds” institutions—on local economies (Taylor & Luter, 2013). . Expansion of these institutions brings new income to a metropolitan area, raises earnings by improving worker skills, and has been shown to encourage employers to pay higher wages to all workers (Bartik & Erockcek, 2008).

Boundary spanning theory provides a perspective for reviewing the manner in which the university’s interaction with the community is perceived. . . . The individuals who connect the university and community are referred to as boundary spanners. . This

study will analyze the perceptions of a university's community engagement through the prism of boundary spanners, including internal and external stakeholders. . Additionally, the perceptions of boundary spanners will be analyzed to understand the role and importance of public policies and institutional policies in promoting community engagement.

Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions of the internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles, both within four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education and in the local communities, regarding the influence of community engagement?
2. What community engagement opportunities do internal and external stakeholders believe that four-year Jesuit universities serving as anchor institutes of higher education can become involved in to further the cultural, social, and economic development of the local community?
3. What policies and procedures do stakeholders believe are needed to encourage boundary spanning activities through community engagement by four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education?

Significance of the Research Study

Community engagement is an international movement that requires colleges and universities to adjust how they interact with their surrounding area. . In Europe and Australia, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has led these efforts. . Their research and data has shown the benefits of community engagement

for both the institutes of higher education and the public (Cavaye, 2004). . They have also become a resource for information on how educational leaders can promote interaction between the university and community (Cavaye, 2004). .

In the United States, multiple groups have encouraged the development of community engagement policies by colleges. . These organizations include Campus Compact, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). . In addition, regional associations have expanded their membership to include business, civic, and academic members. . For example, the Hudson County Chamber of Commerce’s Board of Directors includes representatives from three of the four universities located in their region (Hudson Chamber of Commerce, n.d.). . Many Chambers of Commerce across the country also include academic institutions.

This research study measured the economic, cultural, and social impact of universities’ community engagement. Although economic indicators are easier to measure, the cultural and social impact of a university on the surrounding area is extremely important. . Most research concerning community engagement has focused on the economic benefits of the relationship between university and community. . Additionally, most research in community engagement focuses on land grant research institutions. . Therefore, this study seeks to add to the body of knowledge by expanding the issues studied, as well as the type of university studied.

Research Methodology

This research study used a qualitative design. By utilizing a case study approach, this study identified the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders on community

engagement by four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education, as well as the impact of a university's community engagement on local cultural, social and economic development. . The general population for this study was four-year Jesuit universities who received Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015 and are located in urban communities (New England Research Center for Higher Education, n.d.).

There are 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States. . Located in 18 states and the District of Columbia, these institutions range from major research universities to smaller liberal arts-focused schools (Association of Jesuit Colleges & Universities, n.d.). . . Jesuit colleges and universities are institutions founded and operated by the Society of Jesus, a Catholic religious order founded in 1540 by Ignatius Loyola. . Of the 28 Jesuit higher education institutions, 16 have received the Carnegie Community Engagement designation; 11 in 2015. . Of these 11 colleges and universities, five were chosen that represent the expansive diversity of the student population served and because they are located within a city.

I obtained and reviewed the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement application submitted by the five schools included in this study . . to determine ways in which the university self-identifies community engagement activities. . I searched the websites for these five colleges for any references to community engagement, to understand how community engagement activities are organized and structured at each school. Additionally, I reviewed and analyzed the strategic plans for each of the five

universities to determine the priority status the university gave to the concept of community engagement.

The review of the 2015 Carnegie application, websites, and strategic plans assisted in identifying internal stakeholders that serve as boundary spanners. . Additionally, this comprehensive review assisted in identifying external stakeholders that the universities identified as community partners. . These internal and external stakeholders were asked to participate in an anonymous survey for this case study in order to highlight differences and similarities of internal and external perceptions of the universities' community engagement activities. .

The goal was to create a better understanding for leaders at both educational institutions and their communities on the perception of the colleges' community engagement roles.

Definition of Key Terms

- *Boundary Spanning* is the activity of connecting an organization to the external environment by individuals or departments. .
- *Boundary Spanners* are individuals who engage in activities that connect the university to the community.
- *Community* is the local population(s) served by the university.
- *Community Engagement* is the “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutual beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.).
- *Community-based research* is academic research that includes “the institution with the

community in reciprocal relationship to address a local problem or issue” (Beere, Votruba, Wells p.143)

- *Institutes of Higher Education* are the institutions that provide a formal education to individuals after the completion of secondary school. . The terms *colleges* and *universities* may be used interchangeably.
- *Partnerships* are the formal relationships between the college and community for the improvement of the community.
- *President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll* is a federal program, launched in 2006, that annually highlights the role colleges and universities play in solving community problems and placing more students on a lifelong path of civic engagement by recognizing institutions that achieve meaningful, measureable outcomes in the communities they serve.
- *Questionnaire* refers to the written set of questions that were given to stakeholders in order to collect perceptions on the universities’ community engagement.
- *Service Learning* is a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002).
- *Town and Gown* is a phrase used to describe the relationship between the population of the surrounding community (town) and the population of the university (gown) within that community.

Summary

This study used boundary spanning theory to analyze perceptions of four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutions of higher education from the perspective of internal and external stakeholders. . Additionally, this study explored ways in which university and public policy leaders can better promote community engagement at Jesuit universities. . Universities play an increasingly important role in cultural, social, and economic development of their local communities. . It is important to understand perceptions of a university's community engagement through the prism of internal and external stakeholders in order to determine policies and procedures that may encourage partnerships more efficiently. . It is also important to note that these policies and procedures may come from the university or from external stakeholders. . For example, there may be government policies that can foster community engagement on the part of universities within local communities. . There may also be university policies that can serve as best practice examples for other institutions of higher education.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

History of Community Engagement

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching defines community engagement as the “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, and global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Carnegie, 2006). . This engagement emphasizes a two-way approach in which institutions and community partners collaborate to develop and apply knowledge to address societal needs (Boyer, 1996; Kellogg Commission, 1999). .

Reality has too infrequently met this ideal collaborative approach. That is, this two-way relationship, which is intended to focus on mutually beneficial results, has not dominated the history of higher education in America. . Although institutions of higher education have always had a relationship with and been influenced by their external environments, their relationship could best be described as one-way—dictated from the university to the community. . The one-way nature of such a relationship often was a result of the university’s perception of the needs of the community and the need of the university to respond to external pressures, including public safety issues in the surrounding neighborhood and/or federal mandates associated with funding opportunities (Rudolph, 1990). . Therefore, it is fair to characterize the relationship during an earlier era as often bring forced upon the university, rather than invited by the university out of a desire to contribute to the common good.

Colonial Period

The earliest Colonial colleges provided the religious and civic leaders for the colonies and future American society (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). . Initially, the mission of colleges involved strictly teaching. . Faculty would share their knowledge, normally through a lecture format, with their students. (Kerr, 2001). . During this period, faculty members were not well paid. . Additionally, a faculty position was not a highly sought-after career. . In fact, these faculty members were often called tutors—they were recent graduates awaiting an assignment as a religious minister (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). .

Generally, student populations were also limited to wealthy families. . For the few students that were able to attend college, faculty acted as both teacher and custodian (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). . In fact, the earliest connections between communities and institutions of higher education were based on religious affiliations (Mayfield, 2001). . For example, the original missions of Harvard University, Dartmouth College, and the College of William and Mary included the “Christianization and civilizing of indigenous” populations (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 22).

During the Colonial Period, the curriculum at colleges, reflecting their missions and small enrollment, were limited. . Therefore, rhetoric, classical scholarship, and the Bible were the primary focus (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). . As colleges expanded, so did their course offerings, in order to reflect their goals and objections. . The curriculum was:

Nothing less than the statement a college makes about what, out of the totality of man’s constantly growing knowledge and experience, is considered useful, appropriate, or relevant to the lives of educated men and women at a point of time. (Rudolph, 1977, p. xxi)

Colleges continued to change their structure and mission and grow as the country increased its territory (Kerr, 2001). . As the United States of America was born from revolution and expanded through the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the Mexican-American War of 1848, dozens of new colleges were established (Rudolph, 1990). . Colleges experienced significant student enrollment growth despite continuing restrictive enrollment practices that discriminated against immigrants, women, and religions. . Faculty members became more professionalized with the introduction of full-time professors who specialized in specific subjects (Rudolph, 1990). . During this period, the German concept of the professor as an independent researcher began to take hold in the United States (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). .

Slavery and the University

It is important to note that American colleges share a historical connection to American slavery. . Recently, several universities have identified and recognized the role their institutions played in fostering and benefiting from slavery. . Harvard University President Drew Gilpin Faust wrote an article in the Harvard Crimson recognizing the relationship between Harvard and slavery (Faust & Gilpin, 2016). . Additionally, Georgetown University, the oldest American Jesuit university, recognized that in 1838, 272 slaves were sold by Maryland's Jesuit priests to pay outstanding debts of the young university (Zauzmer, 2017). . .

Morrill Act

The role of the federal government in higher education began to expand with the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862 that significantly impacted the relationship between institutes of higher education and their surrounding community (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

The purpose of the Morrill Act was:

Without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactic, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (Morrill Act of 1862, 7 U.S.C. §304).

The Morrill Act, which originated during the Civil War, permitted a state to select 30,000 acres of federal land multiplied by its number of Congressmen for the development of universities (Library of Congress, n.d.). . The land, nearly 17.5 million acres, was sold by the states with the money dedicated to the development of colleges whose focus was agriculture, mechanical arts, and military tactics (Library of Congress, n.d.). The Morrill Act created the land grant universities of America, eventually including Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and New Jersey Institute of Technology (Rutgers, 2014). . It has been contended that it also contributed to the focus of American universities on research purely for greater knowledge without regard to their impact on society (Mayfield, 2001); (Kerr, 2001). .

The fact remains that the Morrill Act assured that land grant universities would be major property holders within their local community, therefore making their potential

economic impact significant. . Today, land grant universities are anchor institutions and economic engines for their surrounding community, thanks to their job generation and purchasing power.

Most HBCUs were established after the American Civil War, often with the assistance of northern United States religious missionary organizations. Despite the Morrill Act, many southern colleges remained systems and generally excluded black students from their land grant colleges. Through the second Morrill Act of 1890, also known as the Agricultural College Act of 1890, Congress required states to establish a separate land grant college for blacks if blacks were being excluded from the existing land grant college. Many of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) were founded by states to satisfy the Second Morrill Act (HBCU Library Alliance, n.d.).

The federal government continued to expand its role in higher education with the passage of the Hatch Act of 1887. . This amended the Morrill Act in order to establish state agricultural experiment stations at land grant universities. . The mission of these institutions was:

To support agricultural research as well as promote the efficient production, marketing, distribution, and utilization of products of the farm as essential to the health and welfare of our peoples and to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity and security. (National Institute of Food and Agriculture, n.d.)

This trend of an increased role for the federal government in higher education continued with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. . Smith-Lever established the United States Cooperative Extension System, a partnership of the Department of Agriculture, land grant colleges, and state and local governments; as well as the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, which provided funding for vocational educational teachers (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

The Smith-Lever Act was particularly important in the trend toward community engagement at land grant universities since it specifically required these institutions to provide practical skills to the public. . Similar to the Morrill Act, this legislation reinforced the focus on the university's ability to contribute to its local community. . However, the relationship between the university and community continued to be characterized as one-way—from the university to the community. . The notion of developing a mutually beneficial relationship that included a two-way partnership had not yet developed; therefore, the modern understanding of community engagement had not yet been established.

Industrial Period

As the Industrial Age flourished, research at institutes of higher education shifted from a strictly agricultural focus to multiple scientific disciplines. . This expansion of research subjects coincided with increased federal funding for more scientific research; often this research was related to the federal government's perception of defense and security needs (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). . This trend of the federal government shifting research priorities through funding continues to this day. . For example, the federal government's investment in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) majors

has forced many liberal arts colleges to review their curriculum (Brint, Riddle, Turk-Bicakci, & Levy, 2005).

Despite the expanding curriculum and increasing student populations, restrictive admissions policies continued to discriminate based on sex and religion. In particular, Jews were openly discriminated against through quota systems. For example, A. Lawrence Lowell, Harvard's president from 1909-1933, voiced concern that enrolling a high number of Jewish students would “ruin the college” by causing elite Protestant students to attend other schools (Karabel, 2006).

