

ESTAÇÃO DE PESQUISA URBANA M'BOI
SÉRIE DOCUMENTOS DE TRABALHO
WORKING PAPERS, Nº 17, NOVEMBRO/ 2017

Rethinking the Civic University: new directions, practical possibilities and many challenges

Peter Spink

Raquel Sobral Nonato

André Luis Nogueira da Silva

Mario Aquino Alves

Fernando Burgos

Lupicínio Iñiguez-Rueda

Centro de Administração Pública e Governo

Getúlio
Novembro



CEAPG
*Centro de Estudos
em Administração
Pública e Governo*

Fundação
Vargas
de 2017

The engaged civic university, which I propose, is one, which provides opportunities for the society of which it forms part. It engages as a whole with its surroundings, not piecemeal; it partners with other universities and colleges; and it is managed in a way that ensures it participates fully in the region of which it forms part..... I argue that civic engagement should move beyond a third or separate strand of activity for universities, with less prestige and fewer resources than teaching or research. It should become a guiding principal for their organisation and practice. This does not imply that all universities should have the same mission: universities have different abilities to work at local, national and international levels, all of which are valuable. (Goddard *Reinventing the Civic University*, NESTA, UK, 2009)

1. Introduction

The relationship between the university as an intellectual venture and its insertion in urban and rural life has never been a simple one. Over the years, different political, social and epistemological tensions can be found in such expressions as “the house of knowledge”, “town and gown”, “extra mural”, “extension” and “outreach”, that not only make very clear the separation but also suggest that there is some kind of explicit or implicit requirement to connect. What is the difference in the knowledge that circulates within and without the walls? Should the university be dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge for knowledge sake or is the reason for the university existence to be found in the questions being faced by those beyond its gates? Is there a balance to be found between teaching, research and extension or are the three – like most triangular relationships – doomed to an eternity of instability?

These are not new questions and they have remained topical in some way or another since the very early schools and academies set up their shelters for discussion and, in the middle ages, firmed the roots of what we now have come to call universities (Le Goff, 1993). The University of Paris was very much town and gown, with its *quartier Latin* – the international language of the time - and the medieval Goliards were far more than just an opportunity to sing vulgar songs. The University of Cambridge, itself a virtual campus town, retreated behind its walls in its dedication to knowledge whilst the University of Berlin under Humboldt in the early 19th century would turn science towards the questions being faced by humanity and would influence Bentham’s University College in London, the first UK college for people of any or no religious creed (Spink, 2001). About another equally famous Cambridge College, Thoreau would write in his 1854 text about “Walden or Life in the Woods” that students should not “play life or study it

merely, while the community supports them at this expensive game, but earnestly live it from beginning to end. How could youths better learn to live than by at once trying the experiment of living? Methinks this would exercise their minds as much as mathematics.” (p.33)

By the middle of the 19th century it would be the early trade unionists and utopian socialists that would lead independent moves for education and colleges for workers. The urban conditions of the crowded major cities would, as the century turned, themselves stimulate new ideas on education (for example the London School of Economics and Political Science of the Fabian Socialists in 1895). In 1888, the Pasteur Institute with all its animals, overflowed its humble laboratory and was housed in a special building following an international appeal for funds, which influenced the emergence of other independent applied research centers (including our own *Instituto Butantan* in 1901).¹

Whilst all these remain key to the ongoing discussion, there is no doubt that a significant statement was that made by the Land Grant Colleges in the USA. Set to produce and provide knowledge for agricultural development, these later became many of the great State Universities with continuous traditions of outreach and community service. (The first of these, in 1855, was the Agricultural College of the State of Michigan which one hundred years later on as Michigan State University, would lead a major and highly successful experiment in institution building that became EAESP).

Recently, in part as a reaction to increasing pressures for universities to “globalize” and also as a reaction to the pressures for academic staff to publish “internationally” and assume the global agendas of leading journals (Spink & Alves, 2011), this centuries old discussion has gained new strength and directions. How to combine the global and the local? How is knowledge to be used? Is there such a thing as general knowledge or is all knowledge in fact local? These and many other questions are being raised in debates on civic engagement and on public demands for universities to reposition themselves and rethink their contribution to everyday affairs. In many cases they arise from practical experiences or challenges.

¹ For a major history of the development of the University in Europe, see the four volume series by Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (2003a, 2003b) and Walter Rugg (2004, 2011)

Thus the debate on science parks is a consequence of the parks themselves and the early discussions about field stations was a consequence of the need for biologists to set up their equipment close to what they wanted to study, in the same way that agricultural researchers needed to be close to the biospheres for which they were trying to produce or improve crops. As Sommer (1990) pointed out in discussing the experiences of the University of California at Davies, in these types of settings it doesn't take long before information and debate is flowing back and forth. The New York City Urban Field Station of the US Forestry Commission not only has its own research program, but serves as a host for other researchers from around the world. The impact it is able to achieve is considerable, as shown by its methodological motto: research in action. The active nature of these relationships is perhaps most clearly demonstrated by the experience of the many different research stations in the Antarctic region and their collective impact in not only making an immense and unknown region visible but also showing how what is being learned there applies to the world as a whole.

The 19th Century Land Grant program in the USA continues to generate a very rich and literature with many universities posting information on community based studies and applied research on their web sites and discussing questions of local connectivity in a variety of different inter university forums (see, for example, the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities: cumuonline.org). The outreach approach served many years later as a stimulus for the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Department 's program on Community Outreach Partnerships Centers (COPC), created as a major grant based program for Universities in 1994 and which is still active today².

Brazil and other Latin American Countries³ have also had a significant history of thinking “outside the walls”, usually through the notion of “extension” (which is a term with many similarities to outreach”). In Brazil, for example, the 1988 citizen’s constitution would (article 207) guarantee the academic and administrative autonomy of the universities, including

² See www.huduser.gov - Office of University Partnerships/publications and Nye, Walker, Manjarrez and Romanik, 2002; Silka, 2006).

³ Tomasino & Cano (2016) have described in various articles the experiences of the University of the Republic, Uruguay and other southern cone countries.

teaching, research, finances and property, and required them to obey the principle of the inseparability (*indissociability*) of teaching, research and extension⁴.

Over the years there have been many attempts to rethink the university, but in recent years it is possibly the outreach/extension area of discussion and practice that has been the main stimulus to rethinking the university not only in terms of the topics on which it works but also in terms of its relationship to knowledge: knowledge for whom and about what? Should the relationship between knowledge, teaching and outreach/extension be a hierarchical relationship in which knowledge (research) leads the way for teaching and then extension? Or as the Brazilian Constitution suggested and many other community related activists argue, that the three should be seen a firmly bound together: inseparable, fused into a common practice? It is here that the “civic” argument begins to take shape.

