

Silicon Flatirons



A Center for Law, Technology, and Entrepreneurship at the University of Colorado

*Roundtable Series on Entrepreneurship, Innovation,
and Public Policy**

University Outreach and Engagement: *The Ground Is Shifting Under Our Feet*

Matt Burns, Rapporteur†

January 2013



*The Silicon Flatirons Roundtable Series on Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Public Policy is sponsored by Brad Feld, Managing Director of the Foundry Group. This is the 27th Flatirons Report. More Reports – on topics including private equity, internet governance, cloud computing, angel investing, and modern pedagogy – can be found at <http://www.siliconflatirons.com/publications.php?id=report>. Roundtable and Summit discussions further the Silicon Flatiron Center’s goal of elevating the debate around technology policy issues

† Research Fellow, Silicon Flatirons Center. Thanks also to Therese Kerfoot, Brad Bernthal, Phil Weiser, and Ben Abell for their valuable comments and edits

Executive Summary

Challenges facing higher education are acute in Colorado. Over the course of just eight years state funding of CU-Boulder's annual budget dropped from 15% in 2002 to 3.4% in 2010.¹ Moreover, technology shifts enabling on-line higher learning alternatives – ranging from massive open on-line courses offered by universities (so-called “MOOCs”)² to sites such as the Khan Academy³ – pose disruptive long-term threats to the traditional university model.

In addition to stresses felt generally across campus, law schools operate amid other challenges particular to the legal profession. The business model of law is undergoing a transformation. Demand for recent *juris doctorate* recipients has lagged.⁴ While some difficulties may be cyclical, there is a growing sense that trends – such as disaggregation of legal work to low cost providers, do it yourself automated legal solutions, and encroachment by other professionals upon traditional legal tasks – are structural shifts that will continue into the future.

Against this backdrop, as John Bennett, Executive Director of ATLAS observed, the “the ground is shifting under our feet.” That is, the traditional compact between CU-Boulder, a public university fueled by dwindling direct public support, and the public at large is undergoing a shift. Bennett's observation leads to a question of institutional adaptation. Namely, how should CU-Boulder adapt to a changed environment in which the traditional revenue model of higher education is uncertain and technology shifts enable new forms of competition for higher education? One critical dimension of CU's adaptation involves outreach and engagement. A critical question for CU-Boulder in general and Colorado Law in particular is: *what is the vision for CU-Boulder's public engagement and outreach where the ground is shifting underneath higher education's feet?*

To address this question, on July 17, 2012 the Silicon Flatirons Center convened 24 leaders from the legal, academic, and business community (collectively, “the Roundtable”) to discuss ways for the University of Colorado-Boulder and, more particularly, the Law School (“Colorado Law”) to participate in more effective outreach and engagement with the community. The main objectives of the Roundtable included exploring conceptions of university outreach; enhancing Colorado Law's understanding of how to best build platforms for meaningful outreach efforts; as well as to identify risks of outreach and engagement if the underlying platform and resources are not properly conceived and structured.

Questions concerning the balance of external engagement and ivory tower knowledge, as Anne Heinz, Dean of Continuing Education and Associate Vice-Chancellor

¹ Brittany Anas, *CU less dependent on state funds, more on donations*, THE DAILY CAMERA (Aug. 14th, 2011, 6:03 AM), http://www.dailycamera.com/cu-news/ci_18672103.

² See Laura Pappano, *The Year of the MOOC*, N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 2, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massive-open-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html?_r=0.

³ KHAN ACADEMY, <http://www.khanacademy.org>.

⁴ See Therese Kerfoot, *Law 2.0: The New Continuum of Legal Education*, SILICON FLATIRONS CTR., <http://www.siliconflatirons.com/documents/publications/report/201210Law2.0Report.pdf>.

for CU-Boulder observed, are far from new. In 1963, Clark Kerr wrote in his seminal book, *The Uses of the University*, that in founding the University of Dublin in 1854 John Henry Newman favored “liberal knowledge” since “useful knowledge was a deal of trash.”⁵ Sir Francis Bacon, writing almost 250 years earlier, thought differently. Bacon said that knowledge should be “for the benefit and use of life.”⁶ Rather than choosing sides, of course, universities typically navigate this tension as a matter of degree, trying to strike an appropriate balance between basic research that moves the frontiers of knowledge and more applied uses of teaching and external engagement. The changed environment of higher education in Colorado, however, presents important questions about the spectrum of outside engagement. Does the new environment militate in favor of more or less engagement? If academic institutions create a new compact between themselves and the communities they serve, would the State of Colorado or private interest better fund the institution? Does today’s environment suggest opportunities for engagement of a different character than in the past?

