

*CREATING A NEW KIND OF UNIVERSITY: INSTITUTIONALIZING COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT*, STEPHEN L. PERCY, NANCY L. ZIMPHER & MARY JANE BRUKARDT (EDS). ANKER PUBLISHING COMPANY, BOLTON, MA, 2006; PP 288.

Since the release in 1990 of Ernest Boyer's seminal work, *Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professoriate*, there has been a flurry of research and publication activity calling for American colleges and universities to embrace the scholarship of engagement. Organizations such as the National Review Board, the American Association for Higher Education, the American Council on Education, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Campus Compact and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges have weighed in on the subject, offering criteria and guidelines that decipher the complexities of defining engagement; engaging students in service learning and reflective inquiry; determining evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure; fostering a campus climate that promotes community engagement; reconciling conflicts associated with faculty workloads; and implementing transformative cultural change.

North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission has revised its 'Criterion 5: Engagement and Service' accreditation standards by developing operational components and definitions of engagement, and by establishing engagement benchmarks. Recently, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has developed a new Community Engagement Classification scheme that takes into account an institution's involvement with curricular engagement and outreach and partnerships. The scholarship of engagement is systematically gaining legitimacy through a growing community of scholars, an increasing number of professional societies and the emergence of scholarly journal outlets such as the *Journal of Public Service*, the *Journal of Extension* and this inaugural journal, *Gateways*.

The aforementioned issues surrounding engagement are what Stephen Percy, Nancy Zimpher, Mary Jane Brukardt and their colleagues seek to address in *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement*, an important scholarly addition to the debate and discourse on the scholarship of engagement. The book is divided into five parts with each part further subdivided into a number

of chapters. Part I (Chapters 1 to 2) sets the context of engagement through the lens of the Milwaukee Idea, chronicling the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's (UWM) institutional commitment and pathway to university engagement. It highlights the arduous process of cultural and institutional change that occurred in UWM under the bold leadership of then Chancellor Nancy Zimpher, including an analysis of the barriers to and effective strategies for transformative change.

Part II (Chapters 3 to 5) examines the effect of community partners, shared governance structures, and the School of Continuing Education in fostering institutional change. Part III (Chapters 6 to 9) explores the scholarship of engagement in the context of teaching and learning and curriculum reform. It traces the twenty-year history of movements and key milestone moments associated with campus-based service, service learning and civic engagement, beginning with the era of student volunteerism in the 1980s. It then focuses on a number of grassroots approaches to curriculum reform and assessment, including efforts aimed at designing core curricula and general education requirements around the themes of diversity and engagement.

Part IV (Chapters 10 to 11) presents two initiatives – the Milwaukee Partnership Academy and the Milwaukee Non-Profit Community – that served as a framework for creating, structuring, and sustaining community partnership. Part IV (Chapters 12 to 15) concludes by presenting some examples of how universities and colleges can go about institutionalizing and sustaining engagement beyond the initial stages of visioning, planning and adoption. One such example is the US Housing and Urban Development's Community and Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) program, launched in 1992 to encourage colleges and universities to develop and implement outreach and engagement activities addressing the problems of their urban communities.

The three concluding chapters that follow examine the structural and procedural challenges involved in the administration of an engaged university. Specific challenges include the procedures involved with recruiting and hiring faculty who advocate engagement; conflicts associated with promotion and tenure guidelines; negotiating grants, contracts and relations to corporate interests; service to students; and promoting engagement through fundraising and gift giving.

While the opinions entailed in the authors' analysis suggest a number of potential directions for promoting the scholarship of engagement, many of the book's central perspectives are not new to the literature on engagement. Despite these limitations, the authors' analysis makes a significant contribution to the literature on the scholarship of engagement by highlighting the difficult question of how one goes about sustaining and institutionalizing community-university partnerships.

The book's conclusions suggest that universities and colleges can institutionalize engagement in sustainable ways through six practices: integrate engagement into mission; forge partnerships as the overarching framework for engagement; renew and redefine discovery and scholarship; integrate engagement into teaching and learning; recruit and support new champions; and create radical institutional change.

Radical change can occur by acknowledging and removing structural and institutional barriers, fostering interdisciplinarity and facilitating networking. Further, radical change entails instituting recognition systems and financial incentives to reward innovative and creative thinking, developing appropriate mechanisms to support community-university partnerships and requiring new governance structures to develop procedures that inform the processes of assessment and accountability. Ultimately, universities have to be resolute in planning, implementing, assessing and institutionalizing engagement.

**SAMUEL A. ATTOH**  
**LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO**