SOCIAL INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY

by

AMBRA ANN YARBROUGH

(Under the Direction of Chris Linder)

ABSTRACT

Social innovation connects diversity, access, and inclusion to social change in the community and must be explored further within the context of higher education and student affairs. The purpose of this research study is to develop a better understanding of how universities can lead and develop an interdisciplinary approach to social innovation education on campus. Specifically, this study analyzed a socially innovative new student orientation program at a mid-sized private university to understand how the collaborative, social justice initiative manifested itself over time. The guiding questions for the study included: What catalyzed the institution to focus on social innovation education? What was the developmental process for the socially innovative initiative? How did the campus community respond to the social innovation? The Social Change Model for Leadership Development served as the theoretical framework to guide the study.

Despite higher education's central purpose of serving and enhancing the public good through education, and the advancement in practice of social innovation, scholars have very little practical knowledge about what makes an organization good at social innovation. The study was situated in literature surrounding the public good mission of higher education, the emerging field of social innovation, and social innovation in higher education. Through an exploratory and

descriptive case study, this study explored what social innovation looks like within a student affairs and higher education setting through the descriptive lens of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

I categorized the research findings through four thematic categories: Change, Individual Values, Group Values, and Community Values. Many parallels exist between the language used within the field of social innovation and the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, along with conversations about the development of personal and social responsibility within college. Through a case study examination, five key findings illuminate lessons that administrators need to know about infusing social innovation into student affairs and higher education. They include fostering means to identify social needs on campus, developing a collaborative culture, cultivating leadership among all levels of the university, recognizing the process takes time, and generating and integrating scholarship to complement practice.

INDEX WORDS: social innovation; higher education; student affairs, collaboration, social change, social change model of leadership development

SOCIAL INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY

by

AMBRA ANN YARBROUGH

M.Ed., University of Georgia, 2012

Ed.D., University of Georgia, 2017

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2017

© 2017

Ambra Ann Yarbrough

All Rights Reserved

SOCIAL INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY

by

AMBRA ANN YARBROUGH

Major Professor:	Chris Linder
Committee:	Diane Cooper
	Matt Varga

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2017

DEDICATION

To those who seek to serve as changemakers within your sphere of influence and beyond, this is for you. I write this for your dedicated passion to make the world a more just place for all, to affirm your drive and desire to move your community forward. To the dedicated professionals within higher education that believe we can inspire and lead change within the minds and hearts of scholars of all ages and phases of development, this is for you. I am with you. I support you. I write this with you in mind. Join me in the conversation about how to inspire and drive social change through innovative and collaborative ways. Let's be changemakers independently, but more importantly, collectively. The world needs us.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my parents, thank you for a lifelong example of what it means to integrate life and work within student affairs, for the inspiration to pursue my doctorate early, and for the accountability to make the most of this beautiful life. To my brother, thank you for providing me comedic reliefs throughout some stressful seasons, and for endearingly naming me a nerd from the beginning. To my fiancé, thank you for your genuine engagement in my career and scholarly pursuits, for motivating me to continue when I reached moments of exhaustion, and for being a true partner in this grand adventure. I look forward to starting our journey as Mr. and Dr. Hiott within a few short months, and only hope I can serve as such a rock for you for all of our days.

To my colleagues, thank you for your collaboration to make this research possible, for setting the example of social innovation within student affairs, and for your continued support throughout my doctoral journey. To my dissertation committee, thank you for your critical lenses, making me a stronger scholar and contributor to the fields of student affairs, social innovation, and higher education. To the Ashoka U Organization, thank you for serving as a leader in the field of social innovation in higher education, for providing a space for a collection of changemakers to come together and imagine how they can transform higher education and the world for better.

Thank you, to you all, for helping me fulfill my heavenly mission to better serve the multiple communities I exist within, for your belief, inspiration, and dedication to ensuring I give this one, precious life everything I've got. I am eternally grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Higher Education and the Public Good 6

Problem Statement 9

Purpose of the Study 9

Guiding Questions 10

Theoretical Framework 10

Operational Definitions 13

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study 16

Significance of the Study 16

Conclusion 17

2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 18

Public Good Mission of Higher Education 19

Emerging Field of Social Innovation 27

Social Innovation in Higher Education 34

Leadership and Civic Engagement on College Campuses 41

Summary 49

3 METHODOLOGY 50

Research Paradigm.....51

Case Study 51

Setting 53

Participants.....53

Data Collection Methods 55

Data Analysis 60

Researcher Subjectivity 62

Trustworthiness.....63

4 RESEARCH FINDINGS 66

Description of the Program 67

Change 75

Individual Values 82

Group Values 97

Community Values 117

Summary of Findings.....120

Conclusion 125

5 CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....128

Implications.....134

Recommendations for Practice 136

Limitations of the Study.....141

Recommendations for Further Study 142

REFERENCES 145

APPENDICES

A Recruitment Emails.....162

B Interview and Focus Group Questions.....166

C Creating Community Charge Letters.....178

D Future Vision for Creating Community.....185

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1: Social Change Model of Leadership Development Value Definitions 12

Table 2: Pseudonyms for Interview Participants 57

Table 3: Themes and Sub-themes for Findings 67

Table 4: Creating Community Curriculum 69

Table 5: Role of Participants.....70

Table 5: Progress of Change for the Creating Community Program.....72

Table 5: Language Parallels Between Social Innovation and Social Change 133

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Recent social challenges on college campuses require higher education administrators to think boldly and innovatively to generate solutions and changes to pervasive systems of oppression. Social innovation serves as the overarching term that connects diversity, access, and inclusion to social change in the community and must be explored further within the context of higher education. In the past few years, social issues within higher education continue to saturate the forefront of public discourse (Kruger, 2016). Such challenges include college access and affordability, gun violence on campus, sexual violence on campus, and racism brought to awareness by campus activists. Social innovation, the process of developing new strategies, concepts, ideas, and organizations that meet social needs of all kinds and that extend and strengthen civil society, is a venue for the field of higher education to start addressing the most crucial social issues of the time (Ashoka U, 2016).

The public policy discourse about the affordability and value of higher education continues, particularly surrounding how low- and moderate-income students succeed and graduate without going into deep debt (Ebersole, 2014; Heller 2001). Higher education affordability is one of the major policy issues in the 2016 United States Presidential election, focusing on cost, innovation and accreditation, and completion (NASFAA, 2016). While college access has roots as far back as the World War II GI Bill and the Truman Commission Report of 1947, access remains a significant discussion point because of its continued importance and the failure to achieve it despite decades of effort (Heller, 2001). College affordability is a more

recent problem in higher education with rapidly increasing tuition rates. Policy debates surround how to increase affordability for students from low- and middle-class families, which also tie closely with college access (Heller, 2001; Kruger, 2016). An example of a social innovation within this realm is The Coalition of Access, Affordability, and Success that seeks to address college access and affordability through improving the college application process for all students (Coalition of Access, Affordability, and Success, 2016). A diverse range of institutions joined the coalition with their commitment to providing affordable education, including public universities that offer affordable tuition and need-based financial aid and private colleges and universities that provide financial aid to meet the full financial need for every domestic student admitted (Coalition of Access, Affordability, and Success, 2016). Further innovations are necessary to address the pervasive issue of college access and affordability. Through the lens of social innovation, new constituent groups can come together to brainstorm beyond policies and reimagine how they can collaborate to improve college access and affordability across educational systems.

Colleges and universities do not escape the national pandemic of active shooter violence in the United States. Within the first six months of 2016, 165 mass shootings occurred in the United States (Gun Violence Archive, 2016). In 2015, more than 320 mass shootings occurred across the United States, 23 of which occurred on college campuses (Sanburn, 2015). Increases in domestic and international terrorism and an increase in active shooter incidents on college campuses increase the fear many members feel on campus. While the United States Congress stalled policy proposals on firearms at the federal level, many states continue to debate whether students, faculty, and staff have rights to carry firearms on campus (Kruger, 2016; Morse, Sisneros, Perez, & Sponsler, 2016). Currently, seven states allow guns on campus by legislation

and court rulings and 20 campuses prohibit guns on campus by legislation and higher-education system-level policy (Morse, Sisneros, Perez, & Sponsler, 2016). Regardless of legislation decisions, social innovation can help campuses proactively prepare by educating campus citizens how to respond to active shooter incidents and re-evaluating protocols for cancelling classes and exams, issuing warnings to the campus community, and handling anonymous threats of violence through social media posts and emails. These steps require tools and skills highlighted within social innovation, including permission to dream beyond boundaries and systems, work alongside new partners and colleagues, and examine pervasive issues within a new lens. Such empowerment will give colleagues permission to brainstorm ways to reduce gun violence on campus and in society, and then brainstorm innovative methods to be proactive and reactive when such violence occurs.

Another persistent issue within higher education is how colleges should address sexual assault and gender-based violence on campus (Kruger, 2016). In recent years, public scrutiny continues to increase around the effort and approach of colleges and universities to prevent and address campus sexual violence (Morse, Sponsler, & Fulton, 2015). Two national surveys further fueled concern over the prevalence of campus sexual violence reporting that one in five females, one in 20 males, and one in four transgender students experience sexual violence after enrolling in college (Cantor et al., 2015; DiJulio, Norton, Craighill, Clement, & Brodie, 2015). The national visibility of campus sexual violence turned this issue into a top priority for policy action among lawmakers at both state and federal levels (Morse, Sponsler, & Fulton, 2015). On the state level, 23 states proposed legislation around how universities manage cases of sexual assault within the past two years (Kruger, 2016). On the federal level, President Obama established the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault to help

institutions live up to their obligation to protect students and reduce sexual violence (The White House, 2014). While responses to these initiatives include an investment in staffing for Title IX Officers, sexual assault investigators, victim's advocates, and resources for campus-climate surveys on college campuses, questions remain surrounding how federal legislation and the Office of Civil Rights will continue to influence the practices and procedures on college campuses (Kruger, 2016). Beyond federal requirements, the higher education community needs to continue approaching campus sexual violence with a commitment to prevention including bystander intervention and educational programs to address campus climate and cultural issues (Morse, Sponsler, & Fulton, 2015). Social innovation can ensure this work continues to expand in ways that are more effective on college campuses by bringing together new groups of people to critically examine campus culture, empower them to think beyond boundaries, and generate bold strategies to create change within and beyond the campus walls to eliminate sexual violence.

Further, protests around issues of systemic oppression and racism continue to rise on college campuses (Kruger, 2016; Velasquez & LaRose, 2015). While colleges and universities have been known as hotbeds for student activism since the 1960s, activism around social justice issues continue through protests, petitions, sit-ins, building take-overs, and hunger strikes (Kruger, 2016; Quiroz, 1998). Technology and social media, including computers, cell phones, text messaging, and social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter, continue to amplify campus-based activism (Biddix, 2010; Velasquez & LaRose, 2015). A recent case study is the progression of the #BlackLivesMatter movement from a national protest to a local protest on college campuses (Edwards & Harris, 2016; Kruger, 2016). The #BlackLivesMatter call to action rests on a historical foundation of oppression to the black community and reoccurring

race-related deaths in the twenty-first century (Edwards & Harris, 2016). The national call to action expanded to campus-based activism demanding an expansion of black faculty and staff, an increase in campus resources for Black and Multicultural Centers, and an increase in degree attainment for low-income, first-generation, and students of color (Kruger, 2016). This activism movement affirmed equity and inclusion as a critical component of university missions, but a history of oppression and racism is the reason activism had to commence in the first place. Socially innovative practices can help institutional leaders brainstorm how to support and encourage open expression of college students when issues of oppression and violence occur. Administrators can join students in their dialogue and efforts to fight oppression, supporting their desire to share their voice and perspective, instead of hindering students with red tape to work around established university policies and procedures.

Social innovation serves as the overarching term that connects diversity, access, and inclusion to social change in the community, and scholars must explore it further within the context of student affairs and higher education. Social innovation, with its focus on social problems, an interest in finding novel solutions to address social problems, and its benefits impacting greater society, is the lens that can help continue challenging systems of oppression and generate innovative solutions within higher education (Ashoka U, 2016). Some of the current social issues within higher education include access and affordability, gun violence, sexual assault, and student activism addressing oppression and racism, and more will continue to arise over time. Practitioners must generate new strategies, concepts, ideas, and organizations to meet social needs of all kinds to extend and strengthen civil society, and social innovation in higher education is the framework that can manifest this philosophy (Ashoka U, 2016).

Higher Education and the Public Good

Higher education's central purpose is to serve and enhance the public good through education (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007; NASPA, 1989). A central component of university missions is to support the surrounding community, and increasingly leaders in the field of higher education recognize its obligation to keep the public good at the forefront of their work (Anderson, 2015; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007; McDonald, W. M. & Associates, 2002; NASPA, 1989). The public good refers to resources and benefits accessible to all engaged with higher education, including more informed citizens trained and prepared to improve democracy and create a more inclusive society (Marginson, 2011). University mission statements highlight the role of higher education serving the public good through the inclusion of values such as civic responsibility, service, citizenship, leadership, honesty, and character (Astin & Astin, 2011; Checkoway, 2001; Hersh & Schneider, 2005). The education of students for civic engagement takes on many terms, forms, and practices, but for the purpose of this study, personal and social responsibility will encapsulate the variety of terms that contribute to the public good conversation within higher education. Personal and social responsibility involve the moral obligation to self and community, recognizing that personal responsibility provides the foundation for social responsibility, both continually influencing the other (AAC&U, 2002; Dey & Associates, 2008; Hersh & Schneider, 2005). Through educating students and building campus communities, campus leaders and educators may build a foundation to connect students to communities beyond institutional walls and prepare them to serve as active contributors in society (Cantor, 2004). The public good mission of higher education remains consistent, yet new and more effective methods to achieve it

continue to emerge, including personal and social responsibility and, most recently, social innovation education.

The emphasis of personal and social responsibility within higher education continues to receive increased attention on a local and global scale (AAC&U, 2002; AAC&U, 2010; Hersh & Schneider, 2005). In communities across the world, individuals are becoming more socially conscious and seeking ways to improve environments for themselves and others (Wesley & Antadze, 2010). Yet there are numerous reasons that higher education falls short of transmitting the public good mission as a priority on campus, including a lower institutional emphasis on social responsibility, unclear faculty roles in educating toward the mission, and decreases in student engagement over time (Dey & Associates, 2008; Dey, Barnhardt, Antonaros, Ott, & Holsapple, 2009). The need to find innovative solutions to today's social issues call for civically engaged education within and beyond the university. Such education requires campus leaders to make personal and social responsibility a priority again by bridging theoretical and practical gaps, facilitating campus communities dedicated to the public good mission (Koritz & Schadwald, 2015; Reason, Ryder, & Kee, 2013).

The exercise of discovering creative solutions to address social needs and enhance the public good equates to social innovation. Social innovation goes beyond providing new products and services to creating solutions that are "more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than current solutions" (Stanford Center for Social Innovation, 2016, para. 1), changing the underlying beliefs and relationships that structure the world (Nilsson & Paddock, 2014; Phillis, Deiglmeier, & Miller, 2008; Sanders, Mulgan, Ali, & Tucker, 2007; Wesley & Antadze, 2010). The emergence of the field of social innovation is growing in study and practice, discovering creative solutions to address social needs of society (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010;

Phills, Deiglmeier, & Miller, 2008; Westley & McGowan, 2013). The field of social innovation gained significant national attention in the last decade from the Obama Administration, public, non-profit, and private sectors, and higher education, and some of the most creative work exists at the intersection between sectors (Ashoka U, 2014; Social Innovation, 2010; & The White House, 2009).

Within higher education, the Ashoka U Exchange administered the U.S. Census for Social Innovation in Higher Education, gathering data about social innovation activity on college and university campuses (Ashoka U, 2014). In 2013, 236 institutions completed the Census, revealing that two thirds of submissions came from within the United States while the other third were from other countries (Ashoka U, 2014). The survey revealed that the total number of social innovation offerings grew 200% from 2009 to 2014, with the highest influential factors to growth included institutional mission alignment, student demand, and faculty leadership (Ashoka U, 2014). Between 2008 and 2013, the Census revealed an expansion of social entrepreneurship education from business schools to a much broader selection of schools and departments, creating broader and more specific understandings of social entrepreneurship and social innovation (Ashoka U, 2014; Rogers, 2014). From 2008 to 2013, social innovation majors grew by 60% (n=24), minors grew by 81% (n=31), certificate programs by 73% (n=58), and master's degree programs grew by 100% (n=36) (Ashoka U, 2014). Social innovation offerings include, but are not limited to, fellowships, speaker series, innovation labs, incubators, internships, courses, study abroad trips, and social entrepreneurs in residence (Ashoka U, 2014). The Census found that only 29.1% of respondents felt that the social innovation concepts and practices embedded in courses across disciplines to a "good degree" (Ashoka U, 2014, p. 13). While the numbers of curricular offerings continue to grow, they still do not cross disciplines wide enough

to meet the mission of social innovation as a cross-institution offering. With all of this interest and activity in social innovation within higher education, the potential to tackle complex social issues may seem more realizable than ever before.

Problem Statement

Advances in social innovation teaching and practice are numerous, but research in social innovation is limited. Existing research does not cover social innovation's vast applicability across disciplines, particularly within student affairs units. Despite voluminous research and several associations focused on personal and social responsibility and social innovation education, scholars have very little practical knowledge about what makes an organization good at social innovation, as research provides mainly innovative ideas within entrepreneurs rather than innovative processes within organizations (Ashoka, 2014; Elliott, 2013; Nilsson & Paddock, 2014). Similarly, within student affairs units, social justice, leadership, service, and community engagement are often central functional units dedicated to social causes (Einfeld & Collins, 2008; Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004), yet they remain fragmented from one another. Very few concrete examples of organizational intersections between leadership, social justice and civic engagement, even though the inherent missions could enhance each other (Elliott, 2013). Social innovation serves as the overarching framework that connects diversity, access, and inclusion to social change in the community, and scholars must explore it further within the context of student affairs within higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research study is to analyze a socially innovative new student orientation program at a mid-sized private university to understand how the collaborative, social justice initiative manifested itself overtime. In the absence of well-documented, convincing

examples of social innovation in student affairs, this study offers a case study of a strategic approach to social innovation in higher education that began in a student affairs unit and affected surrounding communities.

The social innovation program under study is the Creating Community new student orientation program. In 2012, a student affairs unit within the university developed a first-year student orientation program utilizing multiple departments, a six person planning committee, 30 trainers, and over 400 student facilitators to promote discussions around integrity, diversity, inclusion, sexual violence awareness and prevention for an incoming class of 1350 students. This program began as a need to address bias incidents and sexual violence on campus, but turned into a visionary, collaborative initiative that is now a social innovation model. The Creating Community program models social innovation because it began as a way to address specific social issues, then grew to a larger initiative addressing integrity, diversity, dialogue across difference, and violence prevention on campus.

Guiding Questions

In this study, I will explore the following questions: What catalyzed the institution to focus on social innovation education? What was the developmental process for the socially innovative initiative? How did the campus community respond to the social innovation?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for the study is the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. The Social Change Model is the most widely used leadership development theory in higher education (Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), 1996; Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). The model was designed specifically for use with college students and defines leadership as "a powerful, collaborative, values-based process that results in positive

social change" (Komives et al., 2005, p. xii). A key concept of the model is that such leadership is a process, and effective leadership resides on collective action, shared power, and a passionate commitment to social justice (HERI, 1996). Goals of the model include enhancing self-knowledge and leadership competence in student participants so that they can facilitate positive social change at the institution or in the community (Astin & Astin, 1996).

Since social change requires collaboration and fostering positive social change, the model examines leadership development from three different perspectives: individual, group, and community/society, and that deepening growth across all angles will produce change for the common good. Within the individual level, the aim is to foster and develop consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment in order to support group functioning and positive social change. Within the group level, the focus is on collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility to facilitate the development of individual qualities and effect positive social change. Within the community/society level, the emphasis is on active engagement in the community, exercising civic responsibility that works toward social change (HERI, 1996).

The Social Change Model for Leadership Development encourages highly participatory and non-hierarchical leadership, with an ever-evolving process that leads to social change. Assumptions that leadership is a values-based, collaborative, and inclusive process that is not focused on a position, but on affecting change on behalf of others in socially responsible ways grounds the Leadership Development Model (Astin, 1996; HERI, 1996; Komives et al., 2009). Many college campuses use this model with broad applicability (Kezar et al., 2006). While the Social Change Model often applies toward student groups, this research study will explore organizational leadership through this framework as a model for social innovation within higher education.

Table 1.
Social Change Model of Leadership Development Value Definitions

Value	Definition
Consciousness of Self	Awareness of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action.
Congruence	Thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty towards others; actions are consistent with most deeply-held beliefs and convictions.
Commitment	The psychic energy that motivates the individual to serve and that drives the collective effort; implies passion, intensity, and duration, and is directed toward both the group activity as well as its intended outcomes.
Collaboration	To work with others in a common effort; constitutes the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust.
Common Purpose	To work with shared aims and values; facilitates the group's ability to engage in collective analysis of issues at hand and the task to be undertaken.
Controversy with Civility	Recognizes two fundamental realities of any creative group effort: that differences in viewpoint are inevitable, and that such differences must be aired openly, but with civility. Civility implies respect for others, a willingness to hear each others'

	views, and the exercise of restraint in criticizing the views and actions of others.
Citizenship	The process whereby an individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership development activity. To be a good citizen is to work for positive change on the behalf of others and the community.
Change	The ability to adapt to environments and situations that are constantly evolving, while maintaining the core functions of the group.

Source: Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

The Social Change Model of Leadership was in fact a social innovation during its time, reimaging leadership development helping colleges and universities "embrace another view of courage, a view that honors the power of individuals coming together to work for change, and yes, the bravery required to do this collaborative work" (Astin, 1996, p. 10).

Operational Definitions

There is no commonly accepted definition of social innovation (Dover, 2011; Goldenberg, 2010). Despite the term's novel usage, humans have experimented with novel, disruptive, and durable changes repeatedly throughout history, making social innovation a common element of human existence (Westley & McGowan, 2013). Even with a growing number of stories of individuals and organizations embodying social innovation, university

courses covering the topic, and social innovation incubators encouraging idea generation, the variety of different definitions of social innovation can undermine its theoretical development (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010). As social innovation continues to gain more momentum, both within and beyond higher education, it is important to notice how different entities are conceptualizing and describing the work they are doing on their campuses.

A review of the literature reveals a wide range of disciplines interested in the topic of social innovation (Dover, 2011). Specifically, people use the terms social innovation, social entrepreneurship, and social enterprise interchangeably, but there are clear distinctions between them and their disciplines. Privately owned and profit oriented ventures, social enterprises market their own products and services, blending business interests with social ends (Wesley & Antadze, 2010). Social entrepreneurship ties commercial interest with a social lens, focusing first on creating an enterprise (Martin & Osberg, 2007). Social innovation orients toward making social change on a systemic level, transcending sectors, levels of analysis, and methods to discover processes that produce lasting impact (Wesley & Antadze, 2010). While all three notions are different from one another, they follow a similar pattern that begins with defining the problem and identifying solutions, implementation, and evaluation on scaling or diffusion (Minks, 2011).

The Ashoka U Census revealed that there is a clear plurality in terminology within higher education, with 41% of all institutions surveyed using "social entrepreneurship" and 13% using "social innovation." While in comparison, "changemaking" and "service learning" were infrequently used, they were significantly more common terms amongst U. S. Census respondents than from other regions (Ashoka U, 2014). Most Census respondents reported that social innovation initiatives are included in activities related to the more commonly used term at

their campuses (such as civic engagement, service learning, or sustainability), or that there is some direct overlap between social innovation initiatives and activities related to the term most frequently used on campus (Ashoka U, 2014). The service learning and civic engagement initiatives of higher education play a critical role in advancing social innovation education, but it is important to establish boundaries, the purpose, and outcomes for each so that they do not get all lumped together. Such clarity will reduce the common suspicion that social innovation is simply the new term for what already exists on campus (Ashoka U, 2014).

This study will focus on social innovation as a process that challenges and changes the structures that continue to create the social problem of concern. When such change occurs to social structures and addresses social injustices, social innovation has occurred (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010). This study will use the terms and definitions provided by Ashoka U, the world's largest network of social entrepreneurs focused on social innovation in higher education (Ashoka U, 2016).

Change Leader: A faculty or staff member who sees it as their mission to advance changemaking across the institution.

Change Team: A committed, inter-disciplinary group of students, leaders, faculty, administrators, staff and community members who help grow and strengthen the campus-wide ecosystem for social innovation.

Changemaker: Changemakers have the freedom, confidence and societal support to address any social problem and drive change.

Intrapreneur: A person within an organization who takes direct responsibility for turning a new idea into reality. Intrapreneurship is now also part of a corporate management style that integrates risk-taking and innovation approaches, as well as the

reward and motivational techniques that are more traditionally thought of as being the province of entrepreneurship.

Social Entrepreneurship: Social entrepreneurs are people who strive to solve social problems using innovative, sustainable, scalable, and measurable approaches.

Social Impact: The transformational effect of an activity on the social fabric of the community and well-being of individuals.

Social Innovation: New strategies, concepts, ideas and organizations that meet social needs of all kinds — from working conditions and education to community development and health — and that extend and strengthen civil society.

Based on this definition, social innovation has three components: first a focus on social problems; second, an interest in finding novel solutions to address these social problems; and third, innovators must distribute the work benefits beyond the innovators into society (Ashoka U, 2016; Dover, 2011).

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

Social innovation teaching and practice far exceeds research in the field. The social innovation in higher education literature is particularly limited; therefore, a weakness to this study is its dependence on few sources of data. Until the research can keep up with and make timely contributions to curricular and cocurricular advances in the field, it may inhibit and undermine social innovation as a viable offering within the academy (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Smith, 2014).

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to develop a better understanding of how universities can lead and develop an interdisciplinary approach to social innovation education on

campus. As universities everywhere carefully reconsider their role in society and their surrounding community (Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008), little research exists to describe how institutions of higher education can create the infrastructure to actually embody this new approach. The research focuses on initiatives led through academic or administrative leadership. Many student affairs units already focus on social justice, leadership development, and civic engagement, yet very few infuse all these functional areas together to focus on furthering contributions to the public good. A better understanding of how student affairs units can develop and lead an interdisciplinary approach to social innovation education will prepare educators and practitioners to enhance personal and social responsibility to serve the public good. My research will help practitioners and scholars actualize the original mission of higher education, enhancing the public good through service and scholarship through social innovation.

Conclusion

My study will explore a social innovation initiative led through a student affairs unit of a mid-sized private, liberal arts institution in the Southeast through a lens of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. In Chapter Two, I describe existing literature surrounding the public good mission of higher education, the social innovation movement, social innovation in higher education, and leadership and civic engagement. In Chapter Three, I will explain the case study methodology used for the study and the associated methods of individual interviews, focus groups, and document review. In Chapter Four, I will analyze the data collected throughout the study through the lens of the Social Change Model of Leadership. In Chapter Five, I will discuss the findings of the study and provide recommendations for future research.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Higher education's central purpose is to serve and enhance the public good through education (Williams, 2016). Universities historically supported communities beyond the institution through a variety of initiatives and programs, and increasingly recognize the need to place the public good at the forefront of their endeavors (Anderson, 2015; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007; McDonald & Associates, 2002; NASPA, 1989). The university takes on a rare and critical role when it "faces outward toward work that changes the culture of the day" (Cantor, 2004, p.18) through the education of leaders for the future. The role is rare because students, faculty, and administrators are encouraged to think beyond social norms and current paradigms, fostering an experimental attitude to explore unknown territory that can lead to new discoveries and social innovation. The university role is critical when it opens its doors wide enough to listen to all sides of the debate over critical issues in society to learn about them firsthand. Such an ability to be open-minded and willingness to experiment prepares students and scholars to engage with social issues in creative and contributory ways, while building community on campus (Cantor, 2004).

In this chapter, I delve into existing literature surrounding the public good mission of higher education, the emerging field of social innovation, and social innovation in higher education. Within the public good mission of higher education section, I provide a summary of personal and social responsibility, shortcomings of achieving the public good mission, and charges for change within higher education in the twenty-first century. The emerging field of

social innovation review includes a history of the social innovation movement and the process of social innovation. The social innovation in higher education section covers leadership, scholarship, and collaborative culture needed for the movement to exist and create change toward the public good.