GI Bill

It can be argued that the most significant federal program to impact the American higher education system was the Serviceman Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly referred to as the GI Bill (Olson, 1973). The GI Bill provided many veteran benefits, including entitlement to one year of schooling as a full-time student, plus an additional month for each month served in the armed services (Bound & Turner, 2002). Institutes of higher education saw enrollment double from prewar levels—over two million veterans attended college under the original GI Bill (Bound & Turner, 2002). Through multiple reauthorizations, today's veterans continue to utilize amended GI Bills to gain access to a university education (McMurray, 2007).

It is interesting to note that the impact of the GI Bill on American colleges and universities was not a primary motivator for Congress. Rather, it was developed as a proactive defense against the economic and social disruptions of returning veterans. Congress had witnessed firsthand the negative impact protests by unemployed veterans

could have on the nation during the 1932 Bonus Army March. . In the midst of the Great Depression, veterans of World War I marched on Washington demanding early redemption of their \$1,000 bond certificates that were not due until 1945. . The tent cities constructed by this Bonus Army were eventually destroyed by the US Army. . The violence outraged many Americans (Dickinson & Allen, 2006).

President Franklin D. Roosevelt did not want a repeat of this conflict and called for legislation to address the needs of veterans. . During a fireside chat on July 28, 1943, he stated:

But the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and they are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems. (A Boat Against the Current, 2009)One of the greatest legacies of the GI Bill was that it forever changed the American public's perception of college. . Before World War II, American colleges were characterized as rural, exclusive, small, elitist, white, and Protestant (Greenburg, 2004). . The GI Bill was not restrictive based on race or ethnicity; therefore, it created opportunities for poor White, Black, Jewish, and Catholic veterans. . The perception of college as being open to all and a pathway to greater social mobility became ingrained in the American psyche (Clark, 1998).

The GI Bill was also much more successful than originally anticipated. . Veterans took advantage of the benefits offered at an incredible rate. . Over 2.2 million veterans attended college or university; another 5.6 million attended high school or vocational school. . During the post-war period, veterans accounted for an estimated 49% of enrollment at colleges and universities. . An incredible 51% of eligible serviceman

participated in the education benefits of the GI Bill. . Whether these servicemen would have attended college without the GI Bill is an issue for debate; however, it is clear that the federal legislation made it easier for them to pursue their educational goals (Mettler, 2005).

Despite the justifiable praise of the GI Bill, it is clear that it predominately benefited white men. GI Bill itself was not discriminatory. . However, although the program was federally funded, its implementation was directed at the state and local level by the Veterans Administration (VA). . The VA was closely affiliated with the pro-segregation American Legion. African American veterans were frequently directed toward vocational training. In some cases, black applicants were told that they needed no further education, since the job market had no place for blacks as skilled workers, only as menial laborers.

Nevertheless, the GI Bill was a watershed moment for the economy of the United States. It fostered the growth of the middle class. Interestingly, the concept of a middle class is a fairly modern notion; for most of history we have had the extremes of rich and poor. One way to grasp the impact of the GI Bill is to look at a snapshot of individuals who took advantage of the program. They include Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush; Supreme Court Justices William Rehnquist, John Paul Stevens, and Byron White; U.S. Senators Bob Dole, John Glenn, George Mitchell, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan; and U.S. Representatives Alan Simpson, Ronald Dellums, and Charles Rangel. Civil Rights activists Medgar Evers and Hosea Williams also used the G.I. Bill, as did legendary entertainers Harry Belafonte, Johnny Cash, Clint Eastwood, Paul

Newman, and Walter Matthau (Mettler, 2005). These individuals attended a vast variety of colleges, from Ivy League schools to Historical Black Colleges and Universities. The GI Bill also includes countless linchpins to American communities—individuals who may not be recorded in history books, but who built and supported their local communities.

Cold War Period

The federal government's role in higher education continued to expand during the Cold War. In 1958, in reaction to the Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik into space, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). The purpose of this federal legislation was to help ensure that highly trained individuals would be available to help America compete with the Soviet Union in scientific and technical fields. In support of higher education, the NDEA included support for loans to college students, graduate fellowships, and vocational-technical training (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.).

The NDEA was important because it was perceived as an example of expanding the federal government's role in education by linking funding to a specific priority. President Lyndon Johnson cited it as such an example when discussing his aggressive education agenda:

First, this law—the National Defense Education Act—ended years and years of debate about one controversial question: 'Shall the Federal Government, with all its massive resources, get directly involved in aiding American education?' The answer this law gave was a loud 'Yes!'—and thus we paved the way for a new era of support for education in America. This law, in fact, helped make possible more than 50 new education laws passed in my administration. (Johnson, 1964)

During President Johnson's Great Society program, equal access to education came into focus as a result of the antipoverty and civil rights laws and U.S. Supreme Court cases of the 1960s and 1970s. The passage of laws such as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibited discrimination based on race, sex, and disability, respectively made civil rights enforcement a fundamental and long-lasting focus of the Department of Education. In 1965, the Higher Education Act authorized assistance for postsecondary education, including financial aid programs for needy college students (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). The Higher Education Act of 1965 specifically recognized HBCUs and provided direct federal aid to qualifying schools.

Expanded access to a college education not only had an economic benefit for the country, but also changed the university. There was an explosion of diversity on campuses. . As a result, college campuses needed to evaluate the ways that they communicated with their students and local communities. This diversity continues today. In many ways, the ivy walls guarding Socrates academia have been breached by the needs of the surrounding community.

The 1960s gave rise to activist academics who began including community work into university curricula. In 1967, Robert Sigmon and William Ramsey of the Southern Regional Education Board coined the term *service learning* in describing faculty and student work with the Tennessee Valley Authority (Axelroth Hodges & Dubb, 2012). Service learning developed a strong antipoverty mission. Federal funding assisted in expanding its presence on college campuses. The National Student Volunteer Program

was established in 1969 by President Richard Nixon. These programs continued to grow, under various name changes, until the 1980 election of President Ronald Reagan. During this period, academic benefits were emphasized while activism was deemphasized (Axelroth Hodges & Dubb, 2012). The 1990s saw a reinvestment in service learning by President George H.W. Bush and President William J. Clinton.

Post-Cold War

The end of the cold war and a momentary de-emphasis on defense research saw the creation and expansion of several small federal programs focused on local research for the benefit of meeting state or local community goals (Axelroth Hodges & Dubb, 2012). The Office of University Partnerships (OUP) at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development the Learn and Serve America Program and the U.S. Department of Commerce's University Centers program within the Economic Development Administration all saw funding increases (Dubb & Howard, 2007).

Scholars began to call for an increased focus on the role of the university and its relationship to the community (Kerr, 2001); (Cohen & Kisker, 2010); (Boyer, 1990) (Boyer, 1996); (Bok, 1982). Derek Bok, president of Harvard University, and Ernest Boyer, president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, were two vocal critics of the university as a strictly research entity focused on research for researcher's sake, with little relationship to the external community (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). They argued that institutions of higher education should expand relationships with the community. In fact, they contended that universities needed to grow their "efforts on behalf of the broader community" (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 414).

Boyer (1996), in discussing the need for an expanded definition of the term “scholarship,” stated:

We conclude that for America's colleges and universities to remain vital a new vision of scholarship is required. What we are faced with, today, is the need to clarify campus missions and relate the work of the academy more directly to the realities of contemporary life. (p.13)

Boyer’s work built upon the writing of Bok (1982), where he argued that institutions of higher education should be working directly to not only research, but also solve basic social problems (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). This perspective of higher education having a responsibility to address social issues has significantly influenced current trends in academia in regard to community engagement.

Additionally, neighborhood deterioration within America’s urban communities spurred by low primary school graduation rates, high crime, and increased drug use led many scholars to recognize that universities as anchor institutions needed to play an important role in addressing these issues. Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett of the University of Pennsylvania are leading figures in this research. In their book, *Dewey’s Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform*, they state:

In the aftermath of the cold war, accelerating external and internal pressures forced research universities to recognize (very reluctantly) that they must—and could—function as moral/intellectual institutions simultaneously engaged in advancing university knowledge, learning and improving the well-being of their local geographic communities (i.e., the local ecological systems that powerfully

affect their own health and functioning). (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007, p. 79)

Current Trends in Community Engagement

As discussed earlier, community engagement is defined as a two-way interaction between the university and community (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement for Teaching, n.d.). The modern interpretation of community engagement anticipates a mutual benefit for the university and the community partner (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). A commitment to community engagement has led to the development of organizational structures to provide support for such activities.

In the United States, multiple groups have encouraged the development of community engagement policies by colleges. As discussed previously, these organizations include: Campus Compact, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). The mission of Campus Compact, which was founded in 1985, illustrates the current trend:

Campus Compact advances the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility. Campus Compact envisions colleges and universities as vital agents and architects of a diverse democracy, committed to educating students for responsible citizenship in ways that both deepen their education and improve the quality of community life. We challenge all of higher education to make civic and community engagement an institutional priority. (Campus Compact) Campus Compact now has over 1,100 university members in 35 states (Campus Compact, A). Conferences organized for

the sole purpose of discussing the issue of community engagement and ways by which colleges can institutionalize policies to foster effective community partnership occur annually. Although earlier scholarly work focuses on land grant and research institutions, the trend throughout higher education is the institutionalization of community engagement.

Additionally, recent research has highlighted the importance of individual connectors or boundary spanners in expanding the capacity of the university in interacting with their local community. In 2006, *Making Place Matter*, a report resulting from the collaborative efforts of the Alliance for Regional Stewardship, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, provided guidance on how state colleges and universities could promote community partnership (Lee, 2012).. This report was significant because it recognized that despite previous community partnerships, boundary spanners were needed to expand and institutionalize community engagement (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2006).

In 2006, President George W. Bush launched The President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll. The purpose of the award is to annually highlight the role of colleges and universities in addressing community problems and encouraging students to pursue civic engagement and community service. The President's Honor Roll recognizes higher education institutions in four categories:

- General Community Service
- Interfaith Community Service

- Economic Opportunity
- Education (National Service, n.d.)

Also in 2006, the Carnegie Foundation first offered a community engagement classification (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement for Teaching, n.d.). This elective classification was offered in 2008, 2010, and 2015. As indicated earlier, the Jesuit institutes of higher education used in this study all applied for and received this classification in 2015. In 2015, the Carnegie Foundation selected 240 colleges and universities to receive the community engagement classification; therefore, including the 2008 and 2010 cycles there are a total of 361 campuses that have the designation (New England Research Center for Higher Education, n.d.).

It is important to note that the classification is not an award. Rather it is “an evidence-based documentation of an institution’s practices to be used in a process of self-assessment and quality improvement” (New England Research Center for Higher Education, n.d.). The Community Engagement Classification takes place on a five-year cycle. Therefore, the next opportunity for institutions to apply for classification will be during the 2020 cycle (New England Research Center for Higher Education, n.d.).

Researchers have highlighted five best practices among colleges and universities qualifying for the Carnegie Foundation community engagement classification. These are: (a) executive leadership, including faculty members, backed by supportive infrastructure, (b) intentional advancement strategies, (c) longitudinal assessment plans; (d) rewarding community engagement in the peer review process; and (e) developing clear direction (Axelroth Hodges & Dubb, 2012).