The idea of civil (rather than civic) engagement of the University was raised by Boyer (1996) the then President of the Carnegie Foundation in an important address to the American Academy of Arts and Science and has served as a counterpoint to the outreach approach and a stimulus for different ways of being together including that of reworking “communities of practice” (Hart and Wolff, 2006). A recent bibliography on the scholarship of engagement produced by Healey in the UK listed over 200 key texts, addresses, articles and books and there have been conferences in many parts of the world on similar themes. The civic university theme served as a basis for a number of important reports in the UK including the Goddard provocation for the National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts with the title of “Reinventing the Civic University” (2009) with a book of experiences in December 2016 (Goddard et al, 2016).

This preliminary paper seeks to map out the principle themes in these debates and some of the many tensions and conflicts present. In doing so it uses material mainly gathered from Europe (including the UK), the USA, Australia and Brazil. Its practical concern is to translate this experience, where possible, into the Brazilian context where the question of extension and its inseparability with research and teaching is very present in the normative or even ideological sense, but absent in practice. Here there are two important arenas of discussion and possibility.

⁴ Art. 207. As universidades gozam de autonomia didático-científica, administrativa e de gestão financeira e patrimonial, e obedecerão ao princípio de indissociabilidade entre ensino, pesquisa e extensão.

The first is the Brazilian Forum of Pro-Rectors of Extension, which is a very active body for debate and experience; the second is the recent opening that has been provided by the transformation of a number of Federal Centers for Education and Technology into Federal Institutes for Education, Science and Technology, with a mandate for local social and economic development.

The paper is divided into six parts, including this introduction. The next part will focus on the broad principles that are appearing in the current international discussion around civic engagement and the university. Brief mention will be made of the history of the Land Grant Colleges because of the way in which certain principles have managed to remain constant over the years and that they like the Brazilian Federal Institutes were charged with supporting local development. The third part will look at some of the international experiences which demonstrate not only the practice led importance of the field – and its pragmatic tradition - but also its roots, for a number of reasons, in the notion of outreach/extension. The data source used will be mainly that of the journal of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (*Metropolitan Universities*) founded in 1990. The coalition is an international affiliate organization of universities in large metropolitan areas that share common understandings of their institutional missions and values in relationship to their surroundings. Member institutions pledge to enrich their metropolitan communities while strengthening the universities' core commitment to teaching and research; hence the concern with university-community engagement in what CUMU refers to as the stewardship of place ⁵.

The fourth part will describe recent development in Brazil, especially since the 1988 constitution which made specific mention of the inseparable relationship between teaching, research and extension. It will provide an overview of the variety of experiences as seen through Brazilian Journal of University Extension (*Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*) which was founded in 2003 by the Forum of Vice Rectors of Extension of Public Sector Higher Education Institutes (FORPROEX)⁶. The fifth part describes an important long term local innovation which begin in 1959 as the Escola Técnica de Eletrônica Francisco Moreira de Costa in Santa Rita de Sapucaí (MG), the first of its kind in Latin America and demonstrates the importance of

⁵ See the CUMU website at www.cumuonline.org

⁶ <https://www.ufmg.br/proex/renex/index.php/apresentacao/forproex-e-renex>

territorial based actions. In the sixth and concluding part, the paper points to the challenges that are present for engaged scholarship but that will have to be assumed if the university is to consolidate a different more useful footing in the world of *knowledges*⁷. It argues that the tensions, conflicts, connections and disconnections in the field of the university and its relations to wider society or, as Goddard put it in the earlier citation “its surroundings” are indeed very present but that there are sufficient examples and clues to be able to break out of the iron triangle of research, teaching and service through the notion of the scholarship of civic engagement.

2. The current debate(s) – an overview of principles

There are two ways to look at the current debate on the civic university. One is in a normative or theoretical manner using as a background current discussions on the epistemology of knowledge, local knowledge and collective practice which reverses the dominant posture on “knowledge as being general and true which, once identified, is then applied to specific situations” . The other way is to follow many different experiences which have created equally different forms of ongoing relationships “in practice”, not because they were seen as correct, but because they were “necessary and useful”. In both it is possible to see a clear relationship with pragmatism.

The “rethinking knowledge” approach is very much part of the linguistic turn in philosophy and also present amongst the actor network theorists (See, for example Rorty, 1967; Brandon, 2000; Latour 1996, 2005, 2013; Spink, 2017). It is also influenced by current debates in university evaluation, which has raised the question – necessary for any evaluation – of what are universities meant to be and the parallel debate on research and academic staff evaluation.

The “in practice” line of debate is perhaps best exemplified by the experience of the USA in which an often used reference is the speech by the former president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Ernest Boyer at the American College of Arts and Sciences and later published (Boyer, 1996). It is here that he coins the term “The Scholarship of

⁷ The plural form of knowledge is non-existent in the english language where knowledge is a collective noun.

Engagement” which has become an organizing concept in much of the rethinking going on in that country. The USA University landscape has in general been far more open to different social classes and ways of working than most of its European counterparts. One of the reasons in recent times was the effects of the so-called GI Bill (The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) which provided benefits for returning war veterans amongst which were payments of tuition and living expenses to attend high school, college or vocational school. It is estimated that by 1956, over 7.5 million veterans had used the Bill for educational purposes of which some 2 million for university education. Another reason, which is fact is the first, was where many of these were to study. It is here that the history of the Land Grant Universities is important – not as a curiosity but as the way in which it points to the long term cultural impact of early periods of institutional development.

The Land Grant Colleges had a lot to do with Agricultural Development but the land in the title was for a different reason. The Morrill Act of 1862 turned Federal land over to the States which could then be sold or used for profit and the proceeds used to “create and sustain” at least one college that would teach agriculture and the mechanical arts. They were often poorly financed and were known as the “1862s” until the second Morrill Act in 1890 provided annual transfers to each State to support its college. The second act brought about another minor revolution for it forbade racial discrimination in admission policies for those colleges receiving Federal funds. States could, however maintain separate institutions providing that the funds were distributed justly. These received the nickname of the “1890s” and there are some 17 of them amongst the historical black colleges.

In time the Land Grant Colleges grew and spread out from colleges of agriculture and mechanics to fully fledged universities but kept their legislative requirement teaching, research and extension. The roll call of nearly all of today's important State Universities and their strong practice of outreach, field stations and community service is the roll call of the “class of 1862”. It does not require much imagination to guess which would be the universities that would open their arms to the returning veterans and which would be the main universities that would respond to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Outreach Partnership Center Program, launched by Henry Cisneros in the Clinton Administration. (For an important evaluation of this program that set out to establish and operate centers for multi-

disciplinary research and outreach activities in cooperation with community groups and local governments and disbursed some 45 million USD between 1994 and 2002, when the evaluation took place, see: Vidal, Nye, Walker, Manjarrez & Romanik, 2002).

