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This paper examines the social roles of universities, and their relationships and partnerships with communities, specifically community-based nonprofit organizations, through literature review and examples from the U.S. and Japan. Recently, universities have rediscovered the importance of their service mission, and started to invest in university-community partnerships (UCPs), with the focus on service learning. Universities and communities can mutually benefit through partnerships both short- and long-term: UCPs lead to more civic engagement by universities and universities become true social institutions. An integrated and balanced approach of UCPs is proposed on the basis of components of institutional commitment and efficient and effective use of an intermediary organization.
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1. Introduction

Universities in Japan face a turning point: First is the dwindling birthrate, which has been, and will be, affecting the number of university students. Second, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) has decided to restructure national universities, changing their legal status to Independent Administrative Institutions with the Center of Excellence design. Both national and private universities in Japan face financial and managerial challenges, and they are exploring ways for efficient and effective management in a changing and pressing environment. In addition, some universities have initiated internship programs and explored partnerships with communities from the late 1990s. Similarly, universities and communities in the U.S. seem to have rich and successful experiences of partnerships including service learning in the face of various challenges.

In this situation, it is pivotal to revisit the social roles of universities and their relationship with the surrounding communities, how they have interacted, in order for universities to survive and manage effectively and become real social institutions, and for communities to rethink how to interact with them.

The purposes of this paper are to compare history, challenges and initiatives in relation to the social roles of higher education in the U.S. and Japan and theory and practice of university-community partnerships (UCPs), and to learn the lessons for effective partnerships.

This paper consists of four parts. First, literature on the social roles of universities in the U.S. and Japan is reviewed. Second, the relationships and partnerships between universities and communities are examined to explore the ways for a win-win partnership. Third, prominent examples of UCPs in the U.S. and Japan are introduced. Fourth, the lessons learned from the examples are discussed with a few implications.

2. Social Roles of Universities

2.1. Mission

The fundamental missions of universities are considered to be tripartite of teaching, research and service (Hirsh and Weber 1999). Among them, service has been secondary to the other two (Maurrasse 2001). Likewise, few faculty members and top administrators regard education of students in democratic principles as central, even though it is a core of university’s mission (Checkoway 2001, Maurrasse 2001). Under this situation, literature suggests that universities should take more social and civic responsibility, prepare students for active participation in democracy and engage more with community (Hirsh and Weber 1999). Some feel that higher education has “an ethical and social responsibility to utilize its resources to help strengthen the local democratic process in the service of improving community life” (Lisman 1998). Today, many urban universities tie their mis-
sions to areas in which they reside and provide services to the surrounding community (Carr 2000). Universities have defined the meaning of service to them in ways consistent with the primary educational mission (Stanton et al. 1999).

2.2. Evolution

The role of universities in the U.S. and Japan has transformed from elite to mass education. American universities had remained local institutions through the first half of the 20th century. However, in the latter half of the century, universities have centered on the role of scientific research, and served as an engine of technological advance and economic growth (Lisman 1998). With the transformation, the student population has shown greater socioeconomic and academic diversity. However, major criticisms exist toward low quality and high cost. For example, the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) (1999) indicates that 11 percent of college students were not qualified to attend, and 13 percent had the minimal qualifications through a systematic measure.

Before World War II, Japanese education was similarly for the elite. However, since then, Japan’s higher education served the needs of industry and the State under the fundamental ideology of equal opportunity in education, which contributed to the tremendous economic growth (Doyon 2001, Hayes 1997, Itoh 2002, MEXT website). On the other hand, some critics feel it has not created broad opportunities for social development (Hayes 1997): Rather it has lowered the quality of higher education (ibid.), dehumanized people and caused a “moral vacuum” among students through excessive competition (Doyon 2001).

2.3. Current Challenges

Universities in the two countries face both similar and different challenges. In the U.S., major challenges facing today’s universities are engagement/partnership with communities, civic engagement of young people/students (Bennett 1999, Checkoway 2001, Damon 1998, Putnam 2000), and regaining public trust (Englert 1997) as well as lower quality of education and its high cost.

In contrast with American universities, the challenges facing Japanese higher education today are declining birthrates, standardization with the neglect of diverse individuality and competence through excessive emphasis on equal opportunities, quality of education, and financial difficulties (Doyon 2001, Hayes 1997, Kitamura 1997, MEXT website). The striking decline of the educational functions of the home and local community and the advancement of urbanization have formed a backdrop against which various problems such as youth crime have emerged. Continuity of education from high school to higher education is also a critical issue (MEXT website).

Japanese universities are in the process of dealing with the changing social and economic environment with the intensification of international economic competition and aging population. The governments are also trying to promote the partnership and collaboration of industry and academics (Sendai Urban Research Forum 1998). In the history of Japanese higher education, the current reforms are some of the most extensive and radical (Itoh 2002). In 2001, MEXT mapped out specific measures and issues of educational reform in the “Education Reform Plan for the 21st Century” (MEXT website). Some of the principles promoted in the current reforms are enhancement, diversification and individualization of higher education and raising the quality of education and research to an international level (Doyon 2001, Itoh 2002, Kitamura 1997, MEXT website).

3. Relationship between Universities and Communities

Universities have various functions in a community. They are the creators and disseminators of knowledge and understanding to address community challenges, strong economic engines, employers, reservoirs of energetic faculty and students, and powerful social and economic units whose decisions affect communities (Carr 2000, Clary et al. 2000, Nichols 1990).

