

**To Enrich and To Serve:  
Defining and Supporting Public Service  
at the University of Massachusetts Lowell**

Sarah Kuhn

Department of Regional Economic and Social Development  
University of Massachusetts Lowell

*\*Draft\* April 12, 2005*

**Preface**

This paper is a work in progress. It is an attempt to advance a conversation within the university, and between the university and its publics, about the university's mission of public service. Rather than aiming to settle questions about this essential and contested subject, it aims to map some of the terrain on which the discussion might continue, and to point to resources and to action items that I think are worth pursuing. This paper is, thus, an invitation to a conversation; just by having this conversation, if we have it in a reflective and inclusive way, we will strengthen our sense of mission and our ties to and relevance for the community.

**DEFINING PUBLIC SERVICE**

Public service is defined either implicitly or explicitly in the mission statements, statements of priorities, and other documents quoted below. The definitions are heterogeneous, and noted for what they do not say as well as for what they do say. It is useful to review them and to examine the assumptions that they make and the way in which they frame the issue of public service.

The **mission statement of the University of Massachusetts Lowell** begins:

The University of Massachusetts Lowell provides educational and research programs designed to support and enhance the development of a sustainable vigorous industrial sector. As the system's most technologically oriented campus,

Lowell focuses on an integrated strategy in which the academic disciplines of engineering/management/science, education, and health are applied to the pursuit of a robust, self-renewing industrial economic sector. Its mission reflects the university's mission in the following ways...

The mission statement then goes on to list Access, Excellence, Innovation, Economic Development, Public Service, and Quality of Life as subsections, with brief descriptions of each. The section on Public Service reads:

Providing public service by assisting in the improvement of public school systems through a demonstration school and a center for educational field studies and services, by offering multiple language skill development for diverse populations, by contributing to the life-long learning of citizens in the region, and by engaging in research related to the ergonomics and the environment of the workplace.

**The Statement of System Priorities adopted by the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees on June 2, 1993** states:

The modern university is defined by a broad array of teaching, research, and service activities. These encompass undergraduate and graduate education, basic and applied scholarship and research, cultural and artistic expression, and extensive interactions with the community (business and industry, government, and other educational sectors).

Excellence in research is the central and defining feature of the University, and basic research plays an essential role as the ultimate source of new knowledge. As the University of Massachusetts' 1992 Vision Statement asserts, 'The special character of the University stems from that aspect of its mission that focuses on the creation of new knowledge. This research component is not only critical to providing the highest level of support to Massachusetts business and industry, but it also contributes significantly to the high quality of undergraduate education on its campuses.

However, excellence in research alone is not sufficient to fulfill the mission and goals of the twenty-first century university... To receive continued public support, universities must reaffirm the land-grant tradition of meeting public needs and expectations. Today, four challenges are particularly clear, and it is these challenges that define our system-wide priorities:

The Statement lists and discusses the four---Reaffirming teaching and learning; Embracing diversity and pluralism; Promoting economic development; and Advancing the distinctive goals of each campus.

**The University of Massachusetts Intellectual Property Policy** begins:

The prompt and open dissemination of the results of research and creative work among scholars and, eventually, to the public at large is essential to the University's mission of education and research. The commercial development and distribution of the results of research and creative work to benefit the inventor or creator and the economy is part of the University's mission of public service.

The information circulated at Lowell about the **Public Service Endowment Grant [PSEG] program offered by the President's office of the University of**

**Massachusetts** system reads in part:

The PSEG is intended to enhance the public service mission of the University. It is intended to serve as an internal university source of funds to deliver public services through special projects. For the purposes of this program, public service will be defined as "having to do with the outreach of the university to society at large, while extending the resources of the campus to individuals and groups who are not part of the academic community and while bringing an academic institution's special competence to bear on the solution of society's problems. It can take place on or off campus and can be related to either the governmental or private sectors of our national life. The emphasis on public service is in converting knowledge into readily usable forms for immediate applications."

The **College of Public and Community Service at the University of Massachusetts Boston:**

...focuses on the need to improve public and community services in the metropolitan area. One of the primary objectives of the College is to recruit students who are members of communities that have traditionally experienced limited access to higher education and inadequate services, and to enable these individuals to become both service providers and active participants in the development of their communities.