Community Engagement Impact: Economic, Social, and Cultural

The impact or potential impact of higher education institutions on a local and regional economy has been well documented (Drabensott, 2008) (Goddard, 1997) (Goddard & Puuka, 2008). Because of the number of employees and purchasing power of colleges and universities, their presence has a significant financial influence on the surrounding community (Boyle & Stephens, 2011). However, the impact a university has on its community should be greater than purely economics (Boyer, 1990). Institutes of higher education should play a role in the cultural and social development of the community as well (Doyle, 2010) (Munk, 2010). In writing about civic engagement after participating in a meeting that took place at Kettering Foundation in 2008, John Saltmarsh noted:

This nation faces significant societal challenges, and higher education must play a role in responding to them. There is widespread agreement that colleges and universities have civic and public purposes, including the preparation of an enlightened and productive citizenry and engaging in scholarship that both addresses pressing problems and holds a mirror to society to allow for self-reflection and self-correction. The question is how to achieve these aims. (Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009)

Therefore, if a university is going to contribute to the economic, cultural, and social development of a community, it needs to engage with that community. As discussed earlier, community engagement today is characterized by a two-way relationship. In order to form and sustain this relationship, universities need individuals

who act as boundary spanners. These individuals act in multiple roles for the university when interacting with external stakeholders (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010) (Friedman & Podolny, 1992). Internal stakeholders include the administration, staff, faculty members, students, and alumni of a college or university. External stakeholders to the university may include local residents, business leaders, elected officials, government entities, and nonprofit organizations. In some cases, this definition may be expanded beyond the regional context to include global stakeholders, such as when a university has an active international exchange program or participates in international field research studies on climate change. However, this research study will focus on the local surrounding community stakeholders who interact with university staff on a regular basis.

The relationship between the university and the community can take multiple forms. Some of these include service learning programs, international exchange programs, volunteer hours, university-community partnerships, and community-based research. Whatever the form taken, it is likely that boundary spanners will connect the university to the community; therefore, it is important to understand boundary spanning theory.

International Trends in Community Engagement

Community engagement is an international movement that requires colleges and universities to decide how they want to interact with their surrounding area. As referenced earlier, the increased focus on community engagement is not restricted to the United States. Today, it is universally accepted that higher education fulfills three missions: teaching, research, and service. Several studies from Europe and Australia

acknowledge the importance of the third mission of service through community engagement (Alves, Mainardes, & Raposo, 2010) (Buys & Bursnall, 2007).

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an international organization founded in 1961 to foster global trade and economic growth, has recently focused on the relationship of the university and community (OECD, n.d.). It currently hosts conferences concerning higher education and community engagement (OECD, 2012). Additionally, the United Nations has made a concerted effort to recruit and utilize institutions of higher education to foster its mission. The UN has accomplished this effort through two strategies.

First, it has accepted institutes of higher education as Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) through the Department of Public Information (United Nations, n.d.). Universities that receive NGO status are permitted to participate in NGO annual conferences and weekly briefings, as well as other programs. Second, it has created UN Academic Impact (UNAI), a global initiative that “aligns institutions of higher education with the United Nations in furthering the realization of the purposes and mandate of the Organization through activities and research in a shared culture of intellectual social responsibility” (UN Academic Impact, n.d.).

Boundary Spanning Theory

Boundary spanning refers to the linkages between an organization and other sources of information. In the context of institutes of higher education, boundary spanning is defined as the connection or bridge between the university and the local community (Mull & Jordan, 2014) (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). Since the founding of

the first colleges during the Colonial era there has consistently been an interaction between the community and academia (Cohen & Kisker, 2010).

Organizations often have boundary spanners within the organization who interact with various internal and external stakeholders, groups and organizations through either their role or a unique skillset. Boundary spanners are often called on to fulfill multiple roles: communicators, protectors, innovators, and relationship managers (Mull & Jordan, 2014). Communication is an important skill for boundary spanners, not only because of their interaction with community organizations, but also for the dissemination of acquired knowledge within the university (Huggins, Johnston, & Thompson, 2012). Boundary spanners very often fulfill the role of protectors of their organization. They act not only as conduits, but also buffers between the university and the ever-changing external environment (Huggins, Johnston, & Thompson, 2012) (Fennell & Alexander, 1987).

Additionally, boundary spanners are challenged to be innovators as they attempt to weave or integrate new knowledge developed through their interaction with external organizations and existing information developed through their interaction with internal stakeholders, in order to foster a positive relationship between the university and the community. Finally, boundary spanners also manage the relationship and power structure between the university and the community (Ernst & Chrobot-Mason, 2011).

Boundary spanning has been used to examine interorganizational collaboration in higher education (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). It is important to note that boundary spanning is often significantly influenced by the “mission, history, and location of the institution” (Holland, 2005; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). Additionally, research has suggested that an organization’s boundary-spanning behaviors are impacted by a number

of complex, sometimes related social, cultural, and political factors (Maurrasse, 2001). Among the various factors that impact boundary spanners are the historical relationship between the university and the community, power relationships between the campus and the community, availability of funding, university culture, and background of the higher educational representatives and community partners (Maurrasse, 2001; Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). These are critical influences that must be considered by higher education leaders as they attempt to build relationships with community stakeholders (Maurrasse, 2001).

Boundary spanning is not and should not be considered the responsibility of one designated individual; rather, it is more complex and multilayered. For institutes of higher education, there are multiple offices and individuals who interact, at varying degrees, with external partners in multiple roles (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010; Friedman & Podolny, 1992).

According to Weerts and Sandmann, boundary-spanning roles may be organized into two domains: task orientation and social closeness. Task orientation refers to an individual's formal role or job responsibilities within the organization (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010). Many universities have established Offices of Community Engagement. The College of William and Mary established an Office of Community Engagement that focuses on linking the college and the community. The mission for William and Mary's program is to foster active citizenship within its students. The Office includes a dedicated website that outlines programs offered, lists community

partnerships, and provides information on undergraduate student and postgraduate fellowships (William and Mary, n.d.).

Social closeness refers to the degree to which the activities of boundary spanners are aligned with external stakeholders (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010; Friedman & Podolny, 1992). For example, an Office of Campus Ministry may organize volunteers for a local soup kitchen. Additionally, nearly all universities have institutionalized service learning classes. These courses will link academic curricula with service at community partner sites. For example, Arizona State University's Service Learning program provides resources to faculty and K-12 teachers (Arizona State University, n.d.). In the context of institutes of higher education and community engagement, it is clear that boundary spanning is complex and occurs at the individual and organization level; both formally and informally (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010).

Anchor Institutions

In the United States, the concept of "anchor institutions" is increasingly used to understand and describe the role colleges and universities can play in developing successful communities and cities. Over the past 20 years, the concept of anchor institutions emerged as a new paradigm for understanding the role of higher education in contributing to successful community redevelopment (Harkavy, Hartley, Hodges, & Weeks, 2014). Although, there is still no agreed-upon definition for anchor institutions in the literature, there are certain shared character traits. These include: spatial immobility, corporate status, size, and mission (Taylor & Luter, 2013).

Characteristics of Anchor Institutions

Spatial immobility is a defining threshold characteristic for an anchor institution. As a result of immobility, institutions are tied to their local community through investment, mission, relationships, or customers (Taylor & Luter, 2013). It has long been accepted that universities are place-based institutions (Harkavy, Hartley, Hodges, & Weeks, 2014). Anchor institutions are normally nonprofit entities. Although this is not universally agreed upon, generally, private corporations are viewed as more likely to move their corporate headquarters (Taylor & Luter, 2013). It is extremely unlikely that a university would relocate (Webber & Karlstrom, 2009). Additionally, although there is no size test, Taylor and Luter (2013) contend that anchor institutions are “influential institutions whose land holdings, purchasing power, employment and cultural influences impact the local economy” (p. 7). Finally, anchor institutions should have the potential for acquiring social purpose mission. Researchers have argued that universities should have a community engagement agenda that is intentional (Maurrasse, 2001; Hodges & Dubb, 2012). This requires anchor institutions, including many colleges, to transform themselves and refocus their mission. As stated by Benson, Harkavy, and Pucket (2007):

For universities and colleges to fulfill their great potential and really contribute to a democratic...revolution, they will have to do things very differently than they do now...To become part of the solution, higher eds must give full-minded devotion to the painfully difficult task of transforming themselves into socially responsible civic universities and colleges. To do so, they will have to radically

change their institutional cultures and structures, democratically realign and integrate themselves, and develop a comprehensive, realistic strategy. (p.84)

The universities included in this research project all meet the criteria established to be defined as anchor institutions within their communities. Jesuit universities included in this study have adopted a mission based on Boyer's (1990) call "to serve a larger purpose." However, there are some researchers who contend that as universities face difficult economic conditions, there has been a shift in missions focused purely on social responsibility to community relationships which can provide a tangible return on investment (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Of course, this also creates the risk of transforming civic engagement and social responsibility into "narrow economism" (Taylor & Luter, 2013).

The University as an Anchor Institution

The question remains, why universities would consider acting as anchor institutions for the betterment of their community. On this point, Harkavy and Puckett (1994) describe four key reasons why it is in the enlightened self-interest of a university—particularly an urban university—to help revitalize its local community:

The first reason is institutional self-interest, including the safety, cleanliness, and attractiveness of the physical setting ... The second reason involves a more indirect effect on institutional self-interest. It includes the costs (financial, public relations, and political) to the institution that result from a retreat from the community, as well as the benefits that accrue from active, effective engagement.... The third reason involves the advancement of knowledge, teaching, and human welfare through academically based community service

focused on improving the quality of life in the local community... Promoting civic consciousness, we believe, is the core component of the fourth reason for significant university involvement with the community. (pp. 300-301)

As anchor institutions, universities engage the community in social, cultural, and economic ways. In 2006, universities in the United States employed over two million full-time employees, enrolled over 18 million students, and purchased over \$373 million in goods and services (Axelroth Hodges & Dubb, 2012). A university's impact on its local and regional communities has increased since the economic recession of 2009. As stated by Ted Howard, founding executive director of the Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland:

Given the financial restraints cities are facing, anchor institutions are central... We need to assess what's working and what's not working, but also to put the emphasis on what are the possibilities, and where we can point to great things that are happening that can be leveraged in other universities. (Axelroth Hodges & Dubb, 2012)

Jesuits and Education

The Society of Jesus, commonly referred to as Jesuits, is a Catholic religious order of men that was founded in 1540 by Ignatius of Loyola. Education has always been a major component of the Jesuit mission. In 1548, members of the Society of Jesus opened the first Jesuit school in Messina in Sicily. The first Jesuit university, Roman College (Gregorian University), was founded by Ignatius of Loyola in 1551 (O'Malley, 2000). Today, there are 3,730 schools in the Jesuit tradition throughout the world. These schools care for 2.5 million students in places ranging from Egypt and Kenya to Nepal and Belize to Los Angeles and Jersey City. In Canada and the United States, there are 30 Jesuit colleges and 81 pre-secondary and secondary schools (Jesuits, n.d.).

The 28 colleges and universities founded by Jesuits represent a diverse spectrum of higher education; from large research institutions to small liberal art schools, from sprawling tree lined campuses to concrete urban campuses. The first Jesuit college was founded in 1789 by John Carroll. He founded Georgetown College on 60 acres of land in present day Washington, D.C. Georgetown University is the oldest Catholic and Jesuit institution of higher learning in the United States (Georgetown University, n.d.). The last Jesuit university founded in the United States was Wheeling Jesuit University (then Wheeling College) in West Virginia. It was founded in partnership between the Catholic Diocese of Wheeling-Charleston and the Society of Jesus of the Maryland Province in 1954 and is the only Catholic college in the state of West Virginia (Wheeling Jesuit University, n.d.).

Despite their diversity in place, student population, and curriculum, Jesuit universities share the common goal of “developing competent, compassionate and committed leaders” for the service to society (Jesuits, n.d.). These words can be found infused into the mission statements of all the Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States.

One distinctive aspect of Jesuit education at all levels, including higher education, is the emphasis on “cura personalis” or the caring for “the whole person” (Jesuits, n.d.). This concept requires the institutions to care for and develop the mind, body, and spirit of their students. Therefore, Jesuit colleges not only intentionally foster intellectual or academic development, but also consider it a priority to foster moral and spiritual growth. This mission has helped Jesuit institutions of higher education to make service and justice

key priorities of Jesuit education. Pedro Arrupe, S.J., who served as Superior General of the Jesuits from 1965 to 1983, said the principle objective of Jesuit education is to form:

Men and women for others, men and women who will not live for themselves but for God and his Christ ... men and women who cannot even conceive of love of God which does not include love for the least of their neighbors; men and women completely convinced that love of God which does not issue in justice for others is a farce. (Jesuits, n.d.)

This goal has manifested itself at Jesuit colleges and universities through efforts of community engagement and partnership. Throughout the United States, Jesuit universities are involved in local environmental sustainability projects, including the development of community gardens; they are tutoring particularly vulnerable populations in urban high schools; or they are undertaking major redevelopment projects in order to increase the economic viability of their surrounding community.