The Roundtable featured a range of perspectives on these questions. Some participants’ analyses provided fresh thinking about the vision of outreach and engagement even if they did not garner consensus of the group. Other perspectives gained wider support. In particular, three notable perspectives emerged from the July 17th Roundtable discussion.

First, the “community” toward which a university targets its outreach and engagement efforts need not be solely defined by a school’s geography. Technology allows schools to build and interact with networks spanning geographic areas. Place-based conceptions of outreach and engagement remain appropriate in some contexts. But communications tools allow higher education to increasingly look beyond the university’s immediate physical place in considering the community in which it will meaningfully interact. Groups defined by areas of expertise, for example, may be a more pronounced target community for engagement.

Second, while not all faculty will be involved in outreach and engagement, Colorado Law should support outreach and engagement by seeding experiments, evaluating the results, and deploying staged follow up funding for successes. Colorado Law Dean Phil Weiser was clear that not all faculty will or should be closely involved in external engagement efforts. For those that want to become involved, however, a challenge is to provide adequate support. One way to conceive of the Dean’s role is akin to that of an academic venture capitalist, providing support for early ideas, including potentially transformative “skunk works” ideas. Follow on funding can be used in stages for those experiments that grow and thrive over time.

Third, in indentifying opportunities for outreach and engagement, Colorado Law should consider elements of differentiation, comparative excellence, and intellectual leadership. Trevor Faure, Global General Counsel of Ernst & Young Global, and Paul Lippe, Founder and CEO of Legal OnRamp, articulated three elements that can

⁵ CLARK KERR, *THE USES OF THE UNIVERSITY* (1963).

⁶ Francis Bacon, *Preface to the Instauration Magna*, in 39 PREFACES AND PROLOGUES: TO FAMOUS BOOKS (Bartleby.com 2001), <http://www.bartleby.com/39/20.html>.

serve as a framework for evaluating engagement opportunities for Colorado Law. While Roundtable participants did not have an opportunity to fully evaluate the framework, they did discuss criteria that can be considered in determining how to allocate scarce resources. Lippe advocated that homogeneity across different law schools is undesirable and that differentiation poses competitive and intellectual advantages. Accordingly, the law school should consider outreach and engagement as a vehicle to differentiate itself from other law schools. Faure believes that Colorado Law should leverage cross-disciplinary engagement and focus upon projects in areas in which Colorado Law has or can develop comparative excellence over other institutions. In this manner, Colorado Law can identify programs in fields in which it is capable of providing national leadership.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 6 |
| Part I – The Case for Outreach and Engagement | 6 |
| A. Defining Outreach and Engagement and the Community | 6 |
| B. Why Outreach and Engagement Matters..... | 7 |
| Part II – Understanding Different Models of Engagement Platforms | 9 |
| A. Funding Models for Engagement Platforms..... | 9 |
| B. Structural Models for Law School Engagement | 9 |
| Part III – A Framework for Strategic Analysis of Engagement Opportunities..... | 10 |
| A. Challenges to Establishing Successful Outreach and Engagement Programs | 10 |
| B. Strategic Analysis Tools for Outreach and Engagement Programs | 12 |
| Conclusion | 14 |

Introduction

Carefully chosen and properly supported outreach and engagement platforms can improve a university's scholarship, student experience, and connection and contribution to the community (i.e., research, education, and problem solving, respectively). Despite significant limitations and challenges, programs that are sufficiently differentiated and that have the right leadership in place can help a university's community outreach and engagement efforts succeed. This Report presents the Roundtable's specific ideas on just how this can be achieved.

This Report proceeds in three sections below. Part I presents the case for outreach and engagement, identifying the community to which Colorado Law intends to reach out and engage. It then lays out the reasons why Colorado Law should invest time, resources, and money into outreach and engagement. Part II identifies different models of engagement platforms that are used at universities and explores the models that are appropriate for the specific goals of Colorado Law. Part III shifts the discussion to how Colorado Law should strategically analyze the engagement opportunities and choose the best path to most effectively use its resources for outreach and engagement to the greatest benefit for the community and Colorado Law.