The College lists goals for the individual, for urban communities, for public and community service delivery systems, and for higher education (CPCS, 1997).

All of these documents either explicitly or implicitly define public service and its place in the value system of the university. Four things are particularly striking about the place of public service as defined by these texts:

- **The statements are pervaded by the distinction between teaching, research, and service.** In recent decades teaching, research, and service have become the three legged stool on which the university stands. That these are the three functions of the

university, and that they are separable, has become axiomatic. We have seen how this separation is advanced and reinforced in these statements of purpose. The distinction is also fundamental to the reward structure of the university, as reflected in the promotion and tenure process.

- **“Service,” in cases where it is distinguished from teaching and research, is narrowly defined and of lesser importance.** In the University of Massachusetts Lowell mission statement, public service activities are specified, and they all involve teaching or occupational health activities. These are critically important, but still constitute a relatively narrow view of what can be considered public service. In some other statements, service is not even mentioned, but teaching and research are.
- **Public service, using a much broader definition, can be construed to be an overarching goal, but is achieved mostly through indirect means.** Both research and teaching have obvious and powerful potential to benefit the public, and the conventional notion is that universities serve the public by creating an educated citizenry and by “discovering new knowledge,” which ultimately makes its way into the public domain. The Intellectual Property Policy, for example, explicitly links commercial development and distribution of university discoveries and creations to the mission of public service. That research and teaching generally benefit the public is true, but it is also an indirect or “trickle down” notion of what it is for a university to serve the public. The Statement of System Priorities acknowledges this when it says that “[t]o receive continued public support, universities must reaffirm the land-grant tradition of meeting public needs and expectations.”
- **Most of the statements, when they define the public or the community, mention business and government, but not other constituencies.** One important task, if one is to define public service, is to say who the public is. Too often “the public” is an undifferentiated mass or ideal type. In setting real priorities and making real decisions, it is important to be more specific, especially because things that benefit one constituency may not benefit—or may even harm—another. It is notable that the University of Massachusetts Lowell mission statement focuses on the “industrial sector” or the “economic sector” only, while the Statement of System Priorities defines “community” as “business and industry, government, and other educational

sectors.” There is no mention of the nonprofit sector (the most rapidly growing sector in the economy, and important to community economic development). Also unmentioned are labor organizations, and informal community organizations such as immigrant groups. The College of Public and Community Service’s statement is an exception, because it mentions community services and service providers.

### **Federal Legislation Shapes the Debate**

Universities as we know them today have been shaped by a variety of historical forces. A detailed history is not within the scope of this paper, but three pieces of federal legislation deserve mention—the two Land Grant Acts, which help to frame the mission of many universities, and the G I Bill, which greatly expanded access to higher education and thereby changed the character of the university.

The **Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862** made provision for “donating public lands to the several states and territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.” States receiving public land must commit themselves to the “endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts...in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes on the several pursuits and professions in life.” The act also provided for annual reporting of the “progress of each college...including State industrial and economical statistics.” The fact that the purpose of the Act was to promote economic development by educating the working class and by focusing on the application as well as the creation of knowledge, was underscored by the writing and speeches of Jonathan Baldwin Turner, who advocated for two decades the creation of such schools. Turner is credited with developing the concept that was successfully championed by Justin Morrill of Vermont (Herren, 1996). The **University of Massachusetts at Amherst** was established the following year, under the Act.

The **Morrill Land Grant Act of 1890** provided additional funding for Land Grant colleges, stipulating that the money “be applied only to instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts, the English language and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural and economic science, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life...” Interestingly, this post Civil War act forbade funding for any school “where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students,” although it did permit the establishment of separate colleges for “white and colored students” if the funds were “equitably divided.”

The “**G I Bill of Rights**” was passed in 1944, shortly after the D-Day invasion of Normandy during the Second World War. The Bill “helped forge an economic renewal and reaffirmed the right of every American to receive an education,” in the words of Richard Riley, US Secretary of Education (Riley, 1994). Eight million veterans benefited from the provisions of the Bill. The years after the passage of the G I Bill saw a dramatic increase in the number of people seeking higher education, thanks in large part to the Bill.