Although universities and their local communities are “inextricably dependent on each other” (Nichols 1990), they have not necessarily established good relationships. On the one hand, the historic mission of America’s land-grant universities was that of regionally situated institutions developing the array of resources to address regional issues and problems (Edwards and Marullo 1999).

On the other hand, today many universities are located in socially and economically distressed urban areas due to uneven economic development and urbanization (ibid.). If a neighborhood is deemed unsafe or deteriorating, the university might lose prospective students and faculty. Moreover, a power struggle and a lack of trust in the university often result in tensions and a lack of effective efforts of UCPs (Englert 1997).

Recently, however, universities are learning that they cannot afford to be isolated from neighboring community that
faces serious and pressing needs, which would affect the safety, health and management of their own institutions. Researchers have called upon universities to take civic responsibilities toward communities, to be good neighbors and form partnerships with them (Lisman 1998). Lisman (1998) argues that universities need to enlist their resources to strengthen local civic infrastructure, and must work with local community-based organizations in helping communities tackle their problems. Checkoway (2001) maintains that students can be prepared for participation in society by involving them in community studies and service learning projects with a strong civic purpose. Faculty can play a role by conducting collaborative community-based research, changing faculty perceptions, and revising the reward structure (Checkoway 2001).

3.1. Relationship between Education and Civic Engagement

Many authors maintain that education/higher education can contribute to and have great effects on civic engagement (Checkoway 2001, Damon 1998, O'Connell 1999, Putnam, 2000). Ehrlich (2000) contends that educational attainment is a powerful predictor of civic engagement. Damon (1998) claims that college education has a crucial role in the three attributes required for positive civic engagement: intellectual abilities, moral traits and practical experience in community organizations. Checkoway (2001) asserts that higher education can contribute to civic engagement, but that “most research universities do not perceive themselves as part of the problem or of its solution.”

Conversely, Putnam (2000) advocates powerful effects of social capital on education during the college years: Extracurricular activities and involvement in peer social networks are strong predictors of college dropout rates and success.

O’Connell (1999) maintains that every level of formal education, including higher education, should prepare for “citizenship and an understanding of the essential role of civil society in preserving and strengthening American democracy.” Lisman (1998) also argues that education is critical to the development of civic competence necessary for an effective participatory democracy.

Based on this discussion, I propose the following relationships among the roles of universities, civic life, and the respective target population (Table 1). All the roles of university are related to civic life, but in a different manner and different target populations.

Scholars argue that civic engagement is essential to a democratic society, but that many Americans have reduced their engagement in public affairs (Checkoway 2001, O’Connell 1999, Putnam 2000). Especially, possibly due to declining civic education, young people are disengaged in political process such as campaigning for social causes or political candidates, posing a critical problem for a democratic society (Bennett 1999, Damon 1998). Current institutions have drifted away from the civic mission, and thus, they are uneven in their commitments: faculty members are unprepared for public roles, and community groups feel difficulty in gaining access to them (Checkoway 2001). Damon (1998) claims that professors have not always put making their students into good citizens as a top priority.

Putnam (2000) found the greatest decline of social capital among the better educated, as indicated by the fall of participation in public meetings among those who had attended college. In this situation, Ehrlich (2000) is concerned about the future of American democracy, and proposes that college campuses “prepare their graduates to become engaged citizens who provide the time, attention, understanding, and action to further collective civic goals.”

3.2. Historical Developments in the U.S.

Universities have tried to address community issues in various forms and initiatives, not only by themselves but also with the encouragement of government and private initiatives. Among the first attempts to get universities to address community issues was Morrill Act of 1864, providing federal land for the creation of state universities and community colleges (Carr 2000, Lisman 1998, Nichols 1990).

The “Progressive Era” of a century ago spawned important efforts of the university presidents to address commu-
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Relationship between Roles of University and Civic Life</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Knowledge creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Knowledge communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Knowledge application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Created by the author referring to Kitamura (2002).
Community problems. For example, the President of Columbia University, Seth Low, had a compelling vision of university-city relationships (Lisman 1998).

During the 20th century, Congress has proposed numerous national service programs. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 had aims to assist universities in disseminating practical information to local residents (Maurrasse 2001). The 1960s and 1970s saw a variety of initiatives by federal government such as President Kennedy’s Peace Corps and President Johnson’s Volunteers in Service to America. The Higher Education Act of 1965 provided grants for university community service programs (DOE website). The National Center for Public Service Internship Programs founded in 1971 stimulated service learning-type programs (DOE website). A number of campus-based service learning programs date their origins to 1972, University Year of Action (Edwards et al. 2001).

In the 1980s, initiatives went beyond government and an interest in service learning has increased. The wide interest derived from a Carnegie Foundation report in mid-1980s stating that the current educational crisis came from the failure to provide “education for citizenship” (Newman 1985). At the same time, the subsequent founding and activities of many organizations such as the Campus Compact and Campus Opportunity Outreach League marked a significant momentum for the youth service movement (Kezar and Rhoads 2001, Wade 1997, Wutzdorf and Giles 1997).

The initiatives in the 1990s accelerated and expanded service learning: The National and Community Service Act of 1990 increased college-based community service opportunities. The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 established the Corporation for National Service, which offers Learn and Serve America and the AmeriCorps program (DOE website, Wade 1997, Wutzdorf and Giles 1997). Various private foundations also initiated funding for UCPs and service learning programs.