It was against this background of success and engagement that Boyer spoke, as he described it, about the partnership between university and society at current times.

“To what extent has higher learning continued this collaboration, this commitment to the common good? I would suggest that in recent years, the work of individual scholars, as researchers, has continued to be highly prized, and that also, in recent years, teaching has increasingly become more highly regarded, which is of course great cause for celebration. But I believe it’s also true that at far too many institutions of higher learning, the historic commitment to the “scholarship of engagement” has dramatically declined. Almost every college catalogue in this country still lists teaching, research and service as the priorities of the professoriate; yet at tenure and promotion time, the harsh truth is that service is hardly mentioned. And even more disturbing, faculty who do spend time with so-called applied projects frequently jeopardize their careers. Russell Jacoby in a fascinating book titled *The Last Intellectuals*, observes that the influence of American academics has declined precisely because being an intellectual has come to mean being in the university and holding a faculty appointment, preferably a tenured one, of writing in a certain style understood only by one’s peers, of conforming to an academic rewards system that encourages disengagement and even penalizes professors whose work becomes useful to non academics or popularized, as we like to say. [...] But what I find most disturbing – as almost the mirror image of that description – is a growing feeling in this country that higher education is in fact, part of the problem rather than the solution. Going still further, that it’s become a private benefit, not a public good. Increasingly, the campus is being viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty get tenured, while the overall work of the academy does not seem particularly relevant to the nation’s more pressing civic, social, economic and moral problems.” (Boyer, 1996 p. 13-14)

Boyer puts forward four priorities, according to a then recent Carnegie Foundation Report entitled “*Scholarship Reconsidered*”. The scholarship of discovery (pushing back the frontiers of human knowledge); the scholarship of integration (creating more interdisciplinary conversations); the scholarship of sharing knowledge (scholarship is a communal act); and the application of knowledge:

“...which does not mean doing good, although that’s important. Academics have their civic functions, which should be honored but by scholarship of application we mean having professors

become what Donald Schon of MIT has called “reflective practitioners”, moving from theory to practice, and from practice back to theory, which in fact makes theory, then, more authentic – something we’re learning in education and medicine, in law and architecture, and all the rest. And incidentally, by making knowledge useful, we mean everything from building better bridges to building better lives, which involves not only the professional schools but the arts and sciences as well.” (Boyer 1996 p.17)

Certainly Boyer’s talk had at least retrospective impact and has been a constant reference ever since, but the impact of the HUD grant system was also important as was the continued work of a coalition of urban and metropolitan universities in an organization of that name (CUMU) founded in 1989 to pay more attention to how universities relate to the cities in which they are located and the communities which surround them. The results of these relationships can be followed in their annual conferences and in their journal *Metropolitan Universities*. Seventy percent of their ninety university members have received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. This is discussed in more detail in the section on International experiences.

In an interview carried out by the Brazilian journal of University Extension (*Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*), the Dean of the Faculty of Extension at the University of Alberta, Canada talked about how the Boyer approach had been put into practice in community-based research. This is research that seeks to “democratize knowledge creation by validating multiple sources of knowledge and promoting the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination” (Campbell, 2017, p59). For Campbell:

The scholarship of engagement recasts teaching, research and service as learning, discovery and citizenship. Its purposes are to improve the processes and practices of engaged scholarship and/or to contribute to scholarly and professional understanding of them. Relatively few scholars do this. The democratization of knowledge – its creation, ownership and mobilization – are at the center of this domain, whereas in outreach the creation of knowledge (and often ownership) typically belongs to the University and is assessed by a limited community of disciplinary peers”. (p.59)

Finally, on the question of academic staff evaluation – a common theme when questions of change in practice are being considered – the University of Alberta found that introducing the scholarship of engagement meant substantially revising policies and procedures for tenure and promotion.

“For example, we acknowledge external research funding and peer-reviewed publications in high impact journals as “inputs” and “outcomes” respectively, but more important we want to see the social impact. Of course that is much harder to define and assess: impact is seen over time, cannot necessarily be attributed to one individual (because engaged scholarship and engagement scholarship require partnerships), it is in the public domain, it does not easily lend itself to metrics and so on. So, part of engagement scholarship is defining and describing the social return on investment.” (Campbell, 2017, p.60)

In moving from the USA to Brazil it is worthwhile reflecting on the importance of what was basically a decentralized approach to extension with heavy Federal funding to States to “do something”. These were not Federal Universities, they were State Universities, indeed, initially they were Agricultural Colleges. They never became Federal Universities and were never standardized. On the contrary they were territorially based Colleges with some local recognition and State support. Federal aid was oriented to the principle of “do more”.

3. Examples of International Experiences

The objective of this section is to show something of the variety of experiences being discussed in different setting and their varied complexities. A good starting point is to look at current research into university engagement. University College London is one of the top world research Universities and part of the University of London College network of Colleges in which a number of interesting ideas have appeared: from “pop-up” university sessions and debates held in coffee shops to branch campuses. It is one of the two UK Universities, along with others from Finland, Ireland and Holland, featured in the Goddard, Hazelkorn, Kempton and Vallance volume of experiences entitled *Policy and Leadership Challenges for the Civic University* (2016). The “Situating the New Urban University” is based in the Geography Department at UCL, with a grant from the European Union.

The relationship between the university and the city is evolving in an era of global urbanization. The networked nature of urban space and society means we can no longer consider urban universities as simply located ‘in the city’. **Situating the New Urban University** examines how universities can adapt their institutional infrastructures, pedagogical practices, and ways of operating in response to the unprecedented opportunities and profound challenges of contemporary urbanization. The project’s focus on Greater London and the New York metropolitan area provides the first major comparative study of universities in global city-regions.

Engaging the social and institutional variations across these expansive agglomerations aims to reveal what potential capacities universities have as urban leaders in a globalizing world; how universities can better mobilize in, and for, extended city-regions; and how urban inhabitants can more effectively inform universities' spatial and strategic actions. Situating the New Urban University has two main research strands: (1) a review and assessment of universities' spatial strategies; covering broad trends, visions, and modes of outreach; and (2) in-depth comparative analysis of university engagement, networks, and strategic actions across the case regions.(: www.newurbanuniversity.org).