The Impact of Public Policy

Policies on the part of the university and its community partners may impact the perception of community engagement, as well as foster or limit a university's role in the community. As discussed previously, many Jesuit universities have institutionalized community engagement. Therefore, there are specific offices and staffers who work on community engagement programs. These programs may include required service hours for graduation or service-learning opportunities in the curriculum.

Additionally, since universities feel additional pressure to prepare their students for the workplace, many offices with various names have been created in order to place students in internships. These internships are believed to provide the student with a real

world experience while earning credit toward graduation. There are also universities conducting research that directly impacts the local community. Title V funding focused on improving the academic success of Hispanic students is an example of this research.

It is important to understand the role that government, businesses, and non-profits play in a university's community engagement. . Government policies such as Title V funding can foster a university role in the community. Businesses and nonprofits can also make it easier for students and faculty members to interact with the community. If a business develops a comprehensive internship program that allows a student to grow and learn in the field, it is likely that the perceptions of all participants will be more positive. Nonprofits can provide opportunities for students to address some of the challenges faced by local community members on a daily basis.

It is important to recognize the role that each of the internal and external stakeholders have in developing policies that encourage university community engagement.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research study was to explore community engagement at four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutions, as perceived by internal and external stakeholders, using boundary spanning theory. In addition to stakeholder perceptions of existing community engagement, this study identified the perception of opportunities for community engagement through the prism of internal and external stakeholders. Finally, this study discusses and analyzes the public policies and institutional procedures that stakeholders believe are needed to foster community engagement on the part of the universities.

The types of institutions included in this research study were limited to four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institution in their local community and that had applied for and received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015. There are eleven institutions that have received this designation. Individuals participating in the study included internal stakeholders. For purposes of this study, internal stakeholders were defined as the administration, staff, faculty members, students and alumni at each university. These individuals have either a formal or informal role in engaging the community. Additionally, this study included external stakeholders. For purposes of this study, external stakeholders included business, government, and nonprofit leaders from the surrounding local community who have partnered with the universities.

Three specific questions were asked:

1. What are the perceptions of the internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles, both within four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes

of higher education and in the local communities, regarding the influence of community engagement?

2. What community engagement opportunities do internal and external stakeholders believe four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education can become involved in to further the cultural, social and economic development of the local community?
3. What policies and procedures do stakeholders believe are needed to encourage boundary spanning activities through community engagement by four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education?

Research Design

I developed this research study as a qualitative instrumental case study in order to provide an in-depth examination of perceptions of university community engagement. The case study was set in five four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institution in their local community and that had applied for and received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015.

Although there is no agreed-upon definition of qualitative research, it has been defined as the “study of things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Additionally, qualitative research has several common characteristics: natural settings, researcher as key instrument, multiple methods, complex reasoning through inductive or deductive logic, participants’ meanings, emergent design, reflexivity, and holistic account (Creswell J. , 2007).

Accordingly, qualitative researchers often collect field data in the location where participants experience the issue in its natural setting. Qualitative researchers often collect data themselves; they often design their open instruments. Multiple forms of data are used, such as interviews, questionnaires, and documents. Patterns, categories, and themes are built from the bottom up using complex reasoning and inductive and/or deductive reasoning. Throughout the process it is important for the researcher to focus on how the participants understand and define the issue or problem. Qualitative research is emergent, because the initial plan may be challenged and shifted. Additionally, qualitative research is reflexive, since the researchers position themselves in the study. The researchers' experiences inform how information is interpreted. Finally, qualitative research provides a holistic account, since researchers are trying to develop a complex picture of the issue; "researchers are bound not by tight cause-effect relationships among factors, but rather by identifying the complex interactions of factors in any situation" (Creswell J. , 2007, p. 47).

I selected the qualitative approach because the characteristics of qualitative research as outlined in Creswell (2007) are present in the research design proposed for this study. Additionally, qualitative research is appropriate for this study because it is a complex issue that needs to be explored by allowing participants to feel empowered to share their stories and opinions in order to develop theories on community engagement (Creswell J. , 2007).

Case study is an accepted methodology in qualitative research (Creswell J. , 2007) (Yin, 2002). In a case study, the researcher explores a real life, bounded system over time, through data collection from multiple sources and means (Creswell J. , 2007). By

utilizing a collective case study approach, this study identifies the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders on community engagement by Jesuit anchor institutes of higher education, as well as the impact of community engagement on local cultural, social, and economic development. The general population for this study was four-year Jesuit universities who received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015 and are located in urban communities (New England Research Center for Higher Education, n.d.). The five four-year or above Jesuit universities included in this study have also demonstrated commitment to community engagement, can be characterized as anchor institutions, and had a willingness to participate in the study (Carnegie Classification, n.d.).

The constructivist paradigm reflected in qualitative research assumes that “reality is not absolute, but is defined through community consensus” (Mertens, 2005, p. 231). Multiple realities are revealed by reporting through the perspectives of the participants and the researcher through collecting, analyzing and interpreting data.

A collective case study involves the studying of multiple cases (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). A case study is an appropriate methodology for this study because it is bounded by time and activity (Creswell J. , 2007; Mertens, 2005). The cases were studied instrumentally rather than intrinsically (Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Stake, 1995). This was an instrumental case study because the case served as an instrument for studying particular issues related to community engagement. The activity boundary of the study was community engagement. The study reflected a particular moment of current practices and perspectives of the current internal and external stakeholders, as well as the

interpretations of the researcher. In contrast, intrinsic case study is distinguished by the researcher's interest in the case itself rather than in extending theory or generalizing across cases. In comparison, in an instrumental case study the case itself is secondary to understanding a particular phenomenon—community engagement.

The purpose of this study was to use boundary spanning theory to research the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders. Therefore, an instrumental case study was appropriate. Using a multisite or collective case study was important because it made it easier to generalize the results and provided the advantage of permitting a comparative type of study (Yin, 2002; Stake, 1995). After studying each individual case, I conducted a cross-case analysis to determine similarities (patterns in each case) as well as differences in the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders (Johnson & Christensen, 2012).

Participants

Once the purpose of the research study was determined, it was important to establish parameters for selecting the sample population. As Merton (2005) stated, it is essential “to determine the dimensions of diversity that are important to the study” (p.315). .

The general population for this study was four-year Jesuit universities who received Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015 and are located in cities. I selected five institutes of higher education that meet these criteria because they provided the diversity served by Jesuit colleges. These universities are different in many ways, including size, location and socioeconomic profile of their student population; however, they share a common Jesuit mission and location within a city.

Data Collection

This research study used multiple methods of data collection. The use of multiple forms of data collection is important to a case study because it strengthens confidence in findings (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). I used the following methods of data collection in this study:

1. I conducted a comprehensive review of existing data concerning each university's community engagement, specifically, the 2015 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification application, current university strategic plan, and university website.
2. I distributed questionnaires anonymously to internal and external stakeholders.

I selected open-ended survey strategies as the best way to create an in-depth picture from the internal and external stakeholders' perceptions of community engagement (Creswell J. , 2007, p. 136). The document analysis strategy provided an opportunity for triangulation of data provided in surveys and interviews (Creswell J. W., 2009). In order to enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of the data and data analysis, I used several frameworks. This is an accepted means of testing the rigor of qualitative data (Guba, 1981) (Baxter & Jack, 2008). As stated in Baxter and Jack, the research can achieve this by ensuring that: (a) the case study research question is clearly written...and the question is substantial; (b) case study design is appropriate for the research question; (c) purposeful sampling strategies appropriate for the case study have been applied; (d) data are collected and managed systematically; and (e) the data are analyzed correctly. Qualitative study methodology provides an opportunity to explore complex phenomena within their context using a variety of data sources. This allows that the issue

is studied from a variety of lenses that permits for a better understanding of the multiple facets of the phenomena. One of the risks in using case study methodology is the tendency of researchers to ask overly broad questions or establish too many objectives (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Studies have suggested that the best solution to ameliorate this risk is to establish boundaries for the study based on (a) time and place, (b) time and activity, and definition and context (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2002; Stake, 1995; Creswell J. , 2007). The multicase study approach allows for the exploration of similarities and differences between the cases (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2002; Stake, 1995).

Ethical Considerations

I was required to follow the policies of the Institutional Review Board of Saint Peter's University and each participating case study site in obtaining approval for this multisite case study. Since this study limited the general population for the study to four-year Jesuit universities who received Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015, the institutions are not confidential; however, there is no identifiable linkage between the survey data collected and the institutions or specific individuals who participated in the survey.

I distributed surveys anonymously to internal and external stakeholders. These surveys were digital, not paper. All IP addresses were blocked in order to assure anonymity. Since the survey was anonymous, the names of individual participants were completely confidential and are not disclosed in this dissertation. Also because the surveys are anonymous, there is link between the survey results and a particular

university. A summary of the data obtained from the case study will be made available to the specific institution, but individual participants will not be disclosed. This anonymity was important to ensure that participants would answer questions openly and honestly.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Jesuit Universities

Legend has it that Saint Ignatius instructed Francis Xavier to, “ite, inflammate omnia;” translated as “go set the world on fire.” This mantra has continued to drive the Jesuit mission in education. The Society of Jesus, commonly referred to as Jesuits, have a long and distinguished tradition of education as a primary mission. Since 1548, the Jesuits have developed a reputation for high quality education not just focused on religion, but also with an emphasis on liberal arts, research, sciences, and community service. With 3,730 schools and over 2.5 million students in Jesuit institutions globally, the Order plays an important role in the field of education.

Despite their diversity in place, student population, and curriculum, the 28 Jesuit universities in the United States share the common goal of “developing competent, compassionate, and committed leaders” dedicated to serving the larger community or society (Jesuits, n.d.). These words can be found infused into the mission statements of all the Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States. This goal has manifested itself at Jesuit colleges and universities through efforts of community engagement and partnership.

Five Jesuit Universities received surveys to participate in this research study: Saint Peter’s University, Marquette University, Saint Louis University, Gonzaga University, and Scranton University. The universities participating in this study vary in size; however, all are considered urban and share a Jesuit mission. Additionally, these

five universities presented the expansive diversity of the populations served by Jesuit colleges in the United States.

Website Review

Each of the Jesuit universities surveyed has a significant website presence regarding community engagement. The following information was revealed by reviewing the individual websites of each school.

Saint Peter's University

Overview. Saint Peter's University has 2,525 undergraduates and 881 graduate students. Its student population is 62% female and 38% male. It is located in Jersey City, NJ, on a 15-acre campus 3 miles from New York City (Saint Peter's University, n.d.).

Mission Statement. Saint Peter's University, inspired by its Jesuit, Catholic identity, commitment to individual attention, and grounding in the liberal arts, educates a diverse community of learners in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs to excel intellectually, lead ethically, serve compassionately, and promote justice in our ever-changing urban and global environment (Saint Peter's University, n.d.).

Strategic Plan. Saint Peter's is in the process of developing and implementing a new five-year strategic plan, *Pathways to Distinction*. Adopted by the Universities Board of Trustees in May 2016, the stated goal of this plan is to make Saint Peter's a place that is "graduating students for careers and purposeful lives through teaching excellence, experiential learning, leadership, and community engagement" (Saint Peter's University, 2016).

The fifth element of the *Pathways to Distinction* is to develop prominent community partnerships, which is understood as:

- Promote greater student engagement in the external community. Saint Peter's believes that community engagement needs to be "mutually beneficial" and targets "local, regional, and internal organizations" as partners.
- Expand opportunities to bring pre-college students, adults, and community organizations to campus.
- Build a strategic plan for engagement with corporate, community, and educational organizations.
- Be a catalyst for urban innovation and development (Saint Peter's University, 2016).

Structure & Organization. Saint Peter's does not have an Office of Community Engagement. The current strategic plan states that one of its goals is to establish a central clearing house for community partnership activities. However, since its transition to university status in 2012, Saint Peter's has advanced a commitment to the external community through outreach and public service programs. In the past five years, Saint Peter's has created new programs such as the College & High School Partnership for Achievement, the Center for Global Learning, and the Rising Tide Capital Ignite Institute. Additionally, many pre-existing programs have been expanded, including, the United Nations NGO program, Big Brothers, Big Sisters mentoring program, the Service Learning Initiative, and the Special Program for Credit (Saint Peter's University, n.d.).