Part I – The Case for Outreach and Engagement

A. Defining Outreach and Engagement and the Community

Outreach and Engagement is something that universities have done for quite some time. While the classic conception of the university has been as a place of high-level thought, the pursuit of Truth, and learning for learning's sake,⁷ there have long been universities that connect with their communities. Such connections take various forms but often boil down to the idea that the university has, as part of its mission, an obligation to serve its community. Outreach and engagement consists, *inter alia*, of community-facing events, inclusion of community issues and community members in scholarship, and university faculty and students leaving the campus and getting involved in the community directly.

Before discussing the merits of and techniques for outreach and engagement, Roundtable participants analyzed the community with whom Colorado Law is trying to reach out and engage. A community is something that has often been conceptualized as a group united by, among other things, a common geographic place. Universities often provide this common geographic place, but the importance of geographic unity is diminishing. Colorado Law Professor Paul Ohm disagreed with the assertion that community is place-based,⁸ suggesting that the idea of community is more complicated and rich than a purely geographic definition captures. This is partly due to the Internet and other communications technologies that allow people who may never physically meet to engage in a meaningful way.

⁷ See Ken Auletta, *Get Rich U*, THE NEW YORKER, April 30, 2012, available at http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/04/30/120430fa_fact_auletta.

⁸ Jeffrey C. Bridger & Theodore R. Alter, *The Engaged University, Community Development, and Public Scholarship*, 11 J. HIGHER ED. OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT 165 (2006).

This phenomenon, enabled by developing technology, continues to expand the definition of community. John Bennet added that, as a result, the landscape of outreach and engagement, as well as the scrutiny of its results, is going to change. In addition to adjusting to new ways to educate students, universities need to think about new ways to reach the ever-broadening community. Educational techniques are changing through technology with things like massive open online courses, or “MOOCs,” that may soon “redefine normal,” replacing the traditional residential, face-to-face education format.⁹ MOOCs are typically free courses taught entirely online that do not require enrollment in a particular institution, and thus can reach very large audiences.¹⁰ Similar changes to university outreach efforts are inevitable, especially if the community that the university is targeting is, as Professor Ohm argued, unbounded by geography.

When one untethers community from geography, many novel ways to conceptualize community emerge. Sharon Matusik, Associate Professor of Management at CU’s Leeds School of Business, suggested anchoring the idea of a community in an area of expertise rather than a geographic place. As an example for the University of Colorado, she suggested entrepreneurship as just such an area of expertise, with outreach and engagement programs aimed at people in different levels of the field. Focusing in this way will also serve to further the reputation of Colorado Law as a leader in entrepreneurship.

Even as the focus of our outreach and engagement efforts is broadened, the geographically local community remains a touchstone. Paul Lippe reminded the group that the root of universities like the University of Colorado and other land-grant universities is the intent to support the geographic community. In what might be viewed as a “back to the future” dynamic, Lippe emphasized that developing an expertise and giving back to the community was a motivating force behind President Lincoln’s support of land grant universities in the Morrill Act.¹¹ Colorado Law has the good fortune to serve and interact with a talented and vibrant community that can be a source of inspiration and energy for outreach and engagement efforts that include a geographically unlimited audience.

For any particular outreach and engagement effort, it is important that the leaders of the effort take the time to carefully define the community they are targeting. Such careful thought can ensure that the outreach and engagement effort’s resources are properly focused to maximize the positive outcome. Without that first step, the resources of the Law School will be used inefficiently.

B. Why Outreach and Engagement Matters

There are two key motivations for outreach and engagement in the Law School setting. The first is external: a demand from the communities for academia to add value. There is a perception that public universities are paid for by public dollars and therefore

⁹ Ted Strong, *UVA’s massive open online courses sees high enrollment*, THE DAILY PROGRESS (Oct. 13, 2012), <http://www2.dailyprogress.com/news/2012/oct/13/uvas-massive-open-online-courses-sees-high-enrollm-ar-2281176/>.

¹⁰ For more on MOOCs, see Antonio Regalado, *The Most Important Education Technology in 200 Years*, MIT TECHNOLOGY REVIEW (Nov. 2, 2012), <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/506351/the-most-important-education-technology-in-200-years/>.

