

REGIONAL UNIVERSITIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT

Russian-American Experiences AND Lessons Learned in Higher Education

A SYMPOSIUM AND STUDY TOUR

A Collaborative Initiative of

New Eurasia Foundation, Moscow
Institute for Higher Education Policy, Washington, D.C.



The Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP) is an independent, nonprofit organization that is dedicated to access and success in postsecondary education around the world. Established in 1993, the Washington, D.C.-based organization uses unique research and innovative programs to inform key decision makers who shape public policy and support economic and social development. The IHEP's Web site, www.ihep.org, features an expansive collection of higher education information available free of charge and provides access to some of the most respected professionals in the fields of public policy and research.

Institute for Higher Education Policy

1320 19th Street, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036

Phone: (202) 861-8223 • Facsimile: (202) 861-9307 • Internet: www.ihep.org

REGIONAL UNIVERSITIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT

Russian-American Experiences AND Lessons Learned in Higher Education

A SYMPOSIUM AND STUDY TOUR

APRIL 2007

A Collaborative Initiative of

New Eurasia Foundation, Moscow
Institute for Higher Education Policy, Washington, D.C.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the many individuals who contributed to the Regional Universities and Civil Society Development Program. Publication of this report was made possible by the Eurasia Foundation in Washington, D.C., which also supported much of the program activities and travel for the U.S. participants. The New Eurasia Foundation in Moscow provided support for international travel and program coordination, and developed the overall project objectives in collaboration with the Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP). The IHEP staff would like to thank our colleagues at both organizations for making this project possible.

At IHEP, the primary program organizers and authors for this report were Jenna Cullinane, programs coordinator, and Ryan Hahn, research analyst. Jamie P. Merisotis, president; Alisa F. Cunningham, managing director of research and evaluation; Arnold M. Kee, managing director of programs; and Tia T. Gordon, managing director of communications and marketing, were integral in planning and facilitating symposium and study tour activities, and editing and reviewing this report.

We also thank George Mason University and Morgan State University for hosting study tours on their campus. The hospitality and wealth of expertise at these two institutions contributed significantly to the success of the program.

To all of the Russian and American participants, we are grateful for the generosity with which you shared your time and knowledge. We hope that such collaboration will continue to improve access and success in postsecondary education on both continents.

The views expressed in the report are those of IHEP and do not necessarily represent those of the Eurasia Foundation and the United States Agency for International Development.

Preface

The classic definition of what higher education institutions do is often summarized in three concepts: teaching, research, and public service. In American higher education, the intersection of these three key functions has been a growing area of interest in recent years, with the rise of service learning and an increasing emphasis on the civic roles of colleges and universities. In Russian higher education, more emphasis has traditionally been placed on the research and teaching role of universities and less on the public service role or the connections between teaching and service. However, significant changes are occurring with regard to the structure, governance, and funding of Russian higher education. It is becoming increasingly clear that higher education will need to play a critical role in the development and evolution of civil society institutions and the education of graduates who are more attuned to the nation's social and civic development.

Regional universities are especially important in this regard. While many of Russia's national universities continue to focus on their role as cutting-edge research institutions, regional universities are seeing opportunities to carve out a role for themselves as drivers of the nation's development of civil society institutions, from youth-based organizations to environmental groups to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) focused on innovation and change in the business sector. Regional universities are seeking to establish a new role for themselves as academic institutions that not only educate students but also enhance the opportunities their students will have in a local or regional context after graduation.

In this new role, regional universities hope to achieve several key goals, including the following:

- Enhancing the responsiveness of academic programs to the demands of the regional job market.
- Strengthening the financial interdependence of the regional universities and local communities.
- Developing an increased understanding among students of civic responsibilities and encouraging social awareness.
- Connecting existing youth-based groups to socially meaningful projects and goals.

Given this emerging role, Russian regional universities are in an advantageous position to examine the successful practices of other nations where similar issues are being addressed. With its large and diverse system of higher education, the United States provides many examples of university engagement with local communities. The Regional Universities and Civil Society Program—a collaborative project initiated by the New Eurasia Foundation and facilitated by the Institute for Higher Education Policy—linked regional universities in Russia with counterparts in the United States. The goal was to create an increased understanding of civil society development for Russian regional universities while affording American participants an opportunity to learn more about how Russia approaches these issues.

This report chronicles the motivations for the Regional Universities and Civil Society Symposium and Study Tour, its programmatic events, and areas identified for further investigation. A brief introduction to civil society is followed by a summary of the symposium and study tour sessions, an analysis of the project outcomes and lessons learned, and recommended next steps.

Table of Contents

Section I: The Meaning of Civil Society	1
Section II: Symposium and Study Tour Summary	3
Section III: Public and Private Roles of Universities	11
Section IV: Recommended Next Steps	17
Appendix: Symposium and Study Tour Participants	19

Section I: The Meaning of Civil Society

Over the past 15 years, Russian regional universities have faced the dual challenges of adapting to market forces while establishing relationships with their local communities and nascent civil societies. In adapting to these new circumstances, Russian universities have had to renegotiate the meaning of “private” and “public.” Russian civil society organizations, with a foot in both the public and private realms, are playing an increasing role in negotiating public and private interests and the goals of postsecondary education.

Wojciech Sokolowski of the Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies provided a useful definition of civil society when he spoke on the first day of the symposium. He identified civil society as all organizations that are private, non-profit-distributing, self-governing, and voluntary. Two features of his definition stand out: (1) legal recognition by the state is not a criterion, and (2) civil society organizations do not distribute profits. These two features highlight the intermediate nature of civil society—it is a private actor that nevertheless pursues public purposes. It is this intermediate nature that helps civil society organizations mediate the differences that may arise between the public and the private.