Public Good Mission of Higher Education

The relationship between higher education and the public good has evolved throughout history. Kant was perhaps the first to articulate that universities could contribute to the public good through acting as a critical ally to the national government, professions, and society broadly through the pursuit of knowledge (Williams, 2016). Expanding beyond the concept of knowledge as the public good of education, universities also have a role in preserving and transmitting society's accumulated knowledge and understanding of the world for future generations (Arendt, 1954). After World War II, an economic definition of public good altered the discourse in higher education, defining the public good as having inclusive and non-contentious outcomes, being state-funded, and generating outcomes that provide social and public benefits (Samuelson, 1954). This definition raised several questions including whether the public good is gained only by students or by society broadly; if public good is an outcome of higher education or emerges through scholarship; and if the public good is measurable or conceptual (Williams, 2016). Further clarifications between public goods and The Public Good developed. Public goods, defined as the products produced through higher education, are tangible and intangible, individual and collective, including universal knowledge and education (Marginson, 2011). The Public Good, on the other hand, refers to resources and benefits accessible to all gained through engagement with higher education, including more informed citizens prepared to improve democracy and generate a more inclusive society (Marginson,

2011). Ultimately, the framing of the U.S. Constitution led to colleges and universities owning the responsibility of fostering virtues required to sustain a self-governing republic (Hersh & Schneider, 2005). Drawing on this tradition, American colleges and universities continue to proclaim their role in cultivating high ethical and moral standards through guiding documents and principles.

University mission statements highlight higher education serving the public good (Checkoway, 2001). While missions differ by institutional history and type, they typically espouse values such as honesty, character, civic responsibility, service, citizenship, and leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000; Hersh & Schneider, 2005). Above all, universities hold moral responsibility of service to humanity and society (Elliott, 2013). The civic mission of higher education generally addresses the education and preparation of active citizens willing to engage within their communities and effectively communicate across a diversity of perspectives (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2012; Elliott, 2013; Gutmann, 1987; Hamrick, 1998; Hurtado, 2007; Reason, 2011). Serving the public good is an essential part of higher education's purpose.

Personal and social responsibility. The education of students for civic engagement takes on many terms, forms, and practices, but all are rooted in the public good mission of preparing students to contribute to society. While a variety of terms exist, such as civic responsibility, civic engagement, and democratic engagement, personal and social responsibility are often used toward the public good conversation within higher education. Social responsibility builds from a foundation of personal responsibility, both mutually influencing the other. The community culture and values often inform students' personal and social perspectives, and in return the community's own vitality depends on the values and contributions

of its members (AAC&U, 2002; Hersh & Schneider, 2005). For example, students who see numerous opportunities to serve in the community through promotional materials, peer leaders, and signature campus events will increase their likeliness to serve in the community, and in return the community benefits from a campus culture of service and community engagement. Personal and social responsibility involve the moral obligation to self and community, relying on virtues such as honesty, self-discipline, respect, loyalty, and compassion (Dey & Associates, 2008; Hersh & Schneider, 2005).

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) provided an example of how colleges and universities can prepare moral individuals to positively contribute to their communities within and beyond a college campus:

> Empowered and informed leaders are also responsible. Through discussion, critical analysis, and introspection, they come to understand their roles in society and accept active participation. Open-minded and empathetic, responsible leaders understand how abstract values relate to decisions in their lives. Responsible learners appreciate others, while also assuming accountability for themselves, their complex identities, and their conduct…they help society shape its ethical values, and then live by those values. (AAC&U, 2002, p. 23)

Developing the above capacities of personal and social responsibility requires an intentional approach beyond the traditional classroom in higher education. Such intentionality requires more explicit and expansive emphasis for the development of personal and social responsibility as core outcomes of a liberal education, along with assessment of those outcomes (Hersh & Schneider, 2005). An example of such intentionality is a professor's course syllabus that explicitly states that a learning objective for the course includes students exploring, exercising,

and reflecting upon personal and social responsibility, then assigns readings and assignments to aid in the achievement of the learning objective in tandem with the course topic. This intentional incorporation includes an explicit emphasis and affiliated assessment of personal and social responsibility.

In November 2004, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the Templeton Foundation created five specific aims of liberal education integral to personal and social responsibility (AAC&U, 2002; AAC&U, 2010; Hersh & Schneider, 2005):

1. Striving for excellence through developing a strong work ethic
2. Acting on a sense of personal and academic integrity
3. Recognizing and acting on the responsibility to contribute to a larger community, both on campus and beyond
4. Recognizing and acting on the obligation to take seriously the perspectives of others in forming one's own judgments as a resource for learning, work, and citizenship
5. Developing competence in ethical and moral reasoning

(AAC&U, 2010, para. 2).

It is simple to articulate and strive for these outcomes, yet it requires another level of commitment to teach and assess student development along the outcomes throughout students' time in college. Such intentional education for personal and social responsibility requires an institution-wide commitment, from a culture shift recognizing that such learning can occur inside and outside of the classroom to recruiting faculty and staff who will be committed to this agenda (Kuh, 2005). While universities continue to broaden their social responsibility work to increase awareness of the societal impact college campuses play in surrounding communities (Sanchez,

Rodriguez Bolivar, & Lopez-Hernandez, 2012), there are still many reasons that higher education falls short of this mission.

Shortcomings. While the civic mission remains a frequent component of higher education priorities, the transmission of that priority to student development and education has varied throughout history. Faculty members focused so strongly on college students' intellectual development during the late 1800s and early 1900s that they disregarded other forms of development (Reason, Ryder, & Kee, 2013). Some started paying attention to civic engagement in the early to mid-1900s, particularly because of Dewey's emphasis on engaged education in the 1920s and 1930s. Even so, intellectual development remained and continues to remain the primary focus of higher education (Chickering, 2010; Reason, Ryder, & Kee, 2013). Recently, higher education evolved to be known more as a private benefit than a public good (Chickering, 2010). The disconnect between the ideals of educating students for social responsibility and actual practice is a result of three challenges, including institutional emphasis on civic engagement, unclear faculty role in education toward the mission, and student engagement in such activities over their time in college (Dey & Associates, 2008; Dey, Barnhardt, Antonaros, Ott, & Holsapple, 2009).

Over time, higher education deemphasized its historical mission promoting civic engagement, making it more of a by-product of higher education than a central focus (Colby & Sullivan, 2009). Social responsibility took a back seat to intellectual development, and sometimes fell behind skill development and job training (Reason, Ryder, & Kee, 2013). Many understand social responsibility as informal learning that can occur outside of the classroom, led by student affairs administrators or left for students to explore and learn on their own. Further, it can be difficult to find top administrators committed to the civic engagement mission of higher

education, instead focusing some of the many competing priorities, often also tied to competing financial resources (Colby & Sullivan, 2009). When social responsibility is distantly connected to higher education, few faculty will consider it to be part of their role and community members that approach the university will find it difficult to get what they need (Checkoway, 2001). A lack of institutional direction and support results in faculty and staff focusing on more pressing deadlines and priorities.

Further, some faculty members are unclear about their role in educating students toward personal and social responsibility. Many faculty learn to focus on their scholarly productivity, continually under pressure to produce grants, research, and publications. Such an overemphasis of faculty scholarly productivity threatens the democratic mission of higher education because it leads the faculty to be committed to their academic discipline, not necessarily to the engaged university community or democratic society (Checkoway, 2001; Colby & Sullivan, 2009). Although there is extensive support for the public purposes of higher education, many in academia do not make these goals a priority in their work (Koritz & Schadewald, 2015).

Additionally, students become less likely to be involved with personal and social responsibility activities as they progress through their undergraduate education career. Over time, students develop personal interests related to their social networks, employment, and progression toward graduation, leading them to become less engaged in experiential learning (Checkoway, 2001). The Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI) revealed that institutional emphasis on personal and social responsibility decreases each year in higher education (Dey & Associates, 2009). The combination of students becoming less involved throughout their tenure in college along with a decrease in institutional emphasis or ownership

leads to difficulty in developing and maintaining social responsibility initiatives on college campuses.

Universities have attempted to engage the public good mission of higher education over time through a variety of programs and services, including leadership development, civic engagement, and diversity and inclusion programs. These engagements can range between one-time and short-term experiences, student organization leadership, credit-bearing courses, community-based research, and intensive service-learning experiences (CAS, 2015; Flanagan & Bundick, 2011). While students frequently enjoy participating in leadership programs, diversity courses, and service trips, often the experiences remain fragmented from one another and students do not have the opportunity for critical reflection and integration of lessons from those experiences to build a comprehensive connection to their contribution toward the public good mission of higher education. Students participate in and enjoy programs and services offered on college campuses through the co-curriculum, but they are not enough to address the current social demands and pressures on the field of higher education.

The future direction of higher education in the twenty-first century. Societal engagement and social responsibility are becoming of greater importance for higher education in the twenty-first century. Colleges and universities should increase educational efforts to better prepare students for active participation in a diverse democracy, develop knowledge for the improvement of communities, and to think and act upon enhancing the public good (Checkoway, 2001; Elliott, 2013; Reason, Ryder, & Kee, 2013). Philosophically, educational institutions influence students' ethical development, either intentionally or unintentionally, so it is better to explicitly develop and convey institutional messages about moral and civic socialization than leave them to chance (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Hersh & Schneider, 2005).

Within university campuses, students and campus professionals believe educating for personal and social responsibility are essential outcomes of college (Dey, et al, 2009). The Millennial generation holds strong beliefs in the social and environmental responsibilities of businesses and corporations, including universities (Bell, Connell, & McMinn, 2011). Now, there is a recognized demand to educate students for personal and social responsibility from within and beyond the university from the Department of Education and the Association of American Colleges and Universities, increasing the call for civically engaged education to make the public good mission a priority of higher education (AAC&U, 2012; Koritz & Schadewald, 2015). In order to do so, campuses must bridge the theoretical and practical missions of higher education to create campus communities that intentionally educate for personal and social responsibility (Reason, Ryder, & Kee, 2013).

Some intentional priorities that exist for higher education in the twenty-first century around social responsibility stem from the Association of American Colleges & Universities and the Department of Education. The Department of Education commissioned the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement mission of higher education, and released it at a White House meeting in January 2012, challenging the limitation of the higher education mission to workforce preparation and training while minimizing the disciplines foundational to democracy (AAC&U, 2012). The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement calls on educators and public leaders to advance a twenty-first century vision of college learning for all students with civic learning and democratic engagement as an expected component of every college student's education (AAC&U, 2010). Further, the Core Commitments Initiative brings educating students for personal and social responsibility to the forefront of higher education through the following educational outcomes: Students learn to strive for excellence. Students

learn to cultivate academic integrity. Students learn to contribute to a larger community, students learn to take seriously the perspectives of others. Students learn to develop competence in ethical and moral reasoning and action (AAC&U, 2010).

This conglomeration of initiatives are just a few that are producing strategies to renew the civic mission of higher education in the twenty-first century. Key ideas that have arisen include strengthening student learning, involving the faculty and articulating their role, increasing institutional capacity for personal and social responsibility, and connecting democracy and diversity to these initiatives (Checkoway, 2001).

Emerging Field of Social Innovation

A sense of social responsibility extends beyond the university walls with individuals becoming more socially conscious and seeking ways to improve environments for themselves and others in communities across the world (Wesley & Antadze, 2010). Social innovation, as a field of study and practice, discovers creative solutions to address social needs in society (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Phills, Deiglmeier, & Miller, 2008; Westley & McGowan, 2013). It extends beyond providing new products and services to creating solutions that are "more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than current solutions," (Stanford Center for Social Innovation, 2016, para 1) changing the underlying beliefs and relationships that structure the world (Nilsson & Paddock, 2014; Phillis, Deiglmeier, & Miller, 2008; Sanders, Mulgan, Ali, & Tucker, 2007; Wesley & Antadze, 2010). Social innovation starts with a goal to address a social need, ultimately expanding existing structures to enhance the public good. Such change requires agents functioning at the niche and landscape level, locally and globally, in order to create systemic change internally and externally (Westley & McGowan, 2013).

History of social innovation. Social innovation comes at the intersections of diverse ideas and fields of study with the focus of seeking new knowledge and fostering creative venues to better communities and the world (Ashoka U, 2014; Phillis et al., 2008). At the broadest glance, most of what is now considered common was once radical innovation, not perceived as possible by the majority, making social innovation examples immeasurable over the course of the last two centuries (Mulgan, Tucker, Ali, & Sanders, 2007). During some periods, civic society provided the spark for social innovation, including industrialization and urbanization in the 19th century, leading to new model towns, schools, childcare, and housing. During some periods, social movements took the lead, starting with the anti-slavery movement in the late 18th century, which initiated many campaign methods including demonstrations, petitions, logos and slogans, and mass membership. The 1960s and 1970s initiated social movements around the environment, feminism, and civil rights, leading to commercial and government innovations (Mulgan, Tucker, Ali, & Sanders, 2007), all of which came with severe opposition. Another wave of civic innovation exists within the current era of twenty-first century with the power of the internet and television focusing on causes like the environment and world poverty (Bulut, Eren, & Halac, 2013; Mulgan, Tucker Ali, & Sanders, 2007). At other times, governments took the lead in social innovation, recognizing that the university provides cultural benefits to the community and should have a central role to a community under stress and promote growth in one that is thriving (Elliott, 2013). An example of governmental encouragement includes the creation of welfare states, schooling systems, and institutions in the years after World War II (Mulgan, Tucker, Ali, & Sanders, 2007). It is difficult to find any field that social innovation did not influence, using the broadest sense of the term. Social innovators always existed, even if social innovators did not identify them by the term or role of a social innovator.

More specifically, social innovation stems from the field of social entrepreneurship, which emerged in the late 1990s, mainly characterized by new courses and activity within graduate schools of business. In 2004, the field recognized that social innovation contributions were strong in changing the lives of hundreds, but needed to learn how to address social problems on a larger scale (Ashoka U, 2014; Dees, Anderson, & Wei-Skillern, 2004). Social innovation gained significant national attention in the last decade. In 2009, the Obama Administration launched an Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation, and in 2010, a new Social Innovation Fund made 11 investments of approximately $50 million dollars in health care, job creation, and supporting youth (Social Innovation, 2010; The White House, 2009). The field is broad and occurs in all sectors, public, non-profit, and private. Some of the most creative work occurs at the intersection between sectors, in fields as wide as restorative justice, urban farming, waste reduction, distance learning, and fair trade (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010).

While a multitude of social entrepreneurships and organizations embrace social innovation as an approach to enhance society, an understanding of social innovation is still in its early stages of development (Dover, 2011; Mulgan, Tucker, Ali, & Sanders, 2007; Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Phills et al., 2008). Over the past few years, a number of universities have established research centers dedicated to social innovation, yet there is no clear academic home or body of literature (Dover, 2011). Several pioneers including Greg Dees, Johanna Mair, Alex Nicholls, Paulo Bloom, and Paul Tacey established the foundation of the field (Ashoka, 2014). The field also grew from an influence of events such as the NYU Social Entrepreneurship Research Conference that has existed over 10 years, the Social Innovation Exchange, and Research Colloquia on Social Entreprenership at Duke University and Oxford

University (Ashoka, 2014; Social Innovation Exchange, 2014). Advances in social entrepreneurship, as a practice and a field for scholarly investigation, provide opportunities to challenge, question, and rethink concepts and assumptions from a variety of fields in business and management research (Mair & Marti, 2006). For example, within the business field, a critical review of social entrepreneurship as a concept discovered that social entrepreneurship is exercised when a person or collective aim to create social value of some kind. Further, social entrepreneurs pursued that goal through recognizing opportunities to create the social value, employing innovation, tolerating risk, and declining to accept limitations of available resources (Peredo & McLean, 2006). This lens provides a new way for business professionals to approach their practice and scholarship, seeking practical examples to incorporate contributions to the public good within business practice. In the management field, studies highlight how to develop and teach students to lead through social entrepreneurship and community leadership courses by social entrepreneurship competencies (Miller, Wesley, & Williams, 2012) and by creating partnerships between the university, students, and community (Litzky, Godshalk, & Walton-Bongers, 2009).

Even with these advances, research in social innovation is much slower than the advancement in teaching and practice. Current research does not cover the vast applicability of social entrepreneurship and social innovation across disciplines. Until the research can keep up with and make timely contributions to curricular and cocurricular advances in the field, it may inhibit and undermine social entrepreneurship as an academic offering (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Smith, 2014). Research can catalyze the field of social innovation by increasing the field's legitimacy within and beyond higher education, because it demonstrates to

others how social innovation contributes to the production and dissemination of knowledge. Such scholarly advances will serve as the basis for teaching and practice on campuses.

Process of social innovation. Broadly, social innovation involves a series of processes and practices to achieve social impact on any scale. Scholars of innovation tend to separate the process into three phases: invention, development, and implementation (Tjornbo, 2013; Westley & McGowan, 2013). The foundation of social innovation is the willingness to brainstorm new ideas and create novel combinations (Bornstein, 2007; Tjornbo, 2013; Westley & McGowan, 2013), but the idea itself is often prompted by an experience, event, or new evidence that raises awareness of a social need or injustice (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010). Translating one's experience into the emergence of new ideas opens the door to pursue opportunities for new and/or re-interpretations of current practices, or the application of current practices to another discipline or domain (Westley & McGowan, 2013; Tjornbo, 2013). This combination allows for glances of the range of alternative options just beyond current practices (Johnson, 2010). When agents translate these ideas and options to action, they create new processes, programs, and protocol that can lead to shifts in systemic behavior. Exploring possibility beyond what currently exists is essential for social innovation and can be encouraged by fostering the exchange of ideas and practices between people in different disciplines frequently (Tjornbo, 2013; Westley & McGowan, 2013).

When innovative ideas first arise, they do not typically have an immediate impact. A team must work together to develop the idea by matching a problem with a solution (Minks, 2011; Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Tjornbo, 2013). Social innovations require collaboration among a diversity of perspectives and talents to help refine the idea, requiring strategic agency across boundaries (Moore & Westley, 2011). The team must have someone to

brainstorm and express a new idea that addresses a social phenomenon, someone to transform the idea into an innovation through a policy agenda, program, or product, and someone who advocates for the novel social innovation (Below & Tripp, 2010; Westley & McGowan, 2013). Agents can shift from one role to the next, but all roles must exist, cooperate with one another, and compile their efforts throughout the social innovation development internally before it ever enters the mainstream (Below & Tripp, 2010; Tjornbo, 2013).

To move into implementation, social innovations often need access to resources and opportunities beyond its scope and system (Westley & Antadze, 2013). Generating networks within and beyond spheres can help expand boundaries to gain access to additional resources and opportunities (Moore & Westley, 2011; Tjornbo, 2013). Most social innovators start their work on a local level, with the goal of tackling a particular social problem. An innovation may have to wait to before it has a chance to establish itself, but once it is implemented, it must scale broadly in order to generate lasting social change (Bornstein, 2007). When successful, agents work to scale out the innovation, influencing additional individuals, organizations, and communities (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Westley & Antadze, 2013).

Within organizational development research communities, the current focus is on social innovation capacity, examining how external networks can help an organization connect to communities in new ways (Dees, Anderson, & Wei-Skillern, 2004). Three common ways that organizations start scaling their social innovations include organizational models, programs, and principles. The organizational model involves generalizing the innovation within an organization and creating a larger structure that organizes people and resources to serve a common purpose, collectively working toward the growing social innovation (Dees, Anderson, & Wei-Skillern, 2004; Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010). The spread of social

innovation through a program includes an incorporation of activities that serve a specific purpose, and the spread of social innovation through a framework of principles involved general guidelines and values to guide service toward a particular purpose (Dees, Anderson, & Wei-Skillern, 2004). These scaling options provide social entrepreneurs ways to spread their innovations to broader audiences and generate greater impact.

Yet social innovation goes beyond providing additional services to the community; it centers on changing the underlying beliefs and paradigms that structure the world (Dover, 2011; Nilsson & Paddock, 2014; Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Westley & Antadze, 2013). A social innovation may gain its transformative impact as much from the process to create, implement, and maintain it as it achieves through the innovation's implementation. Change starts within. An organization's ability to look inward is a critical source of social innovation capacity (Nilsson & Paddock, 2014). The key to changing the world may have less to do with stakeholders and more with understanding the people who exist within the organization, because the social realities sought to change exist in the room as much as they do outside of it (Dover 2011; Nilsson & Paddock, 2014). For example, an organization that seeks to create a program that generates a decrease in discrimination within society must start by decreasing discrimination within the group creating the program. Through personal and group exploration, the group will decrease discrimination within and have a better idea of what tactics might work for a greater audience. The transformative impact of a social innovation should be measured by if it generates more solutions, greater recognition of the social problem, and more shifts in ways of thinking about the social problem (Dover, 2011; Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Tjornbo, 2013; Westley & Antadze, 2013).

Social Innovation in Higher Education

Recently, a few scholars started exploring how social innovation can influence higher education environments (Anderson, 2015; Ashoka U., 2014; Elliott, 2013). Within the field of higher education, in 2013, 236 institutions completed the U.S. Census for Social Innovation in Higher Education, revealing that two thirds of submissions came from within the United States while the other third were from other countries (Ashoka U., 2014). Universities in the 21st century need to demonstrate the wider role they play in society and their contribution to the public good through teaching, learning, social and cultural contributions to the community, research, community service, and knowledge exchange (Elliott, 2013). The explicit integration of social innovation into university mission statements and strategic plans will place its significance at the forefront of transformational change (Elliott, 2013). This, of course, immediately brings social innovation into disputed territory.

Social innovation's greatest success arises from an interdisciplinary and integrative approach, penetrating the entire campus. It occurs when members of the university community come together as changemakers, from within and beyond the classroom, sharing the work of teaching students the skills they need to make a difference in their communities. For example, two decades ago, some institutions recognized issues with siloed campuses and work divided by functional area, so they explored a new organizational model to cross-institutional boundaries, the matrix organizational model. This model built upon an individualized, adaptive structure based on projects, not functional areas, adapting to the changing priorities within higher education (Johnson, 1990; Smith, 2005; White, 1990). Social innovation is bringing back this concept, with a social justice lens. Imagine a university structure, across functional units, that could dedicate their focus and attention on sexual assault, gun violence, college access and

affordability, supporting student activists, or any other pressing issue that will arise. Ashoka U. (2014) described:

> at its core, social innovation is collaborative, integrative, and inventive, and so must be our leadership and institutional architecture. We must reinvent systems in terms of what we do, how we talk about it, who we include, and how we organize. Permission to be bold and innovative is critical. With collaborative concepts and the investment of key leaders, we can position ourselves to unlock wide-scale potential and systemic transformation for higher education (p. 90).

When the university can collectively encourage experimentation with students and pilot multiple programs, they foster a spirit of creative risk-taking and innovation within the community (Smith, 2014). In order to collaborate, stakeholders within the university must be aware of social innovation and how they can serve as partners toward the social innovation education movement. The Ashoka U Census indicated that 47% of respondents listed the top obstacle to achieving campus-wide social innovation as the lack of a cohesive vision, while 40% identified the lack of awareness of social innovation as the foundation to the problem (Ashoka U. 2014).

While many university administrators would benefit from the advancement toward a more scientific, academic field of social entrepreneurship and social innovation, most staff start by being strategically inclusive with terminology that their campus community embraces, then becoming more specific as the programs develop over time. For example, campus leaders that start using the term "social entrepreneurship," then expand programs toward a more campus-wide reach, may ultimately decide to use a more inclusive term that crosses disciplines and stakeholder groups such as "engaged scholarship," "social innovation," or "changemaking" (Ashoka U, 2014, p. 22). Ultimately, what matters most is that campus leaders are engaging in

the activity of helping students develop as "effective and empowered changemakers" (Ashoka U, 2014, p. 25) to advance the public good, not necessarily how they define the work itself.

Both fields of social innovation and higher education share the common purpose of enhancing the public good through leadership, scholarship, and collaboration (Anderson, 2015). Traditionally, university administrators uphold defined missions on three distinct tenets: teaching, research, and knowledge exchange (Anderson, 2015). Knowledge exchange encompasses the process by which university administrators innovate and externalize the knowledge that they create. Yet, how do they support social innovation? Is there a systemic way that the field of higher education can structurally encourage and reward social innovation on college campuses? How can it be defined as part of the third mission, or should it embody a fourth mission (Anderson, 2015)? Increasingly, university administrators are recognizing the need to place civil society at the forefront of their activities, advancing the public good through scholarship and leadership, but many are unclear of where to start. Focusing on leadership, scholarship, and a collaborative culture dedicated to social innovation is a helpful way to begin (Anderson, 2015).

Leadership. Increasingly, presidents and other senior academic leaders recognize and embrace social entrepreneurship's and social innovation's alignment with the broader institutional civic mission and as a tool to create a competitive advantage for new student recruitment, donor cultivation, and alumni engagement (Ashoka U, 2011; Ashoka U, 2016c). At its core, social innovation is "collaborative, integrative, and inventive," (Garton, 2014, p. 90); therefore institutional leadership and infrastructure must embody these characteristics to propel social innovation. To embody social innovation within higher education, administrators within

higher education must reimagine the work completed, how it is discussed, who is included, and how it is organized (Garton, 2014).

Leaders of social innovation education have a vision of how social innovation will advance the institutional mission and promote student learning and are dedicated to campus-wide change (Ashoka U., 2016c). If the success of social innovation education rests on campus-wide reach, it is important to acknowledge that it is a new, complex standard and a high bar (Garton, 2014). In 2014, fewer than 10% of institutions that participated in the Ashoka U Census reported that their infrastructure is "campus-wide and highly effective" and just over 15% of institutions reported a "coordinated campus-wide strategy." (Ashoka, 2014). Such a standard requires leadership that contributes significant, dedicated time to advance social innovation initiatives and a commitment to building a cross-campus team (Ashoka U., 2016c). A delicate balance exists between shared ownership over social innovation and centralized authority to reinforce the sense of actual shared value (Garton, 2014). Rollins University is exploring an ownership model with multi-disciplinary faculty and staff members, while the University of San Diego is hesitant about blended leadership allegiance. Meanwhile, Duke University supports points of intersection, but reiterates the need for a centralized, stabilized leader to make progress and create connection points across campus (Ashoka U. 2014; Garton, 2014). Additionally, student leadership and demand for social innovation is one of the main drivers of its development on college campuses, so administrators must ensure their inclusion (Ashoka U., 2014). The census showed that 25% of respondents see students as the most active leaders of social innovation, followed by administration, faculty, and staff (Smith, 2014). By investing in and empowering champions to build and maintain momentum a natural dedication to social innovation education will manifest itself throughout the institution.

Another interesting leadership consideration is where social innovation reports within the university structure. With the growth of social innovation programs outside of academic departments, 28% of social innovation programs report directly to the president and/or provost, which was not the case for most institutions seven years ago (Ashoka U. 2014; Garton, 2014). This centralized placement within the university structure provides access to a broad range of faculty and staff, and introduces the opportunity for creative pedagogy and research (Garton, 2014), while introducing access to create campus-wide change. Assessment of the campus culture, climate, and existing initiatives is a helpful place to start.

A resource for institutional leadership is Ashoka U (2016b), a professional organization that specifically seeks to specifically address how institutions of higher education can increase social responsibility through social innovation. The organization seeks to break down barriers to institutional change to foster a campus-wide culture of innovation. Ashoka U catalyzes the development of innovative programs within the higher education environment that develop students into changemakers, who "have freedom, confidence, and societal support to address any social problem and drive change." (Ashoka U., 2016b, para. 7). There are also 30 Changemaker Campuses that lead social innovation education within higher education, sharing the vision of higher education to become the next global driver of social change through educational transformation (Ashoka U. 2016c). Institutional leadership interested in learning how to implement social innovation on campus could benefit from engagement with peer institutions dedicated to social innovation education.

Scholarship. The skills of social innovation within an academic setting have existed within higher education for centuries (Garton, 2014). Yet, through recent research, the field of social innovation education demonstrates growth within colleges and universities, particularly

within curricular offerings. Social entrepreneurship education recently expanded beyond business schools to a broader selection of schools and departments, creating broader and more specific understandings of social entrepreneurship and social innovation through majors, minors, certificate programs, and master's degree programs (Ashoka U., 2014; Rogers, 2014). Other schools and departments that reported social innovation courses, degree programs, and other activities included Law, Social Sciences, Public Policy and Public Administration, Sustainability, Architecture and Urban Planning, Engineering, Interdisciplinary Studies, International Relations, Global Studies, Humanities, and Art & Design (Ashoka U., 2014). For institutions that reported offering social innovation courses at their institution through the U.S. Social Innovation Census, the median number was three courses offered for both undergraduate and graduate programs (Ashoka U., 2014). While the numbers of curricular offerings continue to grow, they still do not cross disciplines wide enough to meet the mission of social innovation as a cross-institution offering.

Curricular innovations are crucial to the development of social innovation education because they extend social innovation beyond the influence of individual leaders, provide new learning pathways for students, and embed social innovation in the institutional center (Rogers, 2014). The growth of degree programs suggests that a stronger understanding of social innovation has found its way into institutions of higher education (Rogers, 2014). A new model of curricular innovation exists at Boston College Graduate School of Social Work. Two leaders created the Social Innovation and Leadership program that integrates a disciplinary understanding of complex social problems with an emphasis on innovation to address social injustices (Boston College School of Social Work, 2016). This particular program provides a

special focus on social intrapreneurship and innovation through existent and new courses, providing new approaches toward student learning in field placements.

In order to embed social innovation into the curricular core, beyond particular disciplines, Ashoka U. (2014) offers two approaches that seem to be helpful. The first approach is to develop a curriculum with business concepts as a foundation, attracting students whose career goals include the launch of a social venture or work with a social enterprise. The second approach to developing a social entrepreneurship or social innovation major that acknowledges students will encounter a world defined by change, regardless of their future career path. The latter approach lends itself well to a double major so that students can gain knowledge and skills in a specific discipline while developing skills and ways of thinking like a changemaker (Ashoka U, 2014). These curricular innovators are engaging in direct problem solving and service while increasing the quality and quantity of changemakers through teaching, research, and conversations (Rogers, 2014).

Collaborative Culture. When institutions of higher education work within a traditional 17th century academy that compartmentalizes areas of specialization, how can campuses create a culture that measures success by collaboration and integration (Elliott, 2013; Garton, 2014; Smith, 2014)? This is one of the most significant barriers to embedding social innovation across campuses, and dedicated leadership must exist to cross-university disciplines and borders. As a lens that can apply to almost any social issue or discipline, social innovation works best when manifested across disciplines and organizational boundaries (Moore & Westley, 2011). In order to grow a strong campus culture for social innovation, collaboration is key (Ashoka U., 2014).

Lessons to influence campus-wide awareness and build a culture of social innovation include making programs and language inclusive and accessible and normalizing

experimentation (Smith, 2014). Providing multiple points of entry for students interested in social innovation makes the initiative accessible for many to participate in, including new student orientation, coursework, student organizations, mentorship programs, and competitions. These various entry points provide consistent messaging about the relevance of social innovation as students navigate their days through college. If the social innovation opportunities pervade the institution, social innovation will become normalized and more practiced (Smith, 2014). Further, in order to foster a culture of experimentation and risk taking, the institution must be willing to do the same (Smith, 2014). A classic example is piloting multiple programs, collecting feedback, then adjusting accordingly (Smith, 2014). If educators intend to teach students the importance of risk taking for social change, then they must model the way (Smith, 2014). Building a social innovation education program that incorporates inclusive design and calculated risk-taking will generate campus-wide momentum by empowering catalysts on campus (Smith, 2014). With an increase in social innovation interest and activity, the potential to address complex social issues may seem more realizable than ever before.

Leadership and Civic Engagement on College Campuses

Although little research examining social innovation on campuses exists, scholarship examining leadership and civic engagement initiatives on college campuses is plentiful, and many parallels exist between the practice of leadership and civic engagement and social innovation. Developing leadership values and skills for effective civic engagement is often a laudable goal for students on college campuses, thus educational objectives surrounding student involvement with these initiatives exist on most campuses (Astin, 1993; Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). The quantity and quality of student involvement in the learning process is directly proportional to the amount of student learning and personal

development that occurs through participation in leadership and civic engagement activities (Astin, 1985). Broadly, student involvement in the college experience positively relates to developmental outcomes (Astin, 1977, 1984, 1993), many engagement outcomes specifically aligning with leadership and civic engagement outcomes. In this section, I will provide an overview of leadership and civic engagement objectives and outcomes, then highlight ways the Social Change Model of Leadership Development has been used as a theoretical framework for student involvement in leadership and civic engagement research studies within higher education.

Leadership. Leadership is a relational process of working with others to accomplish a goal or promote change (CAS, 2003; Komives, et. al, 2009). Colleges and universities allocate resources for the development of formal student leadership programs based on the belief that leadership can be learned and refined through education, training, and development (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005; Owen, 2012). Yet, this comprehensive view of leadership has not always existed. Until the 1970s, most leadership development initiatives within higher education focused on positional leadership development, such as student government officials, resident advisors, and officers in student organizations (Buschlen & Dvorak, 2011; CAS, 2003; Komives et al., 1998; Owen, 2012). During the 1970s, many colleges reconsidered how they teach ethics, leadership, and social responsibility, leading to a refocus of leadership development initiatives to a broader audience across college campuses, not just to a select few students (CAS, 2003; Dugan & Komives, 2007). The leadership framework started to switch toward a holistic leadership development lens from the 1970s to the 1990s, preparing more students to serve as "citizen-leaders in a global community" (CAS, 2003, p. 196). Once

leadership potential clearly existed in every student, colleges and universities started increasing the opportunity for student involvement through the development of numerous leadership programs and activities (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). Four specific leadership trends included the expansion of curricular and co-curricular leadership programs, focused theoretical and conceptual leadership models, professionalization in leadership education, and leadership research (Dugan & Komives, 2007).

Most leadership programs aim to empower students to enhance self-efficacy as leaders and understand how they can make a difference (CAS, 2003; Komives, Owne, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) develops standards of practice to accomplish student learning and developmental outcomes (CAS, 2015). The CAS Professional Standards for Student Leadership Programs (SLPs) provide needed guidance for establishing and maintaining high quality leadership programs (CAS, 2003). The student learning and development outcome domains for student leadership programs include intellectual growth, effective communication, enhanced self-esteem, realistic self-appraisal, clarified values, career choices, leadership development, healthy behavior, meaningful interpersonal relationships, independence, collaboration, social responsibility, satisfying and productive lifestyles, appreciating diversity, spiritual awareness, and personal and educational goals (CAS, 2003). Student leadership programs must be comprehensive in nature, including opportunities to develop competencies required for effective leadership; training, education, and developmental activities; and multiple delivery methods (CAS, 2003; Dugan & Komives, 2007). Some common elements of leadership programs that directly affect student development include opportunities for service, experiential activities, and active learning through collaboration (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001).

Through involvement with leadership programs and activities, students develop critical skills that influence how they view themselves within a community context (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Leadership participants achieve higher levels of educational attainment and increases in personal values, such as a desire to promote racial understanding, than do students who do not participate in leadership activities (Astin, 1993). Leadership participants also show growth in personal and societal values, understanding of leadership theories, leadership skills, multicultural awareness, and civic responsibility (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; Dugan & Komives, 2007). Such personal growth and skill development among college students highlights the significance of leadership programs on college campuses.

Civic engagement. From the beginning of American colleges and universities, one of the purposes of higher education has been to serve society and promote democracy through the education of leaders (Hartley, 2009; Kahne & Sporte, 2008). The partnership between higher education and the community became more significant during the civil rights movement and social activism of the 1960s and 1970s when higher education institutions more intentionally engaged with social, political, and economic issues within their communities (CAS, 2015; Hartley, 2009). The 1980s led to a new period of activism through students and university presidents that led to the Campus Compact, a coalition of presidents committed to returning to the public purposes of higher education that is now comprised of 1,100 colleges and universities, encouraging universities to institutionalize engagement efforts through resources and infrastructure (Campus Compact, 2015). Such growth empowered higher education to reclaim its commitment to civic engagement through leadership, resources, and an internal and public

commitment to service, a commitment that continues to prove its relevance over time (Hartley, 2009; Hollander, 2011; Maurrasse, 2015; O'Leary, 2014; Watson, 2008).

The mission of Civic Engagement and Service-Learning Programs is to involve students in learning experiences that serve community needs through service, community-based research, advocacy, and engagement opportunities. The programs must require reciprocal relationships between the students, institutions, and the community in a mutually beneficial partnership (CAS, 2015). The civic engagement definition follows:

> Civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivations to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community through both political and non-political processes (Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi).

Civic engagement experiences may include one-time and short-term experiences, credit-bearing courses, community-based research, and intensive service-learning experiences (CAS, 2015). Simply, civic engagement can include donating time and money; volunteering; and engaging in civic or public action, community service, or voting (Flanagan & Bundick, 2011). The common denominator of civic engagement is transcending self-interest and contributing to another's interest or the greater good. Within higher education, civic engagement and service-learning programs must be grounded in reflection, based on reciprocal relationships, and designed for a diverse group of learners (Anker, Hillery, Thomas, & Gonzalez, 2008; CAS, 2015).

When campuses advocate for students to become active and involved citizens, students develop a greater commitment to, and skillset for, contributing to the larger society (Barnhardt, Sheets, & Pasquesi, 2015; Goodman, 2014; Harbour, 2016; Maurrasse, 2015; O'Leary, 2014). Common learning objectives for students who experience civic engagement programs include

personal reflection (Anker, Hillery, Thomas, & Gonzalez, 2008; CAS, 2015), cultural sensitivity (Anker, Hillery, Thomas, & Gonzalez, 2008; Denson & Bowman, 2013), and leadership development (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; O'Leary, 2014). Reflection is a critical component to civic engagement and service learning because it fosters values development, an examination of attitudes toward community concerns, and aids with the application of knowledge to experiences (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006; Flanagan & Bundick, 2011). Further, experiences and interactions within a diverse environment positively shape intergroup attitudes and civic engagement outcomes (Denson & Bowman, 2013; O'Leary, 2014). Often students who participate in civic engagement develop interpersonal skills and a greater sense of leadership ability to collaborate and problem solve for the greater good (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; Markham, 2014; O'Leary, 2014; Soria, Snyder, & Reinhard, 2015). When civic engagement embeds into the institutional culture and ethos, students reflect more about their beliefs, learn more from others, and develop leadership skills to help them make a difference in their surrounding communities.

Social change model of leadership. Leadership development that instills a strong sense of civic responsibility and a desire for social change became a focal point of higher education in the 1990s (Astin, 1996; Komives et. al, 2009). Leaders of social change focused on collective action, shared power, and a passionate commitment to social justice, equality, and inclusion, recognizing that development of self is an essential first step toward interdependence and collaboration (Astin, 1996; Komives et. al, 2009). With this desire, the authors of the Social Change Model of Leadership developed it with the aim to design leadership programs that emphasize clarification of values, development of self-awareness, ability to build trust, capacity

to listen and serve others, collaborative work, and change for the common good (Astin, 1996; HERI, 1996).

Basic premises underlying the model are that values require conscious attention, leadership ought to bring about desirable social change, leadership is a process and not a position, all students are potential leaders, and service is a powerful vehicle for developing leaders (Astin, 1996; HERI, 1996). These premises differentiate the Social Change Model for Leadership Development from earlier skill-development approaches to leadership training, allowing this model to adapt for leadership education efforts in the classroom, in group advising, and in co-curricular settings (Astin, 1996). Prior to the Social Change Model of Leadership, few research studies relied on an empirical leadership methodology to study and identify leadership themes (Owen, 2012). Since its development, there have been multiple uses of the social change model within research studies, particularly focusing on individual leadership development and leadership programs and curriculum (Dugan, 2006; O'Dell, Smith, & Born, 2016; Stephens & Beatty, 2015).

Many research studies incorporate the Social Change Model of Leadership to investigate individual leadership development among college students (Buschlen & Dvorak, 2011; Dugan, 2006, O'Dell, Smith, & Born, 2016; Parker & Pascarella, 2013; Stephens & Beatty, 2015). Through a pre- and post-test with the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale and a lens of individual, group, and community values, scholars examined how a student's leadership voice evolves over time, revealing that leadership is a skill to be fostered both inside and outside of the classroom (Buschlen & Dvorak, 2011). Further, the SCM was used as a framework to explore the relationship between Millennial pre-college involvement and college social change behavior, finding that team participation early in life facilitated the development of common purpose and

citizenship growth entering the collegiate environment (O'Dell, Smith, & Born, 2016). Another study used the Social Change Model to delineate how the study of leadership aids new students in experiencing transformations that lead to student persistence and academic achievement, recommending greater leadership engagement with first-year and historically marginalized students to help them thrive in college (Stephens & Beatty, 2015). Other studies found that diversity experiences positively affect student leadership development (Parker & Pascarella, 2013) and that the Social Change Model can provide a reflective lens for students to develop meaning and purpose in life (Stonecipher, 2012). Such studies highlight how the Social Change Model can examine individual leadership growth among college students in the higher education context.

The Social Change Model serves as a research lens for leadership programs and curriculum within higher education, also. One study examined used the SCM as an orienting philosophy for the design and delivery of collegiate student leadership development programs through the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, particularly looking at student, institutional, and community outcomes of leadership development programs (Owen, 2012). Another study explored the effects that undergraduate extracurricular involvement and leadership activities had on the community values of the Social Change Model (Foreman & Retallick, 2016). Within the classroom, the SCM has been used as a framework that faculty can implement to design and evaluate curricula that meet the demands of developing socially responsible students (Nickels, Rowland, & Fadase, 2011). The recent increase in research using the Social Change Model as a framework to investigate leadership development, civic engagement, and social change shows its relevance within the higher education context. The model's emphasis on individual, group, and

community development can also serve as an excellent framework for the implementation and development of social innovation in higher education.

Summary

As universities carefully reconsider their role in society and their surrounding community (Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008), little research exists to describe how institutions of higher education can create the university infrastructure to make such a change. Social innovation serves as the overarching term that connects diversity, inclusion, and leadership to social change in the community, and higher education should explore it further within its context. A better understanding of how universities develop an interdisciplinary approach to social innovation education will prepare educators and practitioners to promote social responsibility education and better meet students' expectations and society's needs. It requires a reframing of the university's civic mission and institutional priorities, including the "development of knowledge (i.e. research) and human capacity (i.e. teaching) aimed at a new kind of global and community engagement (i.e. service)." (Ashoka U, 2014, p. 59). Then it requires stories of communities and systems changed because of the social innovation interventions by the students, staff, and faculty in the community. Social innovation, the process of developing new strategies, concepts, ideas, and organizations that meet social needs of all kinds and that extend and strengthen civil society, is a venue for the field of higher education to start addressing the most crucial social issues of the time (Ashoka U, 2016).

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Despite voluminous research and several associations focused on personal and social responsibility, social innovation education, and leadership and civic engagement, scholars have very little practical knowledge about what makes an organization good at social innovation (Ashoka, 2014; Elliott, 2013; Nilsson & Paddock, 2014). Similarly, within student affairs units, social justice, leadership, service, and community engagement are often central functional units dedicated to social causes (Einfeld & Collins, 2008; Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004), yet they remain fragmented from one another. Social innovation connects diversity, access, and inclusion to social change in the community, so scholars must explore it further within the context of student affairs within higher education.

The purpose of this research study is to analyze a socially innovative new student orientation program on a university campus to understand how the collaborative, social justice initiative manifested itself overtime. This study offers a case study of a strategic approach to social innovation in higher education that began in a student affairs unit and affected surrounding communities. Case study methodology was selected for this study because case studies seek to discover deep understanding of a particular phenomenon through exploring the interaction between a case and its context (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). I investigated this program that began as a need to address bias incidents and sexual violence on campus, but turned into a visionary, collaborative initiative that is now a social innovation model. This study explored the following research questions: What catalyzed the institution to focus on social innovation

education? What was the developmental process for the socially innovative initiative? How did the campus community respond to the social innovation?

Research Paradigm

As the researcher, I operated within the constructivist paradigm, also referred to as interpretive research, which rests on the belief that reality is socially constructed (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Constructivism originated from hermeneutics, or the study of interpretive understanding or meaning, and is now the most common type of qualitative research (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In constructivism, people active in the research process socially construct knowledge (Mertens, 2015), relying on the participants' views of the situation under study to make sense of and interpret meaning throughout the study (Creswell, 2014). My purpose was to understand multiple social constructions of meaning, knowledge, and realities related to the Creating Community program while ensuring a balanced representation of views in the study. Epistemologically, I interlocked with the participants throughout the duration of the study, both mutually influencing the other, so I confirmed my interpretations of participant perceptions throughout the study to ensure accuracy.

Case Study

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of social innovation in higher education through a close look at the development of the Creating Community program. I selected the methodological design of a case study for this research because case studies focus on the "particularity and complexity" (Stake, 1995, p. xi) of a single case, coming to understand its existence within specific circumstances. Case studies draw from naturalistic, holistic, ethnographic, phenomenological, and biographic research methods, mirroring the interdisciplinary nature of social innovation (Stake, 1995). The key to a case study is to focus on

particularization, investigating the particular components of a case, not generalization (Stake, 1995; Tellis, 1997). A variety of case study types exist, including exploratory, explanatory, descriptive, intrinsic, instrumental, and collective (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1993). Exploratory studies are considered a prelude to social research, explanatory studies may be used for doing casual investigations, and descriptive case studies require a descriptive theory to be developed before starting the project (Yin, 1993). Intrinsic studies occur when a researcher has an interest in the case; instrumental cases are used to understand more than what is obvious to the observer; and collective cases arise when a group of cases are examined (Stake, 1995). This case study methodology will use a blend of the exploratory and descriptive case study types to explore the general question of what social innovation looks like within a student affairs and higher education setting through the descriptive lens of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development.

One of the strengths of the case study is its "methodological eclecticism" (Marshall & Rossman, 2016, p. 19). Case studies incorporate a variety of research methods, multiple perspectives, and interpretive strategies to maximize lessons learned through the examination of a particular program. Case study protocol calls for an interpreter placed in the research setting to observe and learn about the workings of the case, objectively record what is happening, while simultaneously examining its meaning with the aim to understand thoroughly (Stake, 1995). Case studies can use a variety of research methods, including documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts (Yin, 1994). For this particular case study, I employed individual interviews, focus groups, and documentation as complementary methods.

The purpose of case study research is to explore the particular case in depth, with the understanding that it cannot generalize to other campuses. However, the case study collected enough details that professionals and administrators may recognize components of the case that may be transferable to their campuses (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). The process of examining and understanding this particular case illuminated the phenomenon of social innovation on college campuses more broadly.

Setting

The defined system under study is the Creating Community program (pseudonym to protect anonymity), from its genesis to its current state on campus. The Creating Community program exists at a top-ranked private institution internationally recognized for its liberal arts colleges, graduate and professional schools, and a leading health care system located in the southeast. This institutional setting is where I conducted the research study, with a total enrollment of 14,724 students, 7,803 in undergraduate study and 6,921 in graduate and professional study. Specifically, the Creating Community program originated and primarily exists in student affairs, so the majority of the participants work within the student affairs unit of the institution.

Participants

The aim of qualitative research is to select a sample to help discover, understand, and gain insight into the phenomenon under study. In order to do so, I employed purposeful sampling and selected participants who could provide the most insight into the Creating Community program (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To analyze social innovation in higher education, I first identified the case to study, the Creating Community program. Since the program existed for three years, it would be unreasonable to analyze all the people, activities,

and documents affiliated with the program, so I conducted two-tier purposeful sampling within the case itself. The individual interview sample consisted of administrators involved in the curriculum direction and development. I also conducted focus groups of staff trainers and student facilitators of the program. I subsequently conducted focus groups consisting of those I interviewed through initial individual interviews and focus groups to confirm arising themes.

The purposeful sample consisted of individuals involved with Creating Community throughout its evolution on campus, including administrators, staff, and students. For this research study, criteria for participation include administrators on the Working Group, administrators that set the direction for the program, staff who served as trainers for at least two years, and students who were involved with the program for at least two years through participation and facilitation. As a previous staff trainer and current curriculum contributor to the Creating Community program, I am intimately familiar with its learning objectives, content, and processes, and therefore had access to participants and documentation for this study.

To recruit participants for my research study, I sent a call for participants through email invitation Fall 2016. For administrators and staff developing the curriculum and direction of the Creating Community program, I drew from a purposeful sample to conduct individual interviews. Those interviewed from the Working Group were those currently serving on the Working Group. Administrators interviewed included those that used to serve on the Working Group or helped initiate the program on campus. I used snowball sampling for the administrator participants, adding additional people administrators recommended as I interviewed them. For staff trainers and student facilitators, I generated a list of staff trainers involved with the program for at least two years and student leaders who experienced the program as a new student and facilitated the program to a group of new students. These leaders were a combination of

Orientation Leaders, First-Year Resident Advisors, and First-Year Sophomore Advisors on campus, since facilitating the curriculum to new students is part of their job responsibilities. I emailed all staff trainers and student facilitators who met the criteria to extend an invitation to participate in my study. Examples of the recruitment emails are included in Appendix A. I sent an email to everyone who I thought met my criteria based on Creating Community training records, then identified those to participate based on mutual availability for interviews and focus groups. I selected participants to ensure that a variety of staff trainers and student facilitators, including those from different functional areas in the field and student leadership positions, in addition to the number of years dedicated to the Creating Community program, ensuring maximum variation in my participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Data Collection Methods

I collected data through a variety of methods, as case study research methodologists recommend collecting data through various venues to better understand the cases and answer research questions than one singular method (Stake, 1995; Tellis, 1997; Yin, 1993). Methods of data collection included qualitative interviews, focus groups, and document review. Criteria for selecting documents to analyze included those that explain the purpose of the initiative, provide direction for the initiative, and share feedback about the initiative from its emergence in 2013 to its current form in 2016.

Individual interviews. Individual interviews, also referred to "conversations with a purpose" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 108), can be used to obtain in-depth information about a phenomenon (Seidman, 2013). Interviews reveal stories of people's lived experiences. The process of a research participant during an interview involves storytelling with them selecting details related to their experience, reflecting on them, giving them order, and thereby making

sense of them, thus making interviews a meaning-making experience (Seidman, 2013). To reveal the story of the Creating Community program through individual interviews, I interviewed members of the Working Group that developed the program curriculum (Working Group Interview, N = 7) and additional administrators involved in the development of the Creating Community program (Administrator Interview, N = 7). Refer to Table 2 for pseudonyms of those individually interviewed and their involvement with the Creating Community program.

Using a semi-structured interview approach (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), I entered interviews with a plan to explore specific topics and to ask specific open-ended questions. The interview consisted of an introduction, five to six questions, and then a concluding question, along with probing questions to prompt further discussion for a particular question if needed. This interview style enabled me to have a relatively unstructured interaction with the interviewees, yet still ensured that I covered the same general topics and questions with all participants. Interviews occurred Fall 2016, each lasting around an hour. Before the interview, I briefed participants that the purpose of the study was to understand how the Creating Community program developed on campus and their perspective of the program's resulting effects. I framed the interview questions through the three tenets of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, focusing on individual, group, and community experiences related to the Creating Community program (HERI, 1996). Examples of the questions asked of each group are included in Appendix B. First-round interviews occurred in the Fall 2016 semester.

Table 2

Pseudonyms for Interview Participants

Participant Code	Pseudonym	Connection to Creating Emory
Working Group 1	Kaitlyn	Working Group since 2015, Integrity specialist, joined in year 3 of Creating Community
Working Group 2	Sean	Working Group since 2014, LGBT and diversity specialist, joined in year 2 of Creating Community
Working Group 3	Brian	Working Group since 2013, Residence Life specialist, joined in year 1 of Creating Community
Working Group 4	Demetrius	Working Group since 2016, Health Promotion specialist, joined in year 4 of Creating Community
Working Group 5	Hayden	Working Group since 2013, Social Justice Education specialist, joined in year 1 of Creating Community
Working Group 6	Noah	Working Group since 2016, Debate specialist, joined in year 4 of Creating Community
Working Group 7	Terrell	Working Group since 2016, Orientation specialist, joined in year 4 of Creating Community
Administrator 1	Marie	Upper-level administrator involved since 2015, Assisted by providing a future direction for Creating Community
Administrator 2	Liam	Upper-level administrator who provided initial charge for Creating Community
Administrator 3	Amara	Administrator involved since the beginning of Creating Community
Administrator 4	Isaac	Administrator involved in starting the Creating Community program, served on the Working Group through 2015, year 3 of the program
Administrator 5	Olivia	Administrator on Working Group that started the Creating Community program through 2013, year 1 of the program, orientation specialist, convener of the Working Group.
Administrator 6	Mary	Administrator on Working Group 2014-2015, years 2-3 of the Creating Community program, orientation specialist, convener of the Working Group.

Administrator 7	Rachel	Administrator on Working Group starting the Creating Community program, served through 2013, year 1 of the program

Interview protocol are included in Appendix B. I arrived to interviews with questions to ask and space to record the answers during the session with a notepad and pen. I recorded all focus group interviews on a recording device and later transcribed them. I also recorded descriptive notes during the interview. After each interview, I encouraged participants to send me any personal or official documents they had related to the Creating Community program to help me further understand its presence and evolution on campus. I conducted all of the initial interviews except for those with the Working Group. Because I am so intimately familiar with those serving on the Working Group, I recruited an external contributor to interview the Working Group staff members, following the same interview protocol I used for the administrator interviews. The external interviewer increased the validity of the results, allowing the Working Group participants to be as transparent as they wanted without worrying about my presence as a member of the Working Group. Following the first round of interviews, I conducted data analysis and searched for commonalities and themes among the data. I recruited the participants for a secondary focus group via email to collect their reactions and feedback to the arising themes from the study in the Spring of 2017.

Focus groups. The purpose of focus groups is to understand how people feel or think about issues and ideas (Krueger & Casey, 2015). The focus group questions are included in Appendix B, although the questions varied for each group because they reflected the themes that emerged through the individual interviews. I designed the focus group questions with the intent to compare the individual perceptions and experiences with the Creating Community program to

identify similarities and differences, and to identify themes across stakeholders (Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

I used two different types of focus groups throughout the study. The first round of focus groups with the Student Facilitators and Staff Trainers of the Creating Community Program occurred alongside the individual interviews with the administrators and Working Group members. The follow-up focus groups focused on themes that emerged from the first round of individual interviews and focus groups. Following each individual interview, I informed participants that their data would be part of a case study design alongside additional interviews and focus groups with administrators, staff, and students, and would be followed up with focus group conversations to discuss emerging themes in Spring 2017.

I selected participants of focus groups because they had certain characteristics in common related to the topic of the focus group (Krueger & Casey, 2015), in my case about the Creating Community program. I clustered focus group participants based on their experience with the Creating Community program, bringing together a collection of student leaders, staff trainers, or administrators to discuss trends that emerged in the individual interviews. Five focus groups occurred, three with students (Student Focus Group, N = 11) and two with staff trainers (Staff Focus Group, N = 11). All staff members that participated in the focus groups served as trainers of the Creating Community program for at least two years, and all students that participated in the focus groups experienced the Creating Community program as new students and then facilitated it for other new students for at least one year. Follow up focus groups occurred for three different groups, each with a smaller participation rate than the initial focus groups: Working Group (Working Group Follow Up Focus Group, N = 5, 71% participation rate), Staff Trainers (Staff Trainer Follow Up Focus Group, N = 4, 36% participation rate), and

students (Student Facilitator Follow Up Focus Group, N = 7, 64% participation rate). Through the focus groups, I learned about the professional staff and student facilitator perspectives and reflections related to the development and impact of the Creating Community program.

Documentation. Further data to complement the information collected through interviews and focus groups included documentation related to the Creating Community program. Secondary, existing data review consists of data that administrators collected, recorded, or left behind at an earlier time, usually for a different purpose than the current research purpose at hand (Johnson & Christensen, 2014, p. 243). Documents for review included program curriculum, email messages, charge memos, and meeting notes through four-years of the Creating Community's existence and evolution on campus. Following each interview and focus group, I asked participants to share any documents that would be helpful to understand the development of Creating Community over time. The program curriculum shows the evolution of the Creating Community program content. The email messages were exchanges between administrators involved in the Creating Community initiation and development, and the charge memos were from Liam and Marie, upper-level administrators involved in providing direction for the program's creation and evolution. Meeting notes are from the Working Group's meetings over the course of the past four years. All documentation was collected by the end of Fall 2016. A combination of personal and official documents provided further perspectives about the Creating Community program as a case study for social innovation in higher education.

