**Part Nine:
Implementation
Implications**

Obviously "reports don't make policy." So an important question is: How can the report recommendations be put into action at Michigan State University? Of course, this is a presumptuous question. It takes as a given that higher-level administrators affirm the recommendations, and see value in implementing some or all of them. Only the record will tell whether implementation will occur at Michigan State. But it is possible at least to recommend implementation strategies.

In Chapter 17, committee members Kenneth Corey and Frank Fear propose a way of thinking about the implementation process. This chapter was written about six months before the report was published, and the ideas contained therein helped the committee reach closure on its work. In Chapter 18, committee members Frank Fear and Charles Thompson articulate an implementation strategy for MSU and for other universities seeking to revitalize outreach. Chapter 18 was written immediately after work on the report was completed.

Chapter 17
THOUGHTS ABOUT IMPLEMENTING THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS[27]

Philosophic Directions for Future Outreach at MSU

Profound, strategic, and sustained change is required to fully integrate outreach into the research and teaching functions of Michigan State University. At least two ingredients are essential if this change is to be successfully achieved: (1) the university must be philosophically provocative and develop a complementary policy framework for outreach, and (2) the university must implement this philosophy and policy simply and practically.

Philosophically, the top leadership of the university, in full partnership with faculty and staff, must build on the long, innovative tradition of MSU by taking a clear and bold stance—to integrate outreach into the mission of the university. With such a goal, it will no longer be normative to practice and sanction unidimensional and relatively unconnected behavior among MSU units,

---

[27] Prepared by committee members Kenneth Corey and Frank Fear

faculty, and staff. Many more of the university's activities will be linked and connected. Along this line, institutional—as well as unit—rewards and incentives must be organized so that, whenever appropriate, research guides outreach, and teaching is connected to outreach needs and requirements. At the policy level, this issue must be taken up by the MSU central administration and board of trustees; at the operating level, it must be addressed by faculty, departments, colleges, and the governance system.

If MSU can effectively align this new integrative approach—align outreach policies and programs from central administration to colleges to departments to faculty and staff, and back up again—over time such synergies will create the fully connected university of the 21st century. We believe that this type of approach represents MSU's special niche in U.S. higher education.

Outreach as a Connected Enterprise vs. Outreach as an Alternative Choice

The will and the necessary targeted resources must permeate every level of the university in order to achieve the intended *connections* approach (i.e., research and teaching and outreach) versus the traditional approach that stresses *alternative* choices (i.e., research or teaching or outreach). It is clear that MSU's research and land-grant mission suggests that knowledge generation should inform and stimulate outreach activities as well as instructional activities.

Indeed, it is not a matter of simply "doing more outreach," and the goal should not be conceived as part of a zero-sum game. For example, some faculty might reply, "We are doing so much teaching and research now, unless we are relieved of some of our current duties, we are not able to get engaged in outreach." Or they may feel that there is an implied de-valuing of research and teaching in favor of outreach. But consider the example of the professor who uses outreach activities to teach students. Such a learning-outreach approach, of course, draws on knowledge that has been generated, transmitted, and preserved, often in the literature by others, and applied by students, under faculty supervision in external settings and with external audience needs being addressed.

Consequently, the university's principal objective should be to foster outreach that is truly integrative with research and instruction. Under this strategy, research informs instruction and outreach; in turn, outreach can enhance and be an integral part of research and teaching. When viewed in this way, outreach involves the connections to the learning and knowledge needs of external audiences. Such activities also should produce scholarly products, both about the substance of the outreach work, as well as about the effectiveness of, and the lessons associated with, outreach work.

Because this is a new way of thinking for some, internal "start-up" pilot funding from within the University, i.e., from the office of the Vice Provost for University Outreach, is needed to stimulate pilot and demonstration efforts. Special attention should be given to activities that follow from MSU-based research and knowledge generation, and relate to MSU teaching and knowledge dissemination. Such internal stimulation can ultimately lead to larger, more strategic, more connected, and longer-lasting outreach efforts that are funded from extramural sources. The notion of pilot and demonstration efforts is also relevant because outreach is often quite complex and requires tailoring, negotiation, maturation, and refinement to meet the needs of external audiences.