The Rediscovery of Civil Society

While civil society is certainly not a new phenomenon, it experienced a minor renaissance in the latter part of the 20th century. Two separate but converging phenomena contributed substantially to this renaissance. As Sokolowski pointed out, neoliberal economic programs (often referred to as Reaganomics or Thatcherism) identified civil society as a remedy for social ills that governments had been unable to address. It was hoped that civil society could substitute for and do a better job than governments in promoting public welfare. At about the same time, Eastern European dissidents such as Vaclav Havel and Lech Walesa “rediscovered” civil society and promoted it as an alternative to the all-encompassing communist state.¹ The two phenomena converged in the push to end the rule of communist governments in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The stunning collapse of communism appeared to vindicate the high hopes for civil society. However, civil society has not miraculously filled the void in former communist countries like Russia, and in the United States it has not taken over the complex tasks of effective governance or the provision of public goods. Sokolowski’s extensive research into the functioning of civil society has provided persuasive evidence that civil society is not a substitute for but rather a complement of effective government. In a survey of 40 countries, volunteering and charitable giving was positively correlated with the degree of government support provided to civil society organizations.² The complementarity of government and civil society returns us to the issue touched on above: the division between public and private purposes. How can Russian and American regional universities contribute to the development of civil society (one of their primary public purposes) while simultaneously aiding local economic development (one of their primary private purposes)?

¹Michael Ignatieff, “On Civil Society: Why Eastern Europe’s Revolutions Could Succeed,” *Foreign Affairs* 74, No. 2 (March/April 1995).

²Lester M. Salamon, S. Wojciech Sokolowski, and Regina List, *Global Civil Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies 2003).

Section II: Symposium and Study Tour Summary

Contributing Organizations

The Regional Universities and Civil Society Program was a collaborative project initiated by the New Eurasia Foundation (FNE) as part of its Regional University–Regional Development Resource Project and facilitated by the Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP). At the opening session of the symposium, Liubov Babaytseva, head of FNE’s Department of Youth and Education, and Tatiana Bogdasarova, the department’s program coordinator, discussed the origins of FNE and its goals for this program. A Russian nonprofit organization founded in 2004, FNE is dedicated to strengthening civil society in Russia through comprehensive grantmaking and operational activities, while developing a diversified portfolio of projects and implementing large-scale, socially significant programs within a dynamic social environment. FNE issues grants to bolster regional and social development by partnering with government and the commercial sector. It focuses on philanthropic initiatives, youth policy, higher education, and small and medium business development. FNE supports visits of Russian higher education experts to western institutions, where they can review these institutions’ experience in developing and maintaining interaction between the universities and the regions in which they operate.

IHEP was founded in 1993 as a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization whose mission is to foster access and success in postsecondary education through public policy research and other activities that inform and influence the policymaking process. At the symposium, President Jamie Merisotis described the organization’s international work, which includes strategic planning for institutions and systems, promoting student access and opportunity, capacity building for effective policymaking, and analyzing higher education finance. The Regional Universities and Civil Society Program is the second collaboration between IHEP and FNE, building on a 2005 study tour to the United States that focused on accountability measures in higher education.

Program Structure

The program included two components: a day-and-a-half symposium in Washington, D.C., and study tours of George Mason University (GMU) and Morgan State University (MSU). The symposium and study tours covered conceptual theory and institutional practices relevant to civil society development that can help mediate the tensions between the public and private purposes of regional universities.

The symposium included six sessions that addressed a range of topics, from service learning and civic education to the role of the university as a business consultant. Presentations and panel discussions were followed by an opportunity for dialogue between Russian and American participants. During the study tours, Russian participants observed the interaction between communities and universities by meeting with faculty, administrators, and community members.

Participants


Russian participants were selected by FNE to represent the three regions participating in the Regional University–Regional Development Resource Project: Pskov, Tambov, and Vladimir. Two senior

leaders represented each of the following institutions: Pskov State Polytechnic Institute, Tambov State University, and the Vladimir Branch of the Russian Academy of Public Administration. These representatives hoped to evaluate the concepts presented during the program for applicability in Russia and develop projects tailored to the strengths and challenges of their own regions. Four experts from FNE also joined the group.

In addition, more than 25 American participants attended the symposium. They included senior representatives from nonprofit organizations and national higher education associations, university and college administrators and faculty, and federal agency administrators. IHEP staff served as facilitators and discussants. (See the appendix for a complete list of participants.)

Context and Goals

The program emphasized cross-cultural exchange between Russian and American participants. The United States and Russia share a distinguished history of academic excellence. In terms of the number of institutions and people with degrees, the two countries are among the most educated in the world. For example, the United States currently ranks first and Russia ranks third in the percentage of the working population that has a university or postdoctoral degree.³ Consequently, a number of similarities exist between the two countries' systems of higher education.



With its large and diverse system of higher education, the U.S. provides many examples of university engagement with local communities.

Because of the U.S. political structure, however, institutions of higher education in the United States have a longstanding role in civil society development. As post-communist Russia continues to evolve, the American experience may prove helpful in shaping university practices regarding social and civic education. As part of the symposium, the Russian representatives described the successes and challenges their institutions face with regard to academic endeavors, community engagement, and business partnerships.