¹¹ For a transcript of the Morrill Act, see <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=33&page=transcript>.

should return value to the public.¹² Whether or not this perception is still appropriate considering the rapidly diminishing funding from the state coffers is perhaps an open question. The second is internal; effective outreach and engagement can improve the University's product. This happens when the outreach and engagement informs and adds value to faculty research as well as when it provides beneficial educational experiences to the students who are then more valuable community members upon graduation.¹³

On the first point, the external motivation, John Bennet believes that "the ground is shifting under our feet." He analogized the situation of the legal academy to that of Youngstown Steel in 1970.¹⁴ Academic institutions need to create a new compact between themselves and the communities they serve to stave off irrelevance and extinction. There is more pressure now for universities to be accountable to their communities for their performance.¹⁵ Creating a demonstrable impact in the community will help a university answer the inevitable questions of accountability.¹⁶

On the second point, the internal motivation, the "product" consists of two things: scholarship and student experience. Outreach and engagement can help scholarship in several ways. First, it helps identify and define the "big problems" that are most appropriate for the academy to handle and that the community most needs solved. Engagement also allows academics to closely collaborate with the community, creating a synergy between academic and community problem solving. Anne Heinz, the University of Colorado Associate Vice Chancellor for Outreach and Engagement, noted that the community can benefit from the problem solving skills of the faculty and students while the way the community frames challenges across academic disciplines can help the faculty and students view the challenges in a new way.

Further, outreach and engagement can increase what Jonah Lehrer calls "conceptual blending," the horizontal idea sharing that has driven innovation in companies like 3M and Google.¹⁷ When creative people are exposed to problems or solutions outside of their regular routine, they often make connections that an equally brilliant but isolated individual might not make. This phenomenon can occur when the university engages with the community or when disparate departments within the university engage with one another.

The other "products" of the university are the students.¹⁸ Outreach and engagement helps the students in two ways. First, it helps them interact with the community that they will soon become a part of, enabling them to learn while in school how to be a more effective and valuable member of that community when they leave school. Second, it helps the students and faculty generate a network of contacts. Professor Ohm noted that when

¹² There is a public demand for accountability. See Barbara Holland, *Exploring the Challenge of Documenting and Measuring Civic Engagement Endeavors of Colleges and Universities: Purposes, Issues, Ideas*, Advanced Institute on Classifications for Civic Engagement (March 23, 2001) at 4, available at www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/pdf/holland_paper.pdf.

¹³ Joan O'C. Hamilton, *The New JD*, THE STANFORD LAWYER (June 11, 2012), <http://stanfordlawyer.law.stanford.edu/2012/06/the-new-jd/>.

¹⁴ Bennet noted that "in 1970 the finest steel in the world was made in Youngstown, Ohio... now no steel is made there."

¹⁵ Holland, *supra* note 12, at 4.

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ JONAH LEHRER, *IMAGINE: HOW CREATIVITY WORKS* 37 (2012).

¹⁸ Holland notes that some universities experience pushback from faculty members who seek evidence that engagement improves students' learning. Holland, *supra* note 12, at 3.

students are looking for work, they can reach out to a network of people they have had meaningful contacts with, and the faculty can help connect their students with employers in the community as well.

In an environment of scarce resources, outreach and engagement programs can be a net-positive for universities. For outreach and engagement programs to achieve this kind of success, it is necessary that they be designed properly. When designing an outreach and engagement programs, a university must look both at the financial support and the operational structure.

Part II – Understanding Different Models of Engagement Platforms

A. Funding Models for Engagement Platforms

Understanding the different funding models of engagement platforms and correctly identifying an outreach program as one or another is critical to having a successful and sustainable program. If the goal is to have a series of self-sustaining outreach and engagement programs, then identifying each program as self-sustaining (and thus charging enough money for the services provided to support the program) or public service (and thus seeking donors to cover the cost of providing services to others) is a key step.

The first type of support is market support where the community that benefits from the platform funds the platform. The examples presented by Mark Chandler, General Counsel of Cisco Systems, include Stanford's Director's College, CodeX project, and IP Litigation Clearinghouse. The Roundtable pointed out that the market exists in the community to support these kinds of projects because they solve problems that the private sector can't solve for itself.