We also need to take advantage of currently available tools and tactics for making it possible to better integrate outreach into the mission of the university. For example, the original purpose of work-study student funding was to devote the effort of work-study students to community service. Yet many work-study students are used as clerical staff. If some of these resources could be re-assigned in concert with faculty outreach-teaching and service-learning projects, then greater program integration will have been realized.

Encouraging the Development of an Outreach Ethos

Once a college, university department/school, institute, center, or nonacademic unit has been able to demonstrate the connectivity and the integration of research, instruction, and outreach, then an MSU-relevant and explicit outreach ethos will have been created. With such evolution and institutionalization of outreach at the unit level, the full integration of outreach with a unit's research and teaching missions can be perfected and further developed over the long term.

In promoting the establishment of this type of ethos—with its attendant norms, sanctions, and reward system—we do not mean to suggest that every MSU faculty and staff member must assume an outreach responsibility. Rather, it is recommended that outreach be accepted as a unit-level responsibility. Outreach, when viewed in this way, is conceptualized as a shared responsibility among the university's units, such as academic units, the MSU Libraries, and the MSU Alumni Association.

The Critical Role of the Unit Administrator

The unit administrator is responsible for nurturing the development of the outreach ethos described here. To accomplish this goal, the unit administrator must make mission-relevant, strategic choices—choices associated with appropriately marshaling and allocating resources for the expressed purpose of achieving unit goals. In this process, unit administrators must understand the nature, scope, and variety of external demands on the unit, have a keen sense of the unit's strengths and weakness, and appreciate the interests, skills, and career stage of each faculty and staff member.

For example, outreach provides an opportunity for faculty and staff, who may have not be centerstage in teaching or research, to make significant contributions to a unit's agenda. Outreach, in this instance, becomes an opportunity for a unit administrator to deploy human resources to meet unit objectives. Consider the case of a faculty member who is not a cutting-edge scholar, but who is exceptionally good at synthesizing existing knowledge and making it available for consumption by learners who are external to MSU. In a unidimensional view of scholarship (i.e., affirmation of knowledge generation only), this faculty member may not always be viewed as an important member of the academy. But, when viewed from the perspective of a unit being able to achieve its mission-related obligations, this faculty member becomes a valuable and valued colleague.

The same can be said of a faculty member who, perhaps at an earlier point, was a cutting-edge scholar, but now seeks to pursue other interests. One of those interests might be off-campus teaching. The ability to deploy the resources of this senior colleague in an off-campus degree

program represents a win-win-win situation: a win for the unit in that additional resources are available for its off-campus program, a win for the off-campus learners because they are able to take advantage of the capabilities of a senior scholar, and a win for the faculty member who is engaged in a personally rewarding activity.

Making Mission-Related Decisions across the Functions

Two of the more provocative questions raised during the committee's deliberations were: What does it mean for MSU "to deliver" in relationship to its outreach obligations? What is MSU's capacity to deliver in outreach?

Depending on the individual circumstances in each MSU college, tactics can be employed to create capacity to permit faculty and staff time to be assigned to research-outreach activities and teaching-outreach activities. In order to support faculty and departments to do outreach by means of reallocating effort from the on-campus instructional program, policy changes and mandates at the highest levels of the university will be required. Such reallocation should be incorporated into the routine planning process that occurs annually between each college and the Provost.

Furthermore, innovative tracking and accounting mechanisms are required that will enable various restructuring of effort across the mission—mechanisms that currently are not readily available within the university. For example, under present joint reporting arrangements, bilateral linkages between colleges may be less relevant than in an environment where it will be expected to integrate outreach into the mission of the university. If one college could be credited for its ongoing support of formerly relevant bilateral links while new linkages are developed, and if responsive accounting methods for this can be perfected, then financial and effort tradeoffs should be possible wherein reciprocal needs between MSU colleges are recognized. Such calibrations can yield greater integration of outreach with research and instruction, and attain a more dynamic and equitable division of labor across MSU colleges.