The *Statement of System Priorities adopted by the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees* refers to the “Land Grant tradition,” and schools such as UMass Amherst often tout their land grant origins in their mission statements and their public relations documents. A reading of the legislation emphasizes the extent to which it was focused on educating the industrial classes and thereby promoting economic development. These universities were seen to serve simultaneously the twofold mission of providing opportunity for individual advancement and of supporting agriculture and industry by providing an educated workforce.

## **A Typology of Public Service**

The university can serve the community and the public in various ways. It is helpful to distinguish between different forms of public and community service, because they draw on differing capabilities, differing personnel, and have differing consequences for the university and for the community.

“Service” is one of the three categories of activity used to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure, but it is the least discussed, the least evaluated, and the least understood. It is often treated as an afterthought, even as a dispensable category. Faculty with much research and little service are tenured with some frequency at US universities, and faculty with extremely strong teaching records can sometimes be tenured and promoted on the basis of teaching, but to tenure or promote primarily on the basis of service would be a rare event. There are many reasons for this, but one is that we do not know how to talk clearly about what service is, what forms it takes, and how to evaluate it.

In *Making the Case for Professional Service*, Ernest Lynton helps us to define service by distinguishing **professional service** from other forms of service performed by university faculty and staff. Lynton defines faculty professional service as “**work based on the faculty member’s professional expertise that contributes to the mission of the university.**” (1995, 17). Other forms of service, which also create benefit but are not scholarly activity in the way that professional service is, are: **institutional citizenship** (committee work, student advising, performing administrative functions, for example); **disciplinary citizenship** (working on disciplinary and professional association activities, for example); and **civic contributions** (such as volunteer work for philanthropic and nonprofit organizations, jury duty, coaching community athletic teams).

The distinction between professional service, institutional citizenship, disciplinary citizenship, and civic contributions helps us to differentiate on the one hand praiseworthy civic undertakings, and on the other hand scholarly service activities that are clearly tied to the university’s mission. All four types of service could be the basis for evaluation

under the university's reward system, but only *professional* service can be considered a scholarly activity.

### **Why should the university engage in public service?**

One answer to this question is that **the university should engage in public service because it advances the scholarly function of the university**. As Derek Bok said in *Beyond the Ivory Tower*, "Efforts to understand economic and social development require a constant interaction between experience in the field and attempts to construct useful concepts and theories." (1982; quoted in Lynton, 1995)

The work of Donald Schön calls our attention to the limits of "technical rationality," and argues that, in professional education (and by extension in all education for practice), much learning takes place through the process of "reflection-in-action" that characterizes both professional practice and professional learning. In this view, as in Bok's, interaction with the rich, varied, and often unpredictable context in which practitioners must make judgments, is an important ingredient of learning. Community interaction (through public service) thus not only teaches, but also generates new knowledge, because it affords an opportunity to see old concepts in new ways, or to discover new problems, new connections, and new solutions. This directly contradicts both the view that public service is a "trickle down" from research and teaching, and the notion that universities "discover new knowledge" and then later transmit this knowledge out to a waiting public. It is a much more integrated, situated, and interactive notion of the learning and teaching process, and one in which teaching, research, and service can be embodied in a single activity.

Lynton reinforces the view of service as potentially integral to the university's scholarly function:

Professional service should and can be an important element in the definition of faculty roles and rewards—but not only because of its societal and institutional benefits. It can also constitute a scholarship of the highest order, equivalent in intellectual challenge, creativity, and importance to scholarly research and scholarly teaching...Professional service has in recent decades been slighted, in

part...because it has generally been lumped together—and confused—with activities of institutional, disciplinary, and other citizenship...Other critics slight the value of professional service even if it is solidly grounded in scholarly expertise because they make a distinction between the *discovery* of knowledge and its *application*—a distinction that is, in fact, false. (Lynton, 1995, 21; emphasis in original)

**Another answer to the question of why the university should engage in public service is that the university has a legal and moral obligation to serve the public.** As we have seen, Land Grant institutions were created for a specific purpose that had public service, at least in one form, at its center. The origins of the Land Grant institutions suggest a public purpose, and although this has been modified over the years, it is at least given lip service—and often much more—by many universities.