The second type of support of engagement platforms is the public service model, where the community served does not provide financial support for the engagement platform. This is often because the communities served simply do not have the resources to fund the platform, as is sometimes the case with Indian law and juvenile law services. In these cases, the platforms require subsidization, whether from the government, from outside individuals with altruistic motives, and/or from the university itself.

B. Structural Models for Law School Engagement

Whether a market-supported program or a public service program, an engagement program at Colorado Law should be the place where the community goes to seek innovative solutions and to gain a greater understanding of the challenges and opportunities in the future. To deepen the insight into how best to set up outreach and engagement programs, the Roundtable examined a few existing models. These models revolve around the particular portion of the university that drives the program.

The first is the model in which different departments on campus reach out to other departments to gain from their expertise. Brad Bernthal, Associate Professor and Director of the Entrepreneurship Initiative at the Silicon Flatirons Center, called this the "Pixar" model, inspired by the intentional design of the Pixar facility in Emeryville,

California. The facility was designed to create serendipitous interactions between different groups, forcing all of the different employee groups to move through a central atrium and even going so far as to locate all of the bathrooms in one central area.¹⁹ The current example of this on campus is the BioFrontiers Institute. BioFrontiers was created 10 years ago to bring together faculty and students from multiple disciplines. These are mainly science and engineering, but also include people from the Deming Center for Entrepreneurship and the Silicon Flatirons Center. The goal is to break down barriers to allow different members of the biotech community to speak a common language and hopefully spark new ideas. Jana Watson-Capps, Associate Director at the BioFrontiers Institute, noted that BioFrontiers has been effective in achieving this goal.

The second model is the Center model, the obvious example here being the Silicon Flatirons Center. In the Center model, a distinct organization is created in the university for the purpose of supporting outreach and engagement in a particular subject area. Using the Silicon Flatirons Center as an example, the Center exists under the umbrella of Colorado Law. The Center uses the strength of the institution, in this case Colorado Law's expertise with technology law and policy, to act as the main pole of a broader tent. From there, the Center can bring in experts from the community who can expand the tent to cover issues related to the Center's point of strength.

The Center can provide, among other things, logistical support for professors seeking to participate in outreach and engagement. Professor Ohm noted that the Silicon Flatirons Center allowed him to lead a successful conference that reached out to a broader-than-expected community with a minimal amount of difficulty on his end. This assist from the Silicon Flatirons Center can allow faculty to participate in outreach more effectively and with less apprehension of taking on too much.

Both Center model programs and "Pixar" model programs can be funded through whichever funding model is appropriate. These outreach and engagement models then fall in a four-part matrix from which to choose: a market supported "Pixar model", a market supported Center, a public service "Pixar model", and a public service Center. Even if the optimal model is chosen, an outreach and engagement platform will still encounter challenges.

Part III – A Framework for Strategic Analysis of Engagement Opportunities

A. Challenges to Establishing Successful Outreach and Engagement Programs

The Roundtable recognized that there are challenges that influence Colorado Law's ability to maximize outreach and engagement. These varied from the ordinary challenges of limited funding to questions of law school rankings and program leadership.

¹⁹ "We wanted to find a way to force people to come together, to create a lot of arbitrary collisions of people." Rick Lyman, *A Digital Dream Factory in Silicon Valley; Pixar's New Digs Coddle Animators, Writers, and Tech Heads*, N.Y. TIMES (June 11, 2001), <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/11/movies/digital-dream-factory-silicon-valley-pixar-s-new-digs-coddle-animators-writers.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>.

The first group of challenges consists of “practical” challenges. They are the challenges that any organization at Colorado Law faces. Like any other initiative, outreach and engagement efforts require time and money, resources that are in high demand at Colorado Law. These issues are especially challenging in the altruistic programs identified above where some or all of the funding must be allocated from Colorado Law or acquired from outside donors. Programs without an external constituency that can support them have the challenge of guarding against any erosion of the program’s integrity and initial identity.

A further challenge is the misaligned incentives between the faculty and the outreach and engagement programs. Contributions to outreach and engagement programs are not typically significant considerations when faculty members are evaluated.²⁰ The Roundtable discussed leveraging outside collaborators (non-tenured individuals) who can add significant value and expertise as a solution to this challenge. These individuals not only alleviate the burden on Colorado Law faculty’s time, but they also are able to provide excellent information and are able to draw in a broader community.