There also needs to be greater flexibility with respect to resource management and liquidity of funds for outreach and other key MSU functions. The Office of the Provost must encourage experiments to address this need. For example, how can we safeguard the revenue-generating capacity of MSU if a college teaches 1,000 fewer undergraduates in order to engage faculty in outreach work? Perhaps the approach is for a dean to work with the faculty and chairs, and also with the Provost's Office, to renegotiate how the human resources in that college can be best deployed, given its "pressure points," i.e., the demands made by different stakeholders on our knowledge resources. There must be methods for insuring no loss of revenue for the university as we address the needed shifting of resources among the major functions of the university.

Integrating Outreach into the Mission Is Only One Step: Measuring and Rewarding Outreach Excellence Represent Other Critical Steps

With outreach increasingly integrated into MSU's research and instructional mission and programs, we are better prepared to seek and measure outreach excellence. To the extent that we now assess quality and performance in research and instruction, we can extend and routinize these

evaluations more effectively by insuring that outreach is integrated into the core scholarly functions of the institution. In addition to peer, disciplinary, and internally driven assessment, outreach-connected research and outreach-connected instruction evaluations will have to incorporate internally driven benchmarks and client satisfaction into newly integrative performance evaluations. This expanded definition of quality cannot rely principally on academic peer comparisons. Rather, integrative scholarly performance evaluation must be more multifaceted and accountable to more diverse audiences. Faculty, staff, administrators, and external clients are challenged to devise and perfect sensitive measures of quality for the new, integrated form of outreach-research and outreach-teaching scholarship being recommended here.

Measurement of outreach performance will enable rewards and incentives to be provided to stimulate even more effective, valued, and integrated scholarship at Michigan State University. The matching of faculty preferences with unit priorities and within the planning and budgeting context are some of the needed initial connections. Consequently, it will be the responsibility of each unit to demonstrate that they are adequately rewarding faculty and staff for their outreach involvements. Most importantly, each unit must operationalize what it means to conduct "exemplary" outreach, and then adjust its reward systems accordingly so that truly outstanding outreach is rewarded through merit pay increases and other means.

Outreach as a Mechanism for Helping to Achieve Diversity and Pluralism Goals

The integrative scholarship recommended here is congruent with MSU's policies for strategically connecting outreach scholarship with diversity and pluralism goals (see Section 35 of the *MSU IDEA II* report). Examples of these connections include the annual "State of Black Michigan" report and Michigan's distressed communities and community economic development projects (both undertaken in Urban Affairs Programs), the outreach agenda associated with the Julian Samora Research Institute, and the David Walker Research Institute on the black male.

Chapter 18
REPORT INTERPRETATION
WITH IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES[28]

Throughout their history, American universities have received significant levels of public support because they were viewed as essential components in the development of our nation. Not only have universities provided the vehicle for nearly universal access to postsecondary education, but they have also helped commercialize agriculture, fuel industrial expansion, enhance national defense, and utilize science and technology to advance nearly every aspect of our lives. When our nation has faced major challenges, American universities have generally been partners in addressing them through the extension and application of their knowledge resources.

Today our nation is challenged as never before. We struggle with the advent of a global economy in which all economic sectors must be prepared to compete. We are experiencing the growth of an economic underclass characterized by high unemployment and crime. We confront a crisis among our youth who struggle with substance abuse, teen pregnancy, academic failure, crime and delinquency, and the search for meaning in their lives. Environmental challenges threaten our capacity to pass on to future generations enough fresh air to breathe, clean water to drink, and safe food to eat. We live with a health care system that is increasingly unaffordable and inaccessible for large segments of our population. As a nation, we are undergoing a fundamental cultural transformation as thousands of new immigrants bring a new diversity and pluralism to our communities and forever change the nature of our civic life. Finally, we live in an age in which lifelong learning has become not simply a source of enrichment, but a virtual lifeline for nearly every member of our society.