The program's website and the number of publications is a good indicator of the central nature of the “rethinking” theme in urban development. Another is another European Union supported initiative on innovation and responsible research under the initials of HEIRRI (Higher Education Initiatives and Responsible Research)⁸. This again is a consortium of Universities and University Associations focusing on engineers and scientists and working on six principles: public engagement, ethics, governance (research methods, interpretation of data and communication of results), scientific education, gender equality and open access. Here, the UCL experience is important for the fact that it is a leading research university and as Goddard remarked (2009) in the provocation, part of which was cited in the introduction, “many older civic universities have a focus on research and can tend to regard public engagement as a mission for newer, teaching-centered institutions (p.19). Goddard's own University of Newcastle, takes the view that as a research-intensive university it is precisely the “engagement” that becomes the differentiating factor and is discussing this he uses the experience both of Newcastle and Michigan State University which puts together a high research profile with an extensive program of engagement, locally, nationally and internationally. But as Goddard himself points out:

“...having some world-class universities is not the same thing as having a world-class university system that forms part of a healthy society. While we now have a widespread distribution of higher education provision across the UK, this teaching needs to be underpinned by research that can contribute to local innovation in business, public services and the wider community.”(p.19)

⁸ www.heirri.eu See also Pesquisa Fapesp: February, 2017 p.7-8 Seção Boas Práticas

In the USA, as commented, an excellent vantage point is that of the Coalition of Urban Metropolitan Universities journal. Indeed, their journal is a very good example of how not to do bibliographical research. Anybody looking for “extension” would not find their way to *Metropolitan Universities*,⁹ but in fact it is an excellent source for discussion and practice on the relationship between Universities and their surroundings as the following cross section of papers shows. They are taken along the time line of the journal and show clearly how the move from outreach to engagement follows to some extent the problematization of urban life in the metropolitan regions.

At the beginning of the 1990s Ziegler, for example draws attention to the multiple patterns of residency around the mix of small, medium and large towns that “metropolitan” represents in practice (1990). Learning their human, social, economic and physical geography is a very different challenge from that facing the agricultural colleges as they extended outwards. Emmert (1990) shows the important bridging role that university research centres and specialized institutes can play by providing bridges to the community in which the university is located. As he points out, these “organized research units” (ORU) are more and more accepted as a part of the modern university and their multidisciplinary ability is key in responding to calls for a: “more direct university response to societal needs. Increasingly, universities are being perceived as important engines of economic development by closing the gap between knowledge production and knowledge utilization” (p.42.). He notes the major differences between the ORU’s and the Departments in relation to theory and research, but finds that this often places these new organizations at the margins of the university; capable of rapid adjustment but also with the lack of guarantees of continuity that the latter have. In 1999, an article by Melnick on University Policy Centers and Institutes brings in the experience of independent think tanks to show how these centers – or ORUs to use Emmert’s expression – can fuse the think tank approach with that of an academic unit to provide public service. His paper summarizes research carried out on some 338 of University based Public Policy Centers.

The move to think more seriously about the responsibility of location is not only linked to outreach, but also as Grigsby argues (1990), in being responsible corporate citizens in their own

⁹ We found our way by asking colleagues (not google) “where did people who were rethinking the practice of university – urban relations get together?”

right: “ As employers, owners and users of real estate, producers of waste and other forms of potential environmental pollution, and in other ways as well, metropolitan universities and colleges can have significant adverse consequences for their immediate environment”(p.23). Other effects have been noted in processes of gentrification and the way in which universities can ignore demands of local citizens groups. He uses the example of Occidental College, which worked with UCLA architecture and urban planning students to rethink its physical relationship with the surrounding community, opening up the campus and improving possibilities for interaction.

In 1994 there are two very useful case studies of building community – university partnerships in an active and, increasingly engaged manner. Trenton, New Jersey is the site of the Trenton Office of Policy Studies (TOPS), a joint initiative of the Thomas Edison State College (specialized in mature students) and the city government. TOPS undertakes or sponsors applied research and policy analysis on issues identified by the city as critical needs and or opportunities. It is fully part of the college but its director sits as an invited member on the mayor’s cabinet. Its advisory board includes representatives from other surrounding higher education institutes: Princeton University, Ridge College, Trenton State College, Mercer County Community College and Rutgers University. Its core funding comes from the University with grant supports from corporate partners and foundations (Thurber 1994). The second, that of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign uses participatory action research methods to enhance the capacity of community-based organizations in East St. Louis to create solutions for critical economic, environmental and social problems. This empowerment approach to planning has meant dealing with a number of barriers including politics, class and race. As Reardon (1994) notes in his conclusion: “ The expanding number of university/community partnerships emerging throughout the country is encouraging to followers of John Dewey, who believe that optimal learning is achieved when students are challenged to solve critical social problems through an integration of theory and practice” (p.58).

In 1995, Michael Stegman who was the head of Policy Development and Research at HUD was issuing a call for more and more metropolitan universities to join in its University Partnership Initiative and provided a number of examples of the community Outreach Partnership Center Program (Stegman 1995). A later evaluation of this program has already been mentioned (Vida

et. al , 2002), but what seems important to point out, especially in relation to Brazil, is that this push forward – even though from within the “outreach” frame - was already using similar expressions to those involved in engaged scholarship and it was being provided by a Governmental Department that was interested in having some very practical and pressing problems solved. In the case of Brazil, a similar role was played by different institutions in the health arena, where the issue was how to turn the Unified Health System (SUS) from a social movement for change into an everyday fact.

By 2000, engaged scholarship appears more and more as center point for new ideas and practices. Finkelstein (2001) discusses the experience of the University of South Florida’s Center for Engaged Scholarship; a result of linking research with outreach by which the university could share its resources with the community. As she puts it: all faculty work, even so-called basic research has potential applications outside academia. Her comments on the relationship between traditional outreach and engaged scholarship are both clear and very incisive:

“...unlike many university initiatives that promote engagement, the Center for Engaged Scholarship is not exclusively geared toward disciplines that typically include a community component. In fact the Center was initially founded as the Center for Applied Community Research, but the director was concerned that the name implied too narrow a definition of engagement; faculty who were not already community-oriented might dismiss the Center as irrelevant to them. Additionally, the reference to applied research suggested a relationship in which faculty would impose their research paradigms on the public. In contrast, engaged scholarship implies a partnership in which the community functions, not as a subject pool, but as a collaborator”. (p 99)

Ramaley of the National Science Foundation in the same year (2001) asks: “why do we engage in engagement?” in an essay that brings together a number of the theoretical and practical themes in debate: civic virtue, the responsible citizen and civic responsibility. In the same year, the University of South Florida hosted an international conference on the “University as Citizen: Engaging Universities and Communities” (Cavendish 2001) in which again these themes come together and continue shaping the engagement – civic university debate.