Mikhail Nikolaev, head of the Department of Economy and Finance at Pskov State Polytechnic Institute, presented indicators of economic development in the Pskov region and the range of programs offered by his institution. The school cooperates with local businesses by training specialists to meet enterprise demand, involving practitioners in the educational process, and conducting research on behalf of businesses. The university also conducts research on community-related problems, helps create strategic plans for community development, aids business development, prepares specialists for local government, and addresses workforce demands of the region.

The mission of the Vladimir Branch of the Russian Academy of Public Administration is to train highly educated managers in decision-making and critical thinking skills. Alexander Fedin, head

³Tatiana Kastueva-Jean, "The 'Greatness and Misery' of Higher Education in Russia," *Russie. Nei.Visions* n.14. Research Programme Russia/NIS (September 2006).

of the Department of Economy and Law, explained that in the largely industrial economy of the Vladimir region, the university trains enterprise, business, and organizational leaders to manage personnel and to analyze social and economic processes. The institution specializes in law, national economics, finance and credit, and state and municipal management through part-time evening education.

Elena Smolina head of the Department of Economy and Law at the Tambov State University, described the university's myriad undergraduate and graduate programs, which support its mission to train highly skilled experts for regional purposes. Tambov State partners with the regional administration; public service institutions; business structures; mass media; and educational, cultural, and medical institutions. The university aims to enhance educational priorities as well as the economic, cultural, scientific, and educational development of the region.

The Russian system of higher education faces challenges resulting from dynamic social and political circumstances in Russia and changing international postsecondary education standards. The Bologna Process—formalized in 1999 by the ministers of education of 29 European countries—encompasses a series of reforms to increase compatibility, comparability, and competition among higher education institutions. The reforms are focused on standardization of degree systems, quality assurance, and recognition of degrees and study periods.⁴ By the official target date of 2010, Russian institutions are expected to achieve a significant level of compliance. A representative of Tambov State University explained how various components of the Bologna Process are being implemented at her institution. She reported challenges associated with changing Russian degrees to a two-tier system of bachelor's and master's degrees, especially in technical areas. The Russian Ministry of Education is expected to designate certain specialties—such as physics, computer science, and medicine—that will maintain the traditional Russian single-tier degree process, in order to preserve the high level of excellence in these fields.

A primary challenge in complying with the Bologna Process is the lack of formalized standards from government agencies regulating two-tier systems, a system of credit transfer, student transfer, and diploma supplements. Central universities are further along in the process, but many regional universities are only now addressing necessary curricular changes, for example, increasing the number of customized seminars and reducing the number of lecture-based classes.

At the same time, Russian regional universities are subject to changing domestic social and political circumstances. Since the fall of communism, regional universities have greater autonomy to establish curriculum but also greater financial responsibility. New mechanisms of state influence are also changing the way communities are served. As a result of these evolving circumstances, universities are in a position to engage significantly in community development for public benefit and to build the outside partnerships that will be necessary for their own financial sustainability.

The remainder of this section will provide brief summaries of the symposium sessions and study tour presentations, which offer examples of how community, cultural, economic, and educational partnerships in the United States might apply to Russian regional universities. The larger themes of these sessions will be addressed in the following section.

⁴See http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna_en.html.

Service Learning

Service learning provides an immediate link between the community and the university by applying student coursework to community problems through direct service or volunteerism. Mark Terranova, Delana Gregg, and Laura Wilmarth of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) defined service learning and its benefits to the community, the university, and the student. Joint activity among these three parties nurtures civil society by developing university relationships with nonprofit organizations and community leaders while increasing student engagement in community issues and conducting research that benefits the public at large.

Civic and Social Education

Training citizens and future community leaders is another way universities can contribute to the public good of a region. George Mehaffy, vice president for academic leadership and change at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, suggested that regional universities are ideally positioned to focus their efforts on civic engagement as well as learning and community development. His research indicated that effective civic education contributes to increased political socialization and life-long participation.

Kathy Kretman, director of the Center for Public and Nonprofit Leadership at Georgetown University, explained that public and nonprofit leaders must be committed to strengthening communities and have a drive to provide needed resources. To adequately prepare these people for the challenges they will face, university training must include both technical preparation and exposure to leaders in government, business, foundations, and nonprofits.

Federal Policy

Despite the reduction in federal funding for regional universities in Russia, grant funding from the national government remains significant for both Russian and American institutions. Building relationships with government administrators is essential to understanding funding priorities and developing competitive grant proposals. Representing the U.S. Department of Education, Joe Conaty spoke with the group about ongoing and proposed U.S.-Russian initiatives, including tracking workforce trends, especially in the nonprofit sector; developing a joint science or math pedagogical study; building capacity for virtual collaboration; and sustaining an administrative exchange program that goes beyond faculty or student exchange.

Student Pipeline

The “student pipeline” refers to the continuum of education from kindergarten through postsecondary education. This session offered examples of university partnerships with civic organizations that expand educational and professional opportunities for students at key points along the pipeline. Danette Gerald, assistant director of higher education policy with the Education Trust, and Renee Orlick, director of admissions at Trinity University in Washington, D.C., emphasized the value of establishing a diverse student body, citing the public good of educating members from all subgroups within a population. Through service learning and partnerships with nonprofit organizations and secondary schools, universities can increase outreach to traditionally

underrepresented students. Other types of civic organizations analyze student populations and address barriers to entry into higher education.

The goal of the education pipeline is to create a qualified pool of graduates who are prepared for employment. To enhance opportunities for students after graduation, American Humanics, a nonprofit organization, works closely with universities to certify workers specifically for the nonprofit sector. Steve Bauer, director at American Humanics, described the organization's collaboration with colleges and universities to educate, prepare, and certify professionals to strengthen and lead nonprofit organizations. American Humanics also facilitates the Nonprofit Sector Workforce Coalition, which develops strategies to attract, develop, and retain a skilled, committed, and diverse nonprofit sector workforce.