3.3. Current Initiatives in the U.S.

Recognizing the cost of unhealthy relations with their local community, an increasing number of universities have been taking responsibility for their communities; increasing their engagement in addressing community problems, and investing in partnerships with communities (Damon 1998, Glemon et al. 1998, Maurrasse 2001). The universities are now trying to revisit their civic mission to prepare students to be active citizens in a democratic society, reflecting on the current trend of civic disengagement of young people. The Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education developed by Campus Compact calls for a “recommitment of higher education to its civic purpose” (Maurrasse 2001). Various initiatives have been taken for these purposes with partnership between universities and communities mainly in the form of service learning (Checkoway 2001, Damon 1998, O’Connell 1999).

3.3.1. Definitions

Community service refers to a wide variety of volunteer work to meet the needs of others and the community (Campus Compact website, Hepburn et al. 2000). Service learning is a particular form of community service in which volunteer experience in the community is an integrated part of a course (Hepburn et al. 2000). Despite some differences in the emphasis on each component, the common components of definitions of service learning can be characterized as (1) meeting community needs, (2) fostering civic responsibility, (3) improving academic skills through experiential learning, and (4) incorporating reflection and curriculum integration.

3.3.2. Rationales

The formation of UCPs can create mutual gain for university and community in that a university cannot ignore the various critical social problems across the campus in the community, and the conditions of surrounding community affect the reputation and recruitment of the university. The partnership will serve the service mission of university, and provide faculty and students opportunities for community-based teaching and learning (Glemon et al. 1998), improve the public image of universities through addressing community problems (Edwards and Marullo 1999), and gain trust (Englert 1997). For their part, community organizations can access university resources and acquire expertise in support of their activities (Glemon et al. 1998).

Rationales proposed by researchers and proponents for service learning can be categorized as a means of (1) improving education, (2) addressing crucial community needs and problems, and (3) supporting students in advancing civic awareness/engagement/responsibility in community and larger democratic society (Crews 2002, Hepburn et al. 2000, RAND 1999, Wade 1997).

1 The growth and interest in service learning may also be interpreted as a response to lack of curricular relevance, lack of faculty commitment to teaching, and lack of institutional and faculty responsiveness to the larger public good (Kezar and Rhoads 2001), as well as the need to include more practical and experience-based learning (Edwards et al. 2001).
The theoretical rationale of service learning is grounded in John Dewey’s philosophy of experiential education and democratic education (Hepburn et al. 2000, Kezar and Rhoads 2001). Dewey believed that schooling should be tied to experiences, and formal education should foster continuity between internal development and exposure to external surroundings, and that this interaction develops the civic skills (ibid.). Thus, through service learning, the students will be motivated to become more active citizens. Service learning is “a particularly important pedagogy for promoting civic responsibility” (Ehrlich 2000).

3.3.3. Size

The number of universities, presidents, faculty and students who are engaging in community partnership, especially in service learning, has been rising in the U.S. In 1999, 75.3 percent of college freshmen performed community service as part of a class requirement (Edwards et al. 2001). Campus Compact, a consortium with 743 members of college and university presidents, is committed to the civic purposes of higher education, promoting UCPs with community service and service learning (Campus Compact website). Campus Compact’s annual statistics reveals the current size of community service and service learning. In 2000, about 712,000 college and university students (35% at responding campuses) participated in service. Among them, about half of the students (46.4%) were involved in ongoing service versus one-time service. In total, they have contributed 18 million hours to service, and 13,661 service-learning courses were offered. Institutional involvement in and support of service learning varies widely. The most common forms of institutional support for service are student-initiated efforts supported by faculty and administration (82%), service awards (74%), and established campus service centers (65%) (ibid.).

3.3.4. Funding Sources

Historically, funding for UCPs came mostly from the federal government, and recent private funding for community initiatives has significantly encouraged UCP efforts (Carr 2000). The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD’s) Office of University Partnerships (OUP) has played the most complete funding initiative to use universities’ diverse resources to address the urban and social problems (Edwards and Marullo 1999). OUP currently funds 8 grant programs including Community Outreach Partnership Center program, and the Historically Black College and Universities program (Carr 2000, HUD-OUP website). Besides, DOE’s Title XI program has funded university projects with the focus on critical urban issues in community development, health and housing (Carr 2000).

Some private or corporate foundations as well as smaller community foundations also fund UCP efforts. Some of them are Annie E. Casey, DeWitt Wallace, Fannie Mae, Ford, Kellogg, Rockefeller, and Surdna Foundations (ibid.). For example, the Fannie Mae Foundation has developed the University-Community Partnership Initiative designed to promote the development of successful partnerships between universities and community organizations to expand affordable housing opportunities in distressed communities (Fannie Mae Foundation website).

3.3.5. Outcomes and Challenges

There are potential outcomes and challenges of UCPs, especially of service learning for each stakeholder proposed by many scholars. While studies have mainly shown student outcomes, very few studies have examined the outcomes for community organizations. Although empirical evidence needs more time, I attempt to summarize the main arguments of major literature on the outcomes and challenges for the main stakeholders.

Studies agree and disagree on the effects of service learning on students’ learning outcomes. The main area of agreements are: (1) service learning is complex, and learning and development connected with it are difficult to measure; and (2) improved learning outcomes occur when service learning is well-integrated into courses and programs (Crews 2002). Educators assert that service learning may positively influence student development in such aspects as academic, problem-solving and critical thinking skills, moral reasoning ability, social and civic responsibility, self-esteem, empathy, political efficacy, tolerance and acceptance of diversity, and career goals (Wade 1997).