Experiences in Australia parallel somewhat those reported in the USA, especially amongst the metropolitan universities. As the editor of a volume of the journal dedicated to Civic Engagement in Australia comments (Holland 2003), there are successes but also many difficulties and most solutions are tailor-made over time. The setting however is similar in many parts of the world especially in those countries where universities are relatively new:

“...Institutions founded mostly in the latter half of the last Century, with strong local support for their creation; a history of chronic-under funding of the financial resource base; a student body drawn primarily from the metropolitan area, many who are first generation learners; a focus on research and academic programs that are especially reflective of and responsive to the development needs and opportunities of the region; and a broad vision of the scholarly roles of faculty and a balanced commitment to excellence in teaching, research and community engagement.” (p.3)

Garlick (2003) after the analysis of a decade of University experiences at a regional level, points out that merely having the presence of a university in a region is no guarantee that this will be beneficial. Temple, Tayebjee & Pearce (2003) report from the University of Western Sydney, one of the newer Universities (sometimes called the New Generation Universities, Reid & Hawkins, 2003) with an aim to: “link arms with community, public services, industry and business across the region of Greater Western Sydney in order to exchange knowledge, harness community expertise and energy to mutual benefit, and to contribute to the region’s development, prosperity and social capital” (p.33). Their article is entitled: *From Outreach to Engagement: Fostering Civil Society Through Educational Partnerships*.

If the major players on the “engagement” scene are often the second or third tier universities or those that have emerged more recently, what, it might be asked, is the situation in the leading research universities. Here, the articles in another special number of Metropolitan Universities on *Civic Engagement at Traditional Research Universities* are very helpful. As the Editor (Gilliam, 2006) comments and as has been confirmed by this brief but focused overview of academic production, whilst the challenges of developing civic engagement initiatives at many different types of more locally rooted institutions has already a considerable history, the leading research universities seem to show a low profile. Indeed as he comments in 2006, they are “relatively new”. Results confirm the difficulties pointed to elsewhere. When this is said to be a result of pressure to publish or a result of ratings, it is perhaps necessary to raise the question

about network causality. After all most of those involved on Journal Boards and on Scientific Committees are part of the same community of leading scholars being “pressured”; hence it is difficult to talk about “external pressures”. He points to four common themes that are present in all the experiences described:

- “1. Success is significantly more likely if the president or chancellor is on board and supportive.
2. There must be a strategically placed central locus of activity headed by a visible senior administrator.
3. There must be a substantive connection to research scholarship.
4. Both internal and external change will take time. Patience, in this case, is indeed a virtue.”(p.4)

An emerging topic, which is also present in the work of a number of large urban Universities around the world is that of the decentralized campus located away from the main campus in, usually, more vulnerable parts of the city or metropolitan region. These use the idea of “anchor” institutions, which are place based and can bring together economic, financial, physical and human resources. They not only create presence but also create jobs and related economic activities and can provide space for community based activities. There are often tensions here, as can be seen in the São Paulo example of the University of São Paulo’s Eastern Zone campus (*USP Leste*) and the analysis of the University of Ulster’s attempts to create a new campus to be known as the Springvale Educational Village in an area of Belfast (N. Ireland), known not only for economic decline and poverty but for being an area in which over 33% of all Northern Ireland residents who were killed in the “Troubles” lived. In the 2016 volume of the journal, Barajas & Martin report on an important experience in sharing space at the University of Minnesota’s Urban Research and Outreach Engagement Center (UROC) located in a community facing inequality, disinvestment and racism. Here patience was indeed a virtue, as was tending to what they refer as liminal space:

“Shared space is more than simply an accumulation of walls, doors and windows. It has a climate, an environment, an “ethos”, a feel, and a presence. Shared conceptual and epistemological space, as liminal space suggests, is where we cultivate a space that is safe for everyone to feel discomfort and challenge. [...] When we talk about conceptual and epistemological space at UROC, we mean the way the space “feels” to the people who enter it. Do people feel respected, valued and welcome? Does the space reflect multiple cultures, values and communities?” (Barajas & Martin, 2015 p.56)

To finish this brief overview it is worth noting that in the 2011 special number on International Perspectives on Community-University Partnerships (Silk & Toof, 2011) one of the featured experiences is that of Workers and Environmental Health in Campinas, Brazil, which discusses partnerships developed between the University and the Unified Health System (SUS). Indeed the experience of the University of Campinas in this area has produced a number of innovations in Health delivery (see also Brigagão et al, 2017) and will help lead the way to some of our conclusions.

4. 3. Recent Developments and Experiences in Brazil

Early references to University extension in Brazil can be found in the 1930s when the term is used in the (new) University Statute and law (19.581/1931)¹⁰. In the 1960s with the law on national education, some conferences and rural extension activities begin to take place but it is in the military period when extension activities were made obligatory in the 1968 University Reform. Later, still in the military period, the Rondon Project is created to provide students with the possibility of working in the far corners of the country so as to be both helpful to local communities and learn about the heterogeneity of the country (Branco, 2006; Santos, 2015).

With the return to democracy in the 1980s and pressure of social movements for change in many areas, the theme of extension activities receives a further impulse including a mention in the 1988 “citizens constitution” as the new public charter was popularly called. In its 207th article, the new Constitution would state “The Universities are autonomous in terms of their teaching, scientific, financial and general administration including their buildings and will obey the principle of the inseparability of teaching, research and extension”.¹¹

The first meeting of the Forum of Vice Rectors of Extension of Public Higher Educational Institutes (FORPROEX) in 1987, provided a landmark definition of extension, which can be found in most of the following formal documents:

¹⁰ For an overview of the early history see Vêras & Souza, 2016.

¹¹ “As universidades gozam de autonomia didático-científica, administrativa e de gestão financeira e patrimonial, e obedecerão ao princípio de indissociabilidade entre ensino pesquisa e extensão”.

“University extension is an educational, cultural and scientific process that articulates research and teaching in an inseparable way and make viable a relationship of transformation between University and Society. Extension is a two-way path with guaranteed transit for the academic community, which will find in society the opportunity to elaborate the praxis of academic knowledge. On their return to the University, scholars and students will bring learning which, submitted to theoretical reflection, will in turn be added to that knowledge. This flow, which establishes an exchange of academic and everyday knowledge, will have various consequences: the production of knowledge that is a result of the confrontation between national and regional realities; the democratization of academic knowledge and the effective participation of the community in the working of the University. As well as been the instrument of this dialectical process of theory/practice, Extension is an interdisciplinary activity which favors an integrated vision of the social world.”¹²

Over the following years amidst much discussion involving three different Forums, one for the Public Universities (FORPROEX), one for the Community Universities (ForExt) and a third for the Private Universities (FUNADESP) a National Plan was developed in 1998 followed, in 2012, by a National Policy on Extension, which requires Universities to elaborate their own plans. There were various attempts to provide grants for extension studies but most of the financing has come from internal resources or resources provided by those agencies directly involved with the demands. The area still holds firm to the theme of the inseparable nature of teaching research and extension. Unfortunately in practice, as the current President of the (FORPROEX) commented in an interview, much has happened but, despite its normative and even ideological strength, inseparability remains still unclear in practice.