If these are challenges for our nation, they are challenges for our universities as well. They require us to think anew about the organization of knowledge, the meaning of access, the nature of scholarship, and the limits as well as the potentials of universities as vehicles for social change. Our current national focus on university reform is long overdue but, with few exceptions, it is being framed too narrowly, often not reaching beyond what is admittedly an urgent need to renew our commitment to undergraduate education.

There is another university mission dimension that also requires thoughtful and expeditious attention if universities hope to maintain their public trust and support. Variously called outreach, public service, extension, lifelong education, extended education, continuing education, and a host of other names, it involves the complex and formidable process of extending and applying knowledge in order to help address the broad range of pressing challenges confronting our nation and its citizens.

University outreach takes a variety of forms. It may involve applied research and technical assistance to help clients, individually or collectively, to better understand the nature of a problem they confront. It includes demonstration projects that introduce clients to new techniques and practices.

Frequently, it involves the extension of the campus instructional capacity through credit and noncredit courses to meet the needs of adult students. It may also involve policy analysis designed to help shape and inform the public policy process.

Despite its importance, outreach is the least understood and most ambiguous dimension of the university's mission. It is also frequently positioned at the academic margin rather than in the mainstream. The risks associated with this marginality are no longer acceptable at a time when universities are being asked to assume greater responsibility for making knowledge resources available and accessible to a variety of external audiences.

We propose a new way of thinking about outreach, and suggest a set of strategic initiatives for those universities intent on making outreach a vital and energetic component of their overall academic mission. Our thinking in both respects is drawn from a collaborative effort of a group of colleagues who, over a period of two years, wrestled with the place of outreach in the overall mission of a research-intensive, land-grant university as members of the Provost's Committee on University Outreach at Michigan State University. The purpose here is to share the key dimensions of the committee's thinking.

The essence of the committee's thinking about outreach is contained in the following definition:

> *Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge and is conducted for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.*

This conception of outreach is different from most in three important ways.

First, it connects outreach with scholarship. What makes an activity scholarly? Some contend that it involves developing or creating new knowledge or, at the very least, synthesizing knowledge in a new way. From this perspective scholarship is generally synonymous with research. Others offer that reflective practice distinguishes scholarship from non-scholarly, repetitive activities.

At the literal level, scholarship is what scholars do: they teach, do research, and serve their universities, disciplines, fields, or professions, as well as the surrounding society. Yet, all of us have observed teaching that is not always scholarly, have read research that appears too mechanical to be called scholarship, and have experienced service that has more to do with other attributes than with any scholarly gifts.

In the committee's view, the essence of scholarship is the thoughtful creation, interpretation, communication, or application of knowledge that is based in the ideas and methods of recognized disciplines and professions. What qualifies an activity as "scholarship" is that it be deeply informed by an appropriate knowledge base, that the knowledge is skillfully interpreted and deployed, and that the activity is carried out with intelligent openness to new information, debate, and criticism. We believe that outreach is a scholarly activity; it both draws on knowledge developed through other forms of scholarship and contributes to the knowledge base. As such, it has the same potential for scholarship as the other major academic functions of a university.

Second, the new conception positions outreach as cross-cutting the university mission of teaching, research, and service rather than standing alone as a separate and conceptually distinct form of activity. From this perspective, there are forms of outreach teaching, outreach research, and

outreach service. Offering credit coursework in off-campus venues is an example of outreach teaching, and working collaboratively with a community health center to conduct research designed to increase the impact of health education programs is an example of outreach research. Outreach service calls on the scholar's expertise and occurs when the subject matter being extended pertains to the programs and mission of the university unit(s) in which the scholar is appointed. For example, a professor of urban planning serving on a city housing commission engages in outreach service. However, many worthwhile forms of service to society are not outreach. This is the case when a chemist serves on the fundraising committee of a local nonprofit organization— a role that is apart from the chemist's scholarly expertise and the programs of the chemistry department.