Diversity

Access to higher education for all students is a key element in developing an open, equitable, and educated civil society. More equitable educational opportunities support greater diversity in the workforce and prepare students for the realities of a global community. Caryn McTighe Musil examined the task of cultivating “public-mindedness” and the role of the university in supporting diversity and tolerance on campus and in the community. Universities are a center for free thought

Regional universities are ideally positioned to focus their efforts on civic engagement as well as learning and community development.

and a catalyst for social change. Musil's research suggests that a diverse student population directly benefits the public good and increases the future success of students as workers and citizens who are locally, nationally, and globally concerned. In the Russian context, increasing immigration from the northern Caucasus, the Middle East, and Asia in recent years has made social inclusion a more pressing issue in higher education.


The University As a Consultant

When universities serve as consultants to businesses and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), they promote regional economic and social development. Peter Magrath, president emeritus of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and Ronald Mitchell, former director of the Small Business Development Center at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC), explained how university-business partnerships can contribute to creating regional jobs; understanding of workforce demands, scientific and market research, student preparation, university financial gain; and encouraging new business development. To achieve these objectives, Magrath said universities need to be more entrepreneurial in marketing their assets to business—universities can provide critical information to businesses regarding changing consumer, business, and economic needs. Jim McKenney, vice president of economic development at the American Association of Community Colleges, noted that institutions can also partner with businesses through employee retraining or competency development specific to the workplace, rather than degree attainment.

Technology Transfer and Entrepreneurship

“Technology transfer” refers to the process by which universities can leverage intellectual property for practical application. It contributes to regional development by increasing institutional resources and acting as a regional economic stimulant. Catherine Vorwald, director of the Office of Research and Development at UMBC explained the university structures, legislation, business relationships, and community relationships required to facilitate technology transfer.

Technology transfer exemplifies university entrepreneurship for institutional gain. A closely related activity is equipping students with entrepreneurial skills, which was described by George Solomon, director of the Center for Entrepreneurial Excellence at George Washington University (GWU). The Center develops entrepreneurs through outreach activities, programs, and product development. Students work with small and developing companies to conduct marketing research, develop business plans, and advise board nominations. The principles of business entrepreneurship can be applied to social entrepreneurship as well, to creatively and innovatively address community challenges.



An engaged university will adapt curriculum and facilities to reflect business and community needs in its immediate region.

George Mason University

The second component of the project was a two-day study tour of George Mason University (GMU) and Morgan State University (MSU) to observe practical applications of the theories presented at the symposium. During the tour, the Russian participants met with faculty and administrators with expertise in the social, civic, and economic role of universities in the regional context.

GMU is the largest higher education institution in Virginia and has had a major effect on the state’s information technology industry, on regional health policy, and on business and nonprofit organization management. The school’s administrators cited proximity to business and community partners, responsiveness to their needs, and the university’s reputation as key elements to building partnerships for civil society development.

An engaged university will adapt curriculum and facilities to reflect business and community needs in its immediate region. Lawrence Czarda, vice president of regional campuses, described the structure of GMU’s distributed campuses in Fairfax, Arlington, Loudoun, and Prince William counties. Curricular specialties at each campus take advantage of the assets of each community. For example, the Prince William campus specializes in biomedicine and technology to maximize partnerships with the pharmaceutical, defense, and communication technology corporations located near the campus.

GMU responds to the needs of its communities by offering public facilities and meeting public workforce demands. President Alan Merten described the university’s community activities as an exchange of service time, facilities, and research with elementary and secondary schools, health care providers, social service organizations, and local government. For example, the university has advised regional officials on land and economic development in exchange for the use of land for university growth. GMU also opens its cultural and recreation centers for public use.

Provost Peter Stearns discussed the university's responsibility to the community in terms of workforce demands; for example, GMU trains over 30 percent of the nurses and health management workers in the region. As the university works with the region to address the demand for workers, it also influences regional health and education policy.

Universities motivate business and community partnerships not only by being responsive to their needs but by marketing university assets and building a strong reputation. To improve a university's image and overall reputation, Merten recommended expanding the institution's research capacity. There are direct positive outcomes, such as funding, but also indirect outcomes, such as better student recruitment and opportunities for business consultancy. Stearns also emphasized the importance of recruiting and retaining human capital to improve a university's reputation. According to Laurie Fathe, teaching excellence director, if a university aims to boost its research output and prestige, it must offer competitive salaries and facilities, and must balance the responsibilities of faculty between teaching and research.

While administrators provided valuable general information about positioning a university for regional development, department leaders offered information about specific programs to achieve this objective. Jennifer Murphy, technology transfer director, expanded the concept of technology transfer by delineating the patent and licensing process, including the role of individual faculty, the university at large, and independent for-profit or not-for-profit organizations. Roger Stough, director of the Mason Enterprise Center, described the ample training opportunities the Center provides for students to learn about business development and for businesses themselves to improve and grow. The mutually beneficial arrangement allows students to work with faculty to guide business development and cultivates university-business-community relationships.

Morgan State University

On the second day of the study tour, the Russian participants visited MSU in Baltimore, Maryland. In the past decade, MSU was Maryland's fastest growing higher education institution; it has had a major impact on the city of Baltimore and the entire Mid-Atlantic region in areas ranging from the production of scientists and engineers to its effect on social organizations, the hospitality industry, and government.

Earl Richardson, president of MSU, and Maurice Taylor, dean of the graduate school, welcomed the group and provided an introduction to the institution. MSU is committed to the needs of low-income communities and to improving the representation of minorities and women. The university keeps these missions in mind in developing new academic departments, hiring new faculty, and performing direct service. Provost T. Jones Robinson emphasized the issue of balancing faculty workload to ensure that faculty can meet their 18-hour contact requirement with students and fulfill their research and service responsibilities.

A university's commitment to civil society development must permeate all facets of the institution. MSU supports its regional mission departmentally, for example, with the community and business partnerships associated with its Institute for Architecture and Planning, National Transportation Center, and School of Public Health and Policy. Richard Lloyd, director of the Institute for Architecture and Planning, explained how local government, businesses, and organizations often

request university assistance in conducting research or analysis to address housing, community development, and urban development needs. At the National Transportation Center, Director Z. Andrew Farkas described various kinds of collaboration between the university and the community. Transportation disciplines lend themselves particularly well to collaboration with government and with private consulting firms. Finally, Vojislav Stojkovic, associate professor in the Department of Computer Science, discussed technology transfer and explained how universities can form partnerships. (Each of these topics is discussed in greater detail in Section III.)

Public health is a growing concern in the Russian society, and universities will need to address this issue through preparation of health professionals, research in health trends and disease, and direct service. Allan Noonan, dean of the School of Public Health and Policy, talked about the ways MSU addresses public health issues such as substance abuse, mental health, and nutrition, particularly in poor and minority communities. Noonan described partnerships with service organizations and how one would develop a new department at a university. He said that support of the university's mission, fundraising for faculty and facilities, and the ability to meet a community or workforce need are all vital to the growth of a community-responsive university.

Differences were noted between Russian and American universities in two areas: degree preparation and class time. Russian students spend significantly more time in class, while American universities tend to require more work outside of class. Patricia Welch and Anna McPhatter of the School of Education and Urban Studies and the Department of Social Work, respectively, explained how social science credentials function in the United States: a bachelor's degree prepares students for entry-level positions; a master's degree is more specialized for a manager or clinician; and a doctoral degree prepares professors and policymakers. As Russia moves toward compliance with the Bologna Process for international degree standards, its degrees will change from a single-tier system to the western-style multiple-tier certification.

Section III: Public and Private Roles of Universities

The Public Roles of Regional Universities

A. Service Learning

Service learning is an area in which the public needs of local communities and the private interests of students complement each other well. This was demonstrated in the talks given by symposium participants from UMBC and speakers at Morgan State University. UMBC has a stated purpose of “integrating research, teaching and learning, and civic engagement so that each advances the others for the benefit of society.” UMBC promotes this triangle of mutually beneficial activities through two programs in particular: the Sondheim Public Affairs Scholars Program and The Shriver Center. Both programs incorporate service-learning—a pedagogy that typically involves some form of engagement with vulnerable populations as a supplement to traditional classroom learning. The potential benefits are numerous. Students gain insight into complex socioeconomic phenomena that will serve them well as they seek employment, communities benefit from the knowledge creation that occurs in the course of research, and governments gain a cadre of well-trained employees who have established relationships with local communities.

The public and private benefits of service-learning were reiterated at MSU. Richard Lloyd, director of the Institute of Architecture and Planning discussed these benefits in the education of future urban planning professionals. He described two phases of learning: (1) the learning that occurs in the classroom, and (2) the learning-by-doing that occurs in interactions with community-based clients. Learning-by-doing involves collecting and analyzing data from (typically poor) local communities, with benefits accruing to both the students and the communities. Thus, both private and public interests are served.

The Russian participants responded with a number of comments and questions. One participant mentioned the Soviet legacy of forced “volunteerism” that has impeded the development of norms of self-motivated volunteerism in many of the former Soviet countries. A number of questions revolved around incorporating service-learning into the curriculum so students and professors would be motivated to engage in this activity. A Russian participant asked how an institution aligns the private interests of students and professors with public purposes. Representatives from UMBC cited several models; for example, some universities make service learning an explicit part of student evaluation and the tenure process, while other universities incorporate it into the curriculum but rely to a greater extent on volunteerism to provide learning outside the classroom. Lloyd said a combination of methods is used to support service-learning: for example, class projects, independent studies, support for doctoral programs, course credit, and, of course, the self-motivation of future professionals who will eventually confront the problems of local communities.

B. Citizenship Preparation

Citizenship preparation, like service-learning, is one of the primary services regional universities provide to communities. The goals are increased civic and political engagement, improved knowledge of political and cultural institutions, greater knowledge of national and global problems, and an improved capacity to provide community leadership. While the public benefits of such activities

are more diffuse than service-learning, they are particularly important in sustaining democracy. Participants at the conference described ways to align individual and institutional incentives with this public role.

As mentioned in Section II, George Mehaffy spoke about the role of regional universities in preparing good citizens. He cautioned against the desire observed in some regional institutions, in the United States and abroad, to pursue the impossible goal of competing with elite institutions like Oxford or the Sorbonne. Instead of pursuing first-class rankings, Mehaffy recommended that regional universities focus on another set of tasks: (1) excellent learning, (2) community development, and (3) civic engagement. He described methods these universities can use to align institutional incentives to achieve these public-oriented goals. The first step usually occurs at the departmental level, when an individual or a group identifies a public need and advocates in the institution. The university can employ various methods to institutionalize this commitment to public service: aligning university funding with citizenship preparation, creating centers and programs within the university that are dedicated to citizenship preparation, and creating transparency about outcomes by measuring the civic literacy of students.