Data Analysis

I conducted data analysis simultaneously with data collection throughout the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This means that immediately following a series of two to three interviews, I employed an outside vendor to transcribe the interviews and started coding

interview transcripts as soon as I received them, while continuing to schedule and conduct further interviews. This approach allowed me to discover emerging themes from the interviews to adapt future interview protocols when needed. As I collected documents from participants, I organized them according to the year of the Creating Community program that they corresponded with, so I created folders of files for 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016. This provided me with a timeline of the program's progression with specific correspondences, curriculum, and assessment data for each year.

Throughout the data analysis process, I maintained and continually developed a master list of all the codes used. As I created preliminary codes, I practiced lumping them into broad categories guided by the Social Change Model for Leadership Development. I framed the interview questions through the large tenets of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, focusing on individual, group, and community experiences (HERI, 1996; Saldana, 2016). These broad categories, individual, group, and community/society levels, each have more specific potential codes as defined by the theory. The codes for the individual category include consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment. Group category codes collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility, and community/society category codes include civic responsibility and social change. An additional category that I examined is change, including what initiated the change on campus, the progress of change overtime, and future directions for the initiative. This approach helped me identify ways that the Social Change Model for Leadership Development fits within the context of social innovation in higher education. These pre-determined categories and codes provided a focal point for me to refer to while reviewing my data (Saldana, 2016). Inductive codes also developed through direct examination of the data, including leadership, scholarship, assessment, and facilitation. These

codes arose as common themes through the interviews and focus groups. The key to data analysis for this study was to remain flexible throughout the analysis process to alter or add to the pre-existing codes as needed depending on the data received (Marshall & Rossman, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

I structured the interview guides through the Social Change Model of Leadership Development theoretical lens, and I sought answers to the research questions through a deductive coding process with the theoretical model as my guide (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The authors of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development categorized it in four themes, including Change, Individual Values, Group Values, and Community Values (Astin, 1996; HERI, 1996). Based on the Social Change Model, I started my data collection and analysis with codes and categories in mind, expanding upon them when additional themes emerged. I based follow-up focus group questions on emergent findings from the initial data analysis process that I wanted to explore further, which were also coded with the same thematic categories. I answered my research questions by looking through the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, with the findings falling within its four thematic categories: Change, Individual Values, Group Values, and Community Values. I used the documents to provide examples of findings from the interviews and focus groups, illustrating exact components of the program to mirror themes mentioned by the participants.

Researcher Subjectivity

Through researching social innovation education on the campus where I serve as an employee, some occasions occurred that I had to reflect upon my philosophical view of higher education and my role within the institution. For this qualitative case study, I served as the researcher instrument. As the instrument, it was critical that I was reflective and aware of my

positionality as an employee at the university under study involved with the Creating Community program. In my previous role at the institution, I created, piloted, and implemented a Social Entrepreneurship Living-Learning Community within a residence hall, and attended the Ashoka U conference at Brown University in January of 2014. As a professional who congregated resources across the institution for a social entrepreneurship endeavor, I acknowledge and recognize that I find great value in social innovation education within higher education.

As the current Associate Director for Transitions and Leadership Programs at the institution where the study occurred, I experienced the Creating Community program as a trainer for the first three years of its existence, and now serve as the Working Group convener, a key contributor to the planning committee. I identified the Creating Community program as an appropriate case study for social innovation because of my intimate familiarity with its learning objectives, content, and continual evolution.

Following data analysis, I shared my findings and results with an expert within the Ashoka U organization to incorporate a perspective external to the institution under review, with a specialized lens of social innovation in higher education. Her revisions and suggestions affirmed the findings illustrated conversations within the field of social innovation in a higher education context.

Trustworthiness

In order to ensure trustworthiness for this research study, I engaged in multiple approaches to obtain reliable and valid results. To establish credibility as a researcher in the study, I ensured prolonged engagement in the Creating Community setting and remained open to new data sources to complement the study. I triangulated the study by gathering data from

multiple sources, through multiple methods, including interviews, focus groups, and document review (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). To ensure reliability, I used the established interview protocol consistently across interviews with all interview audiences, including administrators, staff trainers, and student facilitators. I also employed an external interviewer for the interviews with members of the Working Group, who used the same interview protocol I used for administrator interviews, to provide even greater reliability of responses. The use of multiple data collection methods, through interviews and original document collection, enabled me to combine their themes to have a greater perspective of the Creating Community program. To further ensure goodness of the data collected, I engaged in reflective activities in the form of analytic memos and codebook creation (Saldana, 2016) to complement member-checking strategies. I carried a journal with me to engage in active and critical self-reflection during and beyond interviews, and I recorded reflective notes during and following interviews.

Member-checking strategies occurred in a formal and informal way throughout the data collection and analysis process. Throughout the study, I asked clarifying questions during the interviews to ensure accuracy of my interpretation of participant information and perspectives shared. At the conclusion of initial individual interviews and focus groups, I conducted second focus group interviews to share arising commonalities and themes for feedback. By taking emerging findings back to the participants where they derived, I explored their plausibility and sensibility (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This approach helped me identify themes from the interviews, focus groups, and document analysis that intersected and diverged from one another, with the aim to better understand the concept of social innovation within the higher education context. These aims, in addition to following specific protocol through the interview processes

and data collection created a sound design for trustworthiness in the research (Marshall & Rossman, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Tellis, 1997).

The research rests upon ethical practices by including respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. I practiced respect for persons by respecting all participants' privacy, anonymity, and their informed consent to participate in the study. Through clear communication, participants were be fully informed about the purpose of the study, understood their participation was voluntary, knew the extent of their commitment to the study, and trusted there would be minimal risks associated with their involvement (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Further, I continually considered who benefits and who does not from the study, underpinning the research with a social justice perspective. All of these ethical considerations were paramount as I engaged co-workers and students in conversations surrounding the Creating Community program at the center of the campus life community.

Chapter IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to examine a socially innovative new student orientation program at a mid-sized private university to understand how the collaborative, social justice initiative manifested overtime. The study explored the following questions: What catalyzed the institution to focus on social innovation education? What was the developmental process for the socially innovative initiative? How did the campus community respond to the social innovation? I will answer the research questions by looking through the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, with the findings falling within its four thematic categories: Change, Individual Values, Group Values, and Community Values.

First, I will outline a description of the Creating Community program and how it evolved over time. Then, I will examine the four themes of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development by data from the study, aligning them with sub-themes that exist within the theoretical framework, illustrated in Table 3. Within the change theme, I will examine the sub-theme of reasons the institution wanted change and how assessment data drove many of the changes. I will examine how the campus community responded to the social innovation through the other three themes of the Social Change Model via Individual, Group, and Community Values. I will discuss how the program furthered Individual Values in the community through the sub-themes of commitment, congruence, and consciousness of self. Through engagement with the Creating Community program, I will highlight how the Group Values showed up in the community through discussing the sub-themes of collaboration, common purpose, and

controversy with civility. Finally, I examined the sub-theme of citizenship within the Community Values section. A discussion of these values will help frame the many ways students, staff, and administrators responded to the socially innovative initiative on campus over the course of its development, implementation, and evolution.

Table 3
Themes and Sub-themes for Findings

Themes	Sub-themes
Change	Reasons the institution wanted change Assessment-driven Change
Individual Values	Commitment Congruence Consciousness of self
Group Values	Collaboration Common Purpose Controversy with civility
Community Values	Citizenship

Description of the Program

The Creating Community program launched in 2013 to address the issues of integrity, diversity, inclusion, dialogue, and interpersonal violence prevention on campus. The program has, since its inception, focused on the notion of "creating" the university community, hence, "Creating Community." The program consists of three curriculum-based conversations between student leaders and new students and a performance during new student orientation, all of which continue to evolve every year as a living program. Through conversations among students, staff, and administrators, the university continues to work towards creating a better, safer, and more inclusive campus community each year. The overarching Creating Community objectives for participants in 2016 were:

- Identify personal values.
- Identify resources and engagement opportunities related to integrity, diversity, dialogue, and interpersonal violence prevention.
- Recognize [the university's] policies related to sexual misconduct and discrimination/harassment.
- Describe the diversity of identities on campus.
- Demonstrate skills of how to dialogue across difference to create an inclusive environment.
- Provide accurate information and correct misconceptions about interpersonal violence on college campuses.
- Demonstrate skills of how to intervene to support oneself or a friend facing discrimination or interpersonal violence. (2016 Creating Community Curriculum)

These larger objectives built a foundation to work towards a Community of Practice on college campus, defined in the 2016 Campus Life strategic plan as,

> leveraging personal, local, national, and global resources to enact shared values, passions, and concerns to learn together and positively transform individuals, our community, and the world. A community of practice is regenerative. There will inevitably be moments when our community struggles with its own values and commitments due to the dynamic nature of the community and society. The community will make mistakes, but we must be willing and able to show compassion and forgiveness and ultimately grow from these mistakes.

The Creating Community program works toward its learning objectives through a three-phase curriculum and performance, focused on integrity, dialogue across difference, and interpersonal

violence prevention. Each phase of the curriculum has more specific learning objectives, outcomes, and activities associated. I outlined the curriculum below in Table 4.

Table 4
Creating Community Curriculum

Phase	Focus	Learning Objectives & Outcomes
I	Integrity	Define integrity. Identify personal values. Develop a set of community values with peers. Describe how reflecting on integrity impacts a life of open-mindedness.
II	Diversity: Dialogue Across Difference & Issues Troupe Performance	Describe the diversity of their class. Describe the university commitment to diversity and dialogue across difference. Describe the value of participation in contested conversations. Describe methods and opportunities to create an inclusive environment.
III	Interpersonal Violence Prevention	Discuss types of interpersonal violence and effects of trauma. Practice how to Assess, Listen, and Affirm (ALA) if/when someone discloses to you. List 3 on campus resources and 2 off campus resources available to students affected by interpersonal violence. List the 5 steps of Bystander Intervention. Discuss different ways to assess situations for bystander intervention. Define sexual misconduct, consent, and coercion.

The curriculum also highlighted main takeaways for student facilitators to emphasize during each phase of the curriculum. For the integrity phase, the main takeaways include that participants know the campus community consists of individuals with both similar and differing values, and that exploring integrity prepares students to dialogue with respect and create a more inclusive campus environment. The main takeaways for the Diversity: Dialogue across Difference section included three main points. The first that our communities are increasingly diverse places where we must learn to communicate about and across our differences if we are to advance a common good. The second that administrators challenge students to understand

dissent and an active engagement of diverse ideas as a way for them to create flourishing communities and change the world. And the third that students will be practice communication strategies to build coalition, resolve conflict, and create a better campus community. The main takeaways for the phase on interpersonal violence prevention include that interpersonal violence happens in our community and it can take many forms, but a person can show compassion for someone impacted by violence with very little effort, and that the university takes violence seriously. Additionally, the section explores the support resources for survivors and myriad opportunities for students to take action as a bystander when they see harassment and other forms of violence happening.

The Creating Community program relies on a multi-tiered structural approach to share the aforementioned objectives and mission, including administrators, staff, student leaders, and new students. Table 5 further describes the different groups engaged in the Creating Community program to provide further context for the program.

Table 5
Roles of Participants

Role	Affiliation	Description
Participants	First-year Students	**Experience:** Phase 1, Phase 2, & Phase 3 **Create:** Community
Facilitators	Resident Advisors, Sophomore Advisors, Orientation Leaders	**Experience:** Diversity Baseline Training, SAPA 101 Training, & Creating Community Training **Lead:** Phase 1, Phase 2, & Phase 3 for new students
Trainers	University Staff	**Experience:** Diversity Baseline Training, SAPA 101 Training, & Creating Community Trainer-the-Trainer Training **Lead:** Creating Community Curriculum Training for Facilitators
Working Group	Campus Life Staff and University Partners	**Creates:** Creating Community curriculum and programmatic experience, leads programmatic assessment efforts

		Leads: Creating Community Train-the-Trainer Training
Administrators	Campus Life Staff	**Led:** The initiation of the Creating Community program from Campus Life, but either never served or no longer serve on the Working Group.

The Creating Community program's evolution was both organic and systematic. Within the initiation of the program, administrators received a charge letter from senior staff member, experienced messy group dynamics to determine how to address the charge, and eventually "threw the dart" to see what worked and did not work. Over the next five years, the program grew systematically more complex through collaborative partners, evolving curriculum, and assessment-based changes. The future expansion of the program aims to reach larger audiences and continue conversations throughout the undergraduate experience. Staff reflected that "the greatest strength for this particular program is the willingness to edit and the ability to effect changes as we see them." Hayden shared that "every year was an experiment and I don't think it hasn't been an experiment yet." Even after five years, the program continues to imagine how it can expand and increase impact through reaching larger audiences and continue conversations beyond the first year in college, reflecting how social innovations take time to emerge on campus, and often they are ever dynamic in the way they address community needs. See Table 6 below for large changes the program experience over the past five years.

Table 6
Progress of Change for the Creating Community Program

Change	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Future Growth
What led the change?	Student demands Campus Life Compact Charge letter from Liam (see in Appendix C.1 and staff response in Appendix C.2)	Assessment Data Lessons from facilitating the experience	Assessment Data Lessons from facilitating the experience	Assessment Data Lessons from facilitating the experience Charge letter from Marie (see in Appendix C.3)	Assessment Data Lessons from facilitating the experience Campus context and priorities Charge letter from Marie
Program Structure	Unstructured Working Group Pilot Year Messy and Flawed First-year orientation program extended into the Fall semester 4 Phases of curriculum-based conversations	Re-evaluated Working Group membership Greater collaboration between Residence Life and Orientation student staff Program only occurred during first-year Orientation Shift to 3 Phases of curriculum-based conversations, removing alcohol education	Framed the conversation through an integrity lens Working Group membership shifted, but offices represented remained consistent Started Diversity and Sexual Assault baseline training for Staff Trainers and Student Facilitators	Staff external to Campus Life started serving as Staff Trainers Incorporated Dialogue Across Difference into program The trainings and manuals were streamlined between Staff Trainers and Student Facilitators Shift from Community of Care language to Community of Practice	Expand program to incorporate transfer, Oxford, and graduate students Expand program across the 4-year undergraduate experience Developed new program objectives that apply across populations Developed a more integrated curriculum Re-evaluate program outcomes

After four years of existence serving first-year students through new student orientation, administrators started wondering how they could expand the program for further impact. Marie,

particularly, sent a follow-up charge for the Creating Community working groups, inviting them to continue working on the program while helping envision a broader future for the program itself. The charge can be read in its entirety in Appendix C.3, but the letter asked the committee to consider over the next three years how the program could be broadened to the four-year, transfer, and graduate experience, taking into consideration the development of an inclusive social justice curriculum on campus. Staff, administrators, working group members, and students believe the program should expand in a number of ways in the future, which included reaching larger audiences and continuing the conversations across the four-year undergraduate experience to create a broader vision to scale larger.

Marie's charge encouraged the working group to create a plan for the Creating Community program to reach larger audiences, including transfer students, Oxford students, and graduate students. She described the program as an integral component of Campus Life's contributions to the new student experience. "As one of Campus Life's signature programs, Creating Community has introduced all first-year students to our community of care, empowering students to make healthy choices, support others to do the same, and develop a sense of self in the context of others." While the program does a comprehensive job introducing these concepts to first-year students, she charged the Working Group to consider what this could look like across additional student populations. Most involved with Creating Community envision the program becoming a more central part of the campus culture, to "permeate the whole student experience." Marie shared that "my vision is that it is impacting the entire community and we're thinking about that as the next step using Creating Community as sort of the seed."

To work toward these future visions, the working group attended a retreat Fall 2016 to start mapping out what strategic expansion could look like over the course of the next five years and the timeline can be reviewed in Appendix D.1. The expansion includes inviting different audiences within the campus community, along with expanding the experience along the four-year journey through the institution. During the retreat, the working group also decided the group needed overarching outcomes so that any future editions of the program stemmed from common outcomes of the greater Creating Community program. The new outcomes exist in Appendix D.2. A staff trainer shared that permeating the entire university is "how you keep it relevant and that's how you show that it isn't just an isolated thing that [the university] created, but is actually something that seeps in or permeates into other aspects of their life. It's not isolated just to [college], these conversations and experiences happen elsewhere in the world. So, it really informs a global perspective that we profess our students are having."

The Creating Community program initiation and evolution reflects how many social innovations begin and evolve. Community members become aware of a social issue, come together with other community members, and work towards a solution that can positively transform the systems that created the social issues to begin with. The program overview answers the second research question of 'What was the developmental process for the socially innovative initiative?' The Creating Community program evolved significantly over the course of five years, increasing intentionality and purposeful collaborations, curriculum, and assessment efforts. Often, the social innovation process is messy and collaborative, but getting started is the first step, then the group can continually refine their approach as they learn through experience and feedback.

Change

The Social Change Model of Leadership Development focuses on developing individual, group, and community values while pursuing positive change (Astin, 1996; HERI, 1996). The Creating Community program started from a charge to change the student culture surrounding incidents of bias, oppression, and interpersonal violence from administrators and students. While the program started from a charge for change, Marie explained it experiences change every year it exists on campus, continuing to "change as the student population changes." The findings illustrate the sub-theme of reasons students and staff initially wanted change on campus and how assessment data drives many of the changes each year.

Reasons for change. In general, Creating Community emerged from an increase in incidents of oppression on campus, new leadership within Campus Life, and administrator and student commitment to developing more proactive systems. Administrators and staff indicated that the institution sought change through the Creating Community program because it resulted from a "whirlwind of events and people, administrators and students," catapulting many community members to take action and develop a program to address the social needs on campus.

Increase in incidents of oppression. Staff and students described several incidents of oppression happening over several years that led to the need for the Creating Community program. In Spring of 2012, university administrators removed two historically African American sororities and fraternities from campus for hazing. While administrators found both organizations responsible for hazing, many students criticized that administrators did not hold predominantly white organizations accountable that engaged in similar behavior. In the Fall of 2012, the university administrators removed access to on-campus housing from the Black

Student Alliance student organization due to wear and tear on the building. Olivia shared that in 2013, a student-run TV show provided "unfortunate portrayals of survivors of sexual violence and unfortunate discriminatory portrayals of African American students," making jokes around lynching and walks of shame, creating racial and rape culture parodies. Through the above-mentioned events, students started believing their university was being oppressive against its students of color. Liam, Amara, Isaac, and Olivia indicated that additional climate issues developed during this time. Specifically, students interrogated the presence of Chick-Fil-A on campus for ties to anti-LGBT funding. Similarly, students felt harmed when the university president referred to the three-fifths compromise as a legitimate example of compromise in a published magazine article.

Isaac said that these crises generated "a confluence of events that really alienated and pushed our African American students, especially, but really all students of color, out." Additionally, administrators became increasingly aware of the lack of student knowledge and awareness about the general concepts of power, privilege, and oppression. It was a time that students needed support, but a comprehensive support structure did not exist because Campus Life operated within separate units, seldom coming together to produce collaborative work. Therefore, a unified, formal approach to support students through these isolating moments did not exist.

New leadership within campus life. A major catalyst to the development of Creating Community surrounded new leadership within Campus Life. Marie shared that in 2012 Liam, a new upper-level administrator, started at the institution and introduced a "desire on campus to really be thinking about what it is that we value, who we are as people, how we are interacting together, and how we are coming together." Staff within the Working Group described Liam as

a “new [leader] who is grounded in justice that could hold sort of that torch,” a torch to empower staff members to work together in new ways toward positive social change, while remaining accessible for staff to consult with throughout the process. Recognizing the emerging crises on campus, Liam charged Isaac to take the lead role towards generating a collaborative solution. Liam admitted that tension existed because it was the first-time he called upon departments to work together in that way. Within a generally siloed culture, intentional, systemic transactions were not occurring.

Upon reflection, Liam shared how their leadership with the Creating Community program evolved, initiated through crisis on campus. He reflected that “I wish I could say I saw it right away and wanted to be proactive and it was the first thing I did but it came out of that moment and understanding that we needed to structurally and systematically change our approach to student learning during orientation and beyond.” Essentially, Liam wanted people to come together and collaborate to address issues on campus, and many considered his leadership a turning point that led to the creation of Creating Community.

Staff had an awareness that many issues needed acknowledgement, but they lacked organizational structure and motivation to address the issues on their own. A staff member explained through a carrot or stick analogy, that “no one was attracted to come together and work together and no one was beaten over the head to work together. I honestly think it was the stick that made people work together because they were told so. This was not, from where we were organizationally, it was not a natural phenomenon for people to come together and work together.” The new senior leadership charged administrators to develop a collaborative, proactive way to shift the campus culture contributed to the development of Creating Community on campus.

Administrator and student commitment to developing more proactive systems. Students and administrators recognized that it was unfortunate that the institution initially started this program through a reactive approach, learning from the pain felt by many marginalized students on campus. The program's creation was a response to students' isolation and marginalization, and a commitment from administrators and students to do something to change the culture. The change started with the Campus Life Compact, which led to the development of Creating Community. Staff shared that "we started responding and reacting to some pretty significant events on campus…it maybe motivated us to do something we wanted to be doing anyway. And I think that it's very much evolved that we're not in as much of a reactive/responsive stance now as we are trying to proactively create community." Another staff member corroborated this point sharing that Creating Community "was definitely a response to symptoms, I think, in its initial construction. Creating Community was the medicine, at least one of many forms of medicine" addressing the symptoms of racism, sexism, and oppression we were seeing on campus. Creating Community was a way to generate proactive change on campus through a renewed commitment from administrators and staff to cultivate an environment for students of all identities and experiences.

The increase of staff awareness of incidents of oppression on campus and the senior leadership support to collaborate in ways unprecedented at the university motivated staff to step up and take action. Olivia recognized "it's a crucial time, let's do something," and many staff felt the same. The crises on campus led members of Campus Life to create the Campus Life Compact, focused on creating more inclusive communities. Community conversations occurred among students, staff, and administrators through open forums of social justice dialogues, generating a commitment to students to do better moving forward. Isaac shared that one of the

early decisions was the need to "address what we meant by community as early as we could in freshman year." Ultimately, the Campus Life Compact led to the creation of Creating Community, and is a document often referred to during the evolution of the program. Mary described the creation of the Creating Community program was "a real kind of seizing the moment."

Administrators and students expressed that they seized this opportunity to expand on previous diversity conversations to discuss all levels of diversity, not just race or ethnicity or religion, but to address the intersectionality of student identities and experiences on campus. Olivia shared "it was one of those things where it was just the right – it was the right administrators at the right time, like perfect storm in a sense. So, like there were these events on campus, there were the people that were willing to be brave and just be like, we need to do something about this." At the time of the crises on campus, orientation held a group of student leaders passionate about the social justice issues in discussion, many identifying with several identities feeling oppressed on campus. Olivia shared that they had access to "a group of students that would be open to creating something that could be lasting… It just seemed like the perfect timing, right, I felt like there was this sweet spot." While a group of students were involved in the initiation of the program, student voices are more present in the Individual, Group, and Community Values sections than the Change section because they focused on their experience with the program during their interviews instead of the evolution of the program overtime.

Essentially, Creating Community started from an awareness of oppressive issues in the community, then an upper-level administrator charged a Working Group of staff to come together and figure out how to start addressing the issues in reactive and proactive ways. The

program took on a life of its own over the course of five years, growing and expanding in ways never imagined from its initiation.

Assessment-driven change. Assessment data from community members mainly drove the changes over the course of the five-year program. Assessment was part of the Creating Community program from the very beginning. Brian shared that through all forms of assessment, including surveys, training feedback, and experience navigating the curriculum, the Working Group learned what was and was not working as soon as they started implementing the Creating Community experience. Liam furthered the significance of the assessment results by sharing that "really studying this and seeing what works, what doesn't work was a turning point. Because you can have orientation and it can feel very good but are students actually learning anything? And are we really moving the community forward?" Rachel shared the same significance of the assessment involved in Creating Community, saying it is "a big deal because I think that a lot of times like we're collecting data and not analyzing it." But with Creating Community, the Working Group sought after and analyzed data ever since the beginning. From an administrative perspective, Isaac reflected that after the first year of Creating Community "most of our student leaders were happy though they had really good feedback in how to make it better. I felt like we had not failed, we had made something get across the finish line that we could then refine and I think it's continuing to be refined today, but it was definitely at least a passing grade."

Members of the Working Group articulated the significance of the feedback process for implementing change each year in the Creating Community program. Rachel highlighted the impact that assessment provided to the improvements made early in the initiative, "assessing the program not only for their outcomes, which are important, but also process. So, what can we do

better, what can we do in the future to make this make more sense for folks, you know, who is this serving?" Within year one, many became aware of "a lot of details that initially just didn't work. And again, with the revised systems that we have done over [time], I think that it works a lot better now." Hayden shared how the feedback evolved over the four years of the program, and how they make meaning of student feedback,

> We got a lot of feedback or opportunities to get feedback about their Creating Community experience. Again, very mixed reviews, it's consistently been more positive for both the years. The first year, I don't remember anyone actually saying they enjoyed it. Then they would start to see the value of it, but it was done poorly. Then it was actually, no, I liked it, no, it was awful. And after year three, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive from the actual assessment information, it was just that people were bored, it was too much time, you know it was more logistical. This year, one thing I'm enjoying is a lot of the first-year student criticism is that it doesn't do enough. I'm like, that's a good criticism, that's not bad.

In general, the evolution of Creating Community has occurred at rapid and slow paces, incorporating adjustments to surrounding communities and the student population. A trainer within the follow-up focus group shared "I think, you know, the analogy that makes sense to me around Creating Community is Creating Community is a great mom and pop shop. It's this thing that's sort of home grown and created and we've seen over the four years that even though there have been slight changes and variances in the curriculum, that it's been fairly successful, right, and so now we're on this sort of verge of sort of franchiseablility, right, this idea of can it grow bigger." The process of change, and starting small then expanding larger, illustrates the process that many social innovations go through. Many start with an idea of how to address issues in

society, partner with others to build something new, then figure out how to improve it over time through feedback and program re-evaluation. The reality is that addressing systemic issues of oppression is difficult and takes time, and the evolution of the Creating Community program over the past five years is a specific example and illustration of the progression of change that many social innovators experience.

The change theme focuses on the reasons for wanting change on campus and how the Creating Community program used assessment to guide changes over the course of four years. These sections answer the first two research questions of 'What catalyzed the institution to focus on social innovation education?' and 'What was the developmental process for the socially innovative initiative?' The Creating Community program evolved significantly over the course of five years, increasing intentionality and purposeful collaborations, curriculum, and assessment efforts. Yet, in order for the program to begin, it required a dedicated collection of administrators and staff to come together and create a new, collaborative program to address crises on campus. While the first year of the program was "messy" and overwhelming to create something anew, it started a community-wide conversation of creating a community of care and practice, living lives of integrity, dialoguing across differences, and interpersonal violence prevention.

Individual Values

In the context of change, the Social Change Model of Leadership Development focuses on development along individual, group, and community values. The research question 'How did the campus community respond to the social innovation?' has yet to be explored in depth, which is what I will address in the subsequent themes through the rest of the Social Change Model focused on individual, group, and community values. Within individual values, the

Social Change Model of Leadership focuses on commitment, congruence, and consciousness of self, which is how I will describe individual commitments and responses to the Creating Community program.

Commitment. Through the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, the authors describe commitment as the motivational energy to serve that drives the collective effort. Commitment implies passion, intensity, and duration (HERI, 1996). Students, staff, and administrators described their commitment to the Creating Community program through the lens of commitment to their personal values, commitment to their jobs, and that their commitments to the program and experience required a great amount of time.

Connection to personal values. Many administrators, staff, and students aligned the Creating Community program with their personal values, making their engagement a natural alignment between their intrinsic values and their investment in the program. Mary shared that her involvement in the program was "intrinsic because I am most passionate in my career probably about social justice and transition and this program made both of those things come to a crossroads for me." Isaac also described how the program aligned with his values, as the Creating Community program supported his "inherit interest in creating a more diverse community."

Staff members reflected on how their own values contributed to the development of the new initiative on campus. Olivia shared that from the beginning, she "wanted it to be right and wanted it to be like good." In the midst of trying to figure out how to create a more diverse community on campus within an untouched territory, staff members' intrinsic commitments provided energy to continue exploring options. Noah shared that "I'm someone who genuinely believes that my skills and talents belong to the community and if someone sees a role that I can

play in improving some work that they're doing, then I genuinely feel obligated to figure out ways to do that." Staff also wanted to create solutions for systemic change. Amara shared that her "leadership was really kind of wanting to be at the table on behalf of all of our issues, understanding that we had to hone in on one, supporting that staff member and then trying to build something bigger – creating systemic change." Staff and students expressed intrinsic motivation for their involvement in the Creating Community program, making their participation and facilitation feel natural.