Saint Louis University

Overview. Saint Louis University (SLU) has 8,248 undergraduates and 4,666 graduate students. Its student population is 58.6% female and 41.4% male. It is located in Saint Louis, Missouri, on a 254-acre campus 2 miles from downtown Saint Louis (Saint Louis University, 2016a).

Mission Statement.

The Mission of Saint Louis University is the pursuit of truth for the greater glory of God and for the service of humanity. The University seeks excellence in the fulfillment of its corporate purposes of teaching, research, health care, and service to the community. It is dedicated to leadership in the continuing quest for understanding of God's creation and for the discovery, dissemination, and integration of the values, knowledge, and skills required to transform society in the spirit of the Gospels. As a Catholic, Jesuit university, this pursuit is motivated by the inspiration and values of the Judeo-Christian tradition and is guided by the spiritual ideal of the Society of Jesus (Saint Louis University, 2016b).

Strategic Plan. In 2015, SLU adopted its strategic plan, *Magis: Saint Louis University's Strategy for the Future*. Initiative three calls for SLU to be a "leading catalyst for groundbreaking change in the region, the nation, and the world" (Saint Louis University, 2016c). This initiative specifically notes a "spirit of mutual cooperation...through collaboration." SLU was among the first American universities to make a global commitment when it opened its Madrid, Spain, campus in 1967 (Saint Louis University, 2016c).

In an effort to extend its commitment to community engagement, SLU established six goals within its strategic plan. These include:

- To more vigorously engage the Greater Saint Louis community;
- To develop new approaches to bring community-responsive research and scholarly activity to the community;

- To develop a physical plan that is inclusive of adjacent community needs and desires;
- To expand SLU's global instruction and service activities by investing in organizational infrastructure;
- To develop opportunities for SLU faculty, staff, and students that develop and enhance international engagement; and
- To strengthen the relationship between SLU's Madrid and Saint Louis campuses (Saint Louis University, 2016c).

Structure & Organization. SLU has a Center for Service and Community Engagement. The web page dedicated to the Center for Service and Community Engagement includes information concerning university programming, ongoing volunteer opportunities, one-time volunteer opportunities, and service learning and campus-community research projects (Saint Louis University, 2016d).

As a direct result of SLU's 2014-2015 Strategic Planning process, the Community Engagement Inventory (CEI) was developed. CEI aims to provide a centralized repository for faculty, staff, and student projects in the St. Louis region. This central clearing house is presented in a searchable web page (Saint Louis University, 2016e).

Marquette University

Overview. Marquette University has 8,334 undergraduates and 3,157 graduate students. Its student population is 53.2% female and 46.8% male. It is located in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on a 93-acre campus near downtown Milwaukee (Marquette University, 2016a).

Mission Statement. Marquette University is a Catholic, Jesuit university dedicated to serving God by serving our students and contributing to the advancement of

knowledge. Our mission, therefore, is the search for truth, the discovery and sharing of knowledge, the fostering of personal and professional excellence, the promotion of a life of faith, and the development of leadership expressed in service to others. All this we pursue for the greater glory of God and the common benefit of the human community.

Strategic Plan. Marquette’s strategic plan, *Beyond Boundaries*, is built around six strategic goal themes, including “Social Responsibility through Community Engagement” (Marquette University, 2016b). In pursuit of its strategic plan, in 2016, Marquette became the final tenant in the Global Water Center on Freshwater Way in Milwaukee’s Walkers Point neighborhood (Marquette University, 2016c). Through this facility, Marquette researchers are currently involved in 13 projects involving community partners. In 2014, Marquette partners with Aurora Health Care, Harley-Davidson, MillerCoors, and Potawatomi Business Development Corporation to form the Near West Side Partners Inc. This organization focuses on working to improve the community located in Milwaukee’s near west side. A total of 76 faculty, staff, and students collaborated in research and service with residents and community organizations to increase civic engagement, promote assets, enhance safety, and attract investment in the Near West Side (Marquette University, 2016d).

Structure & Organization.

In 2016, Marquette established an Office of Community Engagement housed within the Office of the Provost. This office is represented on the university website with its own webpage dedicated to its mission and activities. This office serves as the central clearinghouse for community engagement activities, with a focus on bidirectional,

community-based research partnerships. It includes news and event updates on activities related to community engagement (Marquette University, 2016b).

Gonzaga University

Overview. Gonzaga University has 5,041 undergraduates and 2,450 graduate students. Its student population is 53.6% female and 43.4% male. It is located in Spokane, Washington, on a 152-acre campus (Gonzaga University, 2016a).

Mission Statement. Gonzaga University is an exemplary learning community that educates students for lives of leadership and service for the common good. In keeping with its Catholic, Jesuit, and humanistic heritage and identity, Gonzaga models and expects excellence in academic and professional pursuits and intentionally develops the whole person—intellectually, spiritually, physically, and emotionally.

Through engagement with knowledge, wisdom, and questions informed by classical and contemporary perspectives, Gonzaga cultivates in its students the capacities and dispositions for reflective and critical thought, lifelong learning, spiritual growth, ethical discernment, creativity, and innovation.

The Gonzaga experience fosters a mature commitment to dignity of the human person, social justice, diversity, intercultural competence, global engagement, solidarity with the poor and vulnerable, and care for the planet. Grateful to God, the Gonzaga community carries out this mission with responsible stewardship of our physical, financial, and human resources (Gonzaga University, 2016b).

Strategic Plan. In July 2015, Gonzaga’s Board of Trustees approved its strategic plan. Although the plan does not speak directly to community engagement at the local and regional level, it does make an affirmative commitment to community engagement

on a global level. In *Commitment 2: Animate Academic Excellence Across the Institution, Strategic Objective 4: Cultivate Global Perspectives and Global Engagement* the university “seeks to provide students, faculty, and staff the opportunity to advance global justice, enhance opportunity for historically marginalized peoples, and further the welfare of the planet” (Gonzaga University, 2016c).

Structure & Organization.

Since the mid-1990s, the Center for Community Action and Service-Learning (CCASL) has coordinated service-learning courses, managed community-based volunteer and outreach programs, and provided referrals to external volunteer opportunities (Gonzaga University, 2016d). CCASL has its own web page that includes information about its various programs, as well as other community engagement programs at Gonzaga University. CCASL is housed within the Division of Student Development (Gonzaga University, 2016d).

University of Scranton

Overview. University of Scranton has 3,910 undergraduates and 1,512 graduate students. Its student population is 58.1% female and 41.9% male. It is located in Scranton, Pennsylvania, on a 58-acre campus (University of Scranton, 2016a).

Mission Statement. Spirituality is at the core of our mission as a Catholic, Jesuit institution of higher learning. The chief characteristics embedded in the Ignatian vision include: the concept of the Magis, or a restless pursuit of excellence grounded in gratitude; Cura Personalis, individual attention to students and respect for the uniqueness of each member of the University community; seeking God in all things; liberal

education; service of faith and the promotion of justice; and contemplation in action (University of Scranton, 2016b).

Strategic Plan. In 2015, the University adopted its strategic plan, *The University of Scranton Plan: An Engaged, Integrated, Global Student Experience* (University of Scranton, 2016c). This strategic plan focused intently on the student experience at Scranton. In its title, it announces that engagement is a foundational concept of the plan. Specifically, it establishes the goal of creating opportunities for students to be engage in “transformative and reflective academic, social, spiritual and service-oriented experiences that are intentionally designed to develop their knowledge and skills while challenging them to be men and women of faith and service to their communities” (University of Scranton, 2016c).

Structure & Organization. Scranton houses its community engagement mission in the Office of the Provost. The position of Associate Provost for Civic Engagement and Academic Mission works to foster and support engagement with local, regional, national, and global communities (University of Scranton, 2016d). Scranton actually defines civic engagement for faculty as “teaching, scholarship, and service that contribute to public purposes and serve the common good (University of Scranton, 2016e).

This definition of civic engagement is consistent with former Superior General of the Society of Jesus, Fr. Hans Kolvenbach's, S.J., insight that:

The faculty’s “research, which must be rationally rigorous, firmly rooted in faith and open to dialogue with all people of good will,” not only obeys the canons of each discipline, but ultimately embraces human reality in order to help make the world a more fitting place for six billion of us to inhabit. I want to affirm that

university knowledge is valuable for its own sake and at the same time is knowledge that must ask itself, “For whom? For what?” (University of Scranton, 2016e).

Survey Results

External Stakeholders Perceptions

The research proposal established at least 10 as the goal of the number of external participants. Eleven external stakeholders completed surveys related to this research study. These participants received the survey from the Jesuit University in their community via email. Although the surveys were anonymous, a few background questions were asked of all external participants. Of the respondents, only one had worked with their Jesuit university for less than one year. Five had worked with their university in collaborative partnerships for one to three years. Five had worked with their university in collaborative partnerships for more than three years. Therefore, 10 of 11 respondents had worked with the university in a collaborative partnership for more than one year.

External partners included five public institutions, one private for-profit institution, and three non-profit institutions. Therefore, over 45% of respondents self-identified as public organizations working in partnership with a university. The primary community needs addressed by these organizations included three in education, three in health, zero in safety, zero in youth services, zero in environment, and five in public services. I had anticipated a larger number of community partners related to public safety and the environment, considering the size and breadth of criminal justice programs at the

universities and the extensive environmental research being conducted by certain schools. Unfortunately, because of the anonymous nature of the survey, it is difficult to interpret the lack of response from these sectors.

I asked participants several questions concerning their recent experiences with the university. When asked how interactions with the university influenced their capacity to fulfill the mission of their organization, six participants responded that the relationship provided new insights about organizational operations, six participants responded that the relationship increased the number of clients served, five participants responded that the relationship enhanced offerings of service, zero participants responded that the relationship increased leverage of financial/other resources, two participants responded that the relationship led to changes in organization direction, three participants responded that the relationship lead to increases in services offered, zero participants responded that the relationship had no influence, and eight participants responded that the relationship lead to new connections/networks with other community members/groups. External respondents consistently responded that the university partnerships led to expanded networking opportunities and improvements to services offered.

When asked about some of the challenges encountered in the relationship with the university, eight of 11 participants completed the survey. Respondents were asked to mark all challenges that apply to their encounter. Five participants indicated demands upon staff time, four participants indicated insufficient project time, three participants indicated that students were not well prepared, two participants indicated that students did not perform as expected, two participants indicated a mismatch between university/organizational goals, and two participants indicated little contact/interaction

with staff/faculty. Impact on time is a consistent theme throughout the survey responses. In this question, external stakeholders referenced the impact on their employees' time.

When I asked about the measurable effect of their work with the university, nine of 11 participants responded. Of those responding, six participants indicated increased value of services; three participants indicated increased organizational services; four participants indicated completion of projects; three participants indicated access to university technology expertise; four participants indicated new products, services, and materials generated; one participant indicated increased funding opportunities; and six participants indicated identification of new staff. Interestingly, external stakeholders identified recruitment of new staff as a significant benefit of the partnership. This would also be a benefit to the university, since assisting students in finding employment postgraduation is an increasingly important measure of university success.

I also asked external stakeholders about what ways they influenced the university as a result of their collaborative partnership. Four participants believed their collaborative partnership had an influence on course content, two participants believed their collaborative partnership had an influence on university policies, eight participants believed their collaborative partnership had an influence on university awareness of community, and four participants believed their collaborative partnership had an influence on student learning experiences. Therefore, 89% of participants believed they were able to influence the university's student awareness of the community as a result of their collaborative partnership.

Participants were also asked how the collaboration impacted their awareness of the university. Five learned more about university programs and services; five know who to call upon for information and assistance; two are more involved with activities on campus; four have an increased knowledge of university resources; four have more interactions with faculty, staff, and administrators; and zero have taken or plan to take classes at the university.

When asked whether they intended to continue working with the university in the future, nine participants indicated yes and zero participants indicated no. This is indicative of the overall positive view of the relationship on the part of external stakeholders.

