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About Diversity & Democracy

Diversity & Democracy supports higher education faculty and leaders as they design and implement programs that advance civic learning and democratic engagement, global learning, and engagement with diversity to prepare students for socially responsible action in today’s interdependent but unequal world. The publication features evidence, research, and exemplary practices to assist practitioners in creating learning opportunities that realize this vision. To access Diversity & Democracy online, visit www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy.
It’s easy to feel overwhelmed these days by the depth and breadth of ostensibly intractable problems facing the world. Challenges that have loomed for decades and even centuries—from climate change to systemic social inequality—can seem, at times, to have gotten the better of us as we struggle together to build a more just, safe, and equitable society. In the face of the temptation to despair, social innovation—driven by a spirit of entrepreneurship for positive social change—can offer optimism to students, indicating a reason for learning, for doing, and for being. It can give students hope and a sense of efficacy, suggesting that the lessons they learn in college can be applied for the betterment of society.

AAC&U has long advocated for a vision of liberal education that connects academic learning to real-world application, most recently through the LEAP Challenge, which promotes students’ pursuit of Signature Work—projects lasting at least one semester through which students integrate and apply their learning by defining and addressing problems that matter to them and to society (www.aacu.org/LEAP/signaturework/). For some students, such projects may be entrepreneurial in scope, representing key innovations that promise important social impacts. Such innovative and entrepreneurial opportunities for applied learning can take many forms, as reflected in the contents of this issue of Diversity & Democracy.

If social innovation derives its power from the hope that positive and measurable change is possible—and from compelling evidence that existing approaches have not been sufficient to address the world’s most pressing challenges—it may also invite criticism for that very orientation toward the new. As Amanda Moore McBride and Eric Mlyn point out in this issue, while “social innovation values disruption and being the outsider … civic engagement values collaboration and working from within”—and true collaboration, as civic engagement practitioners might point out, requires deep investment of time and resources, often with slowly accumulating results. As McBride and Mlyn argue, then, many tensions exist between social innovation and civic engagement, and the need to be “sophisticated changemakers” as they describe a “changemaker toolbox” that students can acquire in college. Sonal Shah argues for experiential education with a civic focus as critical for preparing students to become public sector leaders. Sandra Enos describes the status of social impact efforts at ten colleges and universities, while Amy Schulz shares examples of social entrepreneurship at several community colleges. Other contributors describe programs and initiatives built on the tenets of social innovation and civic engagement, and two recent graduates reflect on their own experiences with social entrepreneurship during and after college.

Together, these authors suggest new ways forward for educators working with their students to create social change across movements, disciplines, and sectors—as well as critical points of reflection when forging new paths. We invite readers to consider the practices described here and their potential for changing not only what and how students learn, but also how higher education can contribute to creating a more just and sustainable world.

—Kathryn Peltier Campbell
Editor, Diversity & Democracy
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Look at the traffic in your email inbox over the last week. If your inbox looks like ours, take note of the number of emails you have received, from both internal and external colleagues, announcing a new undergraduate competition for the best innovative solution to a social problem, a new course on how to construct a business plan to start a social impact organization, or a competition for funding to start a new campus organization. To us, the volume of these emails is stunning, and it speaks to a broader trend in the higher education ecosystem.

Like many readers of *Diversity & Democracy*, we deeply believe in higher education’s civic mission and its critical goal of developing engaged citizens. The pursuit of this goal has evolved throughout the history of higher education, with two approaches now ascendant on many of our campuses—ensconced on some and nascent on others. These approaches can be categorized as social innovation and civic engagement.

In this article, we describe the contours and possible intersections of these approaches. But we begin with caveats and a bit of context. We both lead civic engagement. Duke has included social innovation programs under its broadly conceived civic engagement program, DukeEngage. These partnerships are of great service to our students, faculty, and community partners.

However, viewing the broader landscape of higher education, we are concerned about and have noted the rapid advance of social innovation approaches that might benefit more productively from the civic engagement movement’s hard-earned knowledge about the most effective ways of achieving social change. For example, the civic engagement movement has learned much over the decades about how to consciously integrate community voice and assets into planning and action—though much work remains to ensure mutually beneficial outcomes, and the movement sometimes falls short of its aspirations of humility and reciprocity. We also wonder if social innovation and civic engagement approaches may themselves be competing for participants, partners, and resources. We raised these concerns in an essay published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (McBride and Mlyn 2015), which we followed by organizing a think tank attended in October 2015 by leading scholars, practitioners, and students of these two approaches. (The video stream of the think tank is archived at https://gephardtinstitute.wustl.edu/10-year-anniversary/a-think-tank-on-social-innovation-and-civic-engagement/)

While we chart the landscape of strategies for social change represented by these two approaches in this article, other authors contributing to this issue of *Diversity & Democracy* explore the topic further. We are conscious that there will be exceptions to our generalizations, including perhaps your own experiences and work in this area. We invite conversation and debate with the hope that higher education will continue to contribute to social change and the development of engaged citizens, in part through fostering the kind of conversations about these two approaches that we aim to catalyze here. To us, there is no higher calling for our work.

Conceptions

The two approaches explored here go by various names, which can have different meanings on different campuses. We have chosen to use the language of social innovation because the term designates a more encompassing concept than social entrepreneurship, which tends to conjure up the individual entrepreneur and focuses generally on founding enterprises. In the first editor’s note in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, this leading journal defined social innovation as “the process of inventing, securing support for, and implementing novel solutions to social needs and problems” (quoted in Phillips, Deiglmeier, and Miller 2008). Like social entrepreneurship, social innovation connotes the development and introduction of something new; but that new thing can be an idea, a device, or a process—not just an enterprise or an organization. The innovation is “social” because it intends to address some pressing problem affecting the human condition. Students can be involved in social innovation efforts in a variety of ways: by taking courses, completing internships, working on teams, participating in competitions, and engaging in a range of other activities.
Civic engagement is itself a contested concept, but the term has found favor in the last ten years, particularly when contrasted with other historic terms such as community outreach, public service, or community service. Thomas Ehrlich, a leading scholar in the field, defines civic engagement as a “means of working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes” (2000, vi). By emphasizing education about social issues and ways to address these issues and by placing a premium on students’ abilities to practice their civic skills in community contexts, this approach focuses not only on social change, but also on the development of engaged citizens. The civic engagement approach is predicated on action in order to develop democratic skills, which alumni may later apply in vocational and avocational pursuits as well as in simply being citizens of the world.

Values and Pedagogies
Within these broad conceptions, the fundamental values of the two approaches differ. Broadly described, social innovation values disruption and being the outsider, measurement of change, and a financial bottom line, while civic engagement values collaboration and working from within, the experience of change, and secondary financial success. These values can play out in higher education in the differences between teaching students to value proprietor versus partner, savior versus carpenter, problem solver versus community partner, and capital versus compassion.

Yet despite their differences, practitioners of the two approaches also share a common value: they aim to provide opportunities for students to “make a difference.” Both movements are capitalizing on the desire, primarily of millennials, to have a positive impact on their communities and world. This unifying value suggests the opportunity to find common ground upon which practitioners of the two approaches can work, potentially maximizing their impact. By working together, adherents to these approaches can also address our respective weaknesses: in the case of civic engagement, a potential focus on charity rather than change and a tendency toward small-scale (sometimes minimally effective) interventions; and in the case of social innovation, a potential lack of depth, respect, and follow-through.

The ways in which social innovation and civic engagement practitioners teach and inculcate their values across approaches are not dramatically different in form. Both approaches feature internships, applied coursework, community service, international trips, and group- or team-based programs. Competitions and hackathons are predominant in social innovation, while civic engagement favors service learning. This latter pedagogical difference reflects different values: while social innovation embraces the competition that is so fundamental to market-oriented approaches, service learning underscores collaboration. Similarly, some argue that civic engagement, in its most traditional form of service learning, is “the kind face of the neoliberal University” (Radon and Harrison 2015, 134). One might extend the argument to social innovation, which might likewise be described as the “kind face” of the university’s market-based assumptions.

Differences in execution also reflect values. For example, on one of our campuses, social innovation internships are doubly paid: the partner not only pays the student for his or her time, but also pays the higher education institution for assigning the student. In contrast, most civic engagement experiences reflect a charity ideal, with the partners assuming the opportunity and transaction costs and the students volunteering their time. In these cases, the partnership infrequently focuses on systemic causes of, or systemic solutions for, social challenges. While community partners working with civic engagement programs often see themselves as coeducators right alongside the college or university, this is less often the case with social innovation.

Campus Context
Approaches to social innovation and civic engagement are as varied as our campuses. The presence and status of each differs dramatically depending on institutional mission and culture, which can be connected to an institution’s context as a community college, a four-year
college, or a research university. For example, at community colleges, which are currently under intense pressure to offer vocational training to students, faculty and administrators may view social innovation as a mechanism for such training. In contrast, a four-year institution grounded in the liberal arts tradition may base its entire curriculum around civic engagement. But this binary may be shifting. We suspect that the increased attention being paid to job readiness at all kinds of institutions has led to the ascendance of social innovation approaches even on liberal arts campuses, where these approaches may be seen as preparing graduates for the world of work. Conversely, some community colleges may see their deep roots in the community as justification for civic engagement and may view their development of social entrepreneurs as a component of that engagement.

Approaches vary also by their administrative home within the institution. Social innovation approaches were birthed in business schools, while much civic engagement work has its roots in student affairs. Today, social innovation initiatives are increasingly campus wide, and civic engagement approaches often span academic and student affairs. Large research universities rarely declare a single home for either approach, with multiple offices sharing particular functions; alternatively, as social innovation and civic engagement have become campus-wide priorities, they may be centralized within provosts’ and even presidents’ offices.

On a given campus, the structure and culture of any approach will be reflected in who leads that approach, whether tenured or tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, or staff. Some approaches are encapsulated in singular projects, while others are supported by comprehensive institutes. Painting with a broad brush, civic engagement practitioners have endeavored to engage the humanities, as is manifested in the growth and prominence of the national organization Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life. Social innovation practitioners, in contrast, tend to engage professional schools and applied disciplines.

In relation to the financing of social innovation and civic engagement efforts, the landscape is clearly evolving. While some recent major philanthropic gifts have been directed toward civic engagement initiatives, corporate, foundation, and major private gifts are increasingly being committed to social innovation. To the extent that the language and ethos of social innovation resonates for many who come from the for-profit world, philanthropic support for this work is likely to continue to grow. We cannot help but think that dialogue between the practitioners of these two approaches would yield a more even allocation of resources or might increase the size of the pie altogether.

Social Change Goals
As stated above, practitioners of both social innovation and civic engagement aim to “make a difference” in the world, typically the world beyond campus. The involvement of the larger world can take many forms across the various pedagogies named above, with community members filling different designated roles. Those working in social innovation tend to view the individuals affected by their work as clients, and may see students in the field as advisors or consultants serving community members who may fill the role of end users. In contrast, those working in civic engagement often position community members as experts and coeducators who best know the issues at hand because they live those issues.

Though both social innovation and civic engagement approaches are present in domestic and international contexts, we suspect that more practitioners in the international sphere are embracing social innovation than civic engagement. It may be that the increased globalization of our campuses has served as impetus for the ascendance of social innovation, or that the global context seems to some like fertile ground for the inherent experimentation that comes with innovation. Depending on one’s perspective, social innovations...
implemented abroad may seem like effective ways of addressing pressing social problems, or they may seem like forms of neo-imperialism. This is not to say that civic engagement approaches are able to overcome all of these obstacles—in fact, they often fall prey to the very same pitfalls, leaving community partners dependent and without the additional capacity they need.