The site of the National Extension Network, maintained by (FORPROEX) lists 55 Brazilian University Journals that are dedicated to extension studies. The choice of focusing on the Forum’s own journal (the Brazilian Journal of University Extension - *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*) as opposed to all or any cross-section of other journals was made for

¹² A Extensão Universitária é o processo educativo, cultural e científico que articula o Ensino e a Pesquisa de forma indissociável e viabiliza a relação transformadora entre Universidade e Sociedade. A extensão é uma via de mão dupla, com trânsito assegurado à comunidade acadêmica, que encontrará, na sociedade, a oportunidade de elaboração da praxis de um conhecimento acadêmico. No retorno à Universidade, docentes e discentes trarão um aprendizado que, submetido à reflexão teórica, será acrescido àquele conhecimento. Esse fluxo, que estabelece a troca de saberes sistematizados, acadêmicos e popular, terá como consequências a produção do conhecimento resultante do confronto com a realidade brasileira e regional, a democratização do conhecimento acadêmico e a participação efetiva da comunidade na atuação da Universidade. Além de instrumentalizadora deste processo dialético de teoria/prática, a Extensão é um trabalho interdisciplinar que favorece a visão integrada do social. FORPROEX, 1987.

three reasons. Firstly it is one of the early journals, starting in 2003. A few others started at the end of the 1990s but most date from later periods. Secondly it has registered many of the events and meetings of the Forum and thirdly as it represents the Forum in some way it has to keep a balance between the different views present. The result is obviously an overview that will certainly have missed many innovative experiences at the level of individual universities and should be treated impressionistically. Fortunately the Journal's current editor provided a very helpful analysis of twenty-nine of these different journals in 2014 (Coelho, 2014).

The Journal, like a number of other extension journals was not continuous. It ran from 2003 to 2006, with one number a year, then resumed again in 2014 with two numbers per year and three in 2017. In the first period there was more discussion about extension as such and the normative theme of “inseparability” (Corrêa 2003, Lima 2003) as well as various examples. In the second period there are more examples. Overall there is little research discussion about extension and the international debate is mainly absent. Many of the examples are linked to education and prevention (both as community education, health and different environmental themes in communities and schools, or as professional extension as part of university training – especially in the health arena). Here the important reference point is the Unified Health System (*Sistema Unico de Saúde*) and its community focused orientation to “health for all” (see for example Corrêa et al, 2006, Rocha e Falcão, 2006). The work of the internationally known Brazilian educator Paulo Freire is a constant presence in community based work and also as a methodological guide.

A good overview of the different themes is provided by the published abstracts of the 8th *Ibero Americano Congress of University Extension* (see *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária* 3,2, 2005), organized by the FORPROEX together with the other two Forums. Using as an indicator the number of pages of abstracts for each of the different areas we find there \ are four pages of abstracts on technology and production; four pages on work; six pages of abstracts on culture; ten pages on environment; twenty pages on human rights and justice; 37 pages on education and 63 pages of abstracts on health. Less present in the Journal are more articulated programs that go some way to showing how to resolve the mission of inseparability in practice. Even those that have a broader view tend to be more focused on undergraduate and postgraduate development as teaching and extension, where research plays a mainly technical role. Good

examples are the Federal University of Bahia (Verás & Souza, 2016) and the new Federal University for Latin American Integration (UNILA) Souza & Pereira, 2015).

The importance of the contrast between the normative and constitutional position and practice is amplified when seen in the light of recent developments in the Federal network of professional, scientific and technological education. Here a number of Centers for Technological Education with a strong presence on professional training have been changed into Federal Institutes for Education, Science and Technology (IFS) and given the mandate of offering technological and professional education at all levels. They are seen as sub-regional centers of reference with responsibilities for teaching, research and extension from the high school or community college level up to formal post-graduate master and doctoral programs) and located away from the major urban centers. With a sub-regional focus and freedom to develop their own courses (given the legislation on university autonomy) they are seen as potential levers for local development, that could develop programs more suited to territorial vocations. Amongst the objectives of the Institutes (Law 11.892/2008) are to engage in applied research that is beneficial to their surrounding communities, extension activities that help the development of the labor market and support educational processes that empower citizens and help local and regional socio-economic development.

The challenge is very clear, as is the breadth of the mandate. But will these new Institutes be able to find a way past many of the negative incentives that exist and avoid the pressures to become more and more like the formal Federal Universities? Will they be able to develop the equivalent of a scholarship of engagement?

6. Santa Rita do Sapucaí (MG)

It is here that a recent study on public policies to help local entrepreneurial activities and which amongst various innovative examples was to focus on the case study of Santa Rita do Sapucaí in the State of Minas Gerais, may provide a possible answer, at least in part¹³.

¹³ Gomes, Alves e Fernandes, 2013

Santa Rita has a current population of only 40,000 inhabitants but has an international reputation in the field of electronics, 150 or more innovative firms and a high degree of articulation between government, business and the local educational establishments. The area, known as “electronic valley” generates 14,000 well paid jobs, a very positive human development index, low levels of inequality, exports 13,000 products to 41 countries and has three incubators for new businesses.

The case begins at the end of the 1950s when Santa Rita do Sapucaí was even smaller and with an economy based on coffee and cattle production. A member of the local elite who had been the wife of a Brazilian ambassador, who had seen technical education in various countries, returned to the town after her divorce and dedicated herself to helping the region look for development alternatives. Convinced of the future importance of electronics, she persuaded the then President of Brazil (also from Minas Gerais) to create a Technical High School for electronics in the town¹⁴ (ETE). It was the first of its kind in Latin America.

Brazilian electronics made a big leap forward with the creation of the Brazilian National Telecommunications System in 1962 and in 1965 with the support of the ETE, a university level Santa Rita National Institute for Telecommunications was created (Inatel). The first concentrated on technical level and professional training and the second on university level courses. The two were set up as non-profit foundations with great support from local society as well as the government. In 1971 came the university level Center for Management, Technology and Education (FAI), again a result of local activists, business leaders and schoolteachers, to provide undergraduate and postgraduate programs. It wasn't long before the flux of trained students moving to find firms began to invert and the electronic industry began to move to Santa Rita. But students were also forming their own businesses with the help of their teachers. At the beginning this happened informally inside the Inatel and then formally with an incubator for new business and projects in 1985.