One participant raised the issue of faculty members who are uninterested in participating in outreach and engagement in the “practical” challenge discussion. This participant pointed out that some academics prefer individual research and writing to community outreach. Dean Weiser responded that, while all of the faculty should be encouraged to consider getting involved in some form outreach and engagement, not all faculty members will or should get so involved. What is important, he explained, is for a sufficient number of faculty to be involved and that the faculty members who are involved are the ones with the right expertise and motivation.

The discussion then shifted to answering the question of how Colorado Law should be strategic about outreach and engagement. Trevor Faure supported the viewpoint that Colorado Law should be “ruthless” when making choices on programs and resources, citing Mark Chandler’s comments about Stanford’s willingness to cut support to underperforming programs. In so doing, he acknowledged that, in academia, there is a tension between allocating resources for things that are idealistically right and things that have the highest potential for success, but that, ultimately, academic institutions need to be pragmatic (like Stanford is).

Dean Weiser asserted his support for what he called “skunk works”²¹ programs: high risk-high reward programs designed to push boundaries and lead in unconventional ways. Similarly, the idea that support remains for some highly ambitious and innovative programs that may not show the certainty of success that the pragmatist might demand is important to Dean Weiser. Just as Lockheed’s Skunk Works was given seemingly impossible tasks with no certainty of success (like creating an airplane that was invisible to radar), Dean Weiser believes that there should be support and patience for programs with lofty goals rather than limiting support to programs with less ambitious but more easily achievable goals.

²⁰ David Cox & Sarena Saifer, *Challenges to Community-Higher Education Partnerships: A Call to Action, in Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* 29 (Penny A. Pasque, et al. eds., 2005).

²¹ The reference is to the Lockheed Martin’s Advanced Development Program, known as “Skunk Works,” which focuses on high risk-high reward projects that turned out some of the most impactful designs in aviation. See *Skunk Works*, LOCKHEED MARTIN, <http://www.lockheedmartin.com/us/aeronautics/skunkworks.html>.

While all of these practical challenges need to be overcome to have successful outreach and engagement programs, the Roundtable identified four fundamental challenges that must be considered when designing an outreach and engagement program.

B. Strategic Analysis Tools for Outreach and Engagement Programs

With this foundation, the Roundtable then turned to more specific considerations for strategically analyzing engagement opportunities. The discussion focused on four areas: Differentiation, Excellence, Motivation, and Leadership.

Differentiation: Where can Colorado Law differentiate itself out of law school homogeneity?

There are a number of other law schools and universities generally hosting and developing new outreach and engagement programs. As noted in Part I, the geographic definitions of community are becoming less critical, such that even more distant universities can engage with people in Colorado. Geographic differentiation is no longer sufficient; it is not assumed there will be community engagement merely by virtue of being the best (or only) game in town. Colorado Law's outreach and engagement programs must differentiate themselves both in quality and in subject matter.

Silicon Flatirons, for example, differentiates itself by focusing on a few subject areas (Telecommunications Policy, Privacy, and Entrepreneurship). Focusing on these areas helps differentiate Silicon Flatirons for two reasons. First, they are less common as focus areas in law schools. Second, they are areas of particular strength within our faculty and, by virtue of Boulder's thriving high-tech startup scene, within our geographic community. Partly as a result of this choice of focus area, Silicon Flatirons has achieved positive differentiation. When designing outreach and engagement programs in the future, the program should aim to be the easy answer when a community member asks the question "where do I go for...?"

Excellence: In what areas can Colorado Law be the best in the world and the best in the region?

In some areas, Colorado Law has the capacity to be the best in the world. In other areas, strong international programs have been established already. Colorado's natural and historic areas of strength are natural resources, environmental, and water law as well as Indian law. Colorado Law, and Colorado Law's previous dean, the late David Getches, have long embodied excellence in those areas. In honor of that legacy, Colorado Law's Center in that area – previously known as the Natural Resources Law Center – is being renamed as the "Getches-Wilkinson Center for Natural Resources, Energy, and the Environment."

One participant noted that being selective in the areas in which Colorado Law looks to achieve excellence is important. Having too many priorities leads to a lack of excellence in any single area. The law school has limited resources, both in terms of money and faculty time. In essence, if Colorado Law tries to be a jack-of-all-trades with respect to outreach and engagement programs, it will soon find that it is a master of none, failing to achieve excellence in even a single area. It is preferable to be excellent in a few areas than to be broadly mediocre since the success of outreach and engagement programs depends greatly on the enthusiasm of the participants on all sides. Mediocrity rarely creates enthusiasm.