In both domestic and international contexts, our students aim to address a range of issues, including hunger, homelessness, poverty, illness, and violence. These social issues exist within, and are created and maintained by, political contexts. Whether designed to address formal governmental policy or the power dynamics of a local community, our students’ change-making efforts are short-sighted if they do not take into account these broader contexts. Much evidence suggests that our students view their innovations and their charity as substitutes for failed governance, but students working outside of governmental processes still need political skills to effect change (Zukin et al. 2006). Even innovative approaches to social change—such as Teach for America and City Year—ultimately rely on some governmental resources to achieve scale. And yet, both social innovation and civic engagement approaches are deficient in their teaching on policy and politics. Although some conceptions of civic engagement are broad enough to include politics and policy (see, for example, Erlich 2000), fundamentally, both social innovation approaches and civic engagement approaches in its most common form (service learning) eschew politics.

**Going Forward**

Much more needs to be known about how social innovation and civic engagement approaches contribute to the development of engaged citizens. This issue of *Diversity & Democracy* begins to chart the landscape. As these approaches continue their ascendancy, we are left with several key questions.

What student learning outcomes are we achieving, and how are we achieving them? An engaged citizen is defined by a composite of civic attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Practitioners of social innovation and civic engagement may share overarching goals, but we likely develop different aspects of engaged citizens. As others have asserted elsewhere, the making of engaged citizens involves a nuanced educational process (Colby et al. 2003). A relatively robust literature on both student and community outcomes has emerged from the civic engagement movement, and the social innovation movement might benefit from adapting and expanding on this scholarship. Both movements should apply the tools of social and behavioral science to ascertain the effects of their work on students.

How can we work together (and when should we not)? Social innovation and civic engagement approaches have complementary strengths, which if combined may increase the effectiveness of both. The social innovation sector brings creativity, a focus on design, and skills in program development and communication. The civic engagement sector brings attention to the voices of community members, concerns for the impact on human beings, and consideration of the long-term sustainability of efforts. By combining these strengths, social innovation approaches may be more likely to develop solutions to problems, and civic engagement approaches may be more likely to develop civic leaders who can marshal support for these innovations. Indeed, we are excited about the synergies that have and will continue to emerge, in our work and across higher education.

As a practical matter, how can we explore the connections between the two approaches on our campuses? We have found that conversations between practitioners of the two approaches do not happen often enough. To be sure, there are notable exceptions; but these conversations occur across languages as different as our methods, our approaches to training faculty and staff leaders, our associated disciplinary fields, and so on. With more opportunities for dialogue among practitioners across fields, we are confident that these important conversations will advance.

Clearly, as civic engagement practitioners, we feel cautious about the emergence of social innovation as a guiding framework for social change in higher education. But we also are humbled by the unavoidable observation that the ascendant focus on higher education’s civic mission has not coincided with the emergence of a more just and equitable society. We hope that this issue of *Diversity & Democracy* will inspire a critical discussion, and we look forward to a possible shared future between these two approaches. Our students and world deserve our shared commitment to this work.
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Many of us are working as educators and practitioners to help students develop the mindsets and skill sets of changemakers, even if we use different names for this work. Each of our various educational approaches to social change—from civic engagement and service learning to social innovation and philanthropy—offers valuable perspectives and different strengths for addressing a spectrum of social challenges.

Yet within higher education, silos between different divisions, a lack of common terminology, and duplicative staffing structures have resulted in limited collaboration among faculty and staff and a lack of clarity for students seeking well-defined pathways. As a result, students’ ideas and energy may be scattered. They may never get involved in addressing social challenges; or they may move too quickly, proposing new innovations without fully understanding the context or the existing players.

An educational framework integrated across social change methodologies would offer depth of content and breadth of experience, providing opportunities for students to develop their citizenship skills and hone their entrepreneurial abilities so that they can think and act effectively within systems. To develop such a framework, faculty, staff, and industry professionals will have to become changemakers themselves. We will need to understand the contexts of our diverse fields and institutions, build coalitions, and expand on each other’s experiences in new and creative ways as we support our students in pursuing social change.

Social Innovation: Valuable Strengths

For nearly a decade, Ashoka U has supported colleges and universities as they embed the values and culture of social innovation across their institutions. In the process, we have partnered with a network of Changemaker Campuses, recognized for their institution-wide commitment to social innovation and changemaking. To date, thirty-seven Changemaker Campuses representing seven countries have participated in a rigorous selection process requiring buy-in from senior leadership, evidence of strong student and faculty interest, a long-term funding strategy, and a plan for how the institution will uniquely contribute to solving global problems. These institutions are models for other colleges and universities pursuing excellence in social innovation education.

In our work, we have drawn inspiration from the work of James A. Philips, Jr., Kriss Deiglmeier, and Dale T. Miller (2008), who describe social innovation as “a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals.” Learning with and from our campus partners, Ashoka U has built on this statement to define social innovation in the higher education context as including the following concepts:

- **Systems Thinking**: To identify new ways of addressing complex problems, social innovators need to understand how elements within a system are connected. Systems thinking requires mapping the stakeholders involved, understanding how incentives are aligned, and identifying root causes in order to propose interventions for systemic transformation.

- **Solutions**: While it is always important to understand problems—and existing approaches—before offering solutions, change efforts too often stop at the research phase. Social innovators give themselves permission to relentlessly learn, adapt, find, and implement solutions.

- **Innovation**: While many social change models and strategies exist, new and creative approaches are sometimes needed in order to address intractable problems. Assessment of whether a new approach is more effective or more efficient than preexisting solutions is necessary in order to justify pursuing an innovation over existing alternatives.

- **Scale**: Social innovation models typically have relevance beyond one particular situation (e.g., a school) and can be applied at a systems level (e.g., to an entire school system). Yet innovations that occur at scale can offer both breadth (affecting a significant number of people) and depth (transforming relationships, structures, and systems in a particular place).

- **Financial Sustainability**: Social innovation aims for a triple bottom line of economic, social, and ecological value. Achieving this bottom line requires securing and aligning resources of all kinds, combining private, public, and philanthropic support with income generation to ensure ongoing sustainability.

- **Impact Measurement and Assessment**: When trying to use resources wisely and deliver results, learning what works and what does not work is of utmost importance.
Formative and summative assessments offer critical information to guide continuous feedback and improvement.

- **Collective Impact:** The most difficult and important problems cannot be understood, let alone solved, without involving multiple sectors (nonprofit, public, and private) and diverse stakeholder perspectives. Social innovation encourages collaboration across organizations in order to use resources effectively and efficiently, and to achieve significant lasting social change.

**Potential Vulnerabilities**

While social innovation has served as an empowering framework for many educators and students, every approach to teaching social change has strengths and weaknesses. Indeed, social innovation has its fair share of risks, including the focus on new and potentially unproven ideas; a propensity for action, perhaps without all the information required to act responsibly; and a possible bias toward a deficit model focused on addressing community problems rather than embracing community assets. All of these issues represent key vulnerabilities in developing university-based programs, and are noted in several recent articles and blogs.

For example, educators Eric Mlyn and Amanda Moore McBride (2015) describe a major critique of social innovation related to innovation for innovation’s sake. They argue that an attraction to what is new and exciting can lead to ideas developed without adequate research or understanding of the existing context. However, we would argue that innovation can encourage movement beyond old ways of thinking. By focusing on long-term solutions rather than short-term interventions, innovators can learn from what already works before rushing to innovate new models.

Another recent critique comes from the Deputy Director of the Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship at Oxford University’s Said Business School, Daniela Papi-Thornton (2016), who makes the case for “Tackling Heropreneurship.” Papi-Thornton posits that the contemporary explosion of idea and business plan competitions has served to glorify the role of the individual and establish a focus on products and services as outcomes to be judged. Highlighting process instead of product, she proposes “funding for learning, not just solving” and calls readers to “celebrate a range of social impact roles.” Indeed, it is important for students to identify with many roles involved in social change—including those played by leaders, managers, activists, and change agents across business, government, and nonprofit sectors.

Finally, journalist Courtney Martin (2016) highlights a lack of humility as a key problem of social innovation. Without adequate preparation, students may enter communities with solutions that are not relevant, culturally appropriate, or needed, and they may inadvertently harm those they are trying to help. While this critique could apply to anyone engaged in community-based work, a focus on humility could only improve social innovation’s impact and effectiveness.

The vulnerabilities described above are all of serious concern; yet many can be addressed and mitigated by educators who articulate the strengths, weaknesses, and biases of their respective approaches and who guide students through an array of experiences while working toward the end goal of creating a better world.

**A Changemaker Toolbox**

The strengths and weaknesses of social innovation suggest the value of an integrated approach. As indicated above, focusing only on social innovation is not sufficient, and when done badly, it can cause negative unintended consequences for communities. At the same time, community engagement and service-learning approaches alone might never allow students to see the full potential of their ideas or, in some cases, the true scale of the problems at hand. The solution lies in combining the best aspects of these multiple educational approaches.

As educators, then, we must provide students with an array of approaches to changemaking. We can prepare students to become sophisticated changemakers able to adapt to any situation by offering a toolbox that contains a diverse set of tools: social innovation, civic engagement, service learning, community engagement, philanthropy, design thinking, public policy. Not every tool will be appropriate for every situation all the time. But with a range of theories, approaches, and methodologies in their toolboxes, students can develop the wisdom to deploy the right tool for each job and to combine approaches strategically for the greatest potential impact.

Each field that might contribute to the changemaker toolbox has value as part of the whole. In order to work better together, practitioners of each approach must get out of our own comfort zones, learn from the expertise associated with other methodologies, focus on a shared goal of preparing students to be sophisticated changemakers, and break down institutional boundaries. To accomplish this integration of approaches, educators might consider the following actions:

1. **Develop comprehensive changemaker pathways:** Design holistic student learning pathways that build on each other in developmentally appropriate ways and provide opportunities for students to acquire the tools in the changemaker toolbox.

2. **Encourage T-shaped changemakers:** Expect students not only to gain deep academic experience through their
majors, but also to study and engage in other approaches so they become well-rounded graduates. As described by Jeffrey Selingo (2016), the vertical line of the “T” represents deep understanding of one subject matter (e.g., history) as well as one industry (e.g., health care); the horizontal stroke represents the ability to collaborate across disciplines, with empathy and communication skills playing key roles in allowing individuals to connect across different perspectives.

3. **Invest in on-campus integration and relationships**: Consider improving staff coordination, investing in joint marketing of opportunities, sharing office space, co-branding major strategic initiatives, and designing integrated student experiences. Build relationships of trust, a shared set of values, and an aligned vision for how collaborative efforts can be greater than the sum of their parts.

By taking these steps, faculty and staff can identify areas of opportunity, spark new collaborations, build integrated strategies with enhanced impact, and include campus stakeholders in crafting a vision for change.

**New Models for an Integrated Framework**

Ashoka U’s Changemaker Campuses are already testing new models for an integrated social change educational framework. And promising work is emerging at institutions across the country.

At Tulane University, IGNITE: Community, Creativity, Change is an immersive preorientation program that unites five campus departments with unique approaches to social change. IGNITE provides incoming students with connections to peers passionate about engaging in community; mentorship from upper class students; relationships with Tulane staff members with personal and professional expertise in social justice, community engagement, and social innovation; and exposure to local leaders who model effective ways of creating positive social change. The program introduces students to multiple curricular and cocurricular pathways, such as an undergraduate minor in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship (SISE); a peer-training program to discuss issues of power, privilege, and identity; and a multicultural leadership retreat. Integration across disciplines is modeled in other elements of Tulane’s work, such as a series of endowed Social Entrepreneurship Professorships held by faculty across the natural sciences, humanities, and social sciences.