The forms of outreach may be connected in practice. For example, a humanities professor offering an off-campus course in death and dying (outreach teaching) may require students to do volunteer work in local hospices (outreach service) as a course requirement. And there are certainly linkages between outreach and non-outreach work. This occurs, for example, when a renowned scholar of international trade is interviewed by the national media about the implications of various trade agreements for the U.S. economy (outreach service).

By linking the forms of outreach scholarship and by connecting outreach and non-outreach efforts, universities can increase the synergy and power of their interventions, and scholars may also bring greater coherence to their professional lives. Indeed, many universities and scholars organize and carry out their programs in exactly this way—sometimes without recognizing it, and at other times without receiving recognition from peers, administrators, legislators, and the public for integrating scholarship across domains.

Third, the committee asserts that outreach covers the full spectrum of knowledge functions, including knowledge generation, transmission, application, and preservation. Universities are knowledge enterprises, and teaching, research, and service are simply different expressions of the scholar's central concern: knowledge. Outreach is frequently viewed as involving only knowledge transmission and application activities. But the scope of outreach is inclusive not restrictive. Sometimes outreach involves generating knowledge as occurs when applied research is conducted to help a client better understand a problem. It may also involve transmitting knowledge through credit and noncredit continuing education. Knowledge application occurs routinely when university personnel engage in technical assistance, and knowledge preservation frequently takes place when electronically accessible data bases are created for use by external clients.

Many scholars undertake their work in ways that connect the knowledge functions. For example, a dynamic process of knowledge generation and application occurs when scholars collaborate with end-users in what some call a research-outreach synthesis and others label action research or applied developmental science. And, through outreach, university personnel not only extend knowledge to those who might benefit from it, they often learn and grow professionally and personally from these experiences.

For universities intent on making outreach a vital and energetic part of the academic mission, we propose a set of strategic initiatives:

1.   *Engage faculty, staff, and students in an open discussion of the nature of outreach and its place in the overall mission of the campus.*

Based on the Michigan State experience, we recommend establishing an all-university committee of respected faculty members and administrators to discuss how this new model may be refined

and then adopted on your campus. Request that the committee issue a report of its deliberations. Then, disseminate the report broadly and encourage a vibrant, campuswide discussion of the recommendations.

2. *Declare that outreach is the responsibility of every academic unit although not every faculty member. Accordingly, establish a unit-level planning and account-ability process that is designed to achieve excellence across the full breadth of the mission, including outreach.*

In creating unit plans, special attention must be given to answering these questions: What is the appropriate amount of outreach work? Who should have access to the unit's knowledge resources? What should be the appropriate balance among state-level, national, and international outreach? How should outreach success be calibrated?

Unit outreach activities should focus at the intersection of faculty expertise and interests, on the one hand, and high priority societal needs for knowledge, on the other. Involvement of external constituencies in the planning process can inform faculty about important societal needs and stimulate a dynamic interchange that can lead to exciting, relevant, timely, and informed outreach programs.

We believe that this unit-level outreach planning and accountability process should emerge from a process of explicit or tacit bargaining at several levels: between central administrators and deans, between deans and unit administrators, and among unit administrators, faculty members, and external constituencies. Answers to important planning questions can be continuously revised through discussion, debate, and bargaining among these groups. This explicit, public process is consistent with the norms of open dialogue.

3. *Reward faculty and units appropriately for engaging in outreach.*

Because faculty participation is the key to advancing the university's outreach mission, every academic unit should create guidelines for promotion, tenure, and merit salary increments that explicitly address how outreach will be factored into the decision-making process. These guidelines must include a clear indication that outreach is valued, and special emphasis must be given to how these guidelines apply to the case of junior faculty.

In addition, college-level administrators should advance a set of strategies that makes it possible to offer unit-level incentives and rewards for outreach. These college-level initiatives, such as providing resources for expanding a unit's outreach teaching program, should link with university-level efforts to stimulate outreach in such areas as outreach teaching, outreach research, and involving students in outreach.