The two recent studies identified student outcomes empirically. RAND (1999) found that students in service learning courses, compared to those in similar courses without a service component report larger gains in civic participation (especially intended future involvement in community service) and life skills (interpersonal skills and understanding of diversity). Likewise, Astin et al. (2000) identified 11 outcome indicators for students such as: academic performance, values, leadership, choice of a service career, and plans to participate in service after college. Astin et al. (2000) found that service participation had significant positive effects on
all the outcome measures; that benefits associated with course-based service were strongest for the academic outcomes; and that both faculty and students developed a heightened sense of civic responsibility and personal effectiveness.

Although research on service learning is growing rapidly with the emphasis on student outcomes and pedagogical issues, comparatively little research empirically examines its impacts on the community organizations (Edwards et al. 2001, Vernon and Ward 1999, Wutzdorf and Giles 1997) with a few exception: RAND (1999) studied the impact of Learn and Serve America Higher Education (LSAHE) programs on students and the organizations. Subsequently, Edwards et al. (2001) studied the impact of students on community organizations in a typical college town. RAND (1999) found that organization staff members were extremely satisfied with the contributions of student volunteers, ranking them as more effective than non-student volunteers and non-LSAHE school volunteers. Similarly, Edwards et al. (2001) discovered that staff members highly evaluated student volunteers with strong enthusiasm and interpersonal skills. They also found that student volunteers constituted a substantial pool of volunteer labor that helped sustain the local nonprofit sector and enabled the provision of services that might not otherwise be possible, and that their contributions more than offset any opportunity costs incurred by participating organizations (Edwards et al. 2001). Besides, community agencies “benefit from the new ideas, enthusiasm, and extra help offered by student volunteers” (Wade 1997).

The most visible and direct outcome for community is direct aid that individuals in need receive. Overall, community organizations can benefit from immense intellectual and institutional resources of universities. For example, universities hold faculty members with credentials in academic disciplines and professional fields with potential for problem solving and program planning (Clary et al. 2000).

Long-term benefits also exist. Students come to see themselves as community-minded citizens, and communities come to see youth as one of their most valuable resources. A series of studies by the Independent Sector revealed that early community service experience is a strong predictor of volunteering (ibid.). Thus, with the service experience, they may continue to serve their communities, and may expand their activities to include voting, serving on agency boards, and other meaningful involvement in the community (Wade 1997).

In the process of the growing UCPs and service learning initiatives, researchers have identified various challenges facing the current practice. Damon (1998) argues that many of the efforts are isolated and minimal, and Maurrasse (2001) maintains that universities are not investing sufficient resources to community partnerships. Furthermore, many programs do not meet the standards of quality service learning: programs that do not include reflection, evaluation, curriculum integration, and meaningful service activities (Wade 1997).

The most frequently cited obstacles to the expansion of service learning are the time and pressures of faculty teaching loads (84%), lack of funds to support a service learning office (58%), and a lack of common understanding of the concepts and models of service learning (54%) (Campus Compact website). Many programs are dependent on grant money for their existence. Moreover, faculty find that their institutions do not reward their efforts for engaging students to service learning when the time comes for promotion and tenure decisions (Wutzdorf and Giles 1997).

The challenges facing community agencies are mostly in relation to students: students’ schedules, transportation, the short-term commitment and necessary training and supervision, lack of preparation and inconsistency (Edwards et al. 2001, RAND 1999, Vernon and Ward 1999). RAND (1999) identified other challenges such as communications between community organizations and higher education institutions, and faculty resistance. Besides, universities tend to have more power than other neighborhood-based entities, allowing them to drive the agenda rather than holding equal partnership (Maurrasse 2001).

### 3.4. UCPs in Japan

In Japan, the contribution of universities to community has existed with individual commitment of certain faculty rather than with institutional commitment. Universities are not meeting the expectations of communities because these expectations are too high and the request is not matched with the actual conditions and characteristics of universities (Sendai Urban Research Forum 1998). Recently, however, UCPs have started to be promoted reflecting on the changing social and economic contexts such as the decreasing birthrates, the economic downturn, increased demands for IT, and calls for university reforms. As an overall education reform, MEXT set participation in community service and various programs, and promotion of the school creation trusted by parents and communities in the
seven priority strategies (MEXT website), though it does not specify the educational levels and no remark is made at the higher education level.

Young volunteers are scarce in Japan (13.4% at the age of 15–24) compared with the U.S. (38% at the age of 18–24) in 1996 (EPA 2000). Still, the willingness to volunteer is apparently quite high. Two-thirds of the Japanese population has the intention to volunteer (ibid). In this situation, many people expect education to play a role in understanding the nature of volunteering. About half respondents to an EPA survey support the idea that schools should provide the opportunities for students to learn about and experience volunteer activities (ibid).

Nonprofit activities have gathered momentum since the Great Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake in 1995, and especially with the enactment of the Law to Promote Specified Nonprofit Activities in 1998. On the other hand, many nonprofit organizations face the following major managerial challenges: (1) money — the fragile revenue structures make many nonprofits very small in financial terms; (2) people — increasing membership and recruiting staff are difficult; and (3) location — finding an office and activity space is very problematic.

Under the circumstances, nonprofit organizations in Japan, particularly community-based organizations, can benefit tremendously from the partnership with universities in their communities. They can utilize the resources of universities in terms of people and facilities, and of reducing the financial costs. What’s more, they can build the organizational capacity not only for the short-term, but for the long-term as well for the whole nonprofit sector and community.

One of the major current initiatives of UCPs in Japan is the internship system. Especially in 1997, Japan finally recognized the significance of internship programs implemented in the U.S. for developing creative human resource. At that time, the association of three ministries came up with “A Basic Concept toward Promoting Internship” (MEXT website). Since then, various initiatives have begun across the country in order to activate internship and introduce credit bearing internship programs (Yamaguchi 2001).

According to the annual survey of MEXT, in 2000, 27.1 percent of universities and colleges in Japan implemented internship as courses, more than double the level from 1997. With the guidance of the central government, a majority of national universities (72.7%) started to implement internships, while it is still minor at the private (28.8%) and public (11.1%) universities. In the same year, 24,633 university and college students have experienced internship. However, mostly, the internship is very short-term in Japan. The most widely implemented internship is around one to two weeks during the spring and summer vacation (MEXT website).

At this point, the internship is initiated through respective universities’ individual faculty rather than institutional commitment. The survey results of nonprofit internship program in universities conducted by NPO Support Center Internship Research Committee (2001) indicated that the organizations accept interns mostly (75%) through individual faculty’s personal connections, and that duration and the number of participating students in internship also vary depending on universities.

3.5. Factors for Effective UCPs

What are the crucial factors to improve the practice of UCPs and to maintain effective UCPs in the face of various challenges? Researchers have studied the common characteristics and factors for successful and effective UCPs and service learning. In order to derive essential factors for effective UCPs, I compared 14 publications either listing or describing factors or conditions for successful UCPs or service learning, and conducted a content analysis (Table 2).²

The most cited factor for success is engagement and active participation of all the stakeholders as partners (Carr 2000, Glemon et al. 1998, Honnet and Poulson 1989, Kezar and Rhoads 2001, Vernon and Ward 1999) followed by leadership support and components of reflection that students would reflect their service experience through discussions or summarizing it in writing. Ehrlich (2000) argues that guided reflection gives students opportunities to explore the relationship between academic learning, civic values and commitments.

Other common factors are articulated goals and responsibilities, communication, curriculum integration, and institutional commitment and strong service tradition. Among the relatively low number of citations, trust, evaluation and faculty involvement should also be considered as essential factors reflecting on the challenges discussed in 3.3.5. above. Especially, establishing service centers to coordinate and institutionalize service activities can lead to match service providers and service needs, and may establish criteria for selecting community service placements.

These factors are clearly embedded in the successful ex-

² Content analysis is the analysis of text documents in order to identify patterns in text (Trochim 2001).
4. Examples of UCPs

In this part, a few prominent examples of UCPs in the U.S. and Japan are introduced to understand how UCPs work in the real world: University of Pennsylvania (Penn) and Syracuse University (SU) for the U.S., and the Consortium of Universities in Kyoto (CUK) for Japan. Penn takes a comprehensive approach to UCPs, SU initiates UCPs at various departments with a service center as the role of facilitator, and CUK is an intermediary organization bridging universities and community organizations.

4.1. U.S. Examples

4.1.1. University of Pennsylvania (Penn)

Penn exemplifies a comprehensive approach to UCPs. Literature often cites Penn as an example of large-scale institutional commitment and impact of UCPs (Wutzdorf and Giles 1997). HUD awarded the Penn’s Center for Community Partnerships (CCP) as “the cornerstone for creative collaborations between the university and the community of West Philadelphia” for its function to help improve academic performance in a public school system (HUD-OUP website).
Benjamin Franklin founded Penn in 1740 with the purpose of serving the society. Franklin regarded service to society as “the great aim and end of all learning” (University of Pennsylvania, the Center for Community Partnerships (CCP) website). Now Penn is situated in West Philadelphia, an urban area with poverty, crime, deterioration and diverse demographics. In the last decades, while Penn flourished, West Philadelphia declined, “losing economic and social capital” (Maurrasse 2001).

Under the surrounding conditions, Penn has an explicit interest in revitalizing the community in order for its survival through attracting more students and faculty (ibid.). Thus, Penn began to pay a serious attention to its role in creating partnerships with the key community organizations to effect positive change in the 1980s (CCP website).

Established in 1992, CCP manages much of Penn’s community partnership activities. Penn cooperates with a number of local institutions with the public school system as the central neighborhood-based institution (Maurrasse 2001). The Center coordinates various types of programs, and many of the programs are complementing one another. Penn tries to take a comprehensive approach to community revitalization, with the simultaneous focus on a number of issues. These include schools, housing and economic development reflecting on the shortcomings of piecemeal separate strategies (ibid).

Examples of programs are (1) academically-based community service (ABCS), (2) West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC), and (3) Program in Nonprofits, Universities, Communities, and Schools (PNUCS).

ABCS is the principal vehicle of the Center’s civic engagement, encompassing problem-solving orientation. Over 120 service-learning courses aim to provide real world experience for transforming “students into involved citizens and active community members” (CCP website).

The WEPIC project, founded in 1985 aims to produce comprehensive university-assisted community schools that serve, educate, and activate all members of the community, revitalizing the curriculum through a community-oriented problem-solving approach. A significant feature of WEPIC is its function as a vehicle for engaging the resources of the academy in the interests of the broader community and the recognition that community is a resource for students learning (Wutzdorf and Giles 1997). The WEPIC’s university-assisted community school model led to support for a national replication project (CCP website).