Arizona State University (ASU) has developed a four-year curricular and cocurricular program to foster cross-sector leadership across majors. After evaluating existing public service programs at other colleges and universities and conducting an internal landscape analysis, ASU’s Office of University Initiatives launched the Public Service Academy (PSA), a collaborative leadership development program that trains military and civilian national service leaders to take on complex social challenges across sectors. The PSA’s first initiative, the Next Generation Service Corps (NGSC), builds on the insight that tomorrow’s leaders will have to work across sectors to solve complex social problems, often through careers that span multiple industries and organizational types. The 2015–16 inaugural class brought together 117 first-year students from eighteen US states representing fifty-two academic majors for classes, “corps building” experiences, mentorship, and internships. Students who participate in this four-year program will graduate with a certificate in cross-sector leadership.

These examples—which exemplify program integration, staffing integration, faculty engagement incentives, and innovations for student awareness-building—are heartening. But we need more models that can reach more students, as well as research efforts to help us better understand the potential benefits of various disciplines, methodologies, and social change approaches.

**Conclusion: Educators as Changemakers**

At Ashoka U, we see social innovation not only as an educational offering, but also as a new mindset for reenvisioning the role of the university. We propose taking the best of social innovation—a combined focus on collective impact, systems thinking, innovation, scale, and financial sustainability—and applying it to higher education to create an integrative educational framework for social change. We can accomplish our goal of helping students become sophisticated changemakers only by empowering faculty and staff to see themselves as institutional innovators and to try new approaches, programs, and ways of working. Will you join us?
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To help solve our world’s most challenging problems, our country needs to build a twenty-first-century public sector that is more adaptive, innovative, and resilient—a public sector that can smartly use data and leverage technology to engage citizens in developing and implementing solutions at scale. Doing this requires training a new generation of public-sector innovators who have the skills and the tools necessary to actively and creatively generate solutions to the problems we face, including the ability to apply the values associated with diversity and inclusion. These leaders will need to value civic engagement and understand that diversity is not binary—poor or rich, majority or minority, public or private, Democrat or Republican—but rather is multidimensional, accounting for all aspects of race, class, ideas, beliefs, perspectives, and experiences. Hence, students need learning environments where they can acquire the skills, tools, and knowledge necessary to advance innovation in a diverse democracy. Institutions of higher education have an opportunity to provide experiential learning pedagogies that challenge students to think in new ways.

**Innovation in Government**

I learned firsthand the power of engagement across disciplines and perspectives from my experiences in the private, nonprofit, and public sectors, especially the federal government. I have had the privilege of working in government twice in my career: first as an international economist at the US Department of Treasury, and then as deputy assistant to President Barack Obama at the White House. In the latter position, I worked with a team to create—a among many other initiatives—the Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation (SICP). We created SICP because we realized that to solve the social challenges of our time, our government needed to operate differently across functions, from procurement to recruitment to community engagement. We recognized that innovation in government is critical for change. Innovators need not only to solve today’s problems, but also to anticipate the problems of tomorrow.

To achieve impact, innovation can take many forms. It can involve giving old ideas a modern twist, codesigning new ideas with communities, or challenging current norms and structures. At the White House, I saw social innovation take on a life of its own, with some incredible results. Through SICP, we created innovation funds across government, starting with the Social Innovation Fund; forged new public-private partnerships like the Let’s Move campaign in collaboration with civil organizations, philanthropic entities, and businesses; and used technology to better connect with citizens and improve services, as through the We the People petition website.

We were proud to have created new tools and models for engagement. But tools are not enough to create a twenty-first-century government. During my tenure leading the Technology, Innovation and Government Reform group within President Obama’s 2008 transition team, we made civic engagement the core focus of our efforts to institutionalize a culture of innovation. We wanted to create a culture in government where solutions were human-centric—where a constant and iterative process of learning moved the government beyond compliance and toward outcomes. We sought to embed this outcomes mindset in government by inculcating a new way of thinking that emphasized listening to and learning from communities. We invested in what was already working in communities and scaled what works. This mindset now informs the work of the Beeck Center for Social Impact and Innovation at Georgetown University.

**Education at the Nexus of Theory and Practice**

At the Beeck Center for Social Impact and Innovation, we conceive of our work as located at the nexus of theory and practice. We believe that colleges and universities must be agile and flexible in order to instruct and embolden the next generation of public sector leaders. These leaders will need to be able to think critically not just about the world as it is, but about the world...
Impacts fellows are working with the Center for Civic Innovation in Atlanta, Georgia. They are researching existing models of social entrepreneurship in US cities and adapting those models and best practices to meet the needs of local Atlanta communities. In Managua, Nicaragua, our fellows are interning with Mochila Digital—a social enterprise under the Inventtus International Corporation. They are exploring the role of technology in bridging the education gap and increasing access to education for low-income students.

We also offer courses at the Beeck Center. I teach a course titled Social Impact@Scale, where we engage students in putting theory into practice. Originally launched in 2015 as a non-credit learning opportunity, the course generated more than seventy applications within thirty-six hours from across Georgetown’s schools. In 2016, we made it a full-time, for-credit offering. In this course, students work with an organization for a full semester on a problem of scale. In 2015, we partnered with Ateneo de Manila University in the Philippines to help scale a children’s nutrition program that provides meals to twenty thousand public elementary school students each day. Ateneo needs to scale this program to one hundred thousand students each day. Georgetown students provided recommendations on how Ateneo could expand this program, partnering with the government, the private sector, and the community.

In spring 2016, we partnered with the Mann Deshi Foundation in Mhaswad, India, to scale the reach of its financial services training program from two hundred thousand to one million women. To complement their studies at Georgetown, we sent a team of students to the Philippines and India through GU Impacts to test their assumptions and learn from experience. We also partner with graduate school professors to provide design thinking as part of their semester courses.

GU Impacts, Social Impacts@Scale, and our design thinking partnerships were created to engage today’s students. These students—tomorrow’s leaders—are determined to take charge of their own futures; they are highly entrepreneurial and interested in designing their own courses of study (Northeastern News 2014). They learn through theory and practice. One of our GU Impacts fellows, Etana, exemplifies this point. During her interview for GU Impacts she pointed out that she was less successful in structured, lecture-style classes where learning was primarily based on memorization, but thrived in classes where she had more room for creativity and individualized learning. She demonstrated humility, self-awareness, and introspection. She is exactly the type of leader we want to cultivate. Higher education needs to look beyond traditional indicators of success and cultivate more students like Etana who seek out challenges, are willing to go outside of their comfort zones, can navigate ambiguous situations, and are willing to work hard.

Students’ enthusiasm for the learning opportunities at Georgetown is a testament to their desire for critical engagement with the world. By working to solve real-world problems for organizations—both nonprofit and for profit—students are learning how to collaborate in teams, use analytical skills, make decisions, and learn from failure. They also understand that in order to have impact at scale they need to better understand the full ecosystem, including the role of nongovernmental organizations, government, the private sector, and individuals.

Connecting Student Aspirations to Public Needs

The world is rapidly evolving at a pace faster than expected. To meet
the promise of innovation, we need to invest in a generation of leaders who are creative, have the courage to take risks and try new approaches, and have the humility to understand and learn from communities. While Georgetown and other institutions are educating such a generation of leaders, these leaders need to see government as an opportunity for change. Students are often barraged with antigovernment rhetoric. Many see government as part of the problem (Pew Research Center 2015), not the solution. They consider civil servants to be ineffective, risk-averse, and bureaucratic, and many students resolve to pursue careers in the private sector. This aversion to government and to public service more broadly is dangerous. It increases civic disengagement and reduces the supply of talent needed to create a more agile and technology-literate government.

Fortunately, many young people are beginning to realize that the public sector is where real systems change can be effected. According to the 2014 Deloitte Millenial survey, three-quarters of millennials believe that government has the potential to address societal challenges. They also crave a sense of purpose and mission. Public service offers purpose. Yet though millennials still distrust government, they are engaged in their communities. In fact, they are reinventing civic engagement and creating new models of participation (Brady 2015). These models range from digital engagement through civic tech meetups to more direct participation in budgetary decision-making through participatory democracy.

Public service needs to be transformed. More experiential learning opportunities in higher education that provide students the ability to engage with real-world problems play a significant role in this transformation. At the same time, government needs to do more to attract young people to work in government, by creating on and off ramps to this work and by creating environments that enable government workers to look at problems creatively and engage collaboratively in designing solutions. GovConnect, an initiative in agencies like the US Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency, and local levels, and to eschew the comfort of parochialism and embrace the complexity of systems thinking. By participating in these opportunities, students learn how to account for and engage various factors, actors, and voices in order to solve and deliver solutions at scale. To train the next generation of public sector innovators, institutions of

By balancing theory and practice in pedagogy, educators can ensure a willing cadre of public sector innovators ready to tackle our most intractable problems.

is one such program that allows federal employees to pursue projects of interest that are not necessarily part of their everyday responsibilities. Just imagine the possibility to attract and retain talent if more public agencies offered similar opportunities.

Conclusion
As the world rapidly changes, we need students who have both theoretical training and practical knowledge, who can work in cross-disciplinary teams, and who understand how to leverage data and technology to serve communities. These students need to be prepared to address not only today’s problems, but also those of tomorrow: issues such as global governance in a digital world and the role of labor in an automated workforce. Institutions of higher education need to develop and support experiential learning opportunities that challenge students to draw on a diversity of experiences, perspectives, and disciplines in order to adequately bring these resources to bear on some of society’s greatest problems.

Such opportunities encourage students to think about social innovation and impact at both the global

higher education must become labs for learning and engagement as they develop curricula that support an ecosystem of experiential learning opportunities that bridge gaps not only across disciplines, but also across social, political, and economic cleavages. By balancing theory and practice in pedagogy, educators can ensure a willing cadre of public sector innovators ready to tackle our most intractable problems. The future depends on how effectively we respond to the problems we face and to those we have not yet imagined.
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For several years, I have studied how the civic engagement and social entrepreneurship movements claim their respective places on university and college campuses. How do these movements, which for decades have argued for their own centrality—in institutional mission, in the curriculum, in disciplines, and in reward and recognition systems—make their case and establish a foothold? In this article, I share research I have conducted at ten higher education institutions that are investing in both social innovation initiatives and civic engagement programs as key ways of structuring student learning for social change.

**Separate but Connected**

At first glance, the civic engagement movement and the social innovation movement appear to have much in common. Both are oriented to the community, both seek to change the world, and both argue that students ought to gain skills, dispositions, and attitudes that will position them to be critical thinkers and active doers. But there are important differences as well. Advocates of social entrepreneurship may argue that civic engagement is too comfortable with charity-oriented approaches to community engagement, too focused on student learning, and too little concerned with making sustained impact on communities. Countering, proponents of civic engagement contend that social entrepreneurs are too enamored with business thinking, too focused on launching new organizations, and too prone to ignore the need for civic participation and community involvement (McBride and Mlyn 2015).

Each movement is following a similar path toward institutionalization in the academy—creating definitions and boundaries around its respective field, founding journals, organizing conferences, and establishing programs of study with majors, minors, and certificates. Each field has been influenced by national organizations that are committed to creating and recognizing civic engagement and social innovation programs that are sustainable, academically rigorous, and connected to the core mission of the institution. Promoting community engagement is the three-decade-old Campus Compact, a network of more than 1,100 campuses supported by thirty-four state offices—a sizable measure of this work in the academy. Advancing social entrepreneurship and social innovation is Ashoka U, which has tracked the steady growth of this work on campuses through increasing numbers of social entrepreneurship courses connected to academic programs, faculty involved in teaching these courses, centers and incubators for innovative work, and funding dedicated to these efforts (Ashoka U 2014).