Furthermore, many universities derive a significant portion of their funding from public sources. In 1996, 25 percent of University of Massachusetts revenues derived from state appropriations. Nineteen percent came from tuition and fees, and another 12 percent from government grants and contracts (see Appendix C.) With these public funds come an obligation to public service, perhaps an obligation that extends even beyond providing an affordable education for the citizens of the Commonwealth. How far this obligation goes, and what form it can or should take, is a matter for discussion.

### **Proprietary or Classified Research and Public Service**

There is an uncomfortable tension between the open and free exchange of information which are said to be the foundation of the university, and the requirements for secrecy imposed by proprietary or classified research. Defenders of proprietary and classified research argue that many secret projects can also serve the public interest—by providing defense, in the case of military research which is classified, and by creating new, potentially useful products and systems, in the case of proprietary research. Furthermore, some of the research dollars which come to the university, and which may indirectly support other university activities, would not be spent here if faculty were unable to participate in proprietary research.

A related issue is raised by nondisclosure agreements. Often projects that involve cooperation with industry require that faculty sign such agreements, because the company insists on this. Some faculty, for example Anthony Oettinger at Harvard's Program on Information Resources Policy, refuse to sign nondisclosure agreements but, because of their stature or their reputation for ethical behavior, continue to win funding from industry. Nondisclosure agreements are normally required of researchers in the occupational health field, and a recent incident at a Brown University-affiliated hospital reveals the tensions which these agreements can cause. The Boston Globe reported that Dr. David Kern, director of the only occupational health clinic in Rhode Island, had his contract terminated by Memorial Hospital after he insisted on presenting to scientific colleagues evidence of a previously unreported lung disease. Kern's presentation in May to the American Thoracic Society meetings in San Francisco followed urgings by both hospital administrators and an associate dean at Brown that Kern cancel his scheduled presentation of his findings on a new occupational lung disease among workers at Microfibres, Inc., a Pawtucket textile manufacturer. "Microfibres officials said the presentation of Kern's findings violated a document he signed in 1994 agreeing not to disclose the firm's trade secrets." (Knox, 1997) Kern's dismissal came in the wake of a complaint Kern had filed with the US Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) against the company, the hospital, and the university. After Kern's presentation, the board of the Thoracic Society voted unanimously to support Kern, saying "Barriers to the open communication of scientific information must be resisted... In particular, the threat of litigation and/or elimination of financial support to prevent the open communication of scientific information is abhorrent." (Knox, 1997)

### **Criteria for selecting public service activities**

If the university succeeds at building relationships with community groups and its various publics, there will likely be more demand for service and partnerships than can be met with current university resources. This is especially true for any undertakings that require more than routine planning, and which involve commitment of significant time on the part of multiple faculty and students. Furthermore, it is important to have criteria for

selecting projects—criteria that have the support of the university community—so that inappropriate projects can be screened out. Criteria are also important because as public and professional service become more central to the nature and the reward structure of the university, it will be important to have agreed upon criteria as an aid in evaluating faculty and student community service.

Here are some possible criteria for selecting projects. Some items on the list are mutually exclusive, and deliberately so—the list is proposed as a basis for discussion only.

Through this process of discussion and debate, consensus criteria may emerge.

- The project has a close fit with the mission(s) of the university
- The project best uses the capabilities of the university
- The project will help bring the greatest positive visibility to the university
- The project is for a not-for-profit organization
- The project is for a client who can pay for the services provided
- The project is for a client least able to pay for services on the open market, and therefore most in need of help
- The project produces “public goods” which cannot be monopolized for private gain
- The project benefits the geographic area immediately surrounding the university
- The project has great potential for national and/or international impact
- The project offers the best learning opportunity for our students

Criteria should result from an open process of discussion involving university faculty, administrators, staff, and students. Most important, it should result from a discussion that also involves the community we serve—they should help to form the policy, as well as participate in the projects that result from that policy.