Commitment to job. Even if students and staff did not articulate their commitment stemming from their personal values, many of them shared their commitment to their job, and that Creating Community is part of their job responsibilities. Liam affirmed that Creating Community is a "foundational program for Campus Life in realizing our vision, our mission, everything that we want to be. And that was the very start of sort of an experiment of what would it look like for the community to come together, develop something that's transformative?" This commitment from Liam translated to many feeling like the program is a critical part of the work they do. Marie shared that her motivation and leadership in the program deried from by it being part of her job expectations. She shared that "part of why I took this job is because of the things that we value, I value." She also shared that the work of student affairs professionals is to "provide opportunities for a diversity of students to come together, understand our values, and understand expectations that we have of them [in order to increase their] capacity to be a leader and to create change and to be transformative."

Many members of the Working Group affectionately described their engagement with the program as a non-negotiable expectation of their role on campus. Kaitlyn shared that she "loved being involved and so that's kind of how I got tied in because it's literally my job." Many staff

shared that they were "voluntold" to engage in the Creating Community program. Yet, Kaitlyn shared "being part of the curriculum design team for the entire first year class is an extreme honor and so I've loved being a part of the group and really being able to make change and impact what our students are learning as they're coming in. And so yes, it is part of my role but, just again, what an honor." Brian echoed Kaitlyn's sentiments, sharing he was "voluntold to participate," and Sean recognized "there was a lack of staffing – of staff presence working on diversity components within the [Creating Community] curriculum and it was an obligation to come into that space and do that." While many of the Working Group members felt like they did not have an option about whether they participated or not, they recognized it as a key component to the work they do on campus.

Staff trainers felt a similar sentiment to the Working Group members. A staff member shared their "decision to stay involved was more personal, less voluntell, but there's still some underlying, this is a Campus Life initiative so Campus Life needs to support it. But at inception, this was definitely like a supervisory suggestion that you couldn't really say no to." Staff trainers expressed their investment in the program because of the students they serve. A staff member shared that their investment in providing student leaders to the program demonstrated it "was something that we were dedicating human and financial resources to and so I wanted to make sure that people knew that every piece of residence life was invested." While many staff members felt obligated to participate in the program at first as a function of their role, many returned because they of how the program intrinsically connects to their work.

Students also articulated of their commitment to the program manifested through their commitment to their student positions, either as Resident Advisors (RAs), Sophomore Advisors (SAs), or Orientation Leaders (OLs). Professionals expect students to co-facilitate the Creating

community program with new students as part of their responsibilities. Due to this role, several students articulated "something critical is making sure that there is buy-in from the OLs and SAs because if they don't care, then their – like the students aren't going to care and they need to care." They continued to share that "if you can get [student leaders] to buy in on the front end when they're doing their training and stuff, realize that this is really important and this can potentially influence this person's experience at college if you take these topics seriously."

When reflecting on their experience as new students going through the Creating Community program, students recognized how the surprising content increased their awareness of the university's commitments early on. A student shared that "having that kind of culture shock…kind of made me want to not only learn more but then help others to kind of have those conversations and meet people who were different than them and realize that we can coexist." Students also recognized how their commitment increased as they progressed from experiencing the curriculum as a new student to facilitating the curriculum as a student leader to new students.

Time commitment. The final level of commitment mentioned by many surrounded the time Creating Community requires, including the planning amongst the Working Group, the training for staff and students, and the time set aside in the orientation schedule.

Hayden outlined the time required of the Working Group to prepare for a multi-tiered program,

> There's the Working Group, trainer, facilitator, and then participant, each of those levels has to be informed and trained and implemented. But, one of the things is the – we can't train the trainers until we know what they're going to train the facilitators, we don't know what the facilitators are doing until we set the curriculum, but we have to train the trainers first, but it depends on writing this curriculum first. So, we have to work so far in

> advance that we can work backwards with enough time and we've never had enough time, it's always gotten done, maybe not as well or as much as it could, but that preparation is huge.

A staff trainer mentioned their appreciation for the time invested by the Working Group. They highlighted the benefit of "staff members who meet regularly throughout the year to develop this curriculum…constantly sitting with the material… writing notes for how the training sessions and everything went and I think that that is by far the most beneficial thing that this program does overall." For the Working Group, it is "in reality a duty as assigned, or for many of us an extra duty." But it is an extra duty that Marie described carries "a tremendous support…everybody sees the value in it and really is committed to it."

The hang up to those choosing not to get involved is the amount of time required to serve as a Creating Community trainer. Marie shared that "some people have a hard time taking that time or making that commitment to the time." She aimed to role model engaging in the program, hoping that her involvement provided an example for others. Brian partnered with Marie this past year as a co-trainer in the program, and shared his candid thoughts about staff buy-in related to Creating Community. "I'm going to be very biased because I am fully bought in and I'm fully engaged. Where I don't think there's a lot of participation and buy-in are from the people who refuse, whether because they don't believe in it or because they don't perceive to think they have enough time to participate, by saying they're always – they're too busy to assist in this, I would say, institutionalized priority that – so there's frustration." Many do not doubt the investment of upper level administration, but many do question the full commitment of higher administrators due to them not participating fully in the program. Brian explained what he means by commitment, sharing that "hopefully we can get to a point where there are even people above

Marie that are invested." In addition to upper level administration investment in time, fellow staff members question the time commitment the program requires. A staff member described an interaction with a colleague during their participation with the program who asked "how would my work get done if I did that? And my answer was, isn't this the work" that we're all supposed to be invested in?

Additional time considerations include the time allotted in the orientation schedule for Creating Community dialogues and involvement in the program over time. A staff trainer recognized that Creating Community "gets a lot of time in a pretty tight schedule which is, you know more than anyone. But you know the orientation schedule is pretty fiercely defended by the Division of Campus Life and the College, right, and so to get into that amount of time, it takes not only permission from you and permission from Terrell, sort of permission from several senior leadership members and the committee. I know there's lot of folks in play, I think we have more time now than we used to." Another significant element of time is the investment students and staff make over several years of the program's existence. A staff trainer shared "I do believe that if you want to be a part of Creating Community that it's not just that one time, once a year type of thing. It's one of those things that you have to go along with it because it's going to change every year…there is a process and you have to be along for the process." This investment in time is a similarity with many social innovations, requiring time to make it happen and to help it evolve and work towards the positive change it originally set out to make. Time commitments for the Creating Community program are extensive, including the Working Group investment, the length of training for staff trainers and student facilitators, and the time dedicated in the Orientation schedule.

Congruence. The Social Change Model defines congruence as thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty (HERI, 1996). Students, staff and administrators consistently mentioned congruent experiences when referring to the Creating Community program. The Creating Community program introduces new students to expectations of living lives of integrity, dialoguing across differences, and intervening during incidents of interpersonal violence. In order to share this message, the institution is setting high expectations for students, but also setting standards for the university community including administrators and staff members. Liam shared that from his perspective, the Creating Community program reflects his charge of "interrogating who we are versus who we say we are…an opportunity to sort of unpack our aspirational stuff and really coming to grips with who we are and then working towards those really amazing, sort of visionary awesome goals." This section will reveal this notion of interrogating who we are versus who we say we are through exploring how the program is congruent with student and staff values, analyzing the congruence of students' college experience with the message shared through the Creating Community program, and highlighting the importance of congruence among the curriculum and training experiences.

The values shared through the curriculum are values of Campus Life within the institution. Many staff members and students mentioned how the program was congruent with their own values and the experience they wanted to manifest for students. A staff trainer shared that the values "were all things that we cared about, so people feeling included, people understanding who they were, people who were focused on understanding the issues around being a positive bystander in sexual assault and originally sort of understanding alcohol and the issues around alcohol on college campuses. So, I think those were all things that sort of resonate

with me, it's why I do what I do, and so it made sense. This is sort of an ideological alignment." A staff member within the second trainer focus group echoed that "the project is about things that I really care about. The language that we were using prior to this year was this community of care which is what I feel like is kind of central to my work and so I wanted to be engaged to kind of see how that unfolds in a Campus Life way and to contribute to that in meaningful ways." Another staff member shared that the "topics interested her personally as well…so [engagement in the program] was more like professional and personal work." Staff who believed the program aligned with their personal and professional values felt like their involvement was a natural way to educate and prepare students to facilitate a healthy community on campus.

Students resonated with the values shared in the Creating Community program as well. A student shared that they were able to personally relate the program to their own life, and then they were "suddenly more invested in the whole thing because you can relate better. And it makes everything more real…because you know more about it." Another student shared their connection to the program, recognizing that the university is

> Less diverse than my high school and so I was kind of concerned coming in that there wouldn't be a lot of discussions about that. So just having those [discussions] from the very beginning, I was really excited that was part of [the university's] values and that they wanted to kind of establish that from the beginning. It was stuff like issues troupe, like really getting into it and getting into the nitty gritty of stuff I thought was really interesting and a cool way to establish the community.

While many new students resonated with the program, student trainers reflected on how their values as a student leader aligned with the program as well. A student within the first focus

group shared they "liked being trained for Creating Community because then I was able to see really why we think it's valuable at [the institution] and really why we want to embrace this and start this immediately as defining and setting the standards for the campus culture." They felt a stronger sense of responsibility to contribute to the pursuit of the Creating Community values as facilitators of the conversations and having more contextual knowledge about the program itself. When individual values align with programmatic values, engagement with the program felt natural for both student and staff members.

Students and staff often refer to the congruence between the values expressed through Creating Community and their lived experience at the university, how sometimes they align, but they are incredibly frustrated when they are not. Liam articulated how the Creating Community program provides a platform for staff and students to critically examine congruence at the institution. Many feel a disconnect because "through an orientation lens, you want everything for your students and then you make it out to be this [experience] and then they start experiencing things and they're saying, that's not what you told me it was going to be. And so, I think sort of the values clarification, elements of Creating Community, are so critical, right, because it sort of exposes the realities but also pushes students to recognize their responsibility in it." When students experience a disconnect between the values discussed in Creating Community and their lived experience at the institution, the program encourages students to step in, hold the institution accountable, and help work towards a congruent experience with our aspirational values. Kaitlyn mentioned the challenges associated with so explicitly naming our campus values, and how the community can interpret them,

> I think what's tough and maybe some of the criticism that's been received is making sure that what we're saying is authentic and not just a façade. Because I know in the past

> years… we were using this phase, community of care, and…that term became mocked by most students and most student leaders because they felt it was just this kind of blanket façade of like, yeah, we create a community of care, but do we really? Like what are we doing to actually do that? We're still seeing disrespect, we're still seeing racism, we're still seeing classism. So, are we really creating a community of care and what does that even mean?

The Community of Care concept was highly emphasized in the Creating Community curriculum, and became a point of contention for students. A student within the first focus group further echoed the disconnect between the values discussed in Creating Community and the variety of lived experiences on campus. They highlighted how the program is really enjoyed or despised by students, "and there's like not really any in between because it's such an intense thing that you go through at the beginning that it's either done well and you like it or it's not done well and you hate it." They further explained that students either love their college experience partly due to the amount of support provided by university administrators, while other students do not feel supported. They share this is confusing for many students because the university "makes a very big deal up front we are an open, accepting community and we do all these things. But then I think, again on an administrative level, sometimes they fall short and then people realize that later and become more bitter and then also don't like Creating Community because it was like they were promised things that were not followed through with."

Through receiving criticism between the congruence of Creating Community values and the lived college experience, particularly related to the criticism of inclusive behaviors among administrators and staff, the Working Group developed baseline training for all Creating Community Trainers and Facilitators to experience prior to facilitating the experience for new

students. Developing a shared training experience aimed to increase congruent messages from those facilitating the program. Sean shared the background to the development of baseline training, highlighting that staff often "become complacent in our own knowledge and experience and so we project this development and growth and knowledge and experience onto students all the time…[yet] the things that our students are experiencing are parallel to what our staff are experiencing." He explained that while staff often provide support, trainings, and opportunities to unpack local, national, and global incidents with students, we do not do the same support and opportunities for our staff members. He asked "how can we model what we are trying to project on students?" if we do not continue to reflect on our own identities and experiences before we prepare students to do the same. If staff trainers model what it means to act congruently with the values shared in the Creating Community program, then student facilitators will have a more congruent example to then model the values in an authentic way for new students. Brian shared the baseline training is "a good way to actually get our staff trained on these things when they otherwise probably would not volunteer to do it." The training institutionalizes the notion of discussing power, privilege, and systems of oppression among staff. A staff member further supported the idea of all staff going through the baseline training as part of their employment at the institution, furthering the concept of congruence further. They shared the training "could be part of the onboarding process for new staff and then bringing a training for existing staff, because how can we expect to have the language with our students if we don't learn it ourselves?"

Congruence within the curriculum was the last area several students and staff referenced, congruence within the three phases focusing on integrity, diversity and dialogue across difference, and interpersonal violence prevention. Isaac provided historical information about

how the working group used integrity to frame the conversations of the other two phases around diversity, inclusion, and bystander intervention. He shared that the working group introduced the integrity/values piece of the curriculum "very early on, the very first year…to help link this idea of aligning your values and being a person of integrity." He mentioned integrity "could help be a motivator for bystander intervention, for people to stand up and speak out for one another, for people to get involved and be engaged around these issues, because we wanted some sense of action." Students resonated with the idea of reflecting on their values and aligning them with their collegiate experience. A student within the first focus group shared they "got a lot out of the first [phase]…I took my value sheet and like put it on my wall and had it there for the rest of the year because I felt like that was something that I could look back on and really think about."

The emphasis on integrity provides a platform to discuss inclusion, dialogue across difference, and bystander intervention, to create a congruent curricular conversation for staff and students to connect back to leading lives of integrity. Through intentional curricular design and training experiences, the goal is to continue to increase alignment and congruence between the university and Creating Community values and student and staff experiences on campus.

Consciousness of self. Through the Social Change Model of Leadership, consciousness of self is defined as the awareness of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action (HERI, 1996). While students and staff mentioned moments they were aware of their own beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions throughout the Creating Community program, and most of their self-awareness occurred in relationship to other people. Liam described Creating Community as a program that helps "to really understand yourself, but yourself in the context of others and sort of that engagement across difference." In addition to their beliefs and values, students and staff articulated how their identities and positionality as

student facilitators and staff trainers influenced their experience with the Creating Community program.

Many student facilitators mentioned developing consciousness of self through exercising their facilitation skills. A student discussed "understanding the silence, as a participant, the silence was awkward and…felt uncomfortable, and as a facilitator, you know, you want to let that go and you value that silence and know it is positive." Another student mentioned monitoring their own excitement for the program and managing their disappointment when students were not as eager about the material as she was. This student articulated how she was aware of her own values and beliefs, and aware of her position as a student facilitator, so she had to balance them and determine when to portray her excitement versus facilitation skills. Another student shared how the material resonated with them more when they facilitated the program for new students, versus when they just participated in it themselves because "as a facilitator, you really do learn how to have those conversations we're trying to teach and there's something about teaching to others that makes it – that you learn it yourself." For this student, they became more aware of their values and beliefs in relation to the program through facilitating it for new students.

Another area that many mentioned being conscious of themselves included their social identities and how they are perceived with their involvement in the Creating Community program. A student highlighted the importance of addressing privilege within the first couple of days on campus, "especially talking about all of the racial tension and ethnic tension that's going on in the world today." A student within the first focus group articulated their inner thoughts when they experienced the program based on their previous experiences. "I think that was overwhelming for me because I was so used to just kind of keeping quiet about it. And so, it's

important to have that conversation but it's also – it can be intense within the first couple of days to just all of a sudden kind of reveal something that you've always find, I don't know, hidden within yourself."

Students reflected on how their identities play a large role in their facilitation of the program. Student facilitators shared that "different perspectives are really important because when you cannot relate to someone, someone else might be able to." They followed up with a specific example sharing this year they had "two Res Life staff, an Indian female and a Puerto Rican female, who were both incredibly helpful because they could relate to large portions of my group so much better than I could and could provide those experiences to really talk about diversity from a diverse standpoint." Another student highlighted how they capitalize on their identities when facilitating the curriculum for new students. They shared that "every year for Creating Community I preface I'm gay…I understand what this is like and like feel free to ask me about my experience and that makes it more real for them and every year I've gotten – been paired with Jewish sorority girls. I don't know why but they are very different from me and having the contrast and them being able to talk about their experience and me being able to talk about my experience using real life examples from ourselves can make it more real for them." Through student awareness of their values, identities, and beliefs, they can choose how to approach the Creating Community conversations in an authentic way with new students.

Staff members further reflected on this concept of interrogating the self through baseline trainings before facilitating for others. Terrell shared "if you don't really interrogate yourself and where you show up in these issues, then it's hard to be able to show up in a way that is productive for other people." A staff trainer shared that "an understanding of self helps you be a better facilitator, but it helps you understand the curriculum and understand the point of what

we're trying to get. We have been able to get our facilitators to dig a little deeper because we've done it ourselves." Two staff members also mentioned that their identities are all in "what you'd call the hegemonic majority. The types of identities we talk about mostly in the curriculum are sort of all in the historical majority and I just don't think it's – it's not right for the folks who have some identities that put them at a historical difference to be the ones doing all the education on that piece." Their self- consciousness of their privileges, both positional and social identities, empowered them to step up and participate in the Creating Community program. A staff member within the trainer focus group shared that "you have to infuse the [Creating Community] process with humility and realize that you're always becoming yourself and that you're not perfect." Through interrogating the self before facilitating for others, the Working Group, staff trainers and student facilitators increase their self-consciousness, developing an increased understanding of how personal identities, experiences, and perspectives motivate one to take action.

Group Values

The individual values of commitment, congruence, and consciousness of self comprise a major component of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996). While individual values are crucial to leadership development, leadership requires working with others in order to progress towards positive social change. The group values included in the Social Change Model of Leadership Development are collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility (HERI, 1996). The Creating Community program engages all three of the group values, specifically stemming from the collaborative model required such a wide-scale program to exist on campus.

Collaboration. The Social Change Model of Leadership Development framework defined collaboration as working with others in a common effort. It constitutes the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust (HERI, 1996). Mary shared that the most crucial aspect of the Creating Community program is "collaboration, for sure. I think my favorite thing about Creating Community is the amount of folks that are involved in the process. I feel like it really has let that intentionality in the design of it and how robust it is in the actual curriculum is what makes it a really effective program in the actual implementation stage." The Creating Community program was a collaborative charge from the beginning, spanning collaborative efforts among the Working Group and across staff and students on campus.

Starting a collaborative culture was a culture shift within Campus Life at the time. Liam described Creating Community as "the first-time departments were called upon to work together in that way. It was so siloed…it's not like collaborations didn't happen, they happened through friendships and relationships and they were great but intentional, systemic kinds of transactions weren't happening." From Brian's perspective, he recalled the Campus Life culture prior to Creating Community, "everybody was owning things and everybody thought they were experts on everything and there was no – people didn't naturally work together and they were forced to." Liam further reflected on his initiation of the collaborative approach for Creating Community, and how it aligned with his positional placement on campus. "It also presented a unique opportunity for me to demonstrate leadership around collaboration and partnership, and what that could mean."

From the staff and Working Group perspective, the beginnings of creating a culture of collaboration involved messy, yet crucial processes. While it took a while to determine the best

composition of the Working Group, Liam shared it was a turning point that that "people were working together as a springboard for other opportunities to work together on these really critical issues." Marie described the collaborative nature as crucial to the program's success, as "any one area or any one individual could not carry that out." Further, Olivia knew that the program's success depended on the investment of all on campus. "Students need to be a part of it, students need to feel like this is important because they're creating this community of care. Administrators need to know about it, like, we need to know like from a Residence Life standpoint, how can we support the students that are dealing with certain issues and what resources can we point them to." The Creating Community program requires collaboration within the Working Group and partnerships and investment among staff and students.

Collaboration among Working Group. The composition and collaboration of the Working Group is most essential to Creating Community's success. Hayden shared "pulling people from multiple areas and…keeping egos as much at bay as possible…focusing on the goal and not the ego" is crucial to the continual evolution of the program. Sean further described the importance of the Working Group to the success of the Creating Community program.

> If we measured success on the achievement of the outcomes of the program, the factors would then be a solid curriculum that reflected the assessment data and that addressed sort of the year before's stuff to get to those outcomes. And number two would be the collaboration that happened amongst the team that enabled it to implement all of those things. If either one of those things failed, the other wouldn't work. If we had a horrible curriculum, you wouldn't get to the outcomes, if you had a horrible team, you really wouldn't be able to develop and implement the curriculum in a way that would be functioning.

Marie echoed that her leadership style is collaborative, and she described the central team as "a Working Group of people who are really putting their heart and soul into achieving this overarching vision that we have for what Creating Community can be." Amara highlighted that "the Working Group is solid…even with personnel changes, they seem to have a rhythm and a synergy and a framework." The Working Group developed into a team that can work cohesively together towards a shared vision and curriculum for the Creating Community program, even through personnel changes and new directives provided by leadership.

Collaboration through writing curriculum involved trust and meaningful feedback among members of the Working Group. Demetrius described the curriculum contributions from the group, and how the professionals writing curriculum collaborate with those managing logistics for the Creating Community program. "I think that collaboration piece is so important because it does – there are people who are involved in the Working Group who have professional roles that directly show up in the curriculum and also those whose professional roles don't. So just having those different perspectives around either logistics or even the content and just being able to have that – those difficult conversations in the Working Group about how to create the best curriculum to talk about these very important conversations." Such a partnership creates shared responsibility among all within the group. Mary mentioned that despite the role people play in the group, they developed shared ownership for its success and failures. "And of course with any program, there were things that went really well and things that didn't and we had to own all of it as a group. We had to own the wins that we had and we also had to own some of our failures and figure out how to improve and share responsibility and accountability in those things and I think that was a really good process for us but also a really hard one." Noah described "what I like about that is that it is the best way to take advantage of the expertise that's in the

room." While there is time for idea generation, the Working Group also operates on deadlines. Hayden noted that when it comes to deadlines, "there is a place where people have to make decisions and for efficiency, yes, we need that structure. So, I don't want to pretend that this is all one communal – we are always in agreement, everything is open to a democratic process, no, but I do think the structure is a positive one that allows for a balance of these kinds of pieces." Sean highlighted the importance of focusing on the team development of the Working Group to ensure high performance through a changing culture, because "we haven't until recently decided that it's important for us to actually view ourselves as a team that needs to develop as a team" to ensure trust remains within the collaborative group dynamic. Within the Working Group, a staff member shared that "we can teach people what a collaborative Working Group looks like. This is the most, today, the most functional collaborative productive group and to think about this six years ago would be a stunning. It would be an impossibility that we could put this out here, this is a group of people that don't want to kill each other when they come into the room, are so annoyed that they just don't even want to come into the meeting. I think it is very, very productive."

Collaboration can be a challenge among such a diverse team. Rachel highlighted some of the challenges she encountered. "I think that a broader issue and challenge that I know has been faced by a lot of people there is kind of talking a lot about social justice but not necessarily doing it when it comes to the work among staff." She further elaborated on the importance of critically examining how work is getting done within the group under limited resources, ensuring that some "of the hard work is done up front to really ensure that when folks are working together. What does that mean, you know, what are we doing, what is some of our baggage, some of our history, what are some of my feelings about collaboration under scarcity in a time when

resources in higher education seem to be becoming more and more limited?" While the collaborative model can be difficult and require a lot of time, Noah shared "it's clear to me that that cohort of folks, that they're the heart, they're the life blood of the Creating Community experience, but how do we make sure that they continue to be valued, they continue to be supported."

The collaboration among the Working Group is what stands out as significant to the Creating Community program for many. Within the Working Group, a staff member shared

> What I think is generalizable to other schools or transferrable to other schools, is this idea that sort of multiple departments came together to create a program that no one really owns. There's some pluses and minuses to that around a program that no one owns because everyone can sort of like shirk it when they feel like it. But I think that the idea that those folks get together and spend a lot of time together creating this curriculum for nothing other than this program, there's no real – there's no medals or no – it doesn't really – it benefits those departments indirectly but it is a student service provided by multiple departments. I think that is something that Campus Life departments across the country in higher education institutions would love to see is this collaborative effort where everybody is a partner and nobody is a specific owner.

In order for the Creating Community program to model a culture of collaboration, the Working Group needed to develop a collaborative working style, which took time. This resembles how social innovations require modeling the processes they wish to portray to society, as change starts from within and reveals itself externally as an example for others.

Collaboration with staff. In addition to staff members collaborating on the Working Group, staff members also collaborate with other staff members through their training experience to become Creating Community trainers.

Those who serve as Creating Community staff trainers enjoy collaborating with other staff members and facilitating conversations with student leaders and preparing them to facilitate the curriculum for new students. A staff trainer shared that they enjoy gathering "in community to talk about these issues and to have that community feel and so I enjoyed that piece to not be in a standard divisional meeting or awkwardly running into end of in the hallway, it was a time where we actually just got to be together. And so, for me, it was a nice community building time." Another staff trainer echoed a similar sentiment, with Creating Community being "a great way to get to know [the university] and get to know my Campus Life colleagues that I don't always get to see all the time in person on a regular basis." In addition to staff partnering with each other within Campus Life, a staff trainer shared how the program has expanded to include additional departments to build a "more diverse group of facilitators…in terms of department participation."

When staff members get together during the trainer training, they partner with another Creating Community trainer to lead the training conversations with student facilitators. Staff shared they "had a different partner every year and I haven't had a pre-existing relationship with that partner up until that moment and I have now these three sort of collegial relationships." A new staff trainer shared how partnering with another colleague helped their transition to campus and to the Creating Community program, highlighting "it's been a great journey for me because that was a way for me to get to know another office, get to know another colleague across campus." Staff enjoy partnering and working together to train student facilitators.

Collaboration with students. The Creating Community program also fosters collaboration with students through curriculum design and peer-to-peer facilitation. Amara shared that in the very beginning of the program's design, Rachel "took a student's work and the student, I think, herself, was able to go to some meetings with the office that manages orientation on the Campus Life side and kind of pitched [Creating Community] and said, you know, we really need to be doing this." Olivia affirmed continued student involvement from the beginning. "I could have easily put on a program and done it my way, but it wouldn't have been meaningful in the way that it has been because there's little [campus]-isms that make sense for that community and I don't know what it's like to be a student at [the institution]. Really, really, really empowering the students to feel like this was their thing and I would do all that I could to support it and fight the battles that I needed to fight and work across departments the way that I needed to."

When reflecting on how the program began, Isaac shared that he "hopes students are still involved in the curriculum and maybe I hope even more involved." Staff still desire increasing student input surrounding curriculum development. A staff trainer shared "now that we have had so many students go through this curriculum, engaging them in the development or the editing of the curriculum, would create ownership in the program and potentially even make them more comfortable with command of the information." In addition to soliciting student input for curriculum design, student facilitators shared their interest in providing feedback to the Working Group. One student in particular shared "the facilitators would have a very beneficial impact on the curriculum if they could sit down with the writers and say like, this is what we really think would be the most beneficial." Student feedback and assessment data is a critical collaboration between the Working Group and student facilitators.

Collaboration also exists among students through the co-facilitation model shared by Orientation Leaders and Residence Life student staff leaders. Isaac shared "we decided to pair up and do more of a partnership between Orientation Leaders and Residence Life and…I think that was a really sustainable model, but also one that forced our orientation leaders and the RAs to work closely together." Isaac outlined some of the difficulties initiating the partnership, including finding time in already full training schedules, developing meaningful relationships between the two groups, and growing baseline trainings that all student facilitators experienced. Students shared their experience working across the aisle with student leaders in different positions than their own. A student facilitator shared that

> it's been incredibly helpful at certain points to have another facilitator with a completely different set of experiences and in many cases a better understanding of a lot of the material than I have you know given my own life experiences. Some of these things are not as easy for me to talk about and they can relate to someone else much better than they could relate to me. So, to have someone else to be that possibility and someone else to provide their input from a facilitator standpoint keeps it from being so narrow, I think, which can be a useful thing in a lot of these discussions.