Recognizing that commitment to either community engagement or social entrepreneurship requires broad dedication of resources and institutional leadership beyond a few committed faculty members, the two movements have developed standards or benchmarks for measuring institutionalization. In relation to civic engagement, such measurement takes the form of the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification, where the goal of community engagement is to “prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good” (New England Resource Center for Higher Education 2015). In relation to social entrepreneurship, Ashoka U recognizes campus commitment through its Changemaker Campus designation, which identifies campuses that inspire students “to create meaningful lives and powerful change in the world” (Ashoka U 2015). Recognition by the Carnegie Foundation and Ashoka U signals that a college or university is committed to these practices and supports them broadly across the institution. Each designation requires documentation and self-study and reveals much about how campuses are organizing around engagement.

**Organizing for Engagement**

As of May 2015, ten campuses in the United States had been recognized both by the Carnegie Foundation for their leadership in civic engagement and by Ashoka U for their leadership in social entrepreneurship: Arizona State University, Cornell University, Duke University, Marquette University, Middlebury College, Portland State University, Rollins College, Tulane University, the University of San Diego, and Western Washington University.

These campuses paint an interesting picture of organization for engagement that draws on both civic engagement and social entrepreneurship. The ten campuses represent an array of institutional types, from small selective liberal arts colleges to large public research universities, and include a variety of public and private master’s- and doctoral-degree-granting institutions. Among these institutions, undergraduate enrollments
range from 2,500 students at Middlebury College to over 68,000 at Arizona State University. The ten campuses include some with strong reputations for civic involvement, like Tulane and Portland State University; some with strong traditions of social justice, like the University of San Diego; and some with long traditions of experiential education, like Cornell.

How do these very different campuses, all sharing commitments to both civic engagement and social entrepreneurship, organize work in these areas? During spring 2015, I conducted phone interviews with leaders and staff members of the campuses’ social entrepreneurship and civic engagement programs to better understand how they were working together (or not) to advance their respective practices. I also interviewed thought leaders in both fields, as well as the directors of the state Campus Compact offices where the ten campuses were located, to get a broad perspective on how these fields were emerging and developing on a state and national level as well as on the campus stage.

The individuals I interviewed and the campuses they represented used a great variety of terms to describe this work. On different campuses, different terms predominated, including engaged learning and research, service learning, social entrepreneurship, innovation, community engagement, social justice, social responsibility, community-based learning, community-oriented research, public service, social embeddedness, community and economic development, and community-connected teaching, learning, and research. This variety indicates how differently the work is manifested, depending on how each campus understands its mission and focus and how it organizes its community-oriented work.

As I conducted the interviews, important differences emerged in where civic engagement and social entrepreneurship programs were located on each campus. Reflecting variations in size and operational complexity, some campuses had centralized their civic engagement and social entrepreneurship efforts within a few offices, while others had multiple centers, institutes, and initiatives located throughout, some serving either practice exclusively. Staff support might be located in stand-alone centers focused on supporting students and faculty and developing and managing partnerships; faculty might also find support through centers for faculty development, teaching, and innovation. Programs focused on either practice might be located in a variety of different offices and divisions: the office of the provost, the division of student affairs, offices of outreach and partnerships, and other places.

On some campuses, most programming was centered and supported through the co-curriculum, with minimal engagement occurring in academic programs and little buy-in from faculty or leaders in academic affairs. On others, civic engagement and social entrepreneurship were key elements of academic identity and programs. Civic engagement might be a general education requirement that exists outside of departments, or it might be present in courses across departments that were organized through majors, minors, and certificate programs. On some campuses, immersion in civic engagement served as a precursor to social entrepreneurship, with the premise that students needed deep engagement with the community before they could launch new organizations using entrepreneurial approaches.

Some interviewees indicated that colleagues at their institutions viewed civic engagement as a practice more at home in the liberal arts, and social entrepreneurship as more aligned with business school priorities—indicating two competing or perhaps complementary versions of how different disciplines might engage with the community. Despite these and other differences, institutions had found creative ways to facilitate the exchange of ideas. Some campuses had organized hubs that brought together several types of effort for social impact—including civic engagement, social entrepreneurship, and other streams of community engagement—for information sharing and joint programming. Others had established advisory councils to examine how best to organize work that connected the university with the community.

Multiple Paths, Many Tools, and Several Fronts

My findings on civic engagement and social entrepreneurship initiatives suggest important questions about higher education’s ultimate aims in engaging with the community. Each movement offers a useful mirror to the other as practitioners consider together how to teach students what they need know about citizenship, broadly defined, in the twenty-first century.

Consider the project of addressing food insecurity in our communities. Those who want to encourage students to engage with this problem in collaboration with community partners could send students to work in the local food bank or organize a food drive, thus exposing them to the issue and helping them understand root causes while gaining civic awareness. Or we could challenge students to think about the multiple ways in which they could make an impact on the issue: by working with local social entrepreneurs who are outfitting a food truck that delivers healthy food to neighborhoods located in food deserts, by collaborating with a local nonprofit on a campaign to raise the minimum wage, or by organizing a community garden where local residents...
and students can grow fresh food to distribute to local shelters. There are multiple paths to making social impact while, at the same time, teaching students a broad array of techniques and helping them acquire a variety of tools for twenty-first-century citizenship.

The unique culture of a campus, its history of engagement, whether members of the campus community see civic engagement as a cocurricular enterprise or the heart of the curriculum, whether the institution has a mission statement that broadly or narrowly defines and supports work with community—all these elements set the foundation for the next stage of an institution’s efforts for social impact. It would be hazardous to suggest a single way forward across higher education given the array of institutional contexts, missions, visions, leadership concerns, and resources.

Nonetheless, campuses can develop languages, fitting to their individual contexts, that incorporate service learning, social entrepreneurship, community organizing, philanthropy, community-based research, deliberative democracy, and other approaches to social change or social impact under a broad umbrella of citizenship and engagement. We can organize these languages using frameworks that support the broad civic purposes of higher education, that build upon a history of engagement, whether members of the larger community to build skills of democratic engagement. The Haas Center for Public Service at Stanford University has created a model of six Pathways of Public Service and Civic Engagement that can be used to help students understand their own inclinations and identify opportunities for public service (Stanford University, n.d.). These examples suggest how campuses might extend their work in both the curriculum and the cocurriculum. In addition, I have developed a schema called the Community Engagement Toolbox, which highlights approaches to social change like conscious consumerism, storytelling, case-making, and organizational support and infrastructure development in addition to direct service, civic work, philanthropy, community-engaged research, community organizing, and social entrepreneurship (Enos 2015). A framework like this opens up opportunities for faculty and student engagement. Campuses can tailor this and other frameworks to their communities and campus cultures.

Through the discussions and debates about language and the challenges we put forth to our college and university communities, we can claim a common interest in the shared goal of educating citizens—individuals who understand the power of social movements, and who know when to apply business principles and when to pursue civic action. It would be an important accomplishment if we as educators and our students could understand the power we hold not only as citizens but also as consumers; if we could understand the power and pitfalls of philanthropy; if we could understand the importance of community involvement; if we could understand and measure impact and could work collectively to solve social problems. By seeking broader frameworks for our work, we can consider how disciplines across the university can connect via shared goals for social impact. By stipulating principles of engagement that underlie our work in the community no matter what form that engagement takes—which civic engagement, social entrepreneurship, or other approaches—we can teach students to become active, engaged, and thoughtful members of society.
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Education focused on social entrepreneurship and innovation prepares students for an ever-changing workforce and arms them with the skills necessary to address contemporary global and local challenges. At community colleges, such education takes a variety of different forms. While some community colleges have launched recent efforts to provide formal instruction in social entrepreneurship, many have been dabbling informally in this arena for decades. At the National Association for Community College Entrepreneurship (NACCE)—a member organization of over three hundred community colleges representing nearly two thousand presidents, educators, administrators, and center directors—many of our members are focused on inciting entrepreneurship in their communities and on their campuses. NACCE has two main goals: to empower community college leaders to approach the work of leading their institutions with an entrepreneurial mindset, and to grow the role of community colleges in supporting job creation and entrepreneurship within their local ecosystems. NACCE has seen a recent surge in interest in social entrepreneurship among its members and is responding by expanding its programming and leadership related to social entrepreneurship efforts at community colleges.

**Valuable Skills and Mindsets**

Within higher education, entrepreneurship is traditionally associated with business departments. But over the years, educators and the public have begun to recognize the value of entrepreneurial skills and mindsets in disciplines beyond business, including computer science, the arts, and the career technical disciplines. Employers have acknowledged that skills and characteristics associated with the entrepreneurial mindset—including problem solving, opportunity recognition, self-motivation, and resilience—are abilities and traits that they seek among their employees. Entrepreneurship education encourages the development of the diverse talents and creativity necessary for success in the twenty-first century (Zhao 2015).

Social entrepreneurship differs from traditional entrepreneurship in its focus on working within complex social and environmental systems in addition to economic systems. Social entrepreneurs need a unique skill set that includes empathy and active listening in order to address the needs of multiple stakeholders and account for how those stakeholders might be affected by a business or other venture (Worsham 2012). Community colleges are helping students build these relational and soft skills through new courses, service-learning projects within existing courses, student clubs, and projects that require students to address complex issues using multidisciplinary perspectives.

A strong experiential learning component ties together all these efforts. Students gain entrepreneurial skills and mindsets through experiential learning and application, and social entrepreneurship education in its many forms exposes students from all disciplines to opportunities for addressing relevant challenges within their own communities. Whether through formal classroom instruction or student-led grassroots movements, NACCE members are integrating social entrepreneurship into student experiences across campus with impressive results.

**Changing the Curriculum at Miami Dade**

Miami Dade College is pioneering social entrepreneurship as part of a broad effort that will reach over three hundred programs of study. Rahnuma Ahsan, assistant professor in the School of Business at Miami Dade’s Kendall Campus, described the particular role of social entrepreneurship at a community college: “Social entrepreneurship fits the community college narrative because of the population we serve. The challenges that community college students face are astronomical. Community college students are better equipped [than some of their peers] to identify and face issues and problems in social entrepreneurship, such as student homelessness, hunger, family, and life issues.”

Under the leadership of President Eduardo J. Padrón, Miami Dade College has prioritized changemaking as a framework for helping students develop the mindsets and skill sets that will lead to new solutions for today’s challenges.

---

1. Unless otherwise indicated, all direct quotations in this article were collected in interviews with or on behalf of the author.
Padrón believes that education focused on changemaking “is an attempt to connect the traditional foundation of liberal arts and sciences to a practical awareness of society’s challenges today while also supporting economic growth. We need changemakers in a community like Miami that is fueled by small business enterprise and that also is in the process of reimagining itself.”

Miami Dade College has translated this vision into action with a college-wide initiative focused on helping all students build a toolkit of skills associated with changemaking. Honors College Dean and MDC Ashoka U Change Leader Pascale Charlot said, “The objective is for MDC to make this toolkit available to all students. Thus, the strategy features a menu of options for a multidisciplinary approach that includes social entrepreneurship and innovation to meet a diverse range of students’ learning goals while also serving the community.” The college is committed to enriching existing curricular and cocurricular pathways by maximizing applied learning opportunities such as service learning and by creating new experiences through a certificate in social entrepreneurship that students can earn for college credit. Changemaking is featured in the college-wide strategic plan, which encompasses all eight Miami Dade campuses and serves over 165,000 students. Because of these efforts, Miami Dade was the first community college to receive the Ashoka U Changemaker Campus designation, indicating that it has embraced the challenge of cultivating a cross-campus culture to educate changemakers and of embedding changemaking in existing academic programs (Brock 2011).