PNUCS is an initiative to build the capacity of local community-based organization. The key projects include: community asset mapping, development of new ABCS courses in order to improve theory and practice in the nonprofit field, programs in nonprofit management, and technical assistance to local nonprofits (ibid.).

Lessons Learned Penn exemplifies various elements for successful UCPs:

An individual university’s commitment can make a great difference in tackling serious problems in community. Penn’s sincere efforts have transformed the distrust between Penn and community to mutual trust in the last two decades. The institutional commitment and comprehensive approach are the essence of Penn’s prominent initiatives.

Penn’s approach to include community school as a major partner is also innovative. The WEPIC model fosters continuity of education, and influences the long-term social capital of the community through the educated young becoming active citizens.

Leadership commitment of top administrators is critical in making the UCPs as a big-scale institutional commitment. Penn’s President has been advocating partnership with community, which surely has affected the consciousness and attitudes of faculty and staff.

The philosophy of mutual gain is also critical for successful partnership. CCP has tried to include community voices and make sure that community residents actually benefit along with Penn. As CCP regards partnership as mutual learning processes, Penn has emphasized the process of partnership to find mutual benefit.

Moreover, Penn has been excellent in demonstrating their outcomes to community residents and to the larger public in the U.S. society. This publicity and accountability to community residents have nurtured trust of community in Penn, and fostered good image of Penn to prospective students and faculty nationwide.

4.1.2. Syracuse University (SU)

SU has promoted UCPs especially through community service and service learning courses at various departments with strong service tradition.

Established in 1870, SU is located in the center of Syracuse city, a central part of New York State. For several decades, the city’s population has been on the decline, and now almost half (47%) of its residents are classified as “low” or “extremely low” income (UWCNY 2001). In 1991, a new Chancellor Shaw saw lively activities of volunteering and community service, but felt that these activities were oper-
ated separately, “which often resulted in frustration, duplication of effort, and lost opportunities” (Yackel 2001). He states “university has an obligation to give students opportunities to learn how to be active citizens” (ibid.). For this purpose, he initiated the creation of the Center for Public and Community Service (CPCS) in 1994.

CPCS facilitates many service learning courses. It aims to “increase the awareness of members of the SU community that public and community service is an integral part of the educational process and a direct reflection” of the University mission to “foster a life-long personal commitment to active public service and civic responsibility” and to “develop student leadership by learning gained through service” (Syracuse University, Center for Public and Community Service (CPCS) website).

CPCS places more than 4,000 student volunteers a year in community, coordinates 1,800 student placements for 40 classes, and monitors a database of more than 400 community organizations in need of volunteers (Yackel 2001). Leadership interns get funding from various corporations in Syracuse such as Career Corporation and Chase Bank.

CPCS Director Pamela Heintz stated, “learning from service is not automatic — it must be accompanied by careful training, monitoring, thoughtful reflection, and continuous evaluation” (ibid.). Students who volunteer as Literacy Corps tutors meet every week for training and reflection on their tutoring experiences at CPCS.

The main characteristic of CPCS is its openness to all in the community and availability to any organization and recognition and awards to students for their community service in order to encourage them to “become active community participants and leaders by serving the needs of others” (CPCS website).

Community Design Center (CDC) Workshop is a major example of partnership that CPCS initiated with School of Architecture and the community since 1997. This interdisciplinary, collaborative workshop course was created to involve students from various academic disciplines in designing and planning a physical environment in the Syracuse community through involving local residents, nonprofit organizations and community leaders.

In addition to facilitating service learning courses, CPCS offers the Service Learning Pedagogy Project, which integrates and stimulates teaching and learning innovations grounded in a service learning philosophy in a formal way across the curriculum.

Besides service learning courses facilitated through CPCS, individual faculty also adopt service learning components in their courses. For example, Carol Dwyer at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs include service learning or case-based components with a strong belief that “real learning is by doing.”

Both Heintz and Dwyer regard the university as being a tremendous pool of resources to the community. Heintz perceives the major resources of university as people, student and staff. UCPs give an opportunity for faculty and students, and with broader diversity, they appreciate and respect each other. UCPs can give faculty an opportunity to be more grounded in the real world, deep knowledge base, and make connections. Students can connect to community, and learn how to be good citizens. Local nonprofit organizations can get extra help. UCPs bring them energy from students and faculty.

**Lessons Learned** Above all, SU’s example tells us the importance of top leadership commitment. It was the new Chancellor, who realized the needs for coordinating various activities and initiated to create CPCS with strong commitment.

Ongoing communication and relationship building are also critical for a successful partnership. Both Dwyer and Heintz have tried to communicate with various community agencies and leaders, and build relationship with them. Openness to all the fields in community is also a crucial lesson.

Not only promoting and facilitating service learning courses, but CPCS also guides and teaches how to teach the service learning courses through the Service Learning Pedagogy project.

Moreover, interdepartmental coordination through CPCS widens the opportunities for students from various academic disciplines. The interdisciplinary CDC course is very open and gathers experts from various academic disciplines, which adds various perspectives on the design and development of the community.

### 4.2. Japanese Example: The Consortium of Universities in Kyoto (CUK)

Established in 1998 as an incorporated nonprofit foundation, CUK is a most leading example of university collaboration with community in Japan. CUK’s activities range from...
from credit transferring to internship programs. Current 55 member organizations of CUK include all the 51 universities in Kyoto Prefecture, one local government (Kyoto City) and four economic organizations (e.g., Kyoto Chamber of Commerce) (Yamaguchi 2001, CUK website).