By now the local government was also talking about entrepreneurial activities and FAI created a second incubator with an emphasis on robotics, which still functions today. With the technological park well on its way and being supported by local associations, schools and

¹⁴ Her name was Luzia Rennó Moreira (Sinhá Moreira) and the school was the Escola Técnica de Electronica Francisco Moreira da Costa (ETE).

university centers, it was only time before the “Electronic Valley” slogan was created by one of the mayors, taken up by the local newspaper and institutionalized with the creation of the Association of Electro-Electronics Industries of Electronic Valley (SINDVEL)¹⁵ which takes care of the brand up until to today.

As a way of summing up the way in which local government, business and education are working together, the organizational chart of the Municipal Secretary for Science, Technology, Industry and Commerce has two main divisions: the Director of Incubation Programs and the Manager of the Business Park.

7. The challenges present and the need to move away from the inseparability of teaching, research and extension

Engagement is a distinctive approach to teaching and research that recognizes that some learning or discovery outcomes require access to external entities with distinctive knowledge and expertise. The hallmark of engagement is the development of partnerships that ensure a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge between the University and the community. Community engagement is transforming higher education in many institutions and nations around the world (UK, Spain, Germany, India, Japan, Vietnam, Thailand, Philippines, Australia USA, Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil and South Africa, amongst others.” (Holland & Ramaley, 2006 p. 33)

The scholarship of engagement, from this brief overview both of concepts and practices is very much here to stay, indeed in a number of places it could be said that it never went away or in others that older traditions have been recovered and recast. Engagement as a theme has broken out of the iron grip of the triangular relationship between research, teaching and extension by saying that neither one nor the other of these are more or less important than the other, that they are often quite different and separate but sometimes overlap and combine. The scholarship of engagement or, as we prefer, the scholarship of civic engagement, asks that all three are rethought within a horizontal relationship with the different facets of the communities and society of which the university is part, both locally and globally. This, as the different arguments

¹⁵ Sindicato da Indústria de Aparelhos Elétricos e Eletrônicos e similares do Vale da Eletrônica.

and experiences have shown, can mean many different ways of relating that draw on many different traditions: workers education, extension, outreach, community development, action research, open access, applied research, collaborative teaching, long term community based field stations, extra-mural studies, learning by doing, interactive planning, socially communicative scientific journalism amongst many others. Different disciplines will be more comfortable with some of these than others and that is very real. Engagement also implies being mutually useful, for this reason the horizontal element is a constant in many of the documents and case studies.

Early extension may have been marked by the importance of teaching, but most late medieval scientists made their living – or at least protected themselves – by inventing some very useful devices. Extension joined with teaching and research as the basis for many modern universities but in doing so created a hierarchy. There were to be “research” universities and “teaching universities” and sometimes there would be extension, extra-mural studies or “outreach”. As we have seen, this was often a task ascribed to a third tier of universities or colleges more linked to agricultural communities – in the beginning – or large urban areas later on. In practice, despite the normative wish for the three to be inseparable, they never were. As we saw from the Brazil experience, despite consultative documents, government programs, laws, decrees and constant reaffirmations each tended to go its own way and as a result the idea of “service” as a descriptor of the universities civic and social purpose slowly faded away. It is here that the Santa Rita do Sapucaí example becomes a very useful baseline as it points to three steps which are mirrored in a number of the other experiences and analyses: firstly, start from a demand or an idea; secondly, start with a school or college that can meet a demand or rise to an idea; and, thirdly don't stop. It is not a question, as some would argue of getting a university for there is no guarantee that the university is a lever of development. What happened in Santa Rita was from the beginning a horizontal relationship of civic engagement and certainly those involved did not foresee just where that would lead.

What we have also seen is that in the push-pull world of social forces and incentives, in addition to these pioneering and locally driven actions, some major breakthroughs have happened when funds are linked to very clear and focused demands from those directly involved in solving problems usually of local or regional importance. Examples have been the Land Grant colleges and agricultural and mechanical education, the HUD community outreach projects for urban

development, the Unified Health Service implementation in Brazil as well as numerous regional and city based initiatives for specific towns and issues.

Another important comment, from those involved, is that building and consolidating mutually useful relationships takes time and takes effort for those on all sides of the many different fences, to unlearn and relearn ways of relating and working together. It is also territorially based; knowledge is being built up to solve specific problems; its starts from the specific and not from some generic and generalized sample. In the publish or perish world of journal ratings and closed access publication it is rare to find a study that is the “result of a long term mutual engagement by the University and surrounding communities in dealing with (for example) sustainable development objectives”. Indeed such a study would probably be written off as somewhat non methodological, somewhat descriptive, probably not academic, difficult to generalize, classified at best as applied or outreach activities and, if lucky, would receive the suggestion to resubmit to a journal of extension studies. How many of us are used to trawling in the network of extension studies with its wide sea of different documents or, as we found, have heard of journals like *Metropolitan Universities*?

Bibliography

Barajas, H.L. & Martin, L. (2016) Shared Space, Liminal Space: Five Years into a Community-University- Place-Based Experiment. *Metropolitan Universities* 27, 3, 47-66

Brandon R.B. (2000) (ed.) *Rorty and his Critics*. Cambridge: Blackwell

Boyer, E.L. (1996) The Scholarship of Engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*. 49, 7, 18 -33.

Branco, A.L.C. (2006) Indissociabilidade do ensino-pesquisa-extensão e a flexibilização curricular: uma visão da extensão. Grupo Técnico: Fórum de Pró-Reitores de Extensão das Universidades Públicas Brasileiras – FORPROEX.

Brigagão, J. Alencar, V., Bittencourt, L. , Burgos, F. & Spink, P.K. (2017) Continuidade nas práticas inovadoras em Saúde: redes ampliadas e ação pública. Em: M.A. Alves, J. Brigagão e

Burgos, F. (orgs) *Por uma Gestão Pública Democrática: 25 anos do Centro de Estudos em Administração Pública e Governo*. São Paulo: Programa Gestão Pública e Cidadania (PGPC)

Campbell, K. (2017) The Scholarship of Engagement and University Extension at the University of Alberta. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*, 8,1, 57-61

Cavendish, J.C. (2001) Institutionalizing Campus-Community Engagement: Reflections on the University as Citizen Conferenece. *Metropolitan Universities* 12, 3, 4-12

Coelho, G.C. (2014) Revistas Acadêmicas de extensão universitária no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*, 5,2, 69-75

Corrêa, E.J. (2003) Extensão universitária, política institucional e inclusão social. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*, 1,1, 12-15