Within this ecosystem, faculty members like Ahsan have engaged in curriculum development related to social entrepreneurship. Ahsan has both incorporated social entrepreneurship into existing courses (Business Capstone and Organizational Management) and designed a new course (Starting and Growing a Social Venture), the latter of which is part of the new certificate in social entrepreneurship. In Ahsan’s Business Capstone course section, piloted in fall 2015, students worked in teams to design business plans that address current social issues in their own community, using statistical research to identify areas of challenge and opportunity. Through the lens of social entrepreneurship, they were exposed to empathy and the “triple bottom line” (people, planet, profit). At the end of the semester, students presented their business concepts to a panel of judges for feedback. Students have responded positively to the course. One student summarized the experience in the exit survey: “This course … has made me more aware of the issues and how we can work together to help for a better cause. You don’t have to be a nonprofit corporation to help the community grow and become better.”

Enacting Change at Feather River

Feather River College, located in the rural Sierra Nevada mountains in northeastern California, adopted a hybrid approach to social entrepreneurship through a one-credit course titled Project-Based Learning with Enactus. Enactus (www.enactus.org) is a student organization in which participants apply entrepreneurial principles to address social and environmental challenges. Several Feather River students had joined Enactus to work on social entrepreneurship projects, and as interest grew and it became apparent that participating students were gaining important skills, the college created the course so students could earn credit for their efforts. Students who enrolled in the course focused on both global and local projects, working in teams to identify needs and challenges, develop sustainable solutions, and implement those solutions. Culminating activities included regional and national competitions in which the Feather River College team competed with teams from other colleges and universities, each presenting on their social impact for the year. Over the seven years in which the course was offered, the Feather River students mentored local foster youth, contributed to business and economic development during times of high unemployment, and participated in a series of projects with a partner village in southwestern Uganda.

Through these projects, students developed deep ties within various communities. Whether working in Uganda or in their own small town, they applied the same principles of community development and stakeholder engagement. For example, in Mabare, Uganda, a delegation of Feather River College students partnered with a grassroots community development organization to work as allies with village leaders to identify community needs and develop solutions. On their first trip to the village, students witnessed a small child suffering from a malaria-induced seizure and were told that she was not expected to survive. Upon their return to Feather River College, they began raising funds for mosquito nets and eventually raised enough money (matched by aid organizations) to provide a net for each family in the village. Over four years, students also worked with villagers to manually dig a water pipeline, awarded microloans through business plan competitions, and installed low-tech hand-washing stations to reduce the spread of disease. In the process, they formed deep friendships with the residents of Mabare, and both students and residents viewed their work as a partnership in development, not a charity.

The projects had positive effects not only on the communities, but also on the students, who experienced personal development that lasted long
past their graduations. Shelbie Mathis, a 2012 alumna and kinesiology major, credits her recent acceptance into a top physical therapy doctoral program to the lessons she learned and skills she developed on the Enactus team, which gave her a competitive advantage over other candidates. For instance, during her interview process, Mathis exercised networking and presentation skills that she gained through hands-on project-based social entrepreneurship. Her work on social entrepreneurship projects at Feather River College also made her more comfortable with ambiguity—an outcome that served her well in her path to graduate school. After completing her doctorate in physical therapy, Mathis plans to start a nonprofit organization to assist spinal cord injury patients by providing therapeutic equipment and home conversions to accommodate mobility issues. Mathis said, “Throughout my life, I have always desired to be a leader of change. I falsely believed that to be a leader you had to be overtly powerful. Through Enactus, I discovered that true leadership is in empowering others, an idea that was powerful in and of itself.”

Seeking Systems Transformation at Paradise Valley

Caron Sada, resident psychology faculty member at Paradise Valley Community College in Phoenix, Arizona, has adopted a grassroots, bottom-up approach to social entrepreneurship. Sada has spearheaded a cross-campus social entrepreneurship movement to inspire students to discover their own passions and design actionable projects to pursue those passions. Sada and her students founded Club Zeitgeist (Club Z), “where creativity and action are always in style.” Through Club Z, students develop projects based around their own interests, incorporating the principles of social entrepreneurship by addressing challenges in the community. For instance, a theater student formed an improvisation group to raise funds for a local theater.

Sada is passionate about giving students a platform to practice and express their interests in a creative way. While Club Z started as a student organization, the ethic it supports is starting to take hold across campus as Sada partners with like-minded educators in the arts, sustainability, and technology. Together, these educators are working to change educational culture by empowering students to design their own educational experiences. Sada explained, “Social entrepreneurship education helps higher education become entrepreneurial to create transformational learning experiences for all of our students and prepare them for the real world, as they are going to exist as entrepreneurs or intrapreneurs” (where one applies an entrepreneurial mindset and skill set as an employee).

Club Z has chosen sustainability as a theme for the 2016–17 academic year. During this time, students will conduct a campus garden project, host a farmers’ market, and hold two sustainable business pitch competitions. While leading projects and working together, students will incubate their ideas and develop their identities as creators, innovators, intrapreneurs, and entrepreneurs. Their work will also be connected to the curriculum, as faculty will integrate club activities into course content. For example, in Sada’s Psychology and Culture course, students will assess whether the club’s vision, mission, values, and strategy statements align with the values of mainstream culture. In other courses, including Computer Information Systems, Developmental Psychology, and Painting, faculty will incorporate social entrepreneurship projects into reflection assignments and as extra credit.

Through the creative process, students are gaining the skills they need for the workforce they are entering—one where employers are hiring employees for what they can do as much as for what they know. Club Z allows students to try projects, work in teams, practice collaborative skills, and give back to the community. Students can focus on their strengths and talents while building portfolios of competencies.

Conclusion

The mission of community colleges is to serve their local communities, and social entrepreneurship education presents ample opportunities for students to make a lasting impact in those communities while learning and gaining applicable skills. Social entrepreneurship gives students opportunities to practice relevant skills, such as communication, empathy, and critical thinking, while empowering members of their own and other communities. Students thrive on the relevancy that social entrepreneurship brings to their education. Community colleges have found many ways to bring these learning experiences to their students, whether through leadership-endorsed formal instruction or grassroots student-led projects. This trend is likely to continue as colleges innovate their own brand of bottom-up social entrepreneurship.

To learn more about NACCE, visit www.nacce.com.
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Apprenticing in Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the Motor City

MATTHEW T. A. NASH, managing director of social entrepreneurship for the Duke Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative and visiting lecturer in the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke University

Each summer, Duke University assigns pairs of undergraduate students to work on capacity-building projects in partnership with innovative, high-impact social entrepreneurs who are tackling some of Detroit’s greatest challenges. The DukeEngage Detroit program, which coordinates these connections, supports the development of changemaking leaders with a clear sense of self, empathy, a willingness and ability to collaborate, an action orientation, a drive for continuous improvement, and a deep sense of accountability for their actions in the world. The program model rests on three key principles: meaningful apprenticeship, comprehensive enrichment, and critical reflection. In this article, I describe how the program integrates these principles, which are fundamental to the impact of any successful immersive service experience.

A Joint Effort
DukeEngage Detroit is the result of a partnership between DukeEngage and the Duke Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative. The program leverages the strengths, methods, and relationships of both initiatives in delivering a high-impact experience for both students and community partners.

DukeEngage annually empowers over four hundred undergraduates to address critical human needs through immersive service, in the process transforming students, advancing the university’s educational mission, and providing meaningful assistance in the United States and abroad. At forty domestic and international sites, each with its own programmatic focus, students participate in a vast range of activities on topics such as environmental advocacy, education, social justice, and economic development. More than 3,600 students have participated since 2007, when the program was launched through gifts from the Duke Endowment and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Commissioned by Duke’s board of trustees under the auspices of the provost, the Duke Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative seeks to “inspire and prepare all members of the [Duke] community for innovative leadership and to actively support and encourage the translation of knowledge in the service of society” (Duke Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative 2016). The initiative recently introduced an academic certificate program that requires undergraduates to complete, in addition to required courses, two immersive cocurricular experiences of at least 150 and 300 hours each. The Detroit program, launched in 2014, offers one way for students to fulfill these cocurricular requirements.

Meaningful Apprenticeship
Few learning experiences are more transformative than those that occur when students engage in immersive service alongside entrepreneurial leaders working on the front lines of social and economic change in a city like Detroit. Despite the Motor City’s painful economic decline punctuated by its declaration of bankruptcy in 2013, a renewed sense of hope for revitalization has emerged, with local entrepreneurs and changemakers rolling up their sleeves to tackle the city’s challenges. Incubators, accelerators, and other enabling organizations are sprouting up to support these entrepreneurs and to harness social and venture capital in partnership with philanthropic foundations, public agencies, and civic alliances.

DukeEngage Detroit places approximately ten students in apprenticeships with innovative social enterprises that are using entrepreneurial business models to achieve positive social impact. Community partners have included:

- **Detroit Food Academy**: “works with local educators, chefs, and business owners to inspire young Detroits through self-directed entrepreneurial experiences rooted in food” (http://detroitfoodacademy.com);
- **Detroit Future City**: works with citizens, city leadership, and key stakeholders to advance a “community-driven vision” for Detroit’s next fifty years (http://detroitfuturecity.com);
- **Build Institute**: helps Detroits “turn their business ideas into reality by providing them with the necessary tools, resources, and support network” in the community (http://buildinstitute.org);
- **TechTown Detroit**: provides connections to “a broad network of resources, catalyzing entire communities of entrepreneurs best poised to energize the local economy” (http://techtowndetroit.org).

The program works with community partners to identify projects that are strategically important to them, that are likely to have a beneficial impact on the community, and that involve problems that students can address in the allocated time. Before beginning their field work, students engage with their assigned community partners to further define and design their projects, ensuring clear objectives, scopes of...
work, and deliverables. This “contracting phase” is an important part of the student learning process.

Student teams are challenged to create significant results that the students will view as signature accomplishments when they graduate. Projects have included:

- conducting a market research and feasibility study on the expansion of a coworking space for local entrepreneurs;
- developing an online “green calculator” and field guide with resources for Detroiter to assess and improve their open-space parcels of land;
- creating a marketing strategy and an evaluation system for a summer accelerator program for aspiring college-age entrepreneurs; and
- coaching teenagers on the development of business plans for their proposed food ventures.

As they implement their projects, students are actively coached by faculty and staff from Duke’s Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative, and they also receive advising from other faculty, alumni, and subject matter experts.

Comprehensive Enrichment

The DukeEngage Detroit program includes a comprehensive set of enrichment activities designed to advance students’ professional and personal development and to familiarize them with the culture, history, and economics of Detroit. Through predeparture gatherings, an onsite orientation, and in-service workshops, students are introduced to basic concepts and tools of social innovation and entrepreneurship, social sector consulting, project management, and related topics.

These activities are supplemented by opportunities to hear speakers and to participate in local conferences, special events, and gatherings of various networks across the city. Other field trips, tours, museum visits, and a scavenger hunt offer opportunities for students to learn more about Detroit and its culture, history, economy, and social progress while also deepening relationships with members of the community.

The program fosters connections with local Duke alumni. It also matches each student with a mentor from Venture for America (http://ventureforamerica.org), which places recent college graduates with startups in emerging cities, where they learn how to build a business while making an impact.

Finally, to encourage self-directed study, the program provides students with relevant readings, including books and magazines on Detroit, periodicals on social innovation and entrepreneurship, and other readings specific to students’ assigned projects.