Kyoto, a Japanese old capital, has historically developed as a major college town. With the population of 1.4 million, 38 universities reside within the Kyoto city. Moreover, about 10% of the city’s population are students, faculty and staff of universities (Yamaguchi 2001). Universities in Kyoto have long fostered a good relationship with the local communities and their industries, and with other universities (CUK website). However, in the early 1990s, Kyoto city felt a severe sense of crisis through drain of universities from Kyoto (College Management 2000), and promulgated “College Town: Kyoto 21 Plan” in 1993 to strengthen collaboration among universities and between universities and communities, and to improve the environment for education (Kawamura 2000). It clarified the concept of “University Consortium” to pursue these aims and led to the creation of CUK (Sendai Urban Research Forum 1998).

CUK regards it necessary to strengthen the relationship among universities and local communities and industries, as well as connections among universities “in order to meet social expectations for university education and the various needs of the students” (CUK website). The major characteristic of CUK is that all the universities in Kyoto and Kyoto City provide both financial and human resources (Yamaguchi 2001).

CUK’s internship programs cover public, private and nonprofit sectors and start-up businesses. Among them, the nonprofit course at the internship programs,12 started in 1998, is the first internship program in Japan to focus on the nonprofit sector. CUK has introduced the internship as an educational program with the concept of “co-op” education, and it has designed, developed and managed the program with the local community organizations (Nakamura 1999). Now it has evolved into the four main programs on nonprofits: the nonprofit course13,14 is one of the internship programs at CUK, and the other courses are public, private and start-up business. The nonprofit course is also classified as one of the programs of the NPO School at CUK.

Yamaguchi (2001) states the three purposes of the NPO School as: to foster abilities to discover problems; to learn about the nonprofit activities historically, socially and culturally; and to improve the social maturity.

The programs of the NPO School have the following effects. For students, they promote their own life design with a concrete career, contact one another after the internship, and talk about their hope to establish a nonprofit organization with their colleagues (Yamaguchi 2001). Nonprofit organizations are overall positive about accepting the interns: About 80% of the replying organizations responded that they would like to accept students for the following year (ibid.). More broadly, the CUK model has started to spread in other parts of Japan such as Osaka (CUK website). On the other hand, the outcomes for community organizations in their perspectives are mostly short-term such as “fill human resource needs in the short-term” (Yamaguchi 2001).

As a major challenge of the NPO School, Yamaguchi feels the limit of a lecture format. In the future, he would like to make the programs that students can participate whenever they want to participate.15 The different level of the commitment of universities in Kyoto is also a challenge. For example, the NPO School 2000 Final Report lists the reports of 15 participating students (CUK 2001), however, these are students only from five major universities.

Lessons Learned CUK example tells us the significant role of a third party intermediary. CUK has been acting as a strong coordinator and catalyst to promote UCPs. The most critical element of its success is found to be the enthusiastic commitment and involvement of all the sectors in community. Moreover, through concentrating and outsourcing the human and financial resources to CUK, universities in Kyoto have been able to manage their own institutions efficiently and effectively: It saves time, cost and energy to coordinate and offer trainings such as pre-study and post-study at the internship programs including business manner classes. Moreover, the continuous reflection, improvement and development of the programs reflecting on the feedback from students and community organizations, and the flexibility and speed of the innovation are worth learning.

Besides, Yamaguchi’s perspectives on the elements for successful UCPs necessary for each stakeholder are to the point: “Universities need to listen to the community, listening especially to the future seeds, not the needs. On the other hand, the nonprofit organizations need to speak up and communicate not what they should or what they want, but what

---

12 The nonprofit course is one of the internship programs at CUK, and the other courses are public, private and start-up business. The nonprofit course is also classified as one of the programs of the NPO School at CUK.

13 The NPO School at CUK provides systematic human resource development programs, which currently consist of the following: (1) volunteer study program, (2) nonprofit course at the internship programs, (3) NPO strategy study program, and (4) community business and service seminar.

14, 15, 16, 17 Personal interview with Hironori Yamaguchi on July 11, 2002 at the CUK, Kyoto, Japan.
they can do. Students should go out to the society and become citizens.”

Although it may be too early to assess the outcomes of this young organization, the concept of consortium of universities is spreading to various parts of Japan. Other areas may also refer to the curriculum of CUK, but just adopting the style would not work. Therefore, every community should develop their own style of consortium reflecting on their regional characteristics and culture.

5. Lessons and Implications

What can we learn from these examples? All the examples are highly regarded in their respective countries. Each takes a different approach, but each has achieved quite surprising impact on students, faculty and staff, university, community organizations and community as a whole.

Overall, the U.S. examples can be applied to Japan and vice versa. Of course it does not mean that direct export of the Penn or SU model to Japan would work. Namely, Japan can apply these models with the consideration of the social and cultural contexts of Japan. As described, social contexts such as racial demographics and population of Japan are very different from those in the U.S. CUK does not have to deal with race and poverty compared to the U.S. Still, Japan also faces increasingly diverse culture and needs, and declining birthrates, and thus, it can learn from the U.S. examples. Likewise, the U.S. universities can also learn from CUK’s accelerating achievements with a fresh perspective.