The survey also asked external stakeholders to rate their level of satisfaction in several areas. Table 1 summarizes those results. Table 1 Satisfaction Ratings of External Stakeholders

Interactions with the university	Strongly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Strongly Negative
Overall Communication with students, faculty and staff	4 (44.4%)	2 (22.2%)	3 (33.3%)	0	0
Level and quality of interaction with students, faculty and staff	4 (44.4%)	2 (22.2%)	3 (33.3%)	0	0
Quality of student work	5 (55.6%)	2 (22.2%)	2 (22.2%)	0	0
Feedback and input into planning and execution	4 (44.4%)	3 (33.3%)	2 (22.2%)	0	0
Scope and timing of activity	3 (33.3%)	4 (44.4%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	0

Level of trust with faculty, staff and students	5 (55.6%)	3 (33.3%)	1 (11.1%)	0	0
Level of mutual respect and sharing of ideas	6 (66.7%)	2 (22.2%)	1 (11.1%)	0	0

When questioned on how logistics of the collaborative partnership were handled with the university, two participants responded that they made the arrangements, two participants responded that the university made the arrangements, and four participants responded that arrangements were handled collaboratively.

In responding to the question, “what were the best aspects of this experience for you?,” external stakeholders provided the following quotes:

- “Networking opportunities.”
- “The high level of professionalism and an eagerness to serve the community. This exists from the President down to the students.”
- “Collaborative process to train and learn from the next generation.”
- “University staff was very nice, welcoming, and very easy to work with.”
- “I was able to extend services of my organization and generally feedback was very good with my constituents.”
- “The students were incredibly inspiring. They were well prepared and dedicated to the project.”

Additionally, external stakeholders gave these responses when asked what changes they would make to the experience:

- “There is nothing that I would change.”

- “Support from faculty to ensure students are staying the course.”
- “The manner in which the faculty approach conversation. They still did not seem to appreciate the value add of my organization, to understand my organization itself, and seemed to lack a level of respect. They're academics and they seem to want to always be the smartest person in the room. That does not make for strong and trusting partnerships.”

“The semester schedule of faculty.”

Finally, when asked for additional comments, one external participant stated: “If Saint Peter's truly wants to be less insular, and I think the University has come a long way, this very basic ability of being able to build trusting relationships with community partners is necessary.”

Internal Stakeholder Perceptions

The research proposal established at least 40 internal participants as a goal. However, after several attempts to recruit additional participants and after consultation with committee members, I decided to stop the survey short of that goal. Thirty-seven internal stakeholders completed surveys related to this research study. These participants received the survey from their Jesuit University. Although the surveys were anonymous, a few background questions were asked of all internal participants. Four participants had worked in high education for less than one year. Seven participants had worked in higher education for one to three years. Six participants had worked in higher education for four to six years. Twenty participants had worked in higher education for seven or more years. Therefore, 54% of participants had worked in higher education for more than seven years and 70% for at least four years. When asked how many times they engaged with the

community in their professional capacity per week, four (11.8%) answered once, eight (23.5%) answered 2-5 times, two (5.9%) answered 6-10 times, and 20 (58.8%) answered more than ten times. Thirty of 34 believe that there are other faculty or professional staff in their department/program who are similarly engaged directly with the community. Therefore, 88.2% believe that other faculty or professional staff in their department/program are similarly engaged directly with the community.

Internal stakeholders self-identified their type of community engagement activities. Five (15%) taught a service learning course; eight (24%) conducted community-based research; 22 (67%) engaged in collaborative partnerships with other organizations; and 15 (45%) indicated other. In determining what academic level students were in when they were involved in community engagement activities, 18 indicated freshman year, 20 indicated sophomore year, 21 indicated junior year, 19 indicated senior year, and six indicated graduate school. All participants checked off multiple student levels.

The survey also asked internal stakeholders to rate their level of satisfaction in several areas to determine their experience and perspective on the impact of community engagement. Twenty-six participants completed this section of the survey. Table 2 summarizes those results.

Table 2

Internal Stakeholder Perceptions

Response	Yes	No
I had previous community volunteer experience prior to my	23	3

first community engagement activity	(88.46%)	(11.54%)
I believe that community engagement activities I have been involved in on behalf of the university have benefited the community	25 (96.15%)	1 (3.85%)
I will continue to volunteer or participate in the community after my current project is complete	22 (81.48%)	5 (18.52%)
My community engagement work has deepened my understanding of community needs	22 (81.48%)	4 (14.81%)
Activities through which students become engaged in the community have a positive effect on the students' educational experience	26 (96.30%)	0 (0%)
I believe that, as a university administrator/faculty/staff member, I have a responsibility to serve my community	26 (100%)	0 (0%)

When questioned about what influence their service had on their personal and professional development, 19 of 24 respondents indicated that performing work in the community has helped them focus on specific areas in their area of professional expertise. Fifteen of 25 respondents indicated that participating with the community has resulted in a change of their approach to their areas of professional responsibility. Twenty of 25 respondents indicated that participating with the community has resulted in advancement at the university. Finally, 23 of 25 found that their relationship with students, faculty, and staff was enhanced because of the community work they perform. Overall, internal stakeholders had a positive experience related to community engagement.

Respondents were asked to comment on their concerns with future community engagement activities. Eighteen (78%) of participants checked time constraints, eight identified communication with community representatives, 12 (52%) identified

coordination of projects, one checked reduced time for classroom instruction as a concern, two identified supervision of students, six claimed unpredictable nature of community work, four indicated assessment of student learning, 11 (48%) indicated costs, and two identified impact on future advancement. Once again, time limitations were indicated as an obstacle to community engagement.

Ideas offered to improve community engagement experiences for faculty, staff, students, and community partners included:

- “Receiving honest and genuine buy-in from our community stakeholders. Respect and communication are critical for the success of community engagement.”
- “Important to have an inventory of the myriad number of community project opportunities, e.g. in the area of sustainability, there are many JC, HC, and local offices and groups. It is valuable to know who does what so the work can be coordinated and efficient.”
- “Provide more community service learning projects for credit as an incentive to students.”
- “Community engagement should be a major component of all of our activity within the university. It showcases the talent we have and helps identify opportunities with our corporate partners.”
- “Better communication.”
- “Must have clear expectations for all involved, especially the expected outcomes.”
- “Improve communication between the groups. More [opportunities] to get to know one another and understand roles.”

- “I think the work of organizing, protest, and resistance is a second fiddle to the work of community service. It shouldn't be, especially in a time when our political officials and system are failing the American people. Community service is good, but also is the work of justice, a work that takes on the structural realities of our society. The latter is in fact what Fr. Arrupe says we should be doing in his ‘Men [and Women] for Others’ speech. In fact, he doesn't speak about service in this talk but does emphasize the work of justice.”
- “It would be helpful if there was one centralized office which could coordinate and track CE [community engagement] opportunities.”

Additionally, internal stakeholders indicated that they would make the following changes to encourage and enhance community engagement by the university:

- “To engage the University Community offering more informal gatherings where faculty, staff, administrators and students can meet/greet to better understand and appreciate each other’s positions and contributions to the University would be helpful.”
- “As part of its mission, Saint Peter's fosters ‘men and women for others.’ Students and employees log many hours of service. Perhaps an occasional newsletter or PR on their contributions can help. Also, enhanced area of our website.”
- “Encourage faculty to include a community engagement experience for students in their syllabus.”
- “Seek out opportunities that would allow us to partner with community partners and organizations to enhance our reputation and provide our students with opportunities.”
- “Our community engagement opportunities are plentiful, but finding the time is difficult.”

- “There are so many opportunities, but I don't think we necessarily think outside the box how other areas within the University could assist.”
- “Offer more programs at varied times to make it more attractive to participate. Define the goals of the experience and help to promote the expected outcomes.”
- “Set up an office like that of the Government Relations and Urban Affairs Office at Fordham. I worked there as a researcher for the Bronx Urban Research Center, something that we should have for Jersey City as well. Work more with the IAF coalition that is doing organizing work. Set up an (or part) of an academic department devoted to social movements and social organizing.”
- “Additional funding could have improved the experience for both sides.”

Finally, internal participants indicated:

- “Acknowledgement and appreciation are lacking in the vernacular on campus. It would be in senior level managements’ best interest to learn the art of motivation which is very impactful in the health and positive attitude of their dedicated staff.”
- “We live in an interconnected society. What happens in and out of the university needs to be linked in appropriate ways. Community engagement is the important connector.”
- “Faculty and administrators should be trained on how to include community engagement experiences for students in their curriculum and compensated for time and effort.”
- “I like the model set-up by the Jesuits at the University of Central America in El Salvador. They well understood how to link the work of service/organizing and the intellectual work. Since our country trained those who killed them (as well as funding a

horrific civil war there) the least we can do is honor their memory by continuing their work.”

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of a Jesuit university's community engagement using boundary-spanning theory.

In answering our first question, what are the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles—both within four year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutions of higher education and in the local communities—regarding the influence of community engagement it is clear that there is generally a positive perception. Internal and external stakeholders perceive the relationship as positive from a networking and recruiting standpoint. Additionally, internal stakeholders believe that the experience improves student performance and commitment to the Jesuit mission.

In regard to perceptions of internal and external stakeholders in boundary spanning roles, both within four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education and in the local communities, regarding the influence of community engagement, it is clear that the survey participants believe in the value of community engagement. Among external stakeholders, 10 of 11 who participated in the survey had worked with the university in a collaborative partnership for greater than one year. Five (45%) had worked in a collaborative partnership with the university for more than three years. These extended relationships show a commitment on the part of the external stakeholders who completed the survey.

Interestingly, the majority (54%) of internal boundary spanners who participated in the survey had been employed in higher education for seven or more years; 70% had

been employed in higher education for four or more years. Therefore, there is evidence that senior members of faculty and staff recognize the importance of community engagement.

Additionally, those internal stakeholders who engage in community partnership do so at a high frequency, with 88% engaged directly with the community at least twice and 59% engaging the community more than 10 times. This finding reveals a limitation in the research. It would have been informative to be able to conduct interviews with those internal stakeholders who consistently engage with the community to determine how and why they do so. For example, 88% of internal respondents also believe that there are other faculty or professional staff within their department or program who are “similarly engaged directly with the community.”

Based upon the results of this survey, it does appear that once an internal stakeholder begins to engage with the community they will continue the practice. Of the survey participants, 88% had previous community volunteer experience and 96% believe that activities through which students become engaged in the community have a positive effect on their educational experiences.

It also appears that nonprofit and public entities are more likely to partner with the universities. In the survey completed by external boundary spanners, 73% (eight of 11) self-identified as public or nonprofit organizations focused on education, health, or public policy issues. The vast majority (80%) of these respondents thought the collaborative partnership improved new connections or networks while providing new insights about organizational operation (60%), increased number of clients served (50%), or enhanced offerings of services (50%).

Internal stakeholders indicated that the academic level of students participating in community engagement is at every level. The survey seemed to under-represent graduate students' participation, with only 23% indicating that graduate students participate in community engagement activities. However, this may be a limitation of the survey instrument because undergraduate faculty may be over-represented in the sample. Each of the five schools contacted for the survey have graduate programs; however, undergraduate points of contact were utilized to distribute the survey. The design and methodology of the study did not take graduate faculty into consideration.

In answering the question of what community engagement opportunities internal and external stakeholders believe four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education can become involved in to further the cultural, social, and economic development of the local community, a comprehensive review of the universities' websites was informative.

I made a few conclusions when comparing the websites of the five Jesuit universities asked to participate in the electronic survey. First, the intentionality of these Jesuit universities to be actively involved in community engagement is revealed in their strategic planning documents. Four of five universities specify the commitment to increased community engagement at the local level within their strategic plan. Only Gonzaga University does not include a specific reference to local community engagement; however, it does discuss its commitment to grow its engagement with the global community. A review of the strategic plan and website leads one to conclude that Gonzaga has previously focused on community engagement at the local level and while

committed to maintain those partnerships, it views the need to “advance global justice” as the next step in its development.