Critical Reflection

To deepen and enhance students’ learning, the program incorporates a variety of opportunities for critical reflection. Too often neglected in civic engagement and social entrepreneurship programs, reflective practice offers great potential for transformative learning.

The emphasis on critical reflection begins before students depart the university. Over four hundred students from across all DukeEngage sites participate in the Fortin Foundation DukeEngage Academy, the largest student civic engagement conference of its kind. The two-day event includes interactive workshops that help students think and talk about identity. Through the renowned Barnga simulation (Thiagarajan and Thiagarajan 2006), students reflect upon their level of intercultural awareness in a fun, thought-provoking way.

Throughout the summer, program staff help students become more self-aware and make meaning of their experiences. For example, weekly group dinners include time for critical reflection, students have regular check-ins with staff, and required weekly blog posts prompt students to respond to specific questions. A program coordinator is on site for the entire eight weeks.

Finally, the program recently added an interactive workshop led by staff from Ask Big Questions (https://askbigquestions.org), which works with universities to engage students in reflective community conversations about purpose, identity, and responsibility.

Closing

Program leaders hope that the Detroit program will have positive outcomes for all stakeholders: that partner organizations will achieve progress on strategic projects leading to improved effectiveness and increased impact; that students will be better prepared and motivated to influence social and environmental problems, and will come to see Detroit as an attractive location in which to work, launch a business, or start an organization; and that relationships between the Duke and Detroit communities will be strengthened, potentially leading to other opportunities for education, research, and engagement.

Surveys of participating students and partner organizations indicate high levels of satisfaction with the program and its outcomes. For this success to continue, the three core components discussed above—meaningful apprenticeship, comprehensive enrichment, and critical reflection—must remain guiding principles.
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New Challenge: Developing Entrepreneurial Leaders for Social Impact

MICHELE KAHANE, associate dean of educational innovation and social engagement at The New School; professor of professional practice in management; and faculty director of New Challenge

Since its inception in 1919, The New School has been at the forefront of progressive higher education, with a rich history of supporting the engagement of students and scholars in thinking about positive social change and challenging the status quo. New Challenge is part of this legacy and an example of how the university continually responds to a changing world.

There is demand globally for new solutions that enhance environmental sustainability and that meet human needs for better health, sanitation, education, and financial security. At the same time, the economy is being transformed by technology and globalization in ways that are changing students’ career choices. For example, Forbes predicts that, by 2020, freelancers and entrepreneurs will comprise more than 50 percent of the American workforce (Wald 2014).

In this context, there is a growing need for students to develop entrepreneurial mindsets and skills. Students must be able to work effectively across boundaries to tackle complex problems that span diverse cultures, sectors, and disciplines. Core competencies for the future will be creativity, critical thinking, problem solving, empathy, resilience, communication, and collaboration. Learning environments like New Challenge, which emphasizes project-based, experiential learning situated in the real world, can help students develop these critical competencies.

A University-Wide Platform

New Challenge is a university-wide social innovation education platform launched in 2012. A year-round learning experience open to both undergraduate and graduate students across the university, New Challenge involves a robust selection process in which the entire New School community identifies teams with a high potential for transformative social impact. New Challenge has engaged more than five hundred alumni, faculty, and administrators as judges and mentors.

During a year of support, winning teams receive mentorship from faculty, staff, and alumni; participate in skill-building workshops; and receive up to $10,000 in seed funding. The teams draw on this support to develop tangible products, services, consultancies, cultural projects, mission-driven businesses, policy-oriented initiatives, media-related projects, game designs, and new technologies that address pressing social issues in communities around the world. This initial support enables many New Challenge winners to leverage additional resources both inside The New School and beyond, connecting with the broader entrepreneurial ecosystem in the region and developing partnerships with a range of collaborators, including individuals, organizations, and companies.

To date, more than seven hundred students have participated in New Challenge, with a total of seventy students and their community partners receiving funding and other forms of support. Teams are tackling a range of issues, including transitional employment for the formerly incarcerated, sustainable transportation, housing and food justice, physical and learning disabilities, recycling, climate change, education, and civic technology, in locations that include New York City, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, India, Liberia, Uganda, and Ethiopia. Projects supported by New Challenge include:

- **Amigo Legal** (Lien Tran), which makes complex legal information readily accessible through games that empower immigrant youth to build skills and acclimate to life in the United States (http://lienbtran.com/games/toma-el-paso);
- **STEAM Punks** (Kristen Kersh and Mehdi Salehi), which expands educational content available for children in Afghanistan, offering opportunities to spark creativity and imagination by exploring technology and design through making (http://www.steampunks.cc);
- **Disability and Beauty** (Lucy Jones), which seeks to create a more inclusive approach to fashion by challenging the notion that design for those with disabilities should constitute a separate market (http://runwayofdreams.org/home);
- **Drive Change** (Annie Bickerton and Jordyn Lexton), which uses the food truck industry to broaden access to opportunity, reduce recidivism, and increase job-readiness for young adults leaving adult jails in New York City (http://drivechangenyc.org);
- **Blank Plate** (Mai Kobori, Eulani Labay, and Amy Findeiss), which addresses issues of food justice in the South Bronx by inspiring teens to engage in creative culinary experiences through community-based programs (https://vimeo.com/46536411);
- **blink blink** (Nicole Messier and Alex Tosti), which inspires girls to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math through the production and dissemination of creative circuit kits (http://www.blinkblick.cc/); and
- **Project Fogg** (James Frankis and Sean Baker), which helps communities respond quickly and effectively immediately following a disaster with the use of an inexpensive visualization and communication kit (http://www.seanbakerprojects.com/portfolio/project-fogg/).

### Evidence of Impact

We recently surveyed past New Challenge winners (a total of seventy teams) to determine what impact their participation has had on them. The following quote captures the sentiment reflected in many responses:

Being a part of New Challenge has been my most valuable experience at The New School. It has taught me how to make a real impact on the world and made me realize what I want to do for the next 10 years. The support of New Challenge has given me the confidence to pursue this project on a bigger scale and the mentorship I needed to see it through. I have received leadership training that I will use for the rest of my life. (Kate Wallace, undergraduate student)

Survey results indicate considerable learning outcomes. For example, at least 90 percent of respondents indicated that they developed skills and mindsets related to collaboration, leadership, and project management, and that they enhanced their ability to adapt, take initiative, embrace challenges, and persist in the face of obstacles. These are critical capacities for graduates as they navigate their careers and life.

### Transformative Potential

The New School’s approach to social innovation education is distinct from the more prevalent and narrow orientation often found at business schools, which tends to focus exclusively on the creation of social ventures. Rather than idolizing the solo entrepreneur, we encourage students to form teams and design **not for**, communities. In addition to conceiving of innovative products and services, New School students work closely with community members to identify solutions that build the capacity of others to meet their own needs.

As a design-led university, we believe that creativity is central to the student learning experience, and we view design as an important means of finding solutions to complex challenges. We also recognize that all disciplines can and must contribute to innovation, preferably through transdisciplinary collaborations. We emphasize the creation of solutions with the potential for sustained systemic impact resulting in a more just world. Finally, we focus on developing social innovators who are versatile and who may pursue diverse careers that span the nonprofit, business, and public sectors. Our unique approach was recognized when we became one of the first universities selected as an Ashoka U Changemaker Campus, signifying leadership in social innovation and social entrepreneurship education.

New Challenge is part of a wave of continual innovation that directly supports the university’s strategic mission and vision. It enriches the learning experience across degree programs by creating a pathway for students to translate their ideas into reality through rigorous student-centered experiential learning. As a cocurricular program outside the formal structure of degree programs, it provides an important, flexible context for educational innovation where new learning methods can be tested and applied broadly over time.

In particular, New Challenge breaks through artificial barriers commonly found within institutions of higher education, such as siloed academic disciplines, semester structures, and separations between teaching approaches that emphasize either theory or practice. New Challenge creates a more holistic student journey, enabling ideas hatched in the classroom to be taken to the next level in the real world with continued support and resources.

New Challenge was built from the ground up by a group of students and faculty from across the university. To support its ongoing evolution, we have created a highly participatory and iterative design-driven process involving multiple opportunities each year for cross-divisional groups of faculty, students, and administrators to convene, reflect, codesign, pilot, and test new features. We have learned much from New Challenge about the transformative potential of experiential learning that is rooted in real-world challenges, that puts students at the center, and that is highly networked and supported by a community of faculty, alumni, and peers.

We recognize that achieving an effective balance between classroom-based learning and applied learning is essential for the entire university. The task ahead of us, and for all of higher education, is to design appropriate institutional structures so we can continue delivering relevant educational paradigms for today’s learners.

To learn more about New Challenge, visit http://newchallenge.newschool.edu/. To view a video of students reflecting on their participation in New Challenge, visit https://vimeo.com/58713050.

### Reference

We recently met a student, “Andy,” who was interested in scaling up a social venture he had launched in high school that involved donating the proceeds from bottled water sold in the United States to provide clean water in underdeveloped communities in Africa. When asked whether the venture was a nonprofit, Andy dismissed the idea outright, explaining that nonprofits are beholden to donors and cannot market products.

Our conversation suggested two things: first, Andy had a poor understanding of both social entrepreneurship and nonprofit operations; and second, he believed that social entrepreneurship was the best mechanism for positive social change and that other forms of engagement were inherently inferior.

Andy is just one of many students who come to college with a narrow view of the “right” way to create positive social change. While Andy came to Stanford, as many students do, to take advantage of the institution’s rich ecosystem for innovation with a social impact, we could just as easily cite stories of activists who reflexively reject market-based approaches to change or policy wonks who view activists as posers. This narrowness isn’t restricted to students: the number of specialized higher education-oriented professional associations, national projects, and conferences dedicated to supporting and promoting particular forms of engagement has expanded dramatically over the past decade. The cultural, pedagogical, and aesthetic norms of these efforts vary greatly.

In spite of these differences, we educators should encourage students to be cautious about adopting an “us versus them” mentality. Particularly in today’s polarized political landscape, we want students to avoid the dismissiveness that can accompany deeply held convictions. We must provide frameworks to help students understand and critically analyze the full range of diverse levers for social change and the multiple possible paths toward positive impact in various communities.

Moving Beyond Narrow Approaches

In 2010, as Stanford University’s Haas Center for Public Service was celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary, we sought to devise a pluralistic framework for civic engagement that would address our concern about angularity while weaving together the rich tapestry of existing campus support for specific forms of civic engagement, public service, and innovation. We developed the Pathways of Public Service and Civic Engagement framework as a “big tent” approach with the idea that there is no single best way to create a more just and sustainable world, and that students must be adept at working and partnering across sectors to effect change on complex issues. The pathways were informed by a review of efforts across Stanford’s campus; by work occurring at other campuses, including the Social Change Wheel developed by Minnesota Campus Compact (n.d.); and by prior frameworks (see, e.g., Coles 1993).

The pathways describe a range of possible ways in which individuals can contribute to the common good. They intersect and overlap, demonstrating the interdependent nature of this work, and they allow for the possibility that people will move in and out of different pathways over time. The pathways are:

- **direct service**: giving personal time, energy, or resources to address immediate community needs or priorities;
- **community-engaged learning and research**: enriching knowledge of and informing action on critical social issues by connecting coursework and research to community-identified concerns;
- **activism**: the process of involving, educating, and mobilizing individual or collective action to influence or persuade others;
- **philanthropy**: the voluntary redistribution of resources by individuals and institutions;
- **policy/politics**: participating in processes of democratic self-governance; and
- **social entrepreneurship**: creating or expanding organizational structures that adopt ethical and effective business practices and/or generate market-oriented responses to solve social problems (Haas Center 2010).
Like any attempt to classify concepts, this typology might seem too broad or too narrow, depending on the context in which it is applied. Thus rather than suggest a perfect means of grouping concepts, the pathways are intended to illuminate possibilities.