Corrêa, E.J., Alves, M.T.S.S.B, Campos, M.F.H., Bernardes, L., Barros, R.M.F. & Crisóstimo, A.L. (2006) A Área da Saúde e a Implementação da Política Nacional de Extensão. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*, 4,2,7-13

Rocha, V.X.M. & Falcão, E.F. (2006) Instrumento metodológico para articulações iniciais do Estágio Nacional de Extensão em Comunidades (ENEC)/Vivências e Estágios em Educação Popular e Saúde da UFPB (VEPOP) e início de abordagem de trabalho junto com as comunidades. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*, 4,2,19-25

Emmert, M.A. (1990) Bridging the Gap: Centers and Institutes. *Metropolitan Universities* 1,3, 41-50

Finkelstein, M.A. (2001) Linking research and Outreach: the Center for Engaged Scholarship. *Metropolitan Universities* 12, 4, 99-106

Gaffikin, F. & Morrissey, M. (2008) A new synergy for universities: redefining academy as an “engaged institution” *Education, Citizenship & Social Justice* 3, 1, 97-116

Garlick, S. (2003) Creative Regional Development: Knowledge-based Associations Between Universities and their Places *Metropolitan Universities* 14, 2, 48-70

Gillian Jr, F.D. (2006) Civic Engagement at Traditional Research Universities *Metropolitan Universities* 17, 3, 5-7

Goddard, J. (2009) *Reinventing the Civic University*. National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts, London (www.nesta.org.uk)

Goddard,J., Hazelkorn, E., Kempton,L and Vallance, P. (eds) (2016) *The Civic University: The Policy and Leadership Challenges*. London: Edward Elgar

Goff, J. le (1993). *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*. London: Wiley-Blackwell

Gomes, M.V.P., Alves, M.A. & Fernandes, R.J.R (2013) *Políticas Públicas de Fomento ao Empreendedorismo e às Micro e Pequenas Empresas*. São Paulo: Programa Gestão Pública e Cidadania.

Grigsby III, J.E. (1991) Metropolitan Universities as Responsible Corporate Citizens. *Metropolitan Universities* 2,3, 23-30

Hart, A. & Wolff, D. (2006) Developing Local Communities of Practice through local Community-University Partnerships. *Planning, Practice and Research*, 21,1, 121-138.

Holland, B.A. (2003) Civic Engagement in Australia. *Metropolitan Universities* 14, 2, 3-6

Holland,P. & Ramaley,J. (2008) Creating a supportive environment for Community-University Engagement: Conceptual Frameworks. In *Engaging Communities, Proceedings of the 31st HERDSA Annual Conference, Rotorua 1-4 July 2008 pp33- 47*

Latour, B. (1996) On Interobjectivity. *Mind, Culture and Activity*. 3,4, p.228-245,

Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An introduction to Actor Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Latour B. (2013) *An Inquiry into modes of Existence: An Anthropology of the moderns*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press

Lima, J. F. de (2003) Extensão universitária como diálogo entre o saber acadêmico e a realidade social. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária*, 1,1, 31-34.

Melnick, R. (1999) University Policy Centers and Institutes: the Think Tank as Public Service Function *Metropolitan Universities* 10,1, 9-99

Monteiro, M.I., Siqueira, C.A., Corrêa Filho, H.R. (2011) Community-University Research Partnerships for Workers'and Environmental Health in Campinas Brazil. *Metropolitan Universities* 22, 2, 79-98

Ramaley, J.A. (2001) Why do we engage in engagement. *Metropolitan Universities* 12, 3, 13-19

Reardon, K.M. (1994) Creating a Community/University Partnership that works: the case of the East St. Louis Action Research Project. *Metropolitan Universities* 5, 4, 47-59

Reid, J. & Hawkins, R. (2003) The emergence of the New Generation University. *Metropolitan Universities* 14, 2, 7-17

Ridder-Symoens (2003a) *A History of the University in Europe Vol.I: Universities in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ridder-Symoens (2003b) *A History of the University in Europe Vol.II: Universities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rorty,R. (1967) *The Linguistic Turn*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ruegg, W. (2004) *A History of the University in Europe Vol.III: Universities in the nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800 – 1945)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruegg, W. (2011) *A History of the University in Europe Vol.IV: Universities since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Santos, A.B. (2015) As ações de extensão universitária da modalidade Rondon. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária* 6, 2, 103-108.

- Silka, L. (2006) (ed.) *Scholarship in Action: Applied Research and Community Change*. US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Washington D.C
- Silka,L. & Toof R. (2011) International Perspectives on Community-University Partnerships *Metropolitan Universities* 22, 2, 5-7
- Sommer, R. (1990) Local Research. *Journal of Social Issues* . 46,1, 203 – 214
- Souza, A.M. & Pereira, N.M.F. (2015) Escrevendo os Caminhos de Extensão Universitária na UNILA. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária* 6, 2, 77-85.
- Spink, P.K. (2001) On Houses, Villages and Knowledges. *Organization* 8,2, 219-226.
- Spink P.K. (2017) Urban Vulnerability from the other side of the street. Paper Presented at the 12th Interpretive Policy Analysis Conference, Loughborough 5th -7th July UK.
- Spink,P.K. & Alves, M.A. (2011) O Campo Turbulento da Produção Acadêmica e a Importância da Rebeldia Competente. *Organizações e Sociedade* 18,57
- Stegman, M.A. (1995) HUD's University Partnerships: HUD shapes a new role as Oartner with Universities in Urban America. *Metropolitan Universities* 6, 3, 97-107
- Temple, J., Tayebjee, F. & Pearce, R. (2003) *Metropolitan Universities* 14, 2, 33-47
- Thoreau, H. D. (1854) *Walden; or, Life in the Woods*. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. (reprinted 1995 by Dover Publications).
- Thurber, J.P. (1994) The Trenton Office of Policy Studies: Building Municipal-Collegiate Partnerships for Urban Revitalization *Metropolitan Universities* 5, 4, 37-46
- Tomasino,H. & Cano,A. (2016) Modelos de extension universitraria en las universidades latinoamericanos en el siglo XXI: tendencias y controversias. *Universidades*, LXVII, 67, 7-24.
- Véras, R. M & Souza, G.B. (2016) Extensão universitária e atividade curricular em comunidade e em sociedade na Universidade Federal da Bahia. *Revista Brasileira de Extensão Universitária* 7, 2, 83 - 90.

Vidal, A., Nye, N., Walker, C. Manjarrez, C, and Romanik, C (2002) *Lessons from the Community Outreach Program*. Final Report prepared for: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research Washington, DC The Urban Institute Washington, DC

Ziegler, J.M. (1990) Winds of Change: the University in search of itself. *Metropolitan Universities* 1, 3, 13-25