In comparison, Saint Peter’s, Saint Louis, Marquette, and Scranton all focus on the important role the university can play within the surrounding community. Their strategic plans attempt to balance the economic development partnerships and the social welfare development partnerships. In this area, the size of the university seems to play a role in the primary focus of these institutions. Saint Peter’s, the smallest of the universities studied, stresses building partnerships with the local community, focusing on social justice and networking opportunities for students. These partnerships, although extensive, are also limited in scope. In comparison, Marquette, the largest of the universities studied, focuses more on expanding research opportunities and development projects at various satellite locations.

In reviewing the structure used by each of the universities in relation to community engagement, a few patterns emerge. First, four of the five universities have specific offices dedicated to achieving their goal of community engagement. These offices are found either within the Office of the Provost (Scranton and Marquette) or with the Student Life/Development division (Gonzaga and Saint Louis). Three of the five schools have specific staff designated as points of contact for community engagement activities. The size of the offices does vary. Additionally, four of the five schools have web pages dedicated specifically to community engagement. These web pages and offices are used as central clearinghouses for information concerning service and community engagement for internal and external stakeholders. Only Saint Peter’s University does not follow this model, although these are listed as goals within its current

strategic plan. Interestingly, a central office for community engagement or central inventory was specifically mentioned by respondents:

- “Set up an office like that of the Government Relations and Urban Affairs Office at Fordham.”
- “Important to have an inventory of the myriad number of community project opportunities.”
- “It would be helpful if there was one central office which could coordinate and track CE [community engagement] opportunities.”

In regard to policies and procedures that internal and external stakeholders believe are needed to encourage boundary spanning activities through community engagement by four-year Jesuit universities that serve as anchor institutes of higher education, it is clear that there are perceived benefits to community engagement. Internal respondents unanimously believe that, as a university administrator, faculty, or staff member they have a responsibility to serve their community. Additionally, internal stakeholders believe involvement in community engagement improved their professional development. For example, 79% perceive performing work in the community as helping to focus on specific area of professional expertise; 80% perceive that participating in the community has helped enhance leadership skills; and 92% perceive that their relationships with students, faculty, and staff were enhanced through their community work. Yet only 66% perceive that participating in community activities has resulted in advancement at the university. Therefore, universities should establish explicit policies that assure that community engagement is included in evaluation and tenure process.

Elevating the role of engagement in the assessment area will build upon Boyer's "scholarship of engagement" (Boyer, 1996). Furthermore, universities should establish faculty development opportunities that focus on ways and rewards of community engagement activities.

Additionally, universities should design their community engagement opportunities to address the concerns of their administrators, faculty, and staff. For example, 78% raised time constraints as a concern in participating in community engagement activities. Members of the university should be encouraged to incorporate community engagement into their position; however, if community engagement is perceived as an additional task (whether compensated for or not) it is not likely to be pursued.

Similarly, university policies and procedures need to make community partnerships as easy as possible for external stakeholders. Nearly 63% of the participants said that they encounter challenging demands upon staff time. Additionally, the academic calendar or university semester schedule appears to pose a challenge for external stakeholders. Fifty percent listed insufficient project time as a challenge. Whether a university could design programs that circulate different students without loss of time or expertise is a question.

As a result of this research study, it has been determined that external and internal boundary spanners who participate in community engagement have a positive perception of that work. However, there are some recurring issues that need to be addressed and could be developed into a best practices guide for community engagement.

First, a central office or digital inventory location would assist internal and external stakeholders in identifying community engagement opportunities. Second, early recruitment of faculty and staff into community engagement activities is important. Those internal stakeholders who participate in community engagement tend to do so at a high frequency. Third, in order for schools to encourage community engagement among faculty members and staff, an environment of positive reinforcement needs to be created. Too often, participants believe that although the university proclaims their commitment to community engagement, the time dedicated to such activities is not rewarded. Fourth, allowing time to be dedicated to community engagement activities is key. Internal and external stakeholders reference time constraints as an obstacle to activities.

Limitations and Further Research

Among the limitations offered by this survey is its overall design and methodology. By relying on reviewing existing materials and an anonymous electronic survey, I was not able to compare responses from the various Jesuit universities or determine how many of the five universities actually participated. Therefore, the comments and responses could be significantly biased toward one university. The anonymous nature made it difficult to follow up with schools and weigh where responses came from to assure there was no over sampling. Additionally, relying on internal stakeholders to distribute the survey limited my ability to receive as many responses as I desired for external stakeholders.

I think it would be interesting to conduct a single case study with interviews to provide rich descriptions of the community engagement experience. This study could

potentially incorporate a snowball sampling in its research design. Additionally, it would be interesting to develop a scale to measure perceptions of community engagement at anchor institutions.

Finally, it remains unclear what type of impact for-profit, proprietary colleges are having on community engagement. For-profit colleges are the fastest-growing postsecondary schools in the nation. These national chains often enroll a disproportionately high share of disadvantaged and minority students. There are legitimate concerns that these institutions are not focused on fulfilling the traditional missions of research, teaching, and service. This sector of the higher education market needs further study.

REFERENCES

1681, 2. U. (n.d.).

A Boat Against the Current. (2009, June). *A Boat Against the Current*. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from <http://boatagainstthecurrent.blogspot.com/2009/06/quote-of-day-franklin-d-roosevelt.html>

Adams, K. (2014). The exploration of community boundary spanners in university-community partnerships. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 18*(3), 113–118.

Alves, H., Mainardes, E., & Raposo, M. (2010). A relationship approach to higher education institution stakeholder management. *Tertiary Education and Management, 16*(3), pp. 159–181.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006). *American Association of State Colleges and Universities*. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/publications/regionalstewardship/>

Arizona State University. (n.d.). *Arizona State University*. Retrieved March 20, 2016, from <https://communityengagement.education.asu.edu/programs/university-service-learning>

Association of Jesuit Colleges & Universities. (n.d.). *Association of Jesuit Colleges & Universities*. Retrieved July 11, 2016, from <http://www.ajcunet.edu/institutions/>

- Axelroth Hodges, R., & Dubb, S. (2012). *The Road Half Traveled: University Engagement at a Crossroads*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Bartik, T., & Erockcek, G. (2008). *The local economic impact of eds and meds: How policies to expand universities and hospitals affect metropolitan economics*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544–559.
- Beere, C.; Votruba, J.; Wells, G. (2011). *Becoming an engaged campus: a practical guide for institutionlizing public engagement*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in the age of education reform*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Bok, D. (1982). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social resposibilities of the modern university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bound, J., & Turner, S. (2002, October). Going to war and going to college: Did World War II and the G.I. Bill increase educational attainment for returning veterans? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20(4), 784–815.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie.
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagment. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagment*, 1(1), 11–20.

- Boyle, M. R., & Stephens, J. (2011). Who has a stake? How stakeholder processes influence partnership sustainability. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 4, 100–118.
- Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: The terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 503–516.
- Brint, S. G., Riddle, M., Turk-Bicakci, L., & Levy, C. S. (2005, March/April). From the liberal to the practical arts in american colleges and universities: Organizational analysis and curricular change. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(2).
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Buys, N., & Bursnall, S. (2007). Establishing university-community partnerships: Process and benefits. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29, 73–86.
- Campus Compact. (n.d.-a). *Campus compact*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://www.compact.org/about/history>
- Campus Compact. (n.d.-b). *Campus compact*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://www.compact.org/indicators>
- Carnegie Classification. (n.d.). *Carnegie classification Indiana University*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup_listings/institution.php
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement for Teaching. (2006). *Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/our-ideas/>

- Cavaye, J. (2004). Governance and community engagement—The Australian experience . In W. Lovan, M. Murray, & R. Shaffer (Eds.), *In participatory governance: Planning, conflict mediation and public decision making in civil society*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, P. 8.–3. (n.d.).
- Clark, D. (1998). The two joes meet—Joe College, Joe Veteran. *History of Education Quarterly*, 98(165), 169–172.
- Cohen, A., & Kisker, C. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dickinson, P., & Allen, T. (2006). *The bonus army: An American epic*. London, UK: Walker Books.
- Doyle, L. (2010). The role of universities in the ‘cultural health’ of their regions: Universities’ and regions’ understanding of cultural engagement. *European Journal of Education*, 45(3), 466–480.
- Drabensott, J. (2008). Universities, innovation and regional development: A view from the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20(2), 43–55.

- Dubb, S., & Howard, T. (2007). *Linking colleges*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Ernst, C., & Chrobot-Mason, D. (2011). *Boundary spanning leadership: Six practices for solving problems, driving innovation, and transforming organizations*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Faust, D., & Gilpin, D. (2016, March 30). *Harvard university*. Retrieved May 17, 2017, from <http://www.harvard.edu/slavery>
- Fennell, M., & Alexander, J. (1987). Organizational boundary spanning in institutionalized environments. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 30(3), 223–249.
- Friedman, R., & Podolny, J. (1992). Differentiation of boundary spanning roles: Labor negotiations and implications for role conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(1), 28–47.
- Georgetown University. (n.d.). *Georgetown university*. Retrieved July 13, 2016, from <https://www.georgetown.edu/about/history>
- Goddard, J. (1997). Managing the university/regional interface. *Higher Education Management*, 9(3), 7–28.
- Goddard, J., & Puuka, J. (2008). The engagement of higher education institutions in regional development: An overview of opportunities and challenges. *Higher Education Management*, 20(2), 11–41.
- Gonzaga University. (2016a). *Gonzaga University*. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from <http://www.gonzaga.edu>

- Gonzaga University. (2016b). *Gonzaga University*. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from <http://www.gonzaga.edu/about/Mission/MissionStatement.asp>
- Gonzaga University. (2016c). *Gonzaga University*. Retrieved February 2017, 2017, from <http://www.gonzaga.edu/about/mcculloh/university-strategic-plan.asp>
- Gonzaga University. (2016d). *Gonzaga University*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.gonzaga.edu/Student-Development/Community-Action-and-Service-Learning/default.asp>
- Greenburg, M. (2004, June 18). How the GI Bill changed higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B9.
- Guba, E. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Resources Information Center Annual Review Paper*, 29, pp. 75–91.
- Harkavy, I., Hartley, M., Hodges, R., & Weeks, J. (2014). *Effective governance of a university as an anchor institution: University of Pennsylvania as a case study*. Retrieved December 5, 2015, from https://www.nettercenter.upenn.edu/sites/netter_internal/files/Effective_Governance_of_a_University_as_an_Anchor_Institution-Raabe_Publishers.pdf
- Hathaway, C., Mulhollan, P., & White, K. (1990). Metropolitan universities. In *Metropolitan universities: Models for the twenty-first century*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press
- HBCU Library Alliance. (n.d.). *Historical black colleges and universities libraries*. Retrieved May 18, 2017, from <http://www.hbculibraries.org/>
- Hodges, R., & Dubb, S. (2012). *Road half traveled: University engagement at a crossroads*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

- Holland, B. (2005). Institutional differences in pursuing the public good. In A. Kezar, T. Chambers, & J. Burkhardt, (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 235–259). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hudson Chamber of Commerce. (n.d.). *Hudson Chamber of Commerce*. Retrieved January 25, 2016, from <http://www.hudsonchamber.org/Value-of-Membership/Staff-Board.aspx>
- Huggins, R., Johnston, A., & Thompson, P. (2012). Network capital, social capital and knowledge flow: How the nature of inter-organizational networks impacts on innovation, industry and innovation. *Industry and Innovation*, 19(3), 203–232.
- Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (n.d.). *Internet encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved September 12, 2015, from <http://www.iep.utm.edu/academy/>
- Jesuits. (n.d.). *Jesuits*. Retrieved July 13, 2016, from <http://jesuits.org/whatwedo?PAGE=DTN-20130520123631>
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Education research: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, L. (1964). *University of California Santa Barbara—Presidency project*. Retrieved January 23, 2016, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=26616>
- Karabel, J. (2006). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities (1999).

- Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.
- Kerr, C. (2001). *The ses of the niversity* (5th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lee, T. (2012). *University of Missouri*. Retrieved October 5, 2016, from <https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/handle/10355/3987>
- Letven, E., Ostheimer, J., & Statham, A. (2001). Institutionalizing niversity-community engagement. *Metropolitan Universities*, 12(3), 63–75.
- Library of Congress. (n.d.). *Library of Congress*. Retrieved July 19, 2015, from <http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Morrill.html>
- Marquette University. (2017a). *Marquette University*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.marquette.edu>
- Marquette University. (2017b). *Marquette University*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.marquette.edu/strategic-planning/documents/Beyond%20Boundaries-onepage16FNL.pdf>
- Marquette University. (2017c). *Marquette University*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.marquette.edu/innovation/global-water-center.php>
- Marquette University. (2017d). *Marquette University*. Retrieved February 2017, from <http://today.marquette.edu/2015/12/near-west-side-partners-sees-much-success-in-first-year/>.
- Maurrasse, D. (2001). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Mayfield, L. (2001). Town and gown in America: Some historical and institutional issues of the engaged university. *Education for Health, 14*(2), 231–240.
- McMurray, A. (2007). College students, the GI Bill and the proliferation of online learning: A history of contemporary challenges. *The Internet and Higher Education, 10*(2), 143–150.
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mettler, S. (2005). *Soldiers to citizens: The GI Bill and the making of the greatest generation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Morrill Act of 1862, 7 U.S.C. §304 (2016).
- Mull, C., & Jordan, J. (2014). Boundary spanning. *Reclaiming children and youth, 23*(3), pp. 56–59.
- Munk, R. (2010). Civic engagement and global citizenship in a university context: Core business or desirable add-ons? *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 9*(1), 31–41.
- National Institute of Food and Agriculture. (n.d.). *National institute of food and agriculture*. Retrieved July 19, 2015, from <http://nifa.usda.gov/program/hatch-act-1887>
- National Service. (n.d.). *National service*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from <http://www.nationalservice.gov/special-initiatives/honor-roll>

- New England Research Center for Higher Education. (n.d.). *University of Massachusetts Boston*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from http://www.nerche.org/images/stories/projects/Carnegie/2015/2010_and_2015_CE_Classified_Institutions_revised_1_11_15.pdf
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education. (n.d.). *New England Resource Center for Higher Education*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92
- Newman, J. H. (1947). *The idea of a university*. New York, NY: Longmans Green and Co.
- OECD. (2012). *OECD*. Retrieved July 20, 2015, from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/imhe/oecdroundtableuniversitiesforskillsentrepreneurshipinnovationgrowth-preliminaryagenda.htm>
- OECD. (n.d.). *OECD*. Retrieved July 20, 2015, from <http://www.oecd.org>
- Olson, K. (1973). The GI Bill and higher education: Success and surprise. *American Quarterly*, 25(5), 596–620.
- O'Malley, J. (2000). How the First Jesuits Became Involved in Education. In V. Duminuco, *The Jesuit ratio studiorum: 400th anniversary perspectives*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Porter, M., & Kramer, M. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89, 62–77.
- Rudolph, F. (1977). *Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.
- Rutgers. (2014). *Rutgers*. Retrieved July 19, 2015, from <http://morrill150.rutgers.edu/rutgers-landgrant.html>
- Saint Louis University. (2016a). *Saint Louis University*. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from <http://www.slu.edu>
- Saint Louis University. (2016b). *Saint Louis University*. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from <https://www.slu.edu/about/catholic-jesuit-identity/mission.php>
- Saint Louis University. (2016c). *Saint Louis University*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from https://www.slu.edu/Documents/strategic_plan/Magis%20%20September%202015.pdf
- Saint Louis University. (2016d). *Saint Louis University*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.slu.edu/life-at-slu/center-for-service>
- Saint Louis University. (2016e). *Saint Louis University*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.slu.edu/cei/>
- Saint Peter's University. (2016). *Saint Peter's University*. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from <http://www.saintpeters.edu/strategic-plan/>
- Saint Peter's University. (n.d.). *Saint Peter's University*. Retrieved December 2015, 14, from <http://www.saintpeters.edu/title-v/>
- Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. (2009). *Democratic engagement white paper*. New England Resource Center for Higher Education. Future of Engagement.

- https://futureofengagement.files.wordpress.com/2009/02/democratic-engagement-white-paper-2_13_09.pdf
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Stokes, P. (2013, October 2013). *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved January 13, 2016, from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2013/10/04/job-skills-increasing-focus-many-colleges-essay>
- Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Harper, G., & Lewis, R. (2005, February). An interactive contextual model of community-university collaboration for research and action. *Health Education Behavior, 31*(1), 84–101.
- Taylor, H., & Luter, G. (2013). *Anchor institutions: An interpretive review essay*. Anchor Institutions Task Force. available at http://www.margainc.com/files_images/general/Literature_Review_2013.pdf
(examining the history and current state of anchor institutions and their
- UN Academic Impact. (n.d.). *UN Academic Impact*. Retrieved July 20, 2015, from <https://academicimpact.un.org>
- United Nations. (n.d.). *United Nations*. Retrieved July 20, 2015, from <http://outreach.un.org/ngorelations>
- University of Scranton. (2016a). *University of Scranton*. Retrieved February 2017, 2017, from <http://www.scranton.edu>
- University of Scranton. (2016b). *University of Scranton*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.scranton.edu/about/jesuit-tradition/index.shtml>
- University of Scranton. (2016c). *University of Scranton*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.scranton.edu/pir/strategic-plan/index.shtml>

- University of Scranton. (2016d). *University of Scranton*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.scranton.edu/academics/provost/civic-engagement>
- University of Scranton. (2016e). *University of Scranton*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from <http://www.scranton.edu/academics/provost/civic-engagement/about/index.shtml>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). *Census Reporter*. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from <https://censusreporter.org/profiles/05000US34017-hudson-county-nj/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Department of Education*. Retrieved January 22, 2016, from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html>
- Webber, H., & Karlstrom, M. (2009). *Why community investment is good for nonprofit anchor institutions: Understanding costs, benefits, and the range of strategic options*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago.
- Weerts, D., & Sandmann, L. (2010, November/December). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(6), 632–657.
- Wheeling Jesuit University. (n.d.). *Wheeling Jesuit University*. Retrieved July 13, 2016, from <http://www.wju.edu/about/history/>
- William and Mary. (n.d.). *William and Mary*. Retrieved March 20, 2016, from <http://www.wm.edu/offices/oce/>
- Yin, R. (2002). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zauzmer, J. (April, 18 2017). *Grappling with its history of slavery, Georgetown gathers*

descendants for a day of repentance. retrieved May 17, 2017, from

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2017/04/18/georgetown-university-hosts-service-of-repentance-dedicates-building-to-slaves-it-sold-in-1938-to-secure-schools-future/?utm_term=.694856742124

APPENDIX A

EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS SURVEY

In order to better understand the influence of community engagement activities of the University X and the local community, please assist us by taking 15-20 minutes to complete this survey¹ and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope.

I. Background Information

A) How long have you worked with the university in a collaborative partnership?

Less than one year 1-3 years More than 3 years

B) What is your organizational status?

Public OR Private For-profit OR Non-profit

C) What are the primary community needs addressed by your organization?

Education Health Safety Youth Services Environment Public Services

II. Recent experiences with the university. Mark any that apply.

D) How did your interactions with the university influence your capacity to fulfill the mission of your organization?

¹ Adapted from Lee, T.G. (2012) *Community Engagement: Spanning Boundaries Between University and Community* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri-Columbia.

- New insights about organizational operation
- Changes in organizational direction
- Increase in number of clients served
- Increase in services offered
- Enhanced offerings of services
- No influence
- Increased leverage of financial/other resources
- New connections/networks other
- Other (please specify)_____ community members/groups

E) What are some of the challenges you encountered?

- Demands upon staff time
- Mismatch between university/organization goals
- Project time period insufficient
- Little contact/interaction with staff/faculty
- Students not well prepared
- Students did not perform as expected
- Other (please specify)_____

F) What were some of the measurable effects of your work with the university?

- Increased value of services
- New products, services, materials generated
- Increased organizational services
- Increased funding opportunities
- Completion of projects
- Identification of new staff
- Access to university technology
- Identification of additional volunteers and expertise
- Other (please specify)_____

G) In what ways do you believe that you were able to influence the university as a result of your connection through this collaborative partnership?

- Influence on course content Influence on university awareness of community
- Influence on university policies Influence on student learning experiences
- Other (please specify)_____

H) As a result of your connection to this university, how has your awareness of the university changed?

- I learned more about university programs and services
- I know whom to call upon for information and assistance
- I am more involved with activities on campus
- I have an increased knowledge of university resources
- I have more interactions with faculty, staff, and administrators
- I have taken or plan to take classes at the university
- Other (please specify) _____

I) Do you plan to continue working with the university in this or another activity?

- Yes No

**III. Please rate your level of satisfaction with your connection to the university in
the following areas.**

Please check the box that most accurately reflects your opinion.

	Very Dissatisfied (0)	Dissatisfied (1)	Neutral (2)	Satisfied (3)	Very Satisfied (4)
J) Overall communication with students, faculty, and staff.					
K) Level and quality of interaction with students, faculty, and staff.					
L) Quality of student work, if applicable.					
M) Feedback and input into planning and execution.					
N) Scope and timing of activity.					
O) Level of trust with faculty, staff, and students.					
P) Level of mutual respect and sharing of ideas.					

Q) How did you handle the logistics of your collaborative partnership with the university? (Please mark the one most accurate response.)

- I made the arrangements
- University representatives made the arrangements
- We handled the arrangements collaboratively

R) What was the best aspect of this experience for you?

S) What aspects of the experience would you change?

T) Please add any additional comments.

APPENDIX B

INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS SURVEY

To better understand the influence of community engagement activities on our faculty and staff, please take this 15–20 minute survey² and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope.

I. First we would like some information about you.

A) How long have you been employed in higher education? _____ [number of years]

B) Approximately how many times have you been engaged directly with the community in your professional capacity at the university?

Once 2-5 times 6-10 times More than 10 times

C) Are there other faculty or professional staff in your department/program who are similarly engaged directly with the community?

Yes No

² Adapted from Lee, T.G. (2012) *Community Engagement: Spanning Boundaries Between University and Community* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri-Columbia.

D) With what type of community engagement activities have you been involved? (Check all that apply)

- Teaching a service learning course
- Conducting community based research
- Engaging in collaborative partnerships with other organizations
- Other (please specify) _____

E) In those activities where students take part in community engagement activities, what academic level of students are involved? (Check all that apply)

- Freshmen
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate

II. The next set of questions relates to the concept of community engagement and your most recent experiences with community engagement activities.

Please check the box that most accurately reflects your opinion.

	Very Dissatisfied (0)	Dissatisfied (1)	Neutral (2)	Satisfied (3)	Very Satisfied (4)
F) I had previous community volunteer experience prior to my first community engagement activity.					
G) I believe that the community engagement activities I have been involved in on behalf of the university have benefited the community.					
H) I will continue to volunteer or participate in the community after my current project is complete.					
I) My community engagement work has deepened my understanding of community needs.					
J) Activities through which students become engaged in the community have a positive effect on the students' educational experience.					
K) I believe that, as a university administrator/faculty/staff member, I have a responsibility to serve my community.					

III. Next we would like to know the influence of your service on your personal and professional development.

Please check the box that most accurately reflects your opinion.

	Very Dissatisfied (0)	Dissatisfied (1)	Neutral (2)	Satisfied (3)	Very Satisfied (4)
L) Performing work in the community has helped me to focus on specific areas in my area of professional expertise.					
M) Participating with the community has resulted in a change in my approach to my areas of professional responsibility.					
N) Participating with the community has helped me enhance my leadership skills.					
O) Participating with the community has resulted in advancement at the university.					
P) I found that my relationship with students, faculty, and staff was enhanced because of the community work we perform.					

IV. Finally we would like you to comment on future community engagement.

Q) Having participated in community engagement activities, what concerns do you have about community engagement activities? Please mark any of the following that are concerns of yours.

- Time constraints
- Communication with community representatives
- Coordination of projects
- Reduced time for classroom instruction
- Supervision of students
- Unpredictable nature of community work
- Assessment of student learning
- Costs
- Impact on future advancement
- Other (please specify) _____

R) Reflecting back on your community engagement experiences, what ideas do you have to improve the overall experience for faculty, staff, students, and community partners?

S) Reflecting back on your community engagement experiences, what ideas do you have to encourage and enhance community engagement by the university?

T) Please add any additional comments.