5.1. Lessons for Japan

Above all, commitment of one individual university and leadership can make a great difference to university and community. For universities, achievements of Penn and SU are quite amazing. Through the Penn case, we learned that the commitment of Penn has made a difference in their efforts to tackle the problems in community and the coordination has positively impacted the students, community organizations and university’s various organizations. Moreover, the Penn example tells us that a comprehensive approach brings about a boomerang effect on university and community, and the larger society; the model has been spreading not only to their surrounding communities, but also nationally and internationally. Both Penn and SU showed that leadership is essential, and communication among the parties is critical.

Japanese universities also need to build capacity and culture to promote and develop UCPs at an individual university level, too. CUK can become a bridge between university and community. However, the efforts will not be fully sustainable and successful without leadership and institutional commitment of each university. CUK has achieved its aim of a ripple effect of spreading the internship system across the Kyoto area through the participation of all the universities in Kyoto. However, it is not clear whether individual universities are making an institutional commitment, and whether all the faculty and staff are conscious of their link to community and involvement.

Also, the NPO School does not accept all the students who are interested and apply for the School. Is the NPO internship program aimed for elite human resource development? If it aims to foster human resource who will be socially engaged and be active citizens for a long time, it will need to offer a mass civic education; not just toward selected elites, but also toward all those who are interested.

Currently, the CUK does not have a capacity to achieve this, and no one organization can afford to offer the NPO School or other internship programs to a large number of students. Thus, it is vital for each university to realize that each of them will need to commit itself to the partnership. It must be true that some of the internship system can surely outsource to an intermediary organization, and an intermediary organization has a significant role of coordination and efficient and effective administration. However, universities cannot fully depend on an intermediary organization. It is significant that faculty and staff of member universities manage the CUK and its funding also comes from member universities. Still, it is not enough because UCPs will be sustained only with both individual and institutional commitment. Also, mutual trust between university and community will be fostered only through their direct interaction. If Japan aims to promote a real committed UCP, the participation and commitment of individual universities play a crucial role. For example, Japanese universities cannot outsource the ABCS. Instead, they should adopt service learning, specifically a type of ABCS and integrate it into curriculum.

Moreover, the challenges that the Japanese education system face include the continuity of education from K-12 to higher education. In order to address this problem, Penn’s model with the focus on community school such as WEPIC can be an excellent model to be applied to Japan. The collaboration between university and high school, junior high school and elementary school through the interaction with college students, faculty, teachers, K-12 students and comm-
munity residents would serve as a comprehensive approach to address the issue of continuity of education and separation between community and school.

It seems that the community organizations in Kyoto realize only the short-term outcomes of UCPs such as receiving service at hand, and sometimes they feel the burdens of accepting the interns. However, the Penn case tells us that the keys to these partnerships are mutual benefit and mutual learning, ensuring that community residents also benefit. So, “avenues for community voices to shape and initiate partnership activities should be actively encouraged” (Maurrasse 2001).

5.2. Lessons for the U.S.

Although CUK is relatively a new organization to promote UCPs compared to the U.S. examples, the U.S. universities can also learn from the CUK. First, the U.S. universities can learn that a third party intermediary can play a critical role for efficient and effective coordination and promotion of UCPs. SU has communicated with other universities in Syracuse through Campus Compact. However, if a third party intermediary like CUK existed in Syracuse, the collaboration among the several universities in Syracuse will enhance, and they can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of each program. Penn has already realized, and started to develop a community-wide consortium. It can be pivotal for universities to collaborate among themselves, exchange information and learn from each other, and develop a community-wide vision and strategy for UCPs, meeting the needs of their distinctive community. Thus, community as a whole and community organizations as a direct partner will benefit to a great deal from the concerted and coordinated effort of multiple universities in the community. Through a co-op type internship, students can learn and receive training necessary for working at a community organization. Toward the weakness of students from the perspectives of community organizations that students are unprepared and require much training, an intermediary organization can systematically offer the appropriate trainings for students to prepare for their service.

Matching process that CUK emphasizes and spends a lot of time and efforts can also be applied to the U.S. universities. This communication between the university and community organizations will foster mutual trust and understanding.

5.3. Implications

Universities have pivotal social roles to affect civic life and social capital. Also, community-based nonprofit organizations and community as a whole as well as universities can benefit greatly through the partnership. Through the development of UCPs, both universities and communities can achieve mutual benefits, and become change agents for the community and society, regaining the civic engagement of young people and increasing social capital. Although effective partnership requires tremendous time, commitment, careful preparation and evaluation, a UCP is a call for today’s complex and diverse society both in the U.S. and Japan.

Moreover, it is more often universities that initiate partnership and therefore have more power and voice. In order for effective UCPs, we need to explore effective means for community organizations to speak up and initiate partnerships with universities.

6. Conclusion

In summary, an integrated and comprehensive approach of UCPs for Japan and the U.S. is proposed. Both countries can adopt a balanced approach with the components of (1) institutional commitment such as service learning with curriculum integration and faculty involvement, and (2) efficient and effective use of an intermediary for coordination, training, and diffusing UCPs. Through the development of UCPs, both universities and communities can achieve mutual benefit, and become change agents for the community and society, helping regain the civic engagement of young people and increasing the social capital. Through learning the lessons from the examples, I hope it will lead to mutual gain for both universities and the surrounding communities.

Through an effective UCP, universities will become more significant members of their communities, students will be more active citizens, faculties’ research will contribute more to the real life, the capacity of nonprofit organizations will increase, and community will enjoy increased social capital.
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