## SUPPORTING PUBLIC SERVICE

University of Massachusetts Lowell has an opportunity to reaffirm its commitment to public service, and to place service at the center of its mission. This can be done without jeopardizing scholarship—indeed, done well, it will enhance the scholarly function which is at the heart of what it is to be a university. A number of proposals, designed to promote public service at University of Massachusetts Lowell, are presented below.

These proposals focus on enhancing *professional service* at the university. They do not speak to the question of whether or how we might want to promote institutional citizenship, disciplinary citizenship, and civic contribution—the three other types of service about which Lynton writes. A discussion of professional service at the university should also consider these other forms of service and their place in our value system, but these other forms are presently better understood and more commonly recognized than is faculty professional service, and are therefore omitted from this discussion.

### **Defining and Assessing Public Service**

**Proposal: Make public service central to the university’s mission.** The mission statement of the university should have public service at its center. We have an opportunity to define what we do in a way that showcases our public service activities. By placing a growing emphasis on professional service, we can better demonstrate how scholarly activity by university personnel contributes to the public good. Revising the university’s mission statement to focus on how our scholarship serves the public would help us to set our sights on scholarly service as an institutional goal, and would be good publicity for us as well.

**Proposal: Define what we mean by public service and set criteria for selecting projects.** Earlier in this paper we saw that varying definitions of public service are used in documents produced within the UMass system. We should discuss and select the definition of public service that works best for the University of Massachusetts Lowell, and delineate criteria for selecting professional service projects.

**Proposal: Create a public service “report card” by which we will evaluate our efforts annually.** Once we have defined what we mean by public service, we should establish criteria for evaluating our public service efforts. Each year we should report on our progress against the criteria we have established, and publicize our determination to serve the public and our progress in expanding public service activities.

### **The Incentive Structure**

The problems inherent in the division of scholarly activities into teaching, research, and service become more visible when one looks at them through the lens of public service. Many critics have noted the heavy emphasis on research and the relatively low value placed on teaching and service, particularly in promotion and tenure decisions, at US universities. In *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Ernest Boyer (1990) observed that research (which he called the *scholarship of discovery*) was not the only faculty professional activity that could be conducted in a scholarly way. He also called our attention to the *scholarship of teaching*, the *scholarship of integration*, and the *scholarship of application*. Noting that a variety of activities could be conducted in a scholarly way helped greatly to advance the conversation. Boyer’s fourfold classification, however, still served to reinforce the notion that teaching, research, and service were separable categories. It may now be time to relinquish this entrenched trinity in favor of a single category, **Scholarship**, that would be the basis for evaluating all faculty professional activity. A focus on scholarship as the basis for faculty evaluation does *not* represent a lowering of standards. Instead, it recognizes the potential for deep interconnections between teaching, research, and service, and the fact that in many excellent and scholarly professional service activities the three can be inextricable.

Lynton enumerates the attributes of scholarship in *Making the Case for Professional Service*: “It is the **antithesis of rote and routine**...[it has] an element of **discovery and originality**...The scholar **learns from the activity** and has the obligation to **share** this in some appropriate form with colleagues.” (1995, p. 25, emphasis in the original) Lynton also offers us a set of criteria for evaluating scholarship, including professional service:

whether the faculty member is knowledgeable in the area or work, whether the goals and methods are appropriate, whether the work is well communicated and presented, whether there is a process of reflection and assessment, and the impact, originality, and extent of innovation shown in the activity. Clearly, criteria can be tailored to the needs and standards of the particular institution, and one list does not fit all.

In a “final word,” Lynton calls upon us to

...bury the triad of ‘teaching, research, and service...In fact, [these activities] are neither distinct nor different, and whatever definitional boundaries might at one time have had some validity are rapidly fading. With more and more field-based and action research, the line between research and professional service is disappearing; and almost every professional service project has an instructional component. In turn, scholarly teaching has a strong element of discovery—indeed, it is itself a form of action research. (p. 61)

Once we recognize that the important distinction, when evaluating faculty, is whether or not a piece of work is *scholarly*, we can begin to let go of teaching, research, and service as categories and begin instead to talk about the characteristics and quality of the scholarship, and its congruence with the mission of the university.