**Exploring Tensions Within and Between Pathways**

We encourage students to think about each pathway in terms of the sense of identity it confers, its language and jargon, its normative practices and hierarchies, and the power structures it requires individuals to navigate. We also work with students to explore, in a holistic way, the tensions and intersections within and between the different approaches to civic engagement. We want the framework to foster critical dialogue about the tensions across predispositions, putting the anticapitalist activist, the libertarian social entrepreneur, and the venture philanthropist in conversation with each other rather than in separate echo chambers of like-minded peers.

Our goal is to help students develop more nuanced understandings of the various levers of social change, the limitations of each, and how different pathways can bolster and complement each other—or, conversely, constructively challenge and serve as corrective forces to each other. We want students to weigh doubts about the government’s ability as a slow-moving bureaucracy to respond to residents’ needs alongside concerns about the unintended outcomes associated with the speed of market-driven approaches to social change that may hurt more than help the most vulnerable. While a student may have a predisposition to a particular pathway, our goal is to enable all students to locate their work within the larger ecosystem of public service and its social, political, and economic contexts.

Stanford is already known for innovation and entrepreneurship; but this year, the university launched Cardinal Service, an institution-wide initiative to elevate and expand service as a distinctive feature of a Stanford education. Cardinal Service is undergirded by the Haas Center’s twin engines of social change: the pathways framework and Stanford’s Principles of Ethical and Effective Service, which include reciprocity through partnership, respect for diversity, understanding cultural context, and humility, among others. The principles and pathways frameworks are essential to the elevation and expansion of work done across campus to prepare students to be lifelong engaged citizens.

**Piloting a Tool for Advising, Planning, and Research**

In 2014–15, the Haas Center advanced the pathways framework by piloting a diagnostic tool for use in undergraduate advising across higher education institutions, programs, and courses (Haas Center for Public Service 2014). The tool helps students develop insight into their interests and predispositions regarding social change across the different pathways.

Over the last two years, we have refined the tool with input from various postsecondary institutions (representing the full spectrum of Carnegie classifications) and through workshops and webinars hosted by Campus Compact, NASPA, and partner institutions. Through this process, the tool has evolved to serve three interrelated purposes: namely, helping the faculty and staff who use it (1) improve the quality of advising with individual students; (2) understand the needs and desires of students, and use that understanding to guide programming; and (3) conduct longitudinal research regarding college student predispositions.

In the past year, twenty-six colleges and universities have joined an international working group dedicated to using and refining the tool. The tool has been used in a variety of settings—including individual student advising, classes and workshops, leadership program cohorts, residential learning environments, and campus service fairs—and has been translated for use at several institutions in China.


**Conclusion**

The second law of thermodynamics states that an isolated system’s entropy never decreases. Without exception, our social and environmental challenges are likewise becoming increasingly complex. So, too, are the means at our disposal to address these challenges. The Pathways of Public Service and Civic Engagement provide a framework to support students and bring coherency to diverse efforts within a rich ecosystem of individuals, organizations, and networks all working to create a more just and sustainable world.
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The Sustainable Enterprise Hatchery: Creating Solutions for Credit

JAY FRIEDLANDER, Sharpe-McNally Chair of Green and Socially Responsible Business at College of the Atlantic

In early 2008, students at College of the Atlantic completed a winter-term venture-planning class. They researched and developed plans for sustainable enterprises—enterprises that create social, economic, and environmental prosperity—ranging from a community-supported farm offering organic agriculture education to a scalable company focused on energy efficiency. At the end of the term, students concluded that they wanted College of the Atlantic to offer a course where they could move from planning to launching ventures. After six months and numerous conversations involving students, administrators, and faculty across disciplines, College of the Atlantic’s sustainable enterprise incubator, the Hatchery, entered its inaugural class.

Seven years and dozens of enterprises later, the Hatchery has resulted in some remarkable accomplishments. Enterprises originating from every academic area have traveled through the program. Students have received funding from the National Science Foundation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and private foundations; they have been recognized at conferences and in national publications. In 2015, the Hatchery was endowed and renamed the Diana Davis Spencer Hatchery. Word of the program is spreading, and individuals at other colleges, universities, and organizations around the globe have inquired about the curriculum.

**Curricular Support for Student-Driven Solutions**

Hatchery students devote all of their academic credit for the spring term—the equivalent of three classes—to designing and launching their enterprises. The decision to structure the Hatchery as a class as opposed to an extra- or co-curricular activity has been fundamental to its success. Because Hatchery students receive academic credit for their efforts, they are able to focus completely on their enterprises. More importantly, when their enterprises are a core part of their educational experiences, students are able to align their studies, actions, and interests. Furthermore, the Hatchery frequently functions as a capstone course. As such, it not only prompts students to synthesize their previous coursework, but also acts as a bridge to life after graduation.

Hatchery students pursue enterprises across the disciplines. Entrepreneurs from the arts, policy, sciences and engineering, international and community development, and food systems take the interdisciplinary course together. These students launch for-profit and nonprofit enterprises ranging from niche lifestyle organizations to scalable ventures.

The class meets students where they are academically, some having taken multiple sustainable business courses, others having taken none. All Hatchery students receive start-up capital; office space and mentorship; and legal, accounting, and graphic design services.

The Hatchery wraps exploration around skill building over the ten-week term. Like many traditional courses, the Hatchery course includes weekly readings and deliverables, with a focus on business analysis and opportunity development. Topics include creativity, pitching, establishing unique customer benefits, graphic identity, public relations, operations, legal entities, and taxes. Students also have individual weekly meetings with faculty to review content and address specific issues.

While completing Hatchery coursework, students explore their enterprise ideas, performing the research and planning necessary to launch prototypes of their concepts by the term’s end. As necessary, students draw on knowledge from other courses and mentors, such as best practices for community partnerships or market entry. The prototype development process forces students to confront their greatest fears and the potential for failure. Projects undergo substantial revision over the course of the term and students learn to embrace mistakes as opportunities for reflection and improvement. Substantial revision is part of the process rather than an indicator of poor performance. After the spring term, students (including graduating seniors) can continue to use the Hatchery space and resources for an additional nine months.

In the Hatchery, success does not equate to launching a viable venture; enterprise creation is the means, not the end. Students deepen their understanding of their fields and learn the process of entrepreneurship while having access to a safety net. In their final presentations, students provide an analysis of their work, indicating whether they will continue, take a new direction, or abandon their enterprises. Regardless of the enterprise outcome, students gain a nuanced understanding of their subject areas and develop resilience as a result of their continuous reflection and revision.
Elevated Learning through Academics and Action

Hatchery students are developing enterprises to solve problems and bring about positive social and environmental change. They want an education that both teaches them how to think and helps them achieve their goals. While rigorous coursework across disciplines is necessary for students to delve into the complexities of various issues, it is not sufficient. Students both want and need opportunities to bring their theories of change beyond the classroom, to engage with the world as part of their educations. The Hatchery provides a framework for students not only to launch remarkable enterprises, but also to ignite their passions, learn new skills, and reinforce their intellectual journeys as they make direct connections between their ideals, their studies, and the world around them.

So why are programs like the Hatchery that award academic credit for entrepreneurship the exception rather than the rule? Anecdotal evidence gathered in conversation with leaders of social innovation centers and incubators suggests that faculties are often reluctant to approve academic credit for such endeavors. Faculty members may express concern that creating an enterprise might degrade the academic experience, as if there were a tradeoff between academics and action. Some have suggested an analogy: that students will focus on turning the screw rather than on understanding the physics behind the action. Our experience suggests otherwise. As in a science lab, Hatchery students learn to formulate and test hypotheses, analyze results, and revise their methodologies. They develop their ideas over weeks, seeking input across diverse disciplines to create rich and nuanced learning experiences. For Hatchery students, academics and action enrich each other.

Hatchery students are committed to their projects and their learning. They have to complete a rigorous application process to join the class, and they devote an entire term of their college educations to their enterprises, becoming subject matter experts in every aspect of their ventures. Like professors conducting research while on sabbatical, they are able to delve deeply into their various areas of interest (see sidebar). One student who founded a biofuel company pored over academic studies, applied for research grants, and later took additional chemistry courses to improve his fuel fermentation process. After graduation, he was accepted to a biochemistry doctoral program at the University of California–Berkeley, where the selection committee saw his ability to bridge science and business as differentiating him from other candidates.

Another student got a crash course in international development and government relations through the Hatchery, and used his experience to bolster the Dyalo Foundation’s work building schools, supporting local agriculture, and expanding access to renewable energy in rural Nepal. He plans to attend graduate school in China as part of the inaugural class of Schwarzman Scholars, a one-year master’s degree program for young leaders focusing on China’s role in global trends.

In these and many other cases, Hatchery students are reaching across disciplines, simultaneously pursuing academic exploration while developing the human relations skills needed to move ideas into action. Merging theory and practice, these entrepreneurs are aligning their studies and sustainability interests. The Hatchery is elevating their academic experiences while giving them the confidence to undertake endeavors to improve the world.

For more information about the Hatchery, visit www.coa.edu/hatchery.

Sustainable Enterprises Launched through the Hatchery

Students in College of the Atlantic’s sustainable enterprise program, the Hatchery, have launched a variety of enterprises. Their accomplishments have included:

- Developing Gourmet Butanol, a biofuel company that converts organic waste to fuel (www.gourmetbutanol.com);
- Establishing a framework to make Mount Desert Island, Maine, where the college is located, carbon negative;
- Preserving ancient foodways by founding Del Rincón, an agave farm using traditional production techniques in Mexico;
- Revamping Earth-in-Brackets, a climate advocacy organization that provided the youth statement at the 2011 Durban, South Africa, Climate Conference (www.earthinbrackets.org);
- Helping to expand the Dyalo Foundation and provide humanitarian relief for hundreds during the April 2015 Nepal earthquake (www.dyalofoundation.org); and
- Systematizing the operations of Share the Harvest, a program that provides organic produce to people on food assistance.
During freshman orientation at Brown University, I met lifelong friends, stayed up all night discussing the meaning of life, and researched potential courses with anticipation. At the same time, Hurricane Katrina bore down on the people of Louisiana.

At the university’s convocation, I glanced up from my new-to-college stupor and realized the magnitude of the hurricane’s destruction. President Ruth Simmons, a graduate of Dillard University in New Orleans, choked back tears as she spoke of the devastation in her hometown. Simmons told us that one of the best things we could do in that moment of tragedy was to focus on our studies, as they would ultimately help us do good for the world.

Eleven years later, I still question these words. Does focusing on academics necessarily preclude taking effective action? I tend not to believe in dichotomies. I think that students need to develop the foundations of knowledge and critical thinking necessary for active citizenship. But I also believe that our education system has an obligation to teach young people how to participate effectively in the political process.

My belief in the importance of teaching engaged citizenship stems from a childhood living abroad, where I saw emerging republics grappling with the messy work of democracy building. During the first truly democratic elections in Kenya’s history in 2002, I observed the tangible excitement when individuals cast their ballots for the first time. I saw a coup in Ecuador in 2005 and violent run-off elections in Zimbabwe in 2008, both demonstrating the fragility of the democratic experiment.