We believe that university outreach will be advanced to the extent that deans and the central administration find ways to make outreach intrinsically appealing by linking it to authentic faculty interests, easy by offering effective forms of facilitation and support, and well-rewarded by providing genuine recognition and incentives to faculty and units.

4. *Create professional development opportunities in outreach.*

Relatively few professional development opportunities exist for outreach. Outreach learning opportunities should be available to undergraduate students, graduate students, junior faculty, and senior faculty. Work-study opportunities represent a relevant, low-cost mechanism for involving undergraduates in outreach. Outreach assistantships can be created for graduate students so that they have the same opportunity for learning and mentoring as has been traditionally available to teaching and research assistants. Senior faculty and unit administrators can assist junior faculty in incorporating appropriate amounts of outreach work in their scholarly portfolios. And, outreach study sabbaticals can help senior faculty learn about exciting outreach efforts that are being undertaken at other institutions—work that they may wish to adapt and adopt at their home institutions. All of these professional development options demonstrate that outreach is an important part of a scholarly life. This is a very different message from what is typically communicated on most campuses.

5. *Advance the pedagogy of outreach.*

Far too often in universities we assume that, if we expose people to knowledge, then they will act on it. This assumption is naive. Universities need to deepen their understanding of the forces that influence people to act on what they learn. How can we design outreach programs to maximize their impact?

Although a considerable amount of attention has been given to pedagogy in traditional instructional settings, outreach pedagogy is generally in a primitive state of development. Many faculty, staff, and students have been neither educated nor trained in the complex issues that are associated with outreach.

We need to view the pedagogy of outreach as a legitimate area of scholarly inquiry, and then to draw upon the results of this scholarship to help inform outreach programming on our campuses. The lessons learned can also be published and presented at professional meetings and conferences.

6. *Charge a campus-wide committee with responsibility for recommending ways to create a stable, long-term revenue flow for outreach.*

If outreach is to be a valued part of the academic mission, it should be funded in a manner similar to other important components of the mission. This involves a combination of base budget allocations supplemented by funding through grants and contracts.

This committee should be established after it is clear what new programs and activities are needed to stimulate and reward outreach at the faculty and unit levels. In addition to determining the costs of these new initiatives and recommending how outreach may be funded adequately over the long term, the committee should also address other issues, such as: How can the institution encourage, stimulate, and reward outreach entrepreneurship? How can the university and its faculty, staff, and students engage in outreach without competing with the private sector? And, what criteria should be advanced so that fees charged for outreach do not become an unfair burden to those who can least afford to pay?

7. *Expect cross-campus leadership for outreach.*

If the outreach mission is to be woven into the fabric of the university at the college and departmental levels, it requires leaders, most notably presidents, provosts, deans, and unit administrators, who share three attributes: commitment in that they view outreach as a fundamental part of the academic mission; capacity to lead the faculty in an enriching, outcomes-oriented discussion regarding how scholarly talents may be best configured to address the outreach dimension of the university mission; and vision by being proactive, seeking opportunities, and positioning the university and its units for the future.

Capacity to provide outreach leadership should be an important criteria for hiring and evaluating university administrators. And, leadership development programs may be needed to help administrators develop appropriate skills to advance the outreach mission.

If universities broaden and refocus the way that outreach is viewed and valued, then important changes will follow in university policy and practice. All institutions in the late 20th century are making choices, many of them new and difficult choices, as they reinvent, refocus, and reform how they operate in turbulent, unpredictable environments. Universities cannot escape these pressures. Indeed, as knowledge enterprises, universities should be shining examples of how institutional transformation can be effected.

Without question, postsecondary education has entered an era of significant change. The change process can be led by the academy if it moves appropriately and deliberately. At issue is not whether change will occur, only when it will occur and who will lead it. Certainly, university outreach is not the only variable in the change equation, but it is an important one. Today, in unprecedented ways, universities are being asked to make their knowledge resources available to society. The all-important question is: Will universities reconceptualize and reconfigure outreach so that they can be more responsive to the society that nurtures and sustains them? It is our hope that the ideas shared here will prove useful to those who seek answers to this question.