**Proposal: In evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure, stress scholarship without requiring that activities be categorized as teaching, research, or service.**

Excellence in scholarly activity is the most relevant consideration, because all forms of scholarship have the attributes, enumerated above, which we usually think of as adhering only to research. Documentation of scholarly work that does not fit the form of conventional research can be more challenging, but it is not insurmountable. One step, that would need to be taken in conjunction with other changes, would be to eliminate “teaching, research, and service” as categories on the Personnel Form #6, which is used in the promotion and tenure process. A category of “Scholarly Work,” perhaps with subcategories, could be listed, along with a record of teaching duties, and a record of institutional citizenship, disciplinary citizenship, and perhaps even civic contribution.

**Proposal: Begin a discussion of faculty professional service by inviting Ernest Lynton to campus, and by distributing copies of *Making the Case for Professional***

**Service to faculty.** When we did this with Ernest Boyer, it was effective in starting a campus wide conversation on these issues. Of course much more needs to be done in order to create change, but this could be an effective beginning. If successful, we might consider continuing this effort by allying ourselves with the Program on Faculty Service and Academic Outreach at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (see *Resource Organizations* below).

**Proposal: Charge a campus committee—preferably an existing one—with helping to promote public service in general and professional service in particular.**

### **Faculty Development**

Faculty development is a key ingredient of an effort to promote professional service. Performing, documenting, assessing, and rewarding public service require some change in the culture of the university, and some additions to the skills of many faculty members. The proposals in this section speak to the need for faculty development if we are to expand and strengthen faculty professional service.

**Proposal: Develop faculty capabilities to document and to evaluate professional service activities.** To encourage and reward scholarship in the form of professional service we must learn how to document it and how to evaluate it. We are accustomed to reviewing, and in some cases to evaluating, the written results of research. The movement to document teaching through the use of teaching portfolios is a model of how an aspect of professional activity, usually poorly documented and poorly evaluated, may come to be more thoroughly assessed. In the case of teaching portfolios, the hope is that a reflective effort to document teaching will improve the ability of faculty to evaluate a colleague's teaching, and that this increased ability will make it possible better to reward excellent teaching.

Service portfolios, like teaching portfolios, are a promising way to document professional service. Lynton argues for thorough and reflective documentation of professional

service, and in *Making the Case for Professional Service* offers five examples of professional service projects (one each from history, geology, ethics, chemistry, and education). Complex and situated work like professional service projects are challenging to document, but since most universities generally do this so poorly, there is much latitude for improvement, and progress can be made fairly rapidly and easily at first.

To learn to create and evaluate service portfolios, classes and seminars for faculty are needed. The workshops on teaching offered by the Faculty Teaching Center could be a model format for faculty professional development in documenting and evaluating service.

**Proposal: Establish a resource center for documenting and promoting professional service.** The faculty teaching center already does an outstanding job of this in the area of teaching. A similar effort could be made for professional service. Professional service requires a variety of kinds of support, but providing reading materials and examples of professional service projects from this and other universities would be useful. A “virtual” resource center might be feasible and perhaps would be more effective. Even an annotated bibliography on professional service would be a step in the right direction.

### **Institutional Structures to Support Public Service**

It is important to support an institutional commitment to public service by providing structures or vehicles conducive to service. Examples of such structures already exist; the proposals below are aimed at strengthening these and acknowledging their role.

**Proposal: Conduct a survey of groups already providing professional service at the university.** Perhaps the information gathered for the “Connections” brochure would be adequate for this, or perhaps another source of such information already exists. The purpose of the survey would be to learn what capabilities already exist within the university for conducting professional service activities, with an eye to supporting those capabilities and helping others to acquire them too. There may be some value in forming

an internal “network” or “coalition” of such groups, to enhance communication between them and to share information, resources, and skills.

**Proposal: Create an “interface” to the university to help the public to learn what is available and locate people who might be helpful in solving public problems.** If we are to engage in public service, it should not always be initiated from within the university. Members of the community must be able to approach us, and even a small college can be very daunting to outsiders. We need to become more “user friendly.” The “interface” metaphor, if taken literally, suggests some sort of World Wide Web-based point of access (the existing university Web page might be extended to support exploration by interested citizens). Among other things, the Web pages might include synopses of professional service projects already conducted, to serve as examples of what is possible. However, other forms of access are needed too: paper brochures and publications, perhaps a “referral service” telephone number that people could call, perhaps a sort of metaphorical “map” of university activities, and certainly the building of ongoing relationships with business, community groups, government, and labor, among others.