Staff who have been involved with the program for several years have seen a stronger partnership between residence life and orientation student staff through the facilitation structure. A staff trainer noticed the "delineation, the cliqueiness between orientation leader and residence life staff was almost totally gone, I couldn't have picked out the residence life staff and the OLs very specifically and I would have been able to, I mean, easily do that the first time that I did it." In general, Creating Community program's success is based on the peer facilitation model. A

trainer elaborated on this point. "I think what makes it successful is the student facilitators, I think the fact that…they do [take it seriously], and that's something that amazes me all the time."

The collaborative component of the Creating Community program is instrumental to its effectiveness. Demetrius shared "there are so many different stakeholders involved and having those conversations with students and giving agency to our student leaders to actually have those conversations, I think there are so many different aspects of it that was very fruitful for everyone who was involved." Mary reflected that the program is an example of a "collaborative model in higher education and what collaborative leadership could look like in terms of implementing a campus-wide initiative." Many students and staff articulated how the collaborative model expands the influence of the Creating Community program beyond what any individual person or office could achieve.

Common purpose. The Social Change Model of Leadership Development defines common purpose as working with shared aims and values, facilitating the group's ability to engage in collective analysis of the issues at hand and the task to be undertaken (HERI, 1996). Because the Creating Community program works among so many different populations, Liam shared it requires intentional design to "build that capacity across so many different dynamics." Many develop the common purpose of Creating Community, including through the program's mission, across offices throughout the university, within the Working Group membership, and among volunteers engaged in the program.

The mission and purpose of Creating Community has evolved over the years, evolving within a dynamic institution and Campus Life culture. From an institutional perspective, Marie shared "we are a very diverse organization and that there are places of contention in that diversity. So, as an institution that seeks to transform our communities and be very innovative,

from a social justice lens, how are we building the capacity for students to engage in that, and how are we dealing with some of those inequities that students are coming to the table experiencing?" At the same time, she articulated that students are "wanting to be heard and are wanting to feel safe and are wanting to feel supported," making the Creating Community conversations even more salient. In addition to creating a campus community that engages in dialogue on critical issues, Liam shared the program's early focus on "grounding orientation in something really important" helps develop a common purpose between the Creating Community mission and the institution's mission.

Working toward this common purpose has been a continual evolution for the Working Group members. Noah shared some of the questions the Working Group inquired throughout the program's evolution,

> What is it that we're really wanting students to acquire? Is it a set of values that we want to inculcate in them that are a part of – that are in line with the community values? Is it transferring sort of essential information that the federal government wants us to pass on to them or what the university as a whole wants us to pass on? And so, there's been this constant balance that's come in doing that…So, yes, questions of social justice, diversity and inclusion will be a part of this curriculum and has to be because it's an essential component of what we are trying to teach undergraduates. But also what we want them to come in believing as core components of what the university values is and how they should comport themselves on campus. But we also – it's not just enough to say that, we need to provide them with some strategies for how to do that…we are literally creating [community], one [community], and in order to do that, communication has to be at the heart of that.

In addition to developing a common purpose in line with the institutional mission, the program aims to develop an interdepartmental common purpose within and beyond the Campus Life walls. From the beginning of the program, Olivia shared Residence Life, Office for Undergraduate Education (OUE), and Orientation worked together "because they were all working directly with first-year students." From the beginning, Amara echoed that it was important to establish this program "isn't just from one office, like this is not a health promotion endeavor, this is not a student leadership endeavor or an orientation endeavor, this is actually – could be a highlight for Campus Life if we can have the support of OUE and really do this well." The Creating Community "movement' helped reduce the amount of time offices were fighting each other due to the mutually beneficial work that the program introduced. Rachel highlighted this phenomenon of developing a curricular game plan to intersect the work of multiple offices to send a comprehensive message of what students need to know. The intersectional work started within Campus Life, but is starting to expand to across campus. Noah shared the current challenge of "how do we figure out what our core values on each side of this from the academic affairs perspective, versus the Campus Life and how do we bring those together so that there's a cohesive experience?" Developing a comprehensive and seamless understanding of what we expect from first-year students is the current mission of the Creating Community Working Group, which will serve as a jumping off point for the entire undergraduate experience.

In order to develop a common purpose throughout campus, the Working Group continually experiences mental exercises developing a common purpose amongst itself developing learning objectives, curriculum design, and training. Kaitlyn shared when developing curriculum, it is "helpful to have the group reminding you of the goals and what we're trying to get after." Sean shared the Working Group seeks ways to "fuse all of the areas

together," which requires occasionally taking a step back to "see a thirty-thousand-foot view." To overcome some of the challenges, Brian shared the group's constant re-orientation toward the program objectives. "What we have done and what we're committed to do is to continue to return to the outcomes, the end of the day, what do we want students to take away from this experience." In order to work in a group with such a high sense of accountability and feedback, the group dynamics are critically important. Demetrius shared the feedback loop within the Working Group is "a very consensus building conversation just hearing the different perspectives. I don't think – there was no voting or anything, it was just conversations about what we saw in the curriculum, what some of the goals were of each curricular component and how are we ensuring that the goals that we are intending to put across are actually happening and what can we do to make that happen." Further, Hayden shared they "appreciated the siloed but collective nature, because I don't feel like it was a team effort to write the curriculum, I feel like it was a team effort to create the curriculum, if you will." The Working Group continually works toward establishing a shared and common purpose for the Creating Community program through campus partnerships, outcome development, and curriculum design.

In addition to the Working Group, developing a common purpose among the student and staff volunteers helping facilitate Creating Community continues to be a crucial component of the experience. The program is a multi-tiered program, where the Working Group trains 30 staff trainers, who train 300 student facilitators, who facilitate the program for 1500 new students. The program is highly contingent on the training of staff trainers and student facilitators, and determining the best method to train the additional volunteers engaged in the Creating Community program. Sean shared an explicit description of the ripple effect and the training required.

> If you think about this, you know how when you grow up and you play telephone and the message gets watered down, the reality is that the six or eight people that are developing the curriculum know it in and out. They then pass it on to a group of 30 people, they then water it down to a group of 300 to 400 people, they then water it down to a group of 1,500 people. And so there is a loss of information but we finally mapped it so that we could really look at what is at the core for these 1,500 students so that it is pounded in so hard at this level that it's not the thing that is lost throughout. And so, you know in the first year we only focused on what was being delivered to the students and so the training was a mess of everyone. We then tightened up the training for the facilitators and then last year we tightened up the training for the trainers. And I think as we go in to next year that will even be the better.

The operation of sharing the common purpose of Creating Community beyond the Working Group with staff trainers and student facilitators requires extensive and intentional training. Staff members generally enjoy the experience of preparing student facilitators for their experience with first year students. A staff trainer shared the training of student facilitators is "the money maker, right, I think, for me. And the sad thing is that that's not really the money maker, right, like at the end of the day, the money maker is the student facilitators with the students."

While relying on so many students and staff to facilitate the curriculum comes with many risks, peer-to-peer facilitation is a powerful tool that helps expand the common purpose of the program vastly. Demetrius shared that having student leaders lead the facilitation experience for new students is "so important because I know just from my perspective…I can speak until like I turn blue in the face and I don't think I'm being heard. It's just so much more effective when students are hearing things from students…who actually believe and own what they're

communicating." He further explained that when students share "I actually – I bought into this, I believe that this is important to have a conversation about, I think this is the most exciting part of my job. And I want to share this information with you because I'm welcoming you into the [campus] experience," the message is even more salient for new members of the campus community. A student facilitator shared the importance of getting the student facilitators bought into the common purpose of Creating Community.

> I think if you really get us as facilitators, like the RAs, SAs, and OLs involved in it the first time around, so if you allow us to kind of talk it out when we're going through and like the person training us is – it's very like circular. The person training us is like allowing us to kind of really deep think, then I think we automatically are like, oh, we want to provide that for the incoming first years. I think if you get us very excited about it and like involved in it, and like for me, if you give me something that was transformative for my – you know, how I saw my values, then I think I want to be able to provide that for someone else. So, I think it really does come down to how we are introduced to the material as well.

Developing a common purpose across the institution, Working Group members, the curriculum, and the staff and student volunteers required extensive thought exercises, intentional design, and multi-tiered training methods for a holistic, congruent Creating Community program.

Controversy with civility. The final group value of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development is controversy with civility, which recognizes two fundamental realities exist within any creative group effort: that differences in viewpoint are inevitable and that such differences must air openly but with civility (HERI, 1996). The process of developing the Creating Community program started because of controversies on campus, and staff worked

together to determine how to engage students in civil ways through the controversies. Similarly, staff and students were not shy to share the challenges they encountered through the program's development, particularly within the Working Group, and how they worked through the challenges to continue forward movement.

When reflecting on the context that inspired the Creating Community program, staff recalled the process of addressing the controversies on campus, which involved the development of a campus life response that eventually shaped the Creating Community program. While administrators designed the program to address campus controversies in a civil way, the process of developing the program was filled with controversies itself. Ironically, the challenges surrounded collaboration among a variety of offices and departments across campus. One of the major conflicts surrounded finding time in the orientation schedule for the program itself. Isaac shared there was resistance in the Office for Undergraduate Education because they were not as involved in the development of the program, even though it required significant time in their orientation schedule. Terrell agreed that the tension arose from a lack of "collaboration with the College to kind of bring about [the Creating Community] existence." Isaac admitted the original team set their "sights on the end goal a little too hard, [therefore] maybe lost a little bit of the collaborative spirit." While that caused conflict within the first year, representatives from Campus Life and OUE met together the next year to reimagine how the partnership should continue in the future with greater communication throughout the program's development and resulting changes to the orientation schedule. While friction does still exist between Campus Life and the College about the amount of time that Creating Emory requires through the orientation schedule, the controversy is mitigated by increasing collaboration and partnerships.

In addition to controversies between the College and Campus Life, controversies also existed among members of the initial Working Group. Most administrators and Working Group members who were part of the initial year of Creating Community reflected on the conflict that existed within the Working Group dynamics, describing it as controversies over ownership, control, power, and unequal contributions. Marie shared that is the purpose of the Working Group, as "I don't think any one area or any one individual can carry it out. The willingness of that team to battle it out. You know, to talk about the things they agree or disagree or want to continue to pursue." While civility has entered the Working Group over the years, it was not always necessarily the case. Rachel shared that she

> really believe[s] in the importance of introducing students to a new community and being clear on what those expectations are and talking seriously about issues that they're going to encounter throughout those four years. But the way that it happened and the message ended up getting across, and how it was done, to me, are – if I were going to case study it, it would be a case study in hell, kind of, while it, for the most part, was well attended, processes can get really problematic real fast….and how dynamics can get really toxic.

Upon reflection, Liam shared that he "asked [Isaac] to help take the lead role…but the lead in collaboration with many other people and he did, but there was lots of tension there because it was really the first-time departments were called upon to work together in that way." The challenges he heard about included "who owns it, who's in charge, that's what I heard about, really sad and unfortunate isn't it? I mean…I'd rather have people arguing over fundamental premise and like the stuff that matters, but it was around like ownership."

When starting work together, members of the Working Group entered from different perspectives and approaches to their collaborative charge. Rachel shared that she

> Looked at it as an opportunity for collaboration and tried to thoroughly establish kind of a memorandum of understanding because the number of offices involved. Those efforts were kind of seen as not the way we do things in Campus Life and that we all just kind of work together. Which I think then led to folks, particularly me and my colleague, doing and being expected to do a lot of work on a pretty much all male team and then the two of us did a lot of work without a lot of appreciation.

While the team hoped to trust each other and work collaboratively towards their end goals, Amara highlighted that things got tricky "when you're working on deadline and your nerves are frayed and there are no clear expectations. So, I think it was a huge challenge to make expectations clear, to feel like everybody was pulling their fair share of the weight of creating this new thing and there was no single leader…so it was an experience in shared leadership, we learned a lot that first year."

Additional challenges included Rachel and Olivia navigating the group dynamics as women in non-director level positions among a group of male administrators of higher titles. Rachel explained that "Campus Life has many strengths when it comes to collaboration, but I think one of the challenges is the idea that folks are kind of on an equal playing field in coming together and I don't think that actually happens anywhere." Rachel further described "there's some identity things including issues particular around race and gender that played out in the dynamics and in really challenging ways that play out in any process. I think that that's, you know, there are huge issues of racism and sexism at [the institution], it's why Creating Community is a really important program. It's also why it's a really important program and it's not an issue that is only with students, it's an issue also with staff. So, those dynamics played out in that process as well, if that makes sense." Issues of power, privilege, and mixed agendas

entered the development of the Creating Community program, yet most members of the Working Group identified the significance of getting started with the initiative. Rachel shared "I also just think getting people around the table to talk about what we're putting out there around these issues was huge. I don't think that process went well, was done intentionally or in the right timing, but I think that it was important."

While the group does not shy away from explaining the controversies that existed within the first year of coming together, they learned how to navigate their differences with civility through role clarification, program outcome creation, and building an environment of trust within differing viewpoints. Sean acknowledged as the group "led into the second year we had to work – basically work through our shit with each other." The team needed to determine their specific roles within the group and how to give feedback to one another. Mary shared that "it was really hard for folks to be critical of each other, and I think it still is but in the beginning – because everybody in the room is an 'expert' on something," people were timid to share their thoughts. They had to work to "create an environment where folks could say, I'm not an expert on this, but I still have an opinion and we can work through what that means for the program, but this is how I'm receiving the information from my side of what I do." In addition to providing feedback, the group struggled with ownership, or lack of ownership of the program. Sean shared that "the reality is that the charge was we need to collaboratively work on this and why does it need one owner? And the reality is that because we were to a point that it was a collaborative effort, you could exchange people without it collapsing and we've done that."

A way the Working Group moved towards providing and receiving feedback in a civil way involved developing program outcomes and connecting feedback to the outcomes themselves. Demetrius explained the feedback process now involves "conversations about what

we saw in the curriculum, what some of the goals were of each curricular component and how are we ensuring that the goals that we are intending to put across are actually happening." Connecting back to the outcomes provided an environment of trust for members of the Working Group to share their dissenting perspectives within a civil environment. Noah highlighted that such an environment requires

> Having a collection of people who are open to criticism and having a collection of people who are willing to provide honest feedback. And I was shocked and pleased by that group having developed such a high degree of that on both ends because that doesn't usually happen, that's something that develops. And I guess that it had developed over time and I guess that in some ways thinking about this that I'm newer and they had already developed some of the trust that's needed for that to happen.

Hayden shared "how the process of change for Creating Community over the years, to me, has been refreshing because it isn't, again, the ego that I am encountering more and more in recent times in Campus Life is not as present in those meetings. I do think there are – and there's the willingness for people to actually say, I disagree…I appreciate the ability to provide feedback in a candid manner with respect, but still, in a candid manner. And I think that's something that is found in Creating Community." The group learned how to engage in controversy with civility through building trust with each other and more clearly defining their roles and responsibilities to the group.

While the Creating Community program initiated as a charge to address campus controversies through a civil and structured manner, the process of developing a collaborative team introduced another exercise in practicing controversy with civility. The Creating Community case study is a reminder that the very social issues that many social innovations seek

to address exist within their organization as well as within society, and it is important to pay attention to them while developing the socially innovative initiatives. While the curriculum continues to raise controversial conversations on campus, the Working Group, staff trainers, and student facilitators continue to find ways to exercise such controversies through civility.

Community Values

The final value set to examine within the Social Change Model of Leadership Development are community values, specifically citizenship, related to the Creating Community program. The Creating Community program is a community initiative of critical conversations, engaging students in the creation of their university. Marie shared that her lens as a senior administrator seeks to explore "how is Creating Community helping us create community and some of those principles that make up the uniqueness of the [campus] community." While the program is geared towards welcoming students to campus and introducing them to skills to serve as members of their collegiate community, it also prepares students to apply similar skillsets to their experience beyond the university walls within the broader community, preparing them to serve as active citizens in the world. While the measurement of effective preparation of campus citizens was reportedly ambiguous, the innovative curriculum and peer-to-peer education model elicited the greatest connection to developing engaged members across the campus community.

Citizenship. The Social Change Model for Leadership Development defines citizenship as the process whereby the individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership experience (HERI, 1996). While many student and staff narratives exist about a shift in campus culture since the Creating Community program began, measurements of citizenship and community development are ambiguous at

best. A staff trainer described the complexity of measuring the campus impact of Creating Community.

> I mean, it hasn't been this overt campus aha change piece but it's been a little bit more subtle, you know, in talking to colleagues and at other institutions, I think [our institution] is advantaged in being able to have these conversations and having a basepoint for it. So, you know, and I think that coinciding with the Black Lives Matter, with gay marriage coming on, amongst other different social rights issues, as well as the sharp increase of awareness of sexual violence on campus, being able to have those conversations honestly.

It is difficult to measure how Creating Community shifts student thoughts and behaviors, or how the greater societal dialogue is shaping college student behavior. A student facilitator mentioned this question.

> It's hard to say how to qualify Creating Community as a cause of any new student ideologies or the way students view a lot of these issues because it could just be a result of students generally talking about it and that being the sentiment outside of Creating Community. But I do think just the shift in – I think, in general, like social justice issues have become like the forefront of college campuses and like American college life in general just over the course of three years and I think Creating Community has evolved along with those social justice changes.

While it is difficult to attribute the program alone as the root cause of increasing dialogues across campus, students do recognize the value in placing these conversations in the orientation schedule. A student facilitator shared they "do think it's valuable in setting the stage immediately and being like, these are our values going in and it can kind of like set people on

like the right track to follow through." Another student facilitator articulated the difference between their own campus culture and those of their peers at other schools. They shared "from speaking with peers at other institutions, it's very clear that the [campus] culture is very, very different than a lot of other communities. I think that, in part, it is because we recognize how diverse of a community we are and we start having these conversations so early." Staff also recognize the limits of their ability to see a difference in student behavior. A staff trainer shared they "don't think that our students are any less capable than they were or more capable than they were before having Creating Community to have really deep, meaningful conversations around topics that can be hurtful, topics that can be enlightening."

There are also limitations to an orientation program catalyzing students to become citizens of this world. Liam asked a poignant question about the placement of the Creating Community program within new student orientation. He shared "you can have orientation and it can feel very good, but are students actually learning anything? And are we really moving the community forward?" A call to extend the program beyond the orientation experience could infiltrate the conversations more into the campus community and generate campus citizens throughout their time in college. A student facilitator shared

> Interestingly enough, I think that I like came to understand the purpose of Creating Community more not through Creating Community, but just like through my normal interactions with people I looked up to in college. I think each year just from naturally being at [college] I've come to be able to explain these topics more through my own experience in a way that I couldn't really understand just through the program alone.

Students and staff continue to brainstorm ways to more fully integrate the Creating Community brand and conversations throughout the college experience, including through the classroom and

student clubs and organizations. A staff trainer mentioned that "if we are going to transform our [campus] community, as we create this generation – well, multiple generations of students who are going to change the world, what does it mean to actually practice what we preach" and to role model investment across the entire university enterprise. Rachel connected the program back to the social issues it initially sought to address on campus, sharing that "while it is an imperfect response, it continues to remain relevant among systemic issues within society."

While the general sentiment about the amount the Creating Community program impacts student citizenship and connection to the greater community is varied and ambiguous, anecdotal stories of student and staff development provide inspiration to continue doing the work and engaging in meaningful conversations. A staff member within the second trainer focus group shared a personal interaction that motivated them to remain involved in the program, sharing "this year, actually, and I think this is the first time – a student stopped me at [a university event] to say how much he appreciated our preparation of them, particularly for that third section around sexual assault and how helpful that had been." It is difficult to tell how seriously the students take their training, and it is difficult to know exactly how the conversations unfold behind closed doors in individual groups. "But this year, I felt like students were really engaged, really took it seriously, and then the follow up comment from one student, you know, appreciating how we had helped them, and I don't think we did anything spectacular or extraordinary but he felt well equipped to lead a pretty intense and difficult conversation."

Summary of Findings

The Social Change Model for Leadership Development as a theoretical framework helped categorize and answer the research questions under investigation. The research questions included What catalyzed the institution to focus on social innovation education?, What was the

developmental process for the socially innovative initiative?, and How did the campus community respond to the socially innovation initiative? The overarching theme of change within the Social Change Model frames the evolution of the Creating Community program, while the Individual, Group, and Community values help frame how the campus community responded to the initiative over time.

What catalyzed the institution to focus on social innovation education? A series of incidents on campus in 2012 catalyzed the institution to develop the collaborative initiative of Creating Community. An increase in racial and sexual violence incidents on campus, and student demands for a stronger administrative response and action, motivated the institution to generate new systems and solutions to address the social issues and culture on campus. Through conversations with students impacted by the incidents occurring at the institution, administrators felt committed to fulfilling promises to students to determine a way the university could be more proactive in changing the institutional culture, rather than responding reactively to incidents as they arise. Additionally, new senior leadership within Campus Life called offices and departments to work together and collaborate in ways they did not systematically operate before. The combination of an increase in bias and sexual violence incidents on campus, in addition to student demands, administrative commitment, and new leadership catalyzed the institution to develop Creating Community, a socially innovation educational experiment.

What was the developmental process for the socially innovative initiative? The five-year developmental process of Creating Community required strong direction, collaborative partners, and experimental risk-taking. The assessment feedback strongly informed ongoing growth and expansion of the program, engaging students and staff in the journey. The program started with an official charge letter from Liam, asking staff members to collaborate to generate a

new student orientation initiative that proactively addressed social justice awareness and community building conversations. Offices and departments within Campus Life partnered together in ongoing ways that did not occur before, imagining a cohesive mission greater than any of their individual goals or purposes. While the creation of the Working Group was a messy process within the first year, with complications of role clarification, ownership, distribution of work, and distributing the curriculum, the team ultimately gave the program a try to see what worked and what did not within the first year.

Through assessment data, lessons from seeing the program implemented the first year, and careful examination of the curriculum, the program shifted in some significant ways upon entering the second year, including the structure of the program, the make-up of the Working Group, and the training methods for student facilitators and staff trainers. Over five years, the Creating Community program continues to shift in intentional ways, and is on the brink of expansion beyond serving solely first-year students. The upcoming expansion required a re-examination of the core outcomes of the program, so that it can intentionally expand among transfer students, graduate students, and across the four-year experience.

How did the campus community respond to the social innovation initiative? The campus community responded through individual, group, and community perspectives, through the lens of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development. Among individual values, members of the campus community reported growing in their commitment, congruence, and consciousness of self through their participation in the Creating Community program. Students and staff reported the program helped them examine and develop a commitment to their personal and professional values, their roles as staff trainers or student facilitators, and their commitment to the college student experience. Through the congruence lens, staff mentioned the start of this

program challenged administrators and staff to interrogate "who we are versus who we say we are" as an institution. Many students and staff also articulated how the curriculum aligns with their own values, and was a method for them to exercise and display such congruence. They mentioned essential components of the program including the development of congruence between institutional and personal values, curriculum design and training preparation, and facilitation of the curriculum. For consciousness of self, staff and students discussed how they showed up when working with the Creating Community program, either on the working group, amongst staff trainers, or as student facilitators. Students and staff also iterated the importance of interrogating the self before facilitating for others, and provided examples of the diversity and sexual violence baseline trainings as methods to engage in self-examination prior to facilitating such conversations with students. Generally, students and staff members reported an increasing awareness of their individual values through their contributions and engagement with the Creating Community program. They felt a stronger commitment to their personal values and job that their work was in congruence with their values, and described feeling a deeper consciousness of self, including their positionality and social identities.

While the Creating Community program aids volunteers in developing a stronger awareness of personal identities, it requires a large amount of group work and collaboration. Among the group values, students and staff members mentioned the significance of collaboration, developing a common purpose, and controversy with civility. Collaboration served as a significant component to the Working Group efforts, and it also was a critical part of the staff trainer and student facilitator training and facilitation experiences. Collaboration was on display through curriculum design, program development, training programs, and models of facilitation. Common purpose was developed among the Working Group through the continual

conversation and development of Creating Community's mission and purpose, imagining a common purpose larger than any of their own perspectives that is fitting for all, including the students. While developing a common purpose, many controversies needed to exercise civility throughout the program evolution. The program itself initiated through campus controversies surrounding racial and sexual assault incidents on campus, social issues that exist beyond the university walls in society. The Working Group also experienced struggles related to ownership of the program, control and power dynamics, and unequal contributions to the work itself. The group learned how to navigate the controversies through clarifying roles within the team, developing program outcomes that they can return to anytime they need direction, and through developing an environment of trust within differing viewpoints. Student perspectives of the program also illustrate controversy with civility, as many have different responses to the program based on their own identities and lived experiences. The program is set up to welcome differing perspectives, while introducing skill sets to help students navigate controversies between perspectives with civility. In general, the Creating Community program requires students, staff, and administrators to work together in ways they never did before the program existed on campus. It brings together colleagues to work toward a common purpose of introducing new students to critical conversations surrounding integrity, dialogue across difference, and interpersonal violence prevention, and it models the way to engage in controversies with civility, from its inception through its evolution.

The final set of values within the Social Change Model of Leadership Development include community values, specifically citizenship. Framed as a community program, the Creating Community initiative engaged critical conversations from the very beginning of its development. It was a program meant to address the most pressing issues on campus, including

racial incidents and sexual violence, reflecting some of the pressing issues in society. The curriculum evolved to empower students to engage in the creation of their campus community, and be part of the solution through learning how to dialogue across differences and intervene oppression and violence as a bystander. The program continues to evolve toward empowering students to be part of positive transformation of campus and the world, aligning the program with broader campus goals. While many mentioned the ambiguity of measuring the student citizenship impact of the Creating Community program, they clearly articulated how the peer-to-peer education model facilitates broad conversations about values congruence and integrity, dialoguing across difference, and bystander intervention, from student leaders to new students within their first week of college. The increasing desire for faculty, staff, and students to engage and expand the program illustrates the communal value of the initiative, addressing social issues through an accessible, collaborative, peer-educated approach. It demonstrates the overarching community commitment to facilitating critical dialogues about the most pressing systemic issues, within college and beyond.

Conclusion

The Creating Community program is socially innovative in how it addresses systemic issues of oppression on a college campus. Isaac shared the program is "definitely innovative, it was long overdue but ahead of its time… it was something that you're sitting there going as your developing it, this should have been created five years ago, ten years ago, why are we just now doing it? But wait, why has no one else done it already?" The innovative pieces connect to the curriculum and peer-to-peer facilitation model, driving the conversations and the modeling of citizenship within the campus community and beyond.

The curriculum, developed by the Working Group, drives the Creating Community conversation. Kaitlyn shared how the curriculum strongly influences the nature of the program itself, using integrity as a lens for students to frame "the way to exist in college." She further explained that "we talk about the hardest issues immediately and I think that's extremely brave and innovative of [the institution] to do so. I think our curriculum is edgy and innovative but we need to get it right. And so I think there's a lot of room to grow in how we're doing that but I do think we have a lot to be proud of with our curriculum."

The Working Group continually seeks intersections between the various modules, in addition to ways to make the curriculum explicitly relevant for students' lives. Demetrius shared the future directions of the curriculum will transition toward developing greater skill development and capacity within students, "giving students more practical skills to kind of be able to have agency to digest some of these very abstract concepts that they were being introduced to…transitioning towards more agency and capacity building." A student facilitator shared "most of the information currently covered is, for lack of a better word, the real world, and applicable to here and whether [students] are ready or not, they do need to hear it and get to the point that they are capable of processing it and working with it." The curriculum engages new students, student leaders, and staff members in essential dialogues as citizens of the campus community and the world.

Many staff and administrators acknowledged the strength in the peer-to-peer education model of the Creating Community program as a methodology that promotes community building and citizenship. Liam articulated "the peer-to-peer educational components of it are mission critical like when you walk around campus…when you see the small groups that are all over campus and you see that learning and that exchange happening, you know, that's what I sort of

dream about the campus looking like every day, that, right? And that's idealistic obviously but that's what we're striving for. The peer-to-peer piece is huge." Isaac shared how the peer facilitation piece was intentionally included in the Creating Community program from the very beginning. "You can't hear these messages from an administrator's mouth and take it the same way as a peer…I was a huge proponent that we can empower our student leaders, they were capable enough if we did our job in preparing them. They can have these conversations." Terrell and Demetrius further supported the peer-to-peer model, with Terrell sharing "that new students are seeing people that at least initially they are looking up to, to spearhead, you know, these conversations and these dialogues that we're having." A staff trainer reflected on the reactions received from students engaged in the program, generally sharing "we're so glad we talked about these things, we're so glad we've done this. I think student leaders are happy to facilitate those conversations and really getting students thinking about things early." The facilitated conversations among students help illuminate a vision of citizenship where participation in the program leads to engagement in the greater community. It is this type of responsibility and connection to the values of living lives of integrity, dialoguing across different identities and experiences, and shouldering the responsibility of interpersonal violence prevention that realizes the Social Change Model for Leadership Development's definition of citizenship. Such a process whereby the individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership experience of the Creating Community program (HERI, 1996).