One of the speakers at GMU also touched on issues that fall under the rubric of citizenship preparation. Lawrence Czarda spoke about the rationale of a distributed campus as it relates to partnerships with the local communities of northern Virginia. Northern Virginia has grown rapidly in the past few decades, but it lacked major cultural and recreational venues. GMU entered into partnerships with businesses and the local government to build and maintain a gymnasium and a performing arts center. These facilities are staffed and operated in part by students, who gain professional experience and contribute to the generation and transmission of culture in their local communities. Czarda provided valuable information about how building and maintaining these facilities has related to GMU's diverse income strategy, which relies on funding from the state, tuition and student fees, funded research, donations, and on-campus businesses.

A number of the questions about citizenship preparation focused on issues of finance. A Russian participant asked if the operations of centers and programs such as The Shriver Center are subsidized. The response was that these centers are not subsidized; they achieve fiscal self-sufficiency through a combination of techniques, including fees, voluntary services, contractual relationships, and exemption from taxes through nonprofit status. Other questions focused on the working definition of "civic education" in American and Russian higher education. Typically in the United States, universities aim to develop engaged, informed, and responsible citizens who are interested in contributing to the public good. In Russia, civic education has a similar goal, but with a greater focus on preparing public officials. Many relationships exist among Russian universities, government, nonprofits, and business; what has been lacking is an implementation strategy to make the university more adaptive to the civic and business needs of the community. Increasing adaptability to local conditions in the preparation of productive citizens appears to be a priority for Russian regional universities.

C. Consultancy

Another public role for regional universities was addressed during the course of the symposium and study tour; in addition to service learning and citizenship preparation, the university can serve as a consultant for governments and local nonprofits. This role overlaps with the first two, but consultancy focuses attention on the role of public universities as generators of new knowledge

that serves the public good rather than instructors of individuals. The benefits of consultancy are numerous, as the improved operations of nonprofits and local governments redound on private businesses, in turn improving the local tax base.

Two examples of university-as-consultant were provided at MSU. The first was that of the National Transportation Center, directed by Z. Andrew Farkas. Farkas described the research the Center does as a federally funded program. The Center plays a number of roles: provider of education to MSU students, conduit for information between government and the local population, and consultant for governments on transportation and human and economic development. The Center also consults for private firms. These multiple and overlapping roles allow the Center to serve a multitude of public and private purposes simultaneously.

The second example of the university-as-consultant is MSU's work with Concerned Citizens for a Better Brooklyn (CCBB). This voluntary nonprofit organization works to improve the standards of living for residents of the Brooklyn neighborhood in Baltimore. Many of CCBB's projects required technical knowledge, so the organization approached MSU to serve as a consultant. Patrick Moylan, a representative from the organization, emphasized the necessity of adequate research and planning

Regional universities [should] focus on another set of tasks: (1) excellent learning, (2) community development, and (3) civic engagement.

before requesting government support for community improvement projects. Without cost analyses, a plan of action, and proposed solutions provided by the students at MSU, Moylan said government support would have been unlikely. At the same time, students honed their urban planning and landscape design skills. The result thus far has been an improved neighborhood, a more accountable government, and better trained students.

A number of questions from the Russian participants revolved around evaluation. One concerned the value of real estate in the neighborhood since the CCBB had started its projects. Moylan explained that there had been a rise in property value but admitted that it is difficult to know how much of this could be attributed to CCBB. Another participant asked about local economic development. Moylan replied that an investor had issued a proposal to develop an abandoned lot, but it is still too early to say what kind of economic development CCBB might bring about. Another question pertained to the cultivation of grassroots community movements in general. Moylan delineated the process CCBB followed, which was essentially motivating and organizing a group of concerned citizens, identifying a problem, establishing contact with local government officials, and partnering with MSU to develop informed solutions.

The Private Roles of Regional Universities

According to Sokolowski's definition, business is not part of civil society, because it distributes profits. While this is undoubtedly true, civil society and business have something in common that is particularly important in the Russian context—both are a space for independent activity away from

the state. In this respect, they are often complementary, as business may provide funding for civil society organizations and these same organizations help promote the basic public welfare necessary for an efficient economy. Presentations over the course of four days made it clear that regional universities have as vital a role in promoting private business as they do in promoting civil society—they help increase the space for autonomous activity in multiple and reinforcing ways.

A. Entrepreneurialism

In their efforts to promote entrepreneurialism, many American universities carry out an important role in promoting and sustaining a culture of risk-taking, innovation, and self-employment. While policies and institutions undoubtedly play a significant role in the proper functioning of a market economy, cultures that support individuals who seek to innovate also promote greater material prosperity. Universities aid in this process in a number of ways, including research, hands-on learning, and the incubation of small businesses. In providing this public service, universities ultimately facilitate the operation of Adam Smith’s “invisible hand,” which leads private individuals to raise the standard of living for the public as a whole.



Civil society and business have something in common...both are a space for independent activity away from the state.

George Solomon of the Center for Entrepreneurial Excellence at GWU discussed the role of entrepreneurialism in economic development. He posed a basic question for educational institutions: Who is the audience for university expertise in business and technology? In the case of American institutions, that audience is overwhelmingly composed of small businesses. In the United States, a majority of businesses have no payroll; that is, the only employees are the business owners themselves.⁵ This large pool of small businesses is an essential part of an entrepreneurial economy, in which many businesses fail within a year and many more are started. While entrepreneurialism carries a structural cost, the net result is positive, because the businesses that succeed often turn into highly successful companies, like Apple and Dell. Solomon described how GWU aids in this process. Classrooms integrate theory with practice by requiring students to complete projects that necessitate working with community businesses (compare this with service learning). University research on business activities also helps to inform the decisions of local business leaders. GWU provides counseling and incubation services for individuals who want to start a new business. The result is win-win: well-prepared students and entrepreneurial small businesses.