After living in East Africa and learning about the world’s futile efforts to quell the 1994 Rwandan genocide, I wanted to help end the genocide in Darfur, Sudan. At Brown, I became a national student leader of STAND, a coalition with over seven hundred high school and college chapters, and helped lead successful movements to divest Brown, the city of Providence, and the state of Rhode Island from foreign companies conducting business in Sudan.

As I dealt with the tricky realities of the Rhode Island legislature, I learned the basics of political activism—and was hooked. But I wanted to ensure that more young people were exposed to the power of politics. So I started Generation Citizen (GC) during my senior year at Brown to teach young people in grades seven to twelve to become politically active using a practice called action civics. Just as young people learn science through experiments, students in GC learn civics by taking action on local issues that they care about. GC focuses its work in underserved schools, where students typically receive little effective civics education.

I originally had no intention of founding a nonprofit. But at Brown, I received the cultural and institutional support I needed to create first the GC program and then the organization. Brown’s ethos of social innovation, combined with formalized programming, peer support, and fundraising support, all offered through Brown’s Swearer Center, proved vital. After starting as a small project working in three schools, GC now serves almost ten thousand students in four cities across the country each year. We are promoting a national conversation about the importance of teaching young people to be politically active.

GC classes are cotaught by college volunteers, called Democracy Coaches, who use their own political experience to motivate their students. Over the course of a semester, students conduct research on local policy issues and design plans for effective action on issues that affect them personally: gang violence, immigration, or public transit, for example. After identifying root causes and potential solutions, students meet with elected officials to advocate for these solutions. Critically, the curriculum is student driven, predicated on young people’s distinct knowledge about the issues and how to solve them.

GC is just getting started. Ultimately, we want action civics to be a staple of the core curriculum, just like math, science, or English. And I want young people in this country to be as excited about politics as the individuals I saw voting for the first time in Kenya. Thinking back, I don’t think GC would exist had I not attended a college that fostered a focus on social innovation and active citizenship.
Setting Aside My Hero Complex

KAITLYN FITZGERALD, business development analyst at Zero Mass Water and 2015 graduate of Arizona State University

In high school, I went on a two-week “voluntourism” trip to Ghana with American and European high school students. We spent our mornings preparing a classroom for use and our afternoons hanging out with kids in the village. One week into the trip, I realized that my fellow volunteers and I were so bad at plastering and painting, our host organization had hired Ghanaian laborers to fix our mistakes. My mind filled with questions: How many more classrooms could have been built if the money spent on our travel had been invested directly in the project? How many more children would have had nice places to learn? I set out to find a better way to make a difference. When I returned home, I launched Anidaso, a project to fund scholarships for children in my host village through the sale of bags made by an artist in Ghana.

A few years later, I enrolled at Arizona State University (ASU). There, I became student director of ASU’s Changemaker Central, an innovative initiative designed to inspire a culture of student-driven social change. Changemaker Central provides programs and services to help students achieve social impact in addition to running four on-campus coworking spaces. Through my position, I worked with other ASU students to ideate and implement strategies for positive change. With access to the seemingly unlimited knowledge of the institution and the backing of university resources, these hardworking students usually reached their goals. However, at the end of the day, very few could measure their impact.

I concluded my time at Changemaker Central frustrated, but also inspired. I wanted to figure out why promising students and their ventures often failed to yield measurable impact. As I investigated how universities prepare students to become agents of change, I found two distinct realms of work focused on social impact: community or civic engagement and social entrepreneurship. In the community engagement realm, students are encouraged to serve while learning alongside community agencies and leaders. In the social entrepreneurship realm, students are encouraged to create innovative, sustainable solutions.

While these methodologies seem complementary, I have learned that practitioners of each approach seem to focus on one another’s weaknesses rather than leveraging one another’s strengths. Community engagement stakeholders may ask: If students don’t spend time in the community, how do they know their ideas will work? When their ideas fail, who will be there to pick up the pieces? Those invested in social entrepreneurship may respond: Civic engagement practitioners have been in the community for years, and their work is still needed. If they walked away today, would those they serve be back where they started?

My college education prepared me to address it. As director of Changemaker Central, I participated in various working groups, all building an ecosystem for students to create positive social change. In these working groups, stakeholders listened to and incorporated each other’s perspectives into their work. This experience showed me just how complex social change truly is; it pushed me to see beyond simple solutions, to set aside my hero complex, and to persevere relentlessly to achieve impact.

Changemaker Central taught me that it was important to listen to community needs. Reflecting on Anidaso, I started to realize that changing someone’s life isn’t always as easy as paying for scholarships. I regretted that I had done little research prior to establishing the project and did not have partners on the ground. I returned to Ghana to evaluate the project’s impact and found that scholarship recipients needed more than financial support to ensure their bright futures. With the help of Ashesi University, an innovative institution near the village, I recruited three high-achieving university students to serve as mentors. In one year, these mentors have achieved more with scholarship recipients than I could alone in three. And we aren’t done innovating. Now with an international team of eight, we are rebranding, scaling sales, and working to fund additional community service projects. While Anidaso exists because of a moment of clarity I had at age sixteen, our growth, impact, and future potential can be credited to what I learned at Arizona State University.

This experience showed me just how complex social change truly is; it pushed me to see beyond simple solutions, to set aside my hero complex, and to persevere relentlessly to achieve impact.
New Publications from AAC&U

Becoming a Student-Ready College
Becoming a Student-Ready College: A New Culture of Leadership for Student Success, published by Jossey-Bass in partnership with AAC&U, is now available. By prompting readers to ask what their institutions can do to support incoming students, the book shifts the conversation about student success from a focus on student preparedness to a focus on institutional preparedness. Tia Brown McNair and Susan Albertine of AAC&U coauthored the book with Michelle Asha Cooper of the Institute for Higher Education Policy and Nicole McDonald and Thomas Major Jr., both of Lumina Foundation. To order, visit www.wiley.com.

Preparing Critical Faculty for the Future
In Preparing Critical Faculty for the Future: Enlisting the Voices of STEM Women Faculty of Color, authors Alma R. Clayton-Pedersen, Terrel Rhodes, Patricia Lowrie, and Jennifer M. Blaney describe critical lessons learned from a recent initiative for women of color in STEM disciplines at historically black colleges and universities. The publication describes actions that every type of higher education institution can take to recognize and support inclusive excellence among faculty and build the capacity of faculty of color to advance in their careers and contribute to higher education reform efforts. To order, visit www.aacu.org/publications.

Increasing Student Success in STEM
Increasing Student Success in STEM: A Guide to Systemic Institutional Change by Susan Elrod and Adrianna Kezar is a new publication for faculty, administrators, and other academic leaders who are poised to mount comprehensive STEM reforms to improve student learning and success, particularly for students from underrepresented minority groups. Based on the experiences of campus teams at eleven colleges and universities in the Keck/Project Kaleidoscope STEM Education Effectiveness Framework project, the guide contains advice for starting and sustaining change, with practical tools to help teams gauge their progress. To order, visit www.aacu.org/publications.

Liberal Education for an Inventive America
At its best, a contemporary liberal education helps form students as creative, innovative, entrepreneurial thinkers who are prepared to face the challenges of participation in a global economy and citizenship in a diverse democracy. The spring 2016 issue of Liberal Education provides models for how to foster this essential learning outcome. Also included are articles on the partnership between AAC&U and the Ford Foundation, the need to support the integrative learning of faculty members, ways to promote global learning across a campus, and the relationship between the rise of the for-profit university and the increasing reliance on adjuncts. The issue is available at www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/.

AAC&U Welcomes President Lynn Pasquerella
AAC&U is delighted to welcome Lynn Pasquerella, who took office as the association’s fourteenth president on July 1. Pasquerella comes to AAC&U from Mount Holyoke College, where she served as president since 2010. At Mount Holyoke, she worked with colleagues on the college’s Lynk initiative, which prompts students to connect academic learning and practical application in preparation for their future careers. Prior to her tenure at Mount Holyoke, Pasquerella served as a professor and administrator at the University of Rhode Island and was provost at the University of Hartford.

Throughout her career, Pasquerella has demonstrated a deep commitment to the precepts of liberal education and inclusive excellence. Articulating that commitment in a statement to the AAC&U community, Pasquerella writes that “the prevailing discourse perpetuates a growing economic segregation in higher education through its treatment of college as a private commodity, contravening the concept that all students are entitled to the full promise of American higher education—an ideal that lies at the core of AAC&U’s mission-level commitment to inclusive excellence. If we hope to redress this trend, those of us within the academy must be willing to engage in an honest and radical reckoning with the extent to which we have failed to take seriously the concerns of those who are raising questions about the worthiness of public and private investments in higher education, concomitantly reinforcing a false dichotomy between a pragmatic education and a liberal education.”

To read the full statement and learn more about President Lynn Pasquerella, visit www.aacu.org/president/.
Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement Calendar

The following calendar features events on civic learning sponsored by members of the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network and others. For more information, please visit AAC&U’s CLDE Calendar online at http://www.aacu.org/clde/calendar/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>CLDE EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>26–28</td>
<td>National Society for Experiential Education 45th Annual Conference</td>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>Global Learning and the College Curriculum: Nurturing Student Efficacy in a</td>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global World (AAC&amp;U Network for Academic Renewal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>Imagining America National Conference</td>
<td>Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11–12</td>
<td>Engagement Scholarship Consortium Meeting</td>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23–25</td>
<td>Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities Annual Conference</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29–30</td>
<td>Campus Compact Heartland Conference</td>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maryland–DC Campus Compact Presidents’ Institute</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>Transforming Undergraduate STEM Education: Implications for 21st-Century</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society (AAC&amp;U Network for Academic Renewal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>Anchor Institutions Task Force Annual Conference</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Inclusive Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27–29</td>
<td>Interfaith Youth Core Interfaith Leadership Institute</td>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAC&U and the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network

As part of its commitment to preparing all students for civic, ethical, and social responsibility in US and global contexts, AAC&U has formed the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network. The CLDE Action Network builds on the momentum generated by the 2012 White House release of the report *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future*. Coordinated by Caryn McTighe Musil, AAC&U senior scholar and director of civic learning and democracy initiatives, the network includes thirteen leading civic learning organizations that are committed to making civic inquiry and engagement expected rather than elective for all college students. *Diversity & Democracy* regularly features research and exemplary practices developed and advanced by these partner organizations and their members:

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- Anchor Institutions Task Force
- Association of American Colleges and Universities
- The Bonner Foundation
- Bringing Theory to Practice
- Campus Compact
- Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement
- The Democracy Commitment
- Imagining America
- The Interfaith Youth Core
- Kettering Foundation
- NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education
# Upcoming AAC&U Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Network for Academic Renewal**  
Global Learning and the College Curriculum: Nurturing Student Efficacy in a Global World | Denver, Colorado | October 6–8, 2016 |
| **Network for Academic Renewal**  
Transforming Undergraduate STEM Education: Implications for 21st-Century Society | Boston, Massachusetts | November 3–5, 2016 |
| **2017 AAC&U Annual Meeting**  
Building Public Trust in the Promise of Liberal Education and Inclusive Excellence | San Francisco, California | January 25–28, 2017 |

---

**About Diversity & Democracy**

*Diversity & Democracy* supports higher education faculty and leaders as they design and implement programs that advance civic learning and democratic engagement, global learning, and engagement with diversity to prepare students for socially responsible action in today's interdependent but unequal world. According to AAC&U's Statement on Liberal Learning, "By its nature...liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives." *Diversity & Democracy* features evidence, research, and exemplary practices to assist practitioners in creating learning opportunities that realize this vision. To access *Diversity & Democracy* online, visit www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/.

---

**About AAC&U**

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,350 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges, community colleges, and universities of every type and size. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.