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Social innovation serves as the overarching term that connects diversity, access, and inclusion to social change in the community, and as such scholars must explore further within the context of student affairs and higher education. Social innovation, with its focus on social problems, an interest in finding novel solutions to address social problems, and its benefits impacting greater society, is the lens that can help continue challenging systems of oppression and generate innovative solutions within higher education (Ashoka U, 2016).

Social innovation within higher education, as an emerging field, does not have many existing examples or illustrations of the process to develop cultures and environments of social innovation within higher education, much less student affairs. The Creating Community program is an excellent case study in the evolution of a socially innovative initiative within student affairs. It started with a focus on social problems on campus, an interest in finding novel solutions to address the problems, and stimulates conversations that increase knowledge, awareness, and skills to disrupt systems of oppression within and beyond the college walls. In the literature review, I framed social innovation within the public good mission of higher education, personal and social responsibility, and the future direction of higher education in the 21st century. I will connect the lessons learned through the Creating Community case study back to the historical and future movements of higher education, then align them with Anderson's

(2015) essential components to infuse social innovation within higher education to highlight recommendations for practice.

The pursuit of the public good mission of higher education can build a foundation to connect students to communities beyond institutional walls and prepare them to serve as active contributors in society through education and building campus communities (Cantor, 2004). Specifically, the development of personal and social responsibility within college students involves education and preparation of active citizens willing to engage within their communities and effectively communicate across a diversity of perspectives (Association of American Colleges & Universities). The common factors within both arenas include education and community building to prepare active contributors to society. The Creating Community program provides a model to foster peer-to-peer education and build community among a variety of groups on campus, centered around conversations in line with the AAC&U and Templeton Foundation aims of liberal education integral to personal and social responsibility (AAC&U, 2002; AAC&U, 2010; Hersh & Schneider, 2005):

1. **Striving for excellence through developing a strong work ethic:** The Creating Community structure models a team of dedicated staff and students striving for excellence to introduce personal and social responsibility to a larger audience. The program engages a small group of dedicated staff who meet year-round to develop the program, a larger group of staff to educate themselves and train student leaders to facilitate the program for others, then a larger group of student leaders to learn the material and work together to share the program with all new students on campus. As students continue their involvement with the program, they increase exposure of the work ethic required to facilitate such a large-scale program.

2. **Acting on a sense of personal and academic integrity:** The Creating Community program models a way to specifically address integrity and values to college students within their first few days on campus. The curriculum then builds on the discussion of integrity to introduce how to dialogue across differences in opinion and perspectives and how to disrupt sexual violence through interpersonal violence prevention, as explicit examples of ways to act on one's personal values and exercise congruence between one's values and actions.
3. **Recognizing and acting on the responsibility to contribute to the larger community, both on campus and beyond:** The program sets the stage for new students to recognize their responsibility to the larger community and to build skills for them to reflect on their own personal values, appreciate the diversity of community members, and intervene during acts of interpersonal violence. Most members draw connections between the curriculum and their immediate campus community, but the program's existing structure does not challenge them to make connections to communities beyond the university setting. The peer-leadership model introduces students to contributing to their campus community through peer education, and the proposed curriculum expansion more explicitly points students towards positive transformation on campus and in the world.
4. **Recognizing and acting on the obligation to take seriously the perspectives of others in forming one's own judgments as a resource for learning, work, and citizenship.** The diversity performance illuminates the experiences of students that hold a variety of marginalized identities on campus, introducing learning the perspectives of others. The peer-led conversations about building inclusive

environments and dialoguing across different perspectives is a positive model for new students to receive about the institutional culture and a model for engaged citizenship in greater communities. The plan for the program to focus on critical inquiry will provide an additional lens for students to examine the trustworthiness and credibility of sources and perspectives of others to inform their decision making within and beyond the classroom.

5. **Developing competence in ethical and moral reasoning.** Through the expansion of Creating Community throughout the undergraduate experience, students will continually reflect on their own values and decision making congruence. The student leaders who experience training around these topics have additional time to reflect on the curriculum's relevance to their student leadership positions, and exercise their ethical and moral reasoning through facilitating conversations about values and integrity with students.

The emerging field of social innovation presents numerous opportunities for incorporation into higher education and student affairs. Within student affairs, many practitioners are excited about social justice work, identifying and bringing awareness to social issues and injustices. At the institution in this study, the social issues included an increase in racial and sexual violence incidents on campus. Social innovation is the process of discovering creative solutions to address social needs in society (Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010; Phills, Deiglmeier, & Miller, 2008; Westley & McGowan, 2013). It starts with a goal to address a social need, ultimately expanding existing structures to enhance the public good. At the institution under study, the social innovation was the creation of a collaborative initiative to educate and provide skills to students to appreciate and dialogue across differences and intervene

to disrupt and prevent interpersonal violence on campus. Social innovation can be the tool to introduce and give skills to students to address the social issues they and the institution care about.

A natural parallel between social innovation and student affairs is through the Social Change Model for Leadership Development. The field is intimately familiar with the leadership model, and practitioners can use it as a model for organizational leadership towards social innovation. It can serve as a framework to introduce social innovation in the field, as social innovation requires all components of the model. It requires commitment from individuals working collectively toward transformational change. The commitment must be intrinsic for the leaders involved, and there must be a structural commitment within the organization to provide time and space for the innovation to evolve. In order for social innovations to work, they require a collection of individuals working towards a common purpose through collaboration, with the aim to grow more connected to the community and society through the leadership experience. Even the language used by the Ashoka U organization parallels with processes explained through the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, illustrated in Table 7.

The Creating Community program is socially innovative in the way that it brings together community members to collaboratively innovate within the community. A socially innovative initiative like Creating Community brings the civic mission of higher education back to the front seat of student experiences, in line with their intellectual development from the very beginning of their collegiate experience. It provides a specific structure and role for staff to foster such conversations, and if the program expands as envisioned, continued engagement across the student experience will only increase the civic mission throughout a students' tenure at the institution. A program like Creating Community also works toward the future direction of

higher education in the 21st century. Colleges and universities are called to increase educational efforts to better prepare students for active participation in a diverse democracy, develop knowledge for the improvement of communities, and to think and act upon enhancing the public good (Checkoway, 2001; Elliott, 2013; Reason, Ryder, & Kee, 2013).

Table 7
Language Parallels Between Social Innovation and Social Change

Ashoka U Exchange Language*	Social Change Model of Leadership Development Language**
Change Leader: A faculty or staff member who sees it as their mission to advance changemaking across the institution	Commitment: The psychic energy that motivates the individual to serve and that drives the collective effort; implies passion, intensity, and duration, and is directed toward both the group activity as well as its intended outcomes
Change Team: A committed, inter-disciplinary group of students, leaders, faculty, administrators, staff, and community members who help grow and strengthen the campus-wide ecosystem for social innovation	Collaboration: To work with others in a common effort; constitutes the cornerstone value of the group leadership effort because it empowers self and others through trust
Changemaker: Changemakers have the freedom, confidence, and societal support to address any social problem and drive change	Citizenship: The process whereby an individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership development activity. To be a good citizen is to work for positive change on the behalf of others and the community.
Social Innovation: New strategies, concepts, ideas, and organizations that meet social needs of all kinds and that extend and strengthen civil society	Change: The ability to adapt to environments and situations that are constantly evolving, while maintaining the core functions of the group

*Ashoka U, 2016
**Higher Education Research Institute, 1996

Many student affairs units already focus on social justice, leadership development, and civic engagement, yet very few infuse all of these functional areas together to focus on furthering contributions to the public good. Creating Community is an example of a student affairs initiative that partners within and across functional areas to create a cohesive experience for students to start imagining their responsibility to the greater campus community. The Social Change Model of Leadership Development as a theoretical framework provides leadership development processes that student affairs administrators and staff can use to collaboratively develop student changemakers. The interdisciplinary approach of social innovation education prepares educators and practitioners to enhance personal and social responsibility to serve the public good. The lens of social innovation will help practitioners to actualize the original mission of higher education, enhancing the public good through service and scholarship. Facilitating socially innovative programs like Creating Community is work that helps higher education "face outward toward work that changes the culture of the day" (Cantor, 2004, p. 18) through the education of leaders for today and the future.

Implications

Students are asking for a different way forward within higher education. They see challenges and are excited to apply their knowledge and skills to address the challenges they see within their communities (Kruger, 2016; Velasquez & LaRose, 2016). Institutions of higher education need to have a collaborative system to prepare and educate students to serve as engaged citizens and positive changemakers in their communities. College is the time that many students gain exposure to a variety of perspectives and possibilities, and a certain level of creative risk-taking is encouraged for students to explore how they perceive the world and their place within it. The field of student affairs is well positioned to discuss building community

among different student experiences and identities, and now is the opportunity to grow together during a pivotal period in history. Students are asking for this education, and in some ways, college is the most critical time to learn how to engage in communities within social challenges.

Social change is the progression toward a society that is more just, stronger, and better serving everyone (HERI 1996). Social innovation is a process, in which the desired outcome is a more just society. Grounding social innovation in programming like Creating Community introduces students to core concepts and skills of leadership, scholarship, and collaboration towards social justice, allowing them to frame their passions and work within a socially innovative framework. The current political realities have led to a world divided on many topics. If higher education is going to move toward an inclusive, stronger society for everyone, then social innovation provides a lens to learn how to navigate difficult conversations to find common ground and move forward in productive ways.

The student experience is powerful. When student leaders ask fellow students to work together, to embrace and learn from their differences, and to lead lives congruent between their values and their actions for the betterment of their communities, the conversations and expectations on campus shift. When conversations happen among students on a wide scale, they ultimately infuse into conversations with staff and faculty, finding their way to upper-level administrators eventually. The Creating Community program provides a model for change to occur from the inside out through training and preparing students to set higher expectations among fellow students, therefore setting higher expectations among administrators, faculty, and staff. This model provides an opportunity for students to shift the conversation on campus, and ultimately hold staff and faculty responsible to similar standards of leadership, scholarship, and

collaboration to benefit many communities and fulfill the civic mission of higher education in new and innovative ways.

Recommendations for Practice

As universities everywhere reconsider their roles in society and their surrounding communities (Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008), little research exists to describe how institutions of higher education can create the infrastructure to embody this new approach. The key findings from the Creating Community case study naturally align within Anderson's (2015) essential components to infuse social innovation within higher education, leadership, scholarship, and collaborative culture, while focusing on addressing systemic social issues. The top five lessons administrators need to know about infusing social innovation into student affairs and higher education include fostering means to identify social needs on campus, developing a collaborative culture, cultivating leadership among all levels of the university, recognizing the process takes time, and generating and integrating scholarship to complement practice.

Identify social needs on campus. The core concept of social innovation is addressing social needs in the world through novel approaches. The social component of social innovation is where the work should always be started, grounded, and focused. Within higher education, administrators are often aware of the social needs that exist on campus and in the world, but we tend to operate in our silos and individual units, unsure of how we can work towards solutions. At conferences, we learn how colleagues are working towards creative solutions to social issues within their own functional areas, but we seldom hear of examples where the campus community comes together, dedicated to progressing the campus forward collectively.

Specifically, administrators need time to come together to brainstorm the most pressing issues on their campus, then commit to one to three of them that they will focus on developing a

socially innovative solution. Often, this will not occur in our day-to-day work environments, so we need to create time and space for such creative thinking to occur. By bringing together people from a variety of disciplines, they can share the social issues they see from their lens, then collectively determine how to work towards addressing them. Creating Community is an example of a program that started from the recognition of multiple social issues on campus, including increases in oppression and violence on campus. Students, staff, and administrators agreed they needed to do better to change the campus culture, so they created the Creating Community working group of dedicated individuals to continually think about how to work towards creating a more socially just and inclusive community on campus. The working group also dedicated time to a retreat outside of their normal meeting spaces to think bolder and more creatively about the current social issues, so they could refine the program accordingly. Such time, space, and dedication to addressing social issues is necessary to keep them at the center of socially innovative initiatives.

Develop a collaborative campus culture. A collaborative culture is key to generating social innovation on college campuses. If institutions flip the script and start to measure success by the extent of collaboration and integration of work versus individual awards and contributions, many barriers to socially innovative work would not exist (Elliott, 2013; Garton, 2014; Smith, 2014). Social innovation works best when manifested across disciplines and organizational boundaries (Morre & Westley, 2011). It requires thinking outside of the box to brainstorm potential partners within student affairs, the university, and the greater community. It also requires humility recognizing that an individual unit cannot achieve as wide-scale and successful results like the work of a collaborative team that consists of a variety of experts. Yet,

collaboration takes time and does not naturally occur in the workspace unless specifically pursued.

To generate a culture of collaboration, I recommend chief student affairs administrators and unit leaders incentivize collaboration through program funding and acknowledgement for the difficult work it requires. A specific example could be a grant-funding process led by a collaborative committee that acknowledges socially innovative initiatives generated by a collective group of campus partners. The Creating Community program is an example of an interdisciplinary, integrative, community-based program where campus partners came together as changemakers, teaching skills to make a difference in communities. It fosters collaboration among many levels, including the working group, offices on campus, and student leaders across functional areas. A collaborative culture enables administrators and students to crate system-wide programs that work towards positive transformation.

Cultivate leadership. Leadership, through the Social Change Model of Leadership Development, is defined as "a powerful, collaborative, values-based process that results in positive change" (Komives, et al., 2005, p.xii). Leadership is a process, and effective leadership is based on collective action, shared power, and a passionate commitment to social justice (HERI, 1996). Within a culture of social innovation, leadership must stem from the grass roots and from the highest levels of an organization. Within the Creating Community program, leadership stemmed from students desiring for a different way forward after a series of discriminatory events on campus. When students are bought into an initiative, it sends a powerful message to other students that they should care as well. Administrative leaders listened and charged a group of staff to develop a proactive way to engage staff and students in a collaborative culture shift in conversations and action on campus. Through the process,

leadership developed throughout several layers of the organization, including from chief administrators providing charges for the program, leadership among the Working Group, staff trainers serving as leaders through their trainings, and student facilitators stepping up as peer leaders to facilitate the greater program. Administrators must listen to students, whether they provide feedback as activists or through surveys, the student perspective matters. Through listening to students and working with them to generate solutions to social issues on campus and beyond, leadership cultivates automatically along many spectrums within the university. This takes time, coming together to truly hear one another and mutually brainstorm creative solutions, and it models the way of genuine leadership in the service of humanity. Through Creating Community engaging numerous leaders across campus, greater social change was possible throughout campus.

Be patient and persistent. Social innovation takes time to develop and evolve. It takes time to identify a collaborative team of members outside of our normal territory, to come together and develop a common purpose, and to develop a collaborative initiative that works toward the social issues initially identified. Even once the program begins, it will not be perfect the first, or second, or even third time. Social innovations are often evolving with the needs of the community, therefore constant evaluation and restructuring are necessary for it to be impactful and remain relevant.

Some specific suggestions include allowing time to dream and think big, while also recognizing that change often happens in increments over time. Oftentimes when working towards generating solutions to social issues, many want to see results quickly, but it is often not possible for such quick resolutions to occur. A practical tip during the dreaming phase is to write down the dream, then figure out how to strategically work towards the goal overtime. This

shows when progress will occur, while also allowing the team to set realistic and tangible goals to move forward. The Creating Community working group developed such a strategic plan for the program's expansion over the next five years, allowing the team to focus on one goal at a time while keeping the broader vision in sight.

The Creating Community program required creative risk taking, approaching unchartered territory, yet growing through trial and error, collecting feedback, then improving the program each year of its existence. The process of engaging in a collaborative culture takes time, as it can be difficult and messy to cross boundaries previously untouched. The Working Group, training processes, curriculum, and the manual evolution are all examples within the Creating Community initiative that highlight how time allowed the collaborative program to improve each year.

Generate and integrate scholarship. The scholarship component of the Creating Community program is what is lacking most, mirroring trends in the field of social innovation within higher education. Little research exists explaining how social innovation infuses within higher education, particularly within student affairs. While social innovation research is limited, coursework in the field is not, so scholars and practitioners can learn from social entrepreneurship and social innovation course syllabi, and rely on assessment cycles to continually improve programs each year. The Creating Community program did not develop under any particular discipline of scholarship, but rather through multiple theories within functional areas and student development. While the program lacked a scholarly foundation, practitioners informed the development of the program through an evidence-based approach of assessment. Assessments informed the growth of the program throughout its entire existence, welcoming feedback from new students, student facilitators, and staff trainers about the

curriculum, structure, training, and materials provided. The feedback collected informed changes made each year, and provided arguments to continue expanding the program broader across greater audiences.

As the field continues to grow, and the Creating Community program continues to expand, scholars and practitioners need to generate and integrate scholarship into the conversation of social innovation within student affairs. A specific way to do so could be through the creation of case study research based on the many practices that exist and continue to increase in the field of social innovation. Until descriptive examples exist in the literature, scholars and practitioners will continue to collaborate across disciplines to guide their work without a common framework from which to work.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study stem from the newness of the field and the limited existing scholarship focused on social innovation within higher education. There is not a common, agreed upon definition of social innovation within the literature, much less within practice, so identifying and measuring impact of socially innovative initiatives is difficult. Even within the Creating Community Working Group, I am the only professional who initially identified our work as socially innovative. For other members, they easily identified our work as collaborative and innovative, addressing issues on campus, but we did not have a common framework or language from which to base our shared work.

Due to limited research or case studies of social innovation within higher education, particularly student affairs, I based the research on theories and frameworks I was familiar with as the researcher. Many social innovators frame their work from their own lens, meaning we do not have a shared baseline understanding of the field that is streamlined. Therefore, this research

study stems from theories and frameworks within student leadership and development, a lens not common among other scholars of social innovation. A common social innovation framework would be helpful for practitioners and scholars to work from.

Further, a boundary of this study involved those engaged with the program for at least two years, excluding the voices of students who only experienced it once. This boundary was intentional to draw a descriptive example of a social innovation generated within student affairs by those most familiar with it. However, it excluded the voices of those less committed to the program, who likely have a different perspective than student facilitators, staff trainers, and working group members.

Recommendations for Further Study

The opportunities for studying and examining social innovation within higher education and student affairs are boundless, due to the young age of the social innovation field. This study takes on an angle that not many people are discussing, as most social innovation measurement focuses on academic and co-curricular experiences. Student affairs practitioners and social innovation experts need to explore how the field of student affairs can contribute to the greater social innovation movement on college campuses. For example, if a campus offers coursework on social innovation, partnering the instructors with offices in student affairs to illuminate lessons learned in the classroom could be beneficial. For example, the class could connect with the Student Leadership and Service units that often discuss how to lead in an ever-changing society and take students into the community for service work, then draw parallels to lessons learned in the classroom. They could also create a social innovation student organization and learn alongside other student leaders about how to be socially innovative across majors and

disciplines, while gaining similar leadership opportunities as other clubs and organizations on campus.

Additionally, the field of social innovation within higher education would benefit from examining how scholars can measure the impact of a collective social innovation experience. From my particular study, I recommend scholars further examine how to measure citizenship development among students who experience socially innovative programs on campus. What could the measurement of citizenship look like for student participants of the Creating Community program? Further, I think an examination of student facilitator citizenship across their involvement in the Creating Community program would be enlightening. I hypothesize that students who serve as facilitators of socially innovative programs develop further through their continued engagement with the program along a variety of scales, including leadership, citizenship, and changemaking. What does it mean to measure changemaker mindset shifts within college students? How can we measure and account for such growth?

I also recommend scholars further examine how the Social Change Model of Leadership Development can contribute to the conversation about social innovation within student affairs and higher education. Practitioners extensively use the theory to investigate leadership development, but it could also apply as a framework to examine socially innovative initiatives to expand the conversation beyond academic affairs. If so, could it help student affairs offices see how they contribute to the social innovation movement in a more natural way, as opposed to hearing about the movement through the business school on campus? The theoretical framework felt like a natural fit for me to examine the Creating Community program on campus through a case study approach, so I predict it would feel natural for other student affairs practitioners and scholars as well. The leadership model's orientation toward positive social change through

individual, group, and community work is a comprehensive way to examine multi-facets of socially innovative initiatives.

As researchers enter the space of investigating and exploring social innovation within student affairs and higher education, this research reveals that advances in social innovation teaching and practice are numerous, but research is limited. Case studies are a way researchers can generate research from the practice of social innovation across higher education. Practitioners need descriptive case studies to highlight how social innovation is applicable across a variety of disciplines, not just those currently emphasized in practice and the literature.

Higher education administrators and staff are required to think boldly and innovatively to prepare and engage students in generating solutions and changes to society's pervasive social issues. As social issues within higher education, such as college access and affordability, gun violence on campus, open expression, sexual violence, and racism, continue to saturate college campuses, practitioners must explore new approaches to our work. Social innovation is an approach that can bring together previously disconnected and siloed functional areas to work collaboratively toward positive social change. Students are calling for a new normal within institutions of higher education, during a time that external organizations are also calling for a new normal within the educational system. An approach similar to Creating Community can help flip the script of higher education, encouraging and training students to talk with other students about the most pressing social issues. Concepts of leadership, scholarship, and collaboration transcend most environments within higher education, and a further examination of the engagement in socially innovative work will further equip scholars and practitioners to partner together and generate student leaders aware, knowledgeable, and skilled to work towards innovative solutions to some of the world's most pressing needs.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M. (2015). SIX global council ideas for the future: A new mission for universities? *Social Innovation Exchange.* Retrieved from http://socialinnovationexchange.org/categories/read/six-global-council-ideas-for-the-future-a-new-mission-for-universities

Anker, L., Hillery, B., Thomas, T., & Gonzalez, J. (2008). Civic engagement and inter-cultural understanding: Course-embedded community field work for first year college students. *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations, 8*(5), 49-56.

Arendt, H. (1954). *Between Past and Future.* London: Penguin.

Ashoka U. (2011). *Social entrepreneurship education resource handbook.* Arlington, VA: Ashoka U.

Ashoka U. (2014). *Trends in social innovation education.* Arlington, VA: Ashoka U.

Ashoka U. (2016)a. *Ashoka u glossary.* Retrieved from http://ashokau.org/resources/ashoka-u-glossary/

Ashoka U. (2016)b. *What we do.* Retrieved from http://ashokau.org/about/what-we-do/

Ashoka U. (2016)c. *Changemaker campus: Change your campus, change the world.* Retrieved from http://ashokau.org/programs/changemaker-campus/

Association of American Colleges and Universities (2002). *Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007). *College learning for the new global century.* Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (2010). *Core commitments: Educating students for personal and social responsibility.* Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/core_commitments/index.cfm

Association of American Colleges and Universities (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning & democracy's future.* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/crucible/Crucible_508F.pdf

Astin, H. S. (1996, July/August). Leadership for social change. *About Campus,* 4-10.

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4), 297-308.

Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence: A critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (2000). Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., Yee, J. A. (2000). How service learning affects students. *Higher Education, 144.* Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered/144

Astin, H. S., & Astin, A. W. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development guidebook* (3rd ed.). College Park, MD: The National Clearinghouse of Leadership Programs.

Barnhardt, C. L., Sheets, J. E., & Pasquesi, K. (2015). You expect "what"? Students' perceptions as resources in acquiring commitments and capacities for civic engagement. *Research in Higher Education, 56*(6), 622-644.

Below, C. L., & Tripp, K. D. (2010). Freeing the social entrepreneur. *Standford Social Innovation Review,* pp. 36 - 41. Retrieved from http://ssir.org/articles/entry/freeing_the_social_entrepreneur

Bell, N. C., Connell, J. A., & McMinn, N. E. (2011). How will the next generation change the business world? A report on a survey. *Insights into a Changing World Journal, 1*. pp. 45 - 60.

Biddix, J. P. (2010). Technology uses in campus activism from 2000 to 2008. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(6), 679-693. doi: 10.1353/csd.2010.0019

Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas.* Oxford University Press, USA.

Boston College School of Social Work (2016). Macro: Social innovation and leadership. Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/schools/gssw/academics/msw/clinical-or-macro/social-innovation.html

Bulut, C., Eren, H., & Halac, D. S. (2013). Which one triggers the other? Technological or social innovation. *Creativity Research Journal, 25*(4), 436-445. doi: 10.1080/10400419.2013.843358

Campus Compact (2015). *Who we are.* Retrieved from http://compact.org/who-we-are/

Cantor, N. (2004). Civic engagement. The university as a public good. *Liberal Education, 90*(2), 17-25.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct.* Retrieved from https://www.aau.edu/uploadedFiles/AAU_Publications/AAU_Reports/Sexual_Assault_Campus_Survey/Report%20on%20the%20AAU%20Campus%20Climate%20Survey%20on%20Sexual%20Assault%20and%20Sexual%20Misconduct.pdf

Caruso, R., Bowen, G., & Adams-Dunford, J. (2006). Student affairs and service learning: Promoting student engagement. *College Student Affairs Journal, 25*(2), 186-198.

Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 125-147.

Chickering, A. W. (2010). Our purposes: Personal reflections on character development and social responsibility in higher education. *Liberal Education, 96*(3), 54-59.

Coalition for Access, Affordability, and Success (2016). *Why the coalition.* Retrieved from http://www.coalitionforcollegeaccess.org/why.html

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing america's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., & Sullivan, W. M. (2009). Strengthening the foundation of students' excellence, integrity, and social contribution. *Liberal Education, 95*, 22-30.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2003). Leadership programs for students: CAS standards and guidelines. In CAS (Eds.), *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* (196-204). Washington, DC: Author.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2015). *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* (9th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2015). Civic engagement and service-learning programs: CAS standards and guidelines. In CAS (Eds.), *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., Burkhardt, J. C. (2000). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(1), 15-28.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Denson, N., & Bowman, N. (2013). University diversity and preparation for a global society: The role of diversity in shaping intergroup attitudes and civic outcomes. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(4), 555-570. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.584971

Dey, E. L., & Associates (2008). *Should colleges focus more on personal and social responsibility?* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/core_commitments/psrii_findings_april2008.pdf

Dey, E. L., Barnhardt, C. L., Antonaros, M., Ott, M. C., & Holsapple, M. A. (2009). *Civic responsibility: What is the campus climate for learning?* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/core_commitments/civicresponsibilityreport.pdf

DiJulio, B., Norton, M., Craighill, P., Clement, S., & Brodie, M. (2015, June). *Survey of current and recent college students on sexual assault.* Retrieved from http://kff.org/other/poll-finding/ survey-of-current-and-recent-college-students-on-sexual-assault/

Dover, G. (2011). *Social innovation and institutional work: A study of the role of place and place-making in social innovations for the "hard-to-house"* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Simon Fraser University, Canada.

Dugan, J. P. (2006). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(3), 335-343.

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study. *National Clearninghouse for Leadership Programs.* University of Maryland: American College Personnel Association Educational Leadership Foundation & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Foundation. Retrieved from http://mslreviewteam.wiki.usfca.edu/file/view/MSLReport+06.pdf

Ebersole, J. (2014). Top issues facing higher education in 2014. *Forbes.* Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnebersole/2014/01/13/top-issues-facing-higher-education-in-2014/#2969ae7a1024.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education.* Westport, CT: American Council of Education and Oryx Press.

Elliott, G. (2013). Character and impact of social innovation in higher education. *International Journal of Continuing Education & Lifelong Learning, 5*(2), 71-84.

Foreman, E. A., & Retallick, M. S. (2016). The effect of undergraduate extracurricular involvement and leadership activities on community values of the social change model. *NACTA Journal, 60*(1), 86-92.

Garton, C. (2014). Institutional infrastructure that embodies the essence of social innovation. *Trends in Social Innovation Education* (p. 90-94)*,* Arlington, VA: Ashoka U.

Goldenberg, M. (2010). Reflections on social innovation. *The Philanthropist, 23*(3), 207-219.

Goodman, H. P. (2014). The tie that binds: Leadership and liberal arts institutions' civic engagement commitment in rural communities. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 18*(3), 119-124.