**Proposal: Affiliate with the Community Research Network.** A network of people, both in and out of universities, has formed to promote research in service to communities. Joining the CRN would give us access to a wealth of good ideas and experience about professional service, and would help to catalyze our thinking about how we would like to serve the public. The charge for membership is nominal. Members communicate through electronic mail and other means. CRN has some printed resource materials already available and is likely to produce more in the future. Information about the CRN is found in Appendix D, and they are listed in *Resource Organizations*, below.

### **Service Learning**

Service learning, in many ways the student equivalent of faculty professional service, is also gaining currency. Service learning is already taking place in many parts of the university. Service learning and professional service can be highly complementary.

**Proposal: Explore the connections between service learning and professional service, and find mechanisms to support the creation of projects that offer both service learning and professional service components.**

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this paper has been to explore the place of public service at the University of Massachusetts Lowell, and to make proposals for promoting public service activities at the university. An examination of the mission, priority, and other statements from around the UMass system revealed that service is often of lower priority than teaching and research, and that public service is sometimes treated as an indirect consequence of teaching and research, rather than being directly pursued.

**Professional service** can be a vehicle for the more direct pursuit of public service by the university. It turns to direct public service the scholarly function which is at the heart of the university. Building on professional service as a base, members of the university community can both advance scholarship and serve the public more directly than the “trickle down” approach traditionally pursued by many US institutions of higher education. By more clearly and explicitly defining public service, and by creating the capability within the University of Massachusetts Lowell to better support scholarly public service, the university can promote scholarship, better advance its mission, and better serve the common wealth. The second half of this paper presents a series of proposals focused on achieving this goal.

### **Resource Organizations**

Program on Faculty Service and Academic Outreach  
New England Resource Center for Higher Education  
University of Massachusetts/Boston  
Graduate College of Education  
Boston, MA 02125-3393  
(617) 287-7740  
nerche@umbsky.cc.umb.edu

Community Research Network  
The Loka Institute  
PO Box 355  
Amherst, MA 01004-0355  
(413) 582-5860  
loka@amherst.edu  
<http://www.amherst.edu/~loka>

## **Bibliography**

Boyer, Ernest. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*.  
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton.

College of Public and Community Service. (1997) Web page found at  
[Http://www.umb.edu/explore\\_academic\\_prog/cpcs/cpcs.html](Http://www.umb.edu/explore_academic_prog/cpcs/cpcs.html). Printed 8/27/97.

Herren, Ray V. and Hillison, John. (1996) "Agricultural Extension and the 1862 Land  
Grant Institutions: The Rest of the Story." *Journal of Agricultural Education*,  
Volume 37, Number 3.

Knox, Richard A. (1997) "Brown Public Health Researcher Fired." *Boston Globe*, July  
6.

Lynton, Ernest. (1995) *Making the Case for Professional Service*. American  
Association for Higher Education, Washington DC.

Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. July 2, 1862, ch. 130, 12 Stat.503, 7 U.S.C.301 et seq.

Morrill Land Grant Act of 1890. August 30, 1890, ch. 841, 26 Stat.417, 7 U.S.C. 322 et  
seq.

Public Service Endowment Grant Instructions and Application. University of Massachusetts Lowell. Circulated July 1, 1997 with a cover memo from the office of Frederick P. Sperounis, Vice Chancellor.

Riley, Richard W. (1994) "Statement by US Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley regarding the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the signing of the G I Bill." Press Release, U S Department of Education, June 22.

Schön, Donald A. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees. (1997) "Statement of System Priorities adopted by the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees on June 2, 1993." [Http://www.umassp.edu/homepage/general/sysprior.html](http://www.umassp.edu/homepage/general/sysprior.html). Printed 8/27/97.

## Appendix A. University Mission Statements

## Appendix B. Relevant Legislation

## Appendix C. Revenue and Expenditure Graphs

Appendix D.  
The Community Research Network