As noted in Section II, Roger Stough of GMU described the wide array of services offered at his university to promote business. The Mason Enterprise Center offers telework centers, a mentor-protégé program, procurement and technical assistance, one-on-one counseling, management training, consulting services, and incubation services. These services help promote a culture of entrepreneurialism in northern Virginia that has contributed to sustained economic development in the region, and Stough noted that 300 such enterprise centers operate at U.S. institutions of higher

⁵According to statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau, approximately three quarters of U.S. businesses had no payroll in 2002. See www.census.gov/epcd/www/smallbus.html.

learning. The Mason Enterprise Center has been involved in setting up an enterprise center in Romania and an exchange program with India.

Russian participants had a number of questions about “getting the incentives right.” How do you get professors, university administrators, students, and businesses to collaborate? Solomon said that contacts with the business community are not the result of enlightened administration at the university but typically the result of one administrator or professor who sees a need for this. For example, a professor may want to collect data on businesses for her research, and a small business will agree to provide the data in return for the results of the analysis. Departments or centers may offer pro bono help to businesses; once the businesses see the value of the work, they may provide compensation, for example, by endowing a chair. Stough explained that additional funds accrue to the university from fees and from a “tax” on the profits of companies that are incubated at the university.

B. Technology Transfer

Technology transfer (tech transfer) is part of the broader effort to promote entrepreneurialism, but it is sufficiently important to merit separate consideration. Tech transfer is the process by which new technologies created at universities are sold or licensed to the private sector. As a knowledge generator, the university is well situated to produce new technologies. However, presenters made it clear that without a strategy and resources devoted to pushing new knowledge and technology out to the private sector, the benefits of university research will be limited.

Catherine Vorwald described the ways in which UMBC engages in technology transfer. She cited two major assets universities have for this type of activity: (1) researchers who are involved in the creation of new knowledge, and (2) facilities and equipment that individual businesses often cannot afford. UMBC maintains four offices that manage university-corporate interaction: Tech Transfer, Commercialization, Research and Design, and Licensing. Most interaction is through sponsored research, either by corporations or government, or through licensing of intellectual property.

Government plays a significant role in these activities by establishing an enabling framework for universities and businesses. One catalyst for economic growth in the United States was the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, which allows universities to retain title on their research. As a result, university scientists have a financial incentive to innovate and license their research for individual and university profit. Vorwald suggested that a similar policy in Russia could stimulate significant economic growth.

Another example of tech transfer was provided by Vojislav Stojkovic at MSU. Stojkovic runs a bioinformatics program that is working toward tech transfer. Because he is at a relatively small university, he has established connections with other universities that in turn can help him connect to firms that are interested in new technology. Such collaboration can occur by chance or sometimes through shared grants. This approach could work for regional universities in Russia that lack resources to establish their own office of tech transfer. At the end of the presentation, a representative of Tambov University offered to collaborate with MSU.

The Russian participants asked how institutions of higher education can partner with businesses to assess business and economic needs. Vorwald offered an example of an assessment of labor needs for the technology sector in Maryland. It was conducted by a council composed of representatives

from academia and industry, and it found that Maryland lacks trained workers at the senior level of the technology sector. Another question concerned selecting appropriate people to be involved in such initiatives. The answer was that entrepreneurs had to have a “spark” or “a fire in the gut.” These answers suggest that public institutions should try to equip interested students with the skills to innovate and then let the market, rather than examinations, evaluate the potential of their innovations.

C. Consultancy

As they do for nonprofits and governments, universities can also serve as consultants for businesses. The benefits run both ways—students garner experience, professors gain prestige, universities obtain capital, and businesses gain knowledge and help in developing products. Further, local business development helps create jobs and tax revenues, thereby supporting government. Thus, the array of benefits is wide.

Peter Magrath, president emeritus of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, described the role of regional institutions generally and explained how consultancy can fit into this broader role. Education of students is, of course, primary, but research and outreach to the local community are also significant. Magrath gave an example of consultancy involving Oklahoma State University. The university helped a private firm develop flight simulators, which were subsequently manufactured in the region, resulting in new jobs for the community and new tax revenue for the local government. The success of this public-private partnership resulted in additional contracts for the university, thereby further strengthening its ties with the local economy.

Alan Merten, president of GMU, spoke briefly about the role of the university as consultant to the private sector. GMU allows individual professors to act as consultants to businesses—they need only inform the university of their activities. The rationale behind this policy is twofold: (1) the university maintains multiple connections with the local community and economy, and (2) professors have multiple and overlapping reasons to continue their relationship with the university. Overall, the policy helps align the incentives of professors with the needs of private business and the public role of the university. Merten offered three recommendations for increasing overall university-business interaction: (1) develop joint proposals to leverage federal funds for faculty-corporate research; (2) solicit corporate giving for scholarships and facilities; and (3) invite business owners to serve on university boards or volunteer in areas of personal interest.

Section IV: Recommended Next Steps

The Russian participants came to the study tour from various institutions and with varying purposes; however, certain comments appeared multiple times in responses to a brief survey at the end of the tour. These comments are summarized below.