Gun Violence Archive (2016). *Gun violence archive 2016.* Retrieved from http://www.gunviolencearchive.org/.

Gutmann, A. (1987). Unity and diversity in democratic multicultural education: Creative and destructive tensions. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hamrick, F. A. (1998). Democratic citizenship and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(5), 449-459.

Harbour, C. P. (2016). Civic engagement and cosmopolitan leadership. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2016*(173), 51-59.

Hartley, M. (2009). Leading grassroots change in the academy: Strategic and ideological adaptation in the civic engagement movement. *Journal of Change Management, 9*(3), 323-338. doi: 10.1080/14697010903125571

Hartley, M. (2009). Reclaiming the democratic purposes of American higher education. *Teaching and Learning, 2*(3), 11-30.

Heller, D. E. (2001). *The states and public higher education policy: Affordability, access, and accountability.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hersh, R. H., & Schneider, C. G. (2005). Fostering personal & social responsibility on college and university campuses. *Liberal Education, 91*(3), 6-13.

Higher Education Research Institute (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Hollander, E. L. (2011). Civic engagement in research universities: Leaders or followers?. *Education & Training, 53*(2-3). 166-176. doi: 10.1108/00400911111115708

Hurtado, S. (2007). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 185-196.

Irving, S. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Johnson, P. (1990). Matrix management: An organizational alternative for libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 16*(4), 222-229.

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (5th ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnson, S. (2010). *Where good ideas come from: The natural history of innovation.* New York: Penguin.

Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education, 56,* 303-324. doi 10.1007/s10734-008-9128-2

Kahne, J. E., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 738-766.

Kezar, A., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 31*(6).

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (1998). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longerbeam, S., Maniella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 6,* 593-611.

Komives, S. R., Wagner, W., & Associates (2009). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Koritz, A., & Schadewald, P. (2015). Be the change: Academics as civic professionals. *Peer Review, 17*(3), 12-15.

Kruger, K. (2016, January 5). NASPA right now – January: Thoughts and predictions for 2016. *NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://www.naspa.org/about/blog/naspa-right-now-january-thoughts-and-predictions-for-2016

Kruger, R. A. & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). New Dehli, India: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Kuh, G. (2005). Do environments matter? A comparative analysis of the impress of different types of colleges and universities on character. *Journal of College and Character,* retrieved from www.collegevalues.org/articles.cfm?a=1&id=239.

Litzky, B. E., Godshalk, V. M, & Walton-Bongers, C. (2009). Social entrepreneurship and community leadership: A service-learning model for management education. *Journal of Management Education,* 1-21. doi:10.1177/1052562909338028

Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 36-44. doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2005.090.002

Marginson, S. 2011. Higher education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly, 65*(4): 411–33.

Markham, P. N. (2014). More than winning: When students become teachers of civic engagement. *Journal of College and Character, 15*(3), 189-194.

Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review,* pp. 27 – 40. Retrieved from http://cddrl.fsi.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/2007SP_feature_martinosberg.pdf

Maurrasse, D. J. (2015). Reconstituting civic engagement for tomorrow's students. *Association of American Colleges and Universities Peer Review, 17*(3), 35.

McDonald, W. M., & Associates (2002). *Creating campus community.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation,* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2015). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology,* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: SAGE Publications.

Miller, T. L., Wesley, C. L., & Williams, D. E. (2012). Educating the minds of caring hearts: Comparing the views of practitioners and educators on the importance of social entrepreneurship competencies. *Academic of Management, 11*(3), 349-370. doi: 10.5465/amle.2011.0017

Minks, M. (2011). *Social innovation: New solutions to social problems* (Thesis). Georgetown University: Washington, D.C. Retrieved from https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/553359/minksMichaelLee.pdf?sequence=1

Moore McBride, A., & Mlyn, E. (2015). Innovation alone won't fix social problems. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 61*(21), 19.

Morse, A., Sisneros, L., Perez, Z., & Sponsler, B. A. (2016, January). *Guns on campus: The architecture and momentum of state policy action.* Retrieved from https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ECS_NASPA_report_revised_1-29.pdf.

Morse, A., Sponsler, B. A., & Fulton, M. (2015, December). *State legislative development on campus sexual violence: Issues in the context of safety.* Retrieved from https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ECS_NASPA_BRIEF_DOWNLOAD3.pdf.

Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R., & Sanders, B. (2007). *Social innovation: What it is, why it matters, and how it can be accelerated.* The Young Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Skoll_Centre/Docs/Social%20Innovation%20%20What%20it%20is,%20why%20it%20matters%20%26%20how%20it%20can%20be%20accelerated.pdf

Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation.* The Young Foundation. Retrieved from http://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/The-Open-Book-of-Social-Innovationg.pdf

National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (2016). *2016 presidential candidates' higher education proposals.* Retrieved from https://www.nasfaa.org/2016_presidential_candidates

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1989). *Points of view.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Nilsson, W., & Paddock, T. (2014). Social innovation from the inside out. *Stanford Social Innovation Review,* Retrieved from http://ssir.org/articles/entry/social_innovation_from_the_inside_out

Nickels, A., Rowland, T., & Fadase, O. (2011). Engaging undergraduate students to be agents of social change: Lessons from student affairs professionals. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 17*(1), 45-59.

O'Dell, I., Smith, M. R., & Born, J. E. (2016). The effect of pre-college involvement on leadership efficacy: Citizenship and social change behaviors among college students. *College Student Journal, 50*(1), 71-85.

Owen, J. E. (2012). *Findings from the multi-institutional study of leadership institutional survey: A national report.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs

Parker, E. I., & Pascarella, E. T. (2013). Effects of diversity experiences on socially responsible leadership over four years of college. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 6*(4), 219-230.

Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 56-65. doi:10.1016.j.jwb.2005.10.007

Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. S*tanford Social Innovation Review,* 34-43.

Quiroz, P. A. (1998). Hotbeds of activism: Locations of student protest. *Oxford University Press, 45*(2), p. 205-220. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3097244

Reason, R. D. (2011). Expanding the conversation. Perspective taking as a civic outcome of college. *Journal of College and Character, 12*(2). doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1786

Reason, R. D., Ryder, A. J., & Kee, C. (2013). Higher education's role in educating for personal and social responsibility: A review of existing literature. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2013*(164), 13-22.

Rogers, P. (2014). Why curricular advances in social entrepreneurship education matter. In Ashoka U. (Ed.), *Trends in Social Innovation* (pp. 49-56).

Samuelson, P. (1954). The pure theory of public expenditure. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 36* (4): 387–89.

Sanchez, R. G., Rodriguez Bolivar, M. P., & Lopez-Hernandez, A. M. (2012). Online disclosure of university social responsibility: a comparative study of public and private US universities. *Environmental Education Research, 19*(6), 709-746. doi:10.1080/13504622.2012.749976

Sanburn, J. (2015, October 1). These are all the college campus shootings in 2015. *Time Magazine.* Retrieved from http://time.com/4058669/northern-arizona-university-school-shootings-2015/

Sanders, B., Mulgan, G., Ali, R., & Tucker, S. (2007). Social innovation: What it is, why it matters, how it can be accelerated. *Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship.* Retrieved from http://youngfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Social-Innovation-what-it-is-why-it-matters-how-it-can-be-accelerated-March-2007.pdf

Smith, B. R. (2014). The future of social entrepreneurship research: Catalyst or inhibitor? *Trends in Social Innovation Education* (p. 74-79)*,* Arlington, VA: Ashoka U.

Smith, J. (2014). Shaping university culture for a generation of changemakers. *Trends in Social Innovation Education* (p. 105-109)*,* Arlington, VA: Ashoka U.

Smith, K. J., & Rubenson, G. C. (2005). An exploratory study of organizational structures and processes at AACSB member schools. *Journal of Education for Businesses, 80*(3), 133-138.

Social innovation (2010, August 12). Let's hear those ideas. *The Economist.* Retrieved from http://www.economist.com/node/16789766

Soria, K., Snyder, S., & Reinhard, A. P. (2015). Strengthening college students' integrative leadership orientation by building a foundation for civic engagement and multicultural competence. *Journal of Leadership Education, 14*(1), 55-71.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stanford Center for Social Innovation (2016). *Defining social innovation.* Retrieved from https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/faculty-research/centers-initiatives/csi/defining-social-innovation

Stephens, C. M., & Beatty, C. C. (2015). Leading and thriving: How leadership education can improve first-year student success. *Journal of Leadership Education, 14*(3), 119. doi:10.12806/V14/I3/T1

Stonecipher, P. (2012). The development of the leader and the spirit: Integrating the concepts toward meaning-making. *Journal of Leadership Education, 11*(2), 88-101.

Tellis, W. M. (1997). Application of a case study methodology. *The Qualitative Report, 3*(3), 1-19. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol3/iss3/1

The White House (2014, April). *Not alone: The first report of the white house task force to protect students from sexual assault.* Retrieved from https://www.notalone.gov/assets/report.pdf

The White House (2009). Office of social innovation and civic participation. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/sicp

Tjornbo, O. (2013). *The potential of mass collaboration to produce social innovation.* Social Frontiers: Waterloo Institute of Social Innovation and Resilience. Retrieved from https://www.scribd.com/doc/191799255/The-potential-of-mass-collaboration-to-produce-social-innovation

Velasquez, A., & LaRose, R. (2015). Youth collective activism through social media: The role of collective agency. *New Media & Society, 17*(6), 899-918. doi: 10.1177.1461444813518391

Watson, D. (2008). The university in the modern world: Ten lessons of civic and community engagement. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 3*(1), 43-55.

Westley, F., & Antadze, N. (2013). *When scaling out is not enough: Strategies for system change.* Social Frontiers: University of Waterloo. Retrieved from https://www.scribd.com/doc/191799315/When-scaling-out-is-not-enough-Strategies-for-system-change

Westley, F., & McGowan, F. (2013). *At the root of change: The history of social innovation.* Social Innovation Generation: University of Waterloo. Retrieved from https://uwaterloo.ca/waterloo-institute-for-social-innovation-and-resilience/research/publications-and-webinars

White, A. E. (1990). *Organizational structure and design in higher education: A literature review of organizational structures in higher education with a focus on the co-existence of academic and non-academic structures.*

Williams, J. (2016). A critical exploration of changing definitions of public good in relation to higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(4), 619. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2014.942270

Yin, R. (1993). *Applications of case study research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.

Appendix A

Recruitment Emails

A.1 Recruitment info shared with Creating Community curriculum developers

Hello,

Thank you for your work related to Creating Community! I am conducting a study to better understand social innovation in higher education with Creating Community as a case study. I am looking to talk with current or recent administrators actively involved with the development of the program.

If you would be interested in participating in a focus group interview for 60-90 minutes about your work in this initiative between now and October 1, 2016, please contact Ambra Yarbrough, Assistant Director of New Student and Transition Program at Emory at ambra.yarbrough@emory.edu.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to talking with you!

Best,

Ambra

A.2 Recruitment email shared with those setting direction for the Creating Community program

Hello,

Thank you for your investment related to the Creating Community program! I am conducting a study to better understand social innovation in higher education with Creating Community as a case study. I am looking to talk with recent and current administrators actively involved with setting the direction of the program.

If you would be interested in participating in an hour-long interview about your work in supporting and guiding this initiative between now and October 1, 2016, please contact Ambra Yarbrough, Assistant Director of New Student and Transition Program at Emory at ambra.yarbrough@emory.edu.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to talking with you!

Best,

Ambra

A.3 Recruitment email shared with staff who served as Creating Community Trainers

Hello,

Thank you for your dedication and involvement with the Creating Community program! I am conducting a study to better understand social innovation in higher education with Creating Community as a case study. I am looking to talk with staff who served as a Creating Community Trainer for at least two years.

If you would be interested in participating in a focus group interview for 60-90 minutes about your work with this program between now and October 1, 2016, please contact Ambra Yarbrough, Assistant Director of New Student and Transition Program at Emory at ambra.yarbrough@emory.edu.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to talking with you!

Best,

Ambra

A.4 Recruitment email shared with students involved with the program for at least two years as a participant (new student) and facilitator (Resident Advisor, Sophomore Advisor, or Orientation Leader)

Hello,

Thank you for your dedication and involvement with the Creating Community program! I am conducting a study to better understand social innovation in higher education with Creating Community as a case study. I am looking to talk with students who experienced the Creating Community program as a new student and also facilitated the curriculum for new students through their role as either a Sophomore Advisor, Resident Advisor, or Orientation Leader.

If you would be interested in participating in a focus group interview for 60-90 minutes about your work with this program between now and October 1, 2016, please contact Ambra Yarbrough, Assistant Director of New Student and Transition Program at Emory at ambra.yarbrough@emory.edu.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to talking with you!

Best,

Ambra

Appendix B

Interview and Focus Group Questions

First Interview and Focus Group Questions:

B.1 Interviews with Creating Community Working Group

1. Tell me about yourself and your involvement with the Creating Community program.
2. Describe the evolution of the Creating Community program from your perspective and your involvement with it. What has transpired from your perspective?
3. From your perspective, what were some of the turning points for the program broadly?
4. What motivated your initial involvement with the program?
5. Describe the group process of curriculum development within the Working Group.
6. Describe the staff response to the implementation of the Creating Community program.
7. Describe how you think the campus community has responded to the Creating Community program.
8. What factors guide the future direction of the Creating Community program?
9. Is there anything else you would like to add or questions you anticipated that I did not ask?

Concluding note to participants:

Thank you for taking the time for me to learn about your perspective with the program. Following first interviews, I will analyze the data and search for commonalities among answers. I will conduct second round focus group interviews to collect reactions and feedback to those findings.

I am also collecting documents related to the Creating Community program. If you have any personal or official documents related to the program in any phase of its development, please email them to me within the next week.

B.2 Interviews with Administrators Setting Direction for the Creating Community Program

1. Tell me about yourself and your involvement with the Creating Community program.
2. Describe the evolution of the Creating Community program from your perspective and your involvement with it. What has transpired from your perspective?
3. From your perspective, what were some of the turning points for the program broadly?
4. What motivated your leadership with the program?
5. Describe the student affairs staff response to the Creating Community program.
6. Describe how you think the campus community has responded to the Creating Community program.
7. What factors guide the future direction of the Creating Community program?
8. Is there anything else you would like to add or questions you anticipated that I did not ask?

Concluding note to participants:

Thank you for taking the time for me to learn about your perspective with the program. Following first interviews, I will analyze the data and search for commonalities among answers. I will conduct second round focus group interviews to collect reactions and feedback to those findings.

I am also collecting documents related to the Creating Community program. If you have any personal or official documents related to the program in any phase of its development, please email them to me within the next week.

B.3 Focus Group Interview with Staff Trainers

1. Tell me about yourself and your involvement with the Creating Community program.
2. Describe the evolution of the Creating Community program from your perspective and your involvement with it. What has transpired from your perspective?
3. What motivated your initial involvement with the program?
4. What was it like for you experience the Creating Community training?
5. Describe the group experience of training student facilitators for Creating Community.
6. Describe how you think the campus community has responded to the Creating Community program.
7. What factors do you think should guide the future direction of the Creating Community program?
8. Is there anything else you would like to add or questions you anticipated that I did not ask?

Concluding note to participants:

Thank you for taking the time for me to learn about your perspective with the program. Following first interviews, I will analyze the data and search for commonalities among answers. I will conduct second round focus group interviews to collect reactions and feedback to those findings.

I am also collecting documents related to the Creating Community program. If you have any personal or official documents related to the program in any phase of its development, please email them to me within the next week.

B.4 Focus Group Interview with Student Facilitators

1. Tell me about yourself and your involvement with the Creating Community program.
2. As a new student, what was it like to experience the Creating Community program during New Student Orientation?
3. Describe your experience transitioning to a facilitator of the Creating Community program? (training, teaching curriculum to new students)
4. Describe the evolution of the Creating Community program from your perspective and your involvement with it. What has transpired from your perspective?
5. Describe the group experience of facilitating the Creating Community program with new students.
6. Describe how you think the campus community has responded to the Creating Community program.
7. What factors do you think should guide the future direction of the Creating Community program?
8. Is there anything else you would like to add or questions you anticipated that I did not ask?

Concluding note to participants:

Thank you for taking the time for me to learn about your perspective with the program. Following first interviews, I will analyze the data and search for commonalities among answers. I will conduct second round focus group interviews to collect reactions and feedback to those findings.

I am also collecting documents related to the Creating Community program. If you have any personal or official documents related to the program in any phase of its development, please email them to me within the next week.

Follow Up Focus Groups:

B. 5 Creating Emory Follow Up Focus Group Questions: Staff Trainers

Curriculum

1. Some mentioned the tension in the curriculum between being prescriptive vs fostering organic experiences. As a trainer, how do you balance upholding the integrity of the curriculum while still being flexible enough to let the actual experience unfold?
2. Some brought up the importance of maintaining topic relevance from year to year. Do you think the program should focus on specific identities (mental health, socioeconomic status, race, etc.) vs. baseline training (power, privilege, oppression) vs. current issues (black lives matter, election, immigration)? How do we consider student development through curriculum creation?

Training

1. Reflect on your progression from staff member to Creating Emory training through becoming a Creating Emory trainer. What did you know as a staff member? What did you learn through the training? What did you learn as a trainer? If there were differences, how has that learning progressed throughout the years?
2. Some mentioned the need to train staff and students through baseline materials before training them as facilitators of the curriculum. Can you talk more about the process of focusing on self before we focus on facilitating for others?

Scaling

1. What are your expectations for the Creating Emory program, as it currently exists? What do you think its potential is?

2. Some mentioned the idea of creating a golden thread of Creating Emory experiences throughout all of the Campus Life programs. What would it take for all to commit to this shift in culture?
3. What pieces of the Creating Emory program do you think can be applied to other institutions?

Are there any questions that you anticipated I would ask but did not? Any other thoughts you want to share?

B.6 Creating Community Follow Up Focus Group Questions: Working Group

Getting started

1. Some people articulated there was a "sweet spot" when the program started, mentioning events on campus, a student appetite to address the incidents and demonstrate care, and administrators deciding to do something about it. Can you elaborate more on the spark that initiated Creating Emory?
2. Some talked about the idea of "throwing a dart" when talking about starting the initiative, crossing territory not crossed before. While there were a range of student and staff responses to the program, the focus was on getting the initiative started. What are your reactions to this concept?

Curriculum

1. Some mentioned the tension in the curriculum between being prescriptive vs fostering organic experiences. What are the key components of the curriculum that we want all participants to experience? Where is there room for the facilitators to bring their authentic selves to the conversation to let the experience unfold?
2. How do we plan to ensure topic relevance from year to year, from population to population? How do we consider student development through curriculum creation?
3. Some mentioned the need to train staff and students through baseline materials before we train them as facilitators of the curriculum. Can you talk more about how and why we focus on self before we focus on facilitating for others?

Controversy through collaboration / how to deal with conflict

1. How does evolving membership on the working group impact Creating Emory development?

2. Some mentioned navigating dynamics of power and privilege within the working group. How does the group navigate such dynamics when collaborating together?

Scaling

1. How does the team envision the program scaling larger, beyond first-year and transfer students?
2. What are pieces of the program that you think can be applied to other institutions?

Are there any questions that you anticipated I would ask but did not? Any other thoughts you want to share?

B.7 Creating Emory Follow Up Focus Group Questions: Student Facilitators

Experience

1. Some described Creating Emory as a "culture shock", not expecting to have those conversations right off the bat. How do you think those conversations influenced your college experience? Or did you realize all of these issues before going through the program? What are your opinions now after going through Creating Emory?
2. Reflect on your progression from new student to facilitator. What did you learn as a participant? What did you learn as a facilitator? If your knowledge advanced, what contributed to the progression?
3. Some mentioned that facilitation ranges from group to group based on the facilitators' connection to the curriculum and the program. How can we generate commitment among all facilitators, so that the commitment will illuminate to the participants?

Curriculum

1. How do you think students should be involved in the Creating Emory curriculum and program development?
2. Some mentioned the tension in the curriculum between being prescriptive vs fostering organic experiences. As a facilitator, how do you balance upholding the integrity of the curriculum while still being flexible enough to let the actual experience unfold?
3. Some mentioned the curriculum needs to balance between topics that are developmentally appropriate for college students without watering the topics down. What do you think is the appropriate balance to set the tone for the Emory experience?
4. How do we connect to all entering students through the curriculum?

Scaling

1. What are your expectations for the Creating Emory program, as it currently exists? What do you think its potential is?
2. How do you want to see the conversations continued throughout your Emory career?
3. What are pieces of the program that you think can be applied to other institutions?

Are there any questions that you anticipated I would ask but did not? Any other thoughts you want to share?

Appendix C

Creating Community Charge Letters

C.1: Initial Charge for Creating Community

Andrea, Bridget, and Mike,

As you know, Campus Life units are collaborating to make the skit night performance during Orientation, Tuesday, August 27, 2013, even more meaningful and to intentionally address health and social justice. Orientation – OSLS is already committed to providing housing and food for the actors; OMPS and OHP are covering the cost of the Director's time and providing training for the actors, OHP is providing additional content to supplement the two Issues Troupe performances as well as personnel time to develop assessment tools.

I need your help leading an initiative to further develop the health and social justice conversations during orientation. Ultimately the program we develop should provide incoming students with the tools and knowledge to reach out for help if they need to, and thereby create an environment that is safe and accepting. We also want to provide the message to students that [the university] cares about students' personal health and well-being. This initiative clearly cuts across your areas of responsibility and is an essential project following recent events on campus. I'll leave it up to you to decide how best to advance this initiative. Please report back to me with a firm plan by the end of March. Thanks in advance for your leadership on this issue.

Questions/areas to explore:

1. How do we organize ~ 160 student leaders to facilitate hour-long debrief conversations after the health and social justice pieces on Tuesday. 8/27/13?
2. Can we collaborate to utilize our RAs in primary facilitator roles and our OLs as support facilitators?

3. In light of recent events on campus, we believe it is important to have these conversations early and to collaborate to show the availability of multiple resources including professional and peer (RAs/OLs) resources.
4. In Dooley Show, SAPA, and other conversations, it has emerged that student leaders do not always feel equipped or trained to handle these conversations. Residents and communities, in turn, have felt the issues of health and social justice were not addressed well. This has been discussed particularly related to sexual assault and high risk drinking. How are we raising the capacity of student leaders?
5. Where can we go to hold these conversations immediately following the skits? (SPACE)
6. Develop an assessment strategy for this initiative.

Possible Solutions:

- OMPS to assist in planning training for student leader facilitators
- OSLS to incorporate Group Facilitation Discussions on Social Justice and Health for OLs and RL&H to re-envision training to allow RAs to be true leaders on these issues in their communities
- Campus Life to work together to support the intersections of these issues, their discussion early on for students, their intentional incorporation into student leader training, their sustainability as topics, and a layered, population-level approach.

SPACE:

- Residence Life to provide locations for students to meet with their RAs/Group after the skits
- Facilitators and extra space for the buildings without capacity to do this work

ASSESSMENT:

- Evaluation of Training = Pre/Post training assessment of discussion leaders
- After event assessment of leaders and students, opportunity for ongoing assessment to inform Orientation 2014
- Paper and pencil survey with closed-ended and open-ended questions for in-person training and the pieces
- Evaluation of orientation = survey on the night, qualitative interviews, e-mail link a few weeks post, orientation question in EBI
- Skit night survey: Paper and pencil with closed-ended and open-ended questions
- Qualitative interviews: key informants sit in on some of the conversations
- OL & RA feedback post-event
- SurveyMonkey on Listserve

FYE Evaluation

- Is there a possibility FYE could follow up with a program related to these issues that is smaller and within communities, perhaps in the Red Zone first six weeks with additional assessment?
- What does that timeline look like?
- Involvement on multiple levels (student, student leaders, staff, parents)

C.2 Response to orientation social justice education charge letter

March 27, 2013

Dear Liam,

Per your charge, we recently have collaborated with staff in the offices representing Student Leadership and Service, Health Promotion (OHP), Residence Life, and Multicultural Programs and Services to review the plans for health and social justice education during fall orientation. OHP has enlisted a graduate student who has drafted a detailed educational plan to address diversity, social justice, sexual assault prevention, alcohol risk-reduction and to challenge misperceived norms with our first-year students.

Attached is the content of the plan which will be done with Issues Troupe for the entire first-year class. We will train Orientation Leaders and Resident Advisors together before Orientation to prepare them for facilitating these critical discussions. The initial performance-based program will take place on Monday or Tuesday night of Orientation Week. Afterwards, we will do the following:

1) Orientation Leaders (OLs) will break into their groups across campus (mostly residence hall lounges, the university center and classrooms) to process with their individual orientation groups. They will then debrief again one or two days later in these small groups.

2) Resident Advisors will provide an additional activity (experiential) for their residents about one or two weeks into school, then debrief again a few weeks later.

We believe this will provide the beginning of meaningful education and dialogue that will be continued through all of our Campus Life programs and activities.

Please let us know if you would like to meet with us as a group to talk further about this plan.

Sincerely,

Bridget, Mike, Andrea

C.3 Creating Community Committee Charge

Date: Sunday, March 6, 2016 at 11:25 AM

Subject: Creating Community committee charge

March 2, 2016

Dear Ambra,

I am writing to request your continued involvement as a member of the Creating Community committee and share a vision for the program's future.

Thank you for your dedication and service as a member of the Creating Community committee. As you are aware "Creating Community" was launched in 2013 as part of our new student orientation program. As one of Campus Life's signature programs, Creating Community has introduced all first-year students to our community of care, empowering students to make healthy choices, support others to do the same, and develop a sense of self in the context of others.

Campus Life has transformed in powerful ways over the last three years. The creation of the Community Portfolio, Student Success Programs, the Respect Program, Centro Latino, MORE Mentoring, Flourish, and the Office of International Student Life, are just a few examples of the progress we have made. Although our work is far from complete, our community is nurturing a more collaborative, culturally humble, and socially just community than ever before. We have developed a new vision and mission and most recently, we identified shared values, all of which will guide us in our strategic planning process.

As we engage in the strategic planning process and re-define the center, Creating Community can and should transform in intentional ways. Creating Community must inculcate

all students regarding our campus's and Campus Life's values. To begin, the program must be broadened across the four year and graduate experience. To accomplish this will require additional resources and broader involvement from the staff and faculty community.

This year, I ask that the committee consider manageable changes for August 2016 by considering ways to more fully engage students across and about difference, address violence prevention from a comprehensive perspective, and incorporate the integrity project.

Over the next three years I ask that this committee consider the following;

- What does social justice mean on campus?
- What would an inclusive social justice curriculum on campus "look like"?
- What does it mean to be a member of the campus community?
- What sacrifices does one make to be a member of a community? How do we develop a sense of self within a larger community?
- How might Creating Community be broadened to the four year, transfer, Oxford continuee, and graduate experience?
- Who needs to be involved in order to realize these changes?
- What resources will the committee require to realize these changes?

Please confirm your interest in continuing to be involved in this committee by responding by Friday, March 11th.

Sincerely,

Marie (pseudonym)

Pronouns – she, her, hers

Division of Campus Life

Appendix D

Future Vision for Creating Community

D.1 Expansion of Creating Community Timeline

Timeline:

Semester	**Population**
Spring 2017	Re-evaluate curriculum, explore first-year opportunities, and plan for Fall 2018
Fall 2017	Undergrad: First Year, Transfer
Spring 2018	Undergrad: Spring Transfer
Fall 2018	Undergrad: First Year Oxford, Second Year, Grad: Public Health & Law Baseline
Spring 2019	
Fall 2019	Undergrad: Second Year Oxford, Third Year (Business, Nursing) Grad: Religion, Business, Nursing
Spring 2020	Undergrad: Oxford Early Graduates
Fall 2020	Undergrad: Fourth Year, Third Year Continuees Grad: Medicine, Graduate School
Spring 2021	Comprehensive assessment of all data, make recommendations for future growth

D.2 2017 Creating Community Overarching Outcomes

Critical Inquiry:

1. Describe the necessity for critical inquiry.
2. Use evidence to support a position or perspective.
3. Incorporate critical inquiry into decision making processes.

Knowledge of Self, Others, and Relationships:

1. Demonstrate self-authorship.
    a. Self-authorship "the capacity to define one's beliefs, identity, and social relations"
2. Demonstrate congruence between ethics and one's actions.
3. Analyze the interconnectedness of identities, privilege, and oppression.

Positive Transformation:

1. Advocate for positive social change.
2. Exhibit empathy and humility.