A. Russian Participant Survey Responses

- A number of participants said the site visits were the most valuable part of the tour. Participants particularly appreciated the transparency with which faculty and administrators described their strengths and the challenges they face.
- Some participants said that many of the ideas presented during the tour were potentially quite useful but would have to be further explored and adapted to the Russian situation.
- Most participants said they learned at least one idea or concept they would share with colleagues and possibly implement at their home institution.

B. Possibilities for Further Collaboration

- *Entrepreneurialism and small business development:* This area showed considerable potential for collaboration for two reasons: (1) some Russian participants were very interested in diversifying revenue streams and promoting local economic development, and (2) some American centers of business development have already had positive experiences setting up similar programs abroad. Since the conclusion of the program, Ronald Mitchell of UDC and Mikhail Nikolaev of Pskov State Polytechnic Institute have taken steps to develop a small business center in Pskov.
- *University-to-university collaboration:* This area showed promise during the conference at two points: (1) Tambov University's offer of collaboration with MSU, and (2) the U.S. Department of Education's grantmaking initiative, discussed in Section II.
- *Diversification of funding:* Further sharing of techniques and methods for diversified university funding could be helpful for Russian regional universities, particularly considering the great interest shown in GMU's funding strategies.
- *A model for future institutional exchange:* The combination of theoretical and practical knowledge in the form of a combined symposium and study tour proved highly valuable. The symposium presentations helped provide a theoretical framework for understanding the day-to-day functioning of both GMU and MSU. This approach would likely be useful for structuring future institutional exchanges among other cohorts of Russian and American institutions.

C. Areas for Further Investigation

- *Measuring results:* Russian participants asked a number of questions about accountability and how to measure results; for example, in service learning, citizenship preparation, and local economic development. While the American initiatives were generally considered to have had positive results, the evidence was often anecdotal rather than comprehensive. Developing a more comprehensive framework to measure and interpret results could be useful for both American and Russian universities.

- *Administration and implementation:* While the merits of such initiatives as service-learning and technology transfer are evident, several Russian participants noted that implementation would be a challenge for them. Future collaborative efforts should include more practical information related to organizational change strategies.
- *Regional development and public policy:* Some Russian participants described difficulty in setting goals for the university because their regional administration lacked a clear development plan with definite priorities. While this issue was touched on in the symposium and study tour, a fuller treatment of the role of regional universities in working with local and regional government to develop public policy could be useful.

APPENDIX

Regional Higher Education Institutions and Civil Society Development: Russian-American Experiences and Lessons Learned

SYMPOSIUM AND STUDY TOUR PARTICIPANTS

Russian Participants

Babaytseva Liubov, department head, Department of Youth and Education, New Eurasia Foundation

Bergel'son Mira, expert, New Eurasia Foundation

Bogdasarova Tatiana, expert-coordinator, New Eurasia Foundation

Chekushov Andrey, deputy director, Russian Academy of Public Administration under the President of Russia, Vladimir region

Chvanova Marina, deputy rector, Tambov State University

Fedin Sergey, department head, Department of Economy and Law, The Russian Academy of Public Administration under the President of Russia, Vladimir region

Nikolaev Mikhail, department head, Department of Economy and Finance, Pskov State Polytechnic Institute

Smolina Elena, department head, Department of Economic Theory, Tambov State University

Svetenko Tatiana, expert, New Eurasia Foundation

Vasilyeva Lidiya, consultant, State Department of Education, Pskov region

American Participants

Clifford Adelman, senior research associate, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Harley Balzer, associate professor, Department of Government and International Affairs and associate faculty member, Department of History, Georgetown University

Steve Bauer, director, Initiative for Nonprofit Sector Careers and director, Management Institute, American Humanics

Joseph Conaty, director, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, U.S. Department of Education

Jenna Cullinane, programs coordinator, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Alisa Cunningham, managing director of research and evaluation, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Ilya Feliciano, interpreter

Danette Gerald, assistant director of higher education policy, Education Trust

Delana Gregg, assistant director, Sondheim Public Affairs Scholars Program and Department of Political Science, University of Maryland Baltimore County

Ryan Hahn, research analyst, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Warren Haynes, workforce development director, Northern Virginia Community College, Alexandria Campus

Richard Jaeggi, director, Community Technology Center, Howard University

Gary Jones, Washington, D.C. representative, Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer

Arnold M. Kee, managing director of programs, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Kathy Kretman, director, Center for Public and Nonprofit Leadership, Georgetown University

Peter Magrath, president emeritus, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and senior presidential advisor, College Board

James McKenney, vice president of economic development, American Association of Community Colleges

Caryn McTighe Musil, senior vice president for diversity, equity, and global initiatives, and co-director, Center for Liberal Education and Civic Engagement, American Association of Colleges and Universities

George Mehaffy, vice president for academic leadership and change, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Jamie P. Merisotis, president, Institute for Higher Education Policy

Anna Mikheeva, interpreter

Ronald Mitchell, former director, Small Business Development Center, University of the District of Columbia

Renee Orlick, director of admissions, Trinity University (Washington, D.C.)

Wojciech Sokolowski, senior research associate, Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project and Nonprofit Employment Data Project, Center for Civil Society Studies, Johns Hopkins University's Institute for Policy Studies

George Solomon, director, Center for Entrepreneurial Excellence and associate professor of Management Science, George Washington University

Mark Terranova, associate director of foundation relations, University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Catherine Vorwold, director, Office of Research and Development, University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Laura Wilmarth, assistant director of service learning, The Shriver Center, University of Maryland, Baltimore County



INSTITUTE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY

1320 19th Street, NW, Suite 400

Washington, DC 20036

www.ihep.org