Motivation: How can Colorado Law create the incentives to motivate the right faculty members to be passionate about outreach and engagement?

Outreach and engagement programs at Colorado Law rely on the initiative of the faculty members involved in the programs. These faculty members have many responsibilities, often with direct impacts on tenure and promotion. For sustainable participation by faculty, incentive alignment is key. Finding professors who want to champion a particular area and care about reputation, influence, and scholarship in that particular area will drive higher-quality programs create positive and lasting outreach and engagement opportunities.

In tandem with identifying these professors, the institution must provide a structure where there are institutional incentives for participation²² and such participation is made easy, desirable, and not intimidating for faculty interested in engaging with the community. Dean Weiser identified the institution's goal in this context as giving larger value and meaning to the work of the faculty. He emphasized normalizing outreach and engagement for the faculty as an important form of service and removing obstacles that inhibit it.

As noted above, one participant identified a barrier here. Some members of the faculty are more interested in topics that are not of great interest to the larger community and as such their academic interests would not be suited for community outreach and engagement. Further, some are natural introverts who are best suited for other types of academic work.²³ As Dean Weiser pointed out, it is not critical that all faculty participate in outreach and engagement programs, but rather that a sufficient number of properly suited faculty participate.

Leadership: The Institution as the Champion

The success of outreach and engagement programs, especially in the early stages, depends heavily on the program's leader. Jana Watson-Capps pointed out that community outreach and engagement is most effective when the leader of the outreach effort is passionate about it. While this ties back to the questions of motivation above, it also means finding the right faculty members (regardless of incentives) to participate in outreach. Without the right leadership, outreach and engagement programs will lose traction in the community (or never gain it) and slowly die off.

As a number of Roundtable participants agreed, the ultimate goal for outreach and engagement efforts is to create an institutional presence that transcends a star leader. Dean Weiser used the analogy of the Dean as a venture capitalist, giving support to a number of programs and getting behind those that take off. Venture capitalists invest in a number of different startup businesses, often as much because of the entrepreneurs as the business idea itself. When the idea gains traction and is ready to scale up, the venture capitalist will invest further money and resources (including his or her own time and advice) to help the business scale beyond what the entrepreneur can bootstrap his or herself. Eventually, the business

²² Jeffrey C. Bridger & Theodore R. Alter, *The Engaged University, Community Development, and Public Scholarship*, 11 J. HIGHER ED. OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT 163, 172 (2006).

²³ See *Id.* at 175.

grows to the point that the entrepreneur can leave and pass the business on to the next generation. The business that was once inseparable from the original entrepreneur now thrives without him or her.

Similarly, the Dean sees his role as seeding the ideas for engagement projects and getting behind the enthusiastic faculty. When the project gains traction and is ready to expand, the law school can provide resources to drive that expansion with the goal of creating a program that transcends the original leadership. This transition is critical because it allows the program to be sustainable over the long term, surviving and thriving when the original leadership moves on to start another program.

Conclusion

The Roundtable's discussion leads to the conclusion that properly supported outreach and engagement platforms can improve a university's scholarship and student experience while benefitting the community. There are significant challenges to establishing successful university outreach and engagement programs, but the reward of overcoming these challenges is worth the effort. Creating outreach and engagement programs that are sufficiently differentiated and led by the right people will help improve the odds that university's community engagement efforts will thrive.

Appendix A
Outreach and Engagement Roundtable – Attendees

| | | |
|---------|--------------|---|
| Brad | Bernthal | University of Colorado |
| John | Bennett | ATLAS – University of Colorado |
| Kristen | Carpenter | University of Colorado |
| Mark | Chandler | Cisco Systems |
| Francis | Draper | University of Colorado |
| Trevor | Faure | Ernst & Young |
| Dale | Hatfield | Silicon Flatirons |
| Anne | Heinz | University of Colorado |
| Harry | Horowitz | University of Colorado |
| DJ | Jackson | University of Colorado |
| Therese | Kerfoot | Silicon Flatirons |
| Paul | Lippe | Legal OnRamp |
| Sharon | Matusik | University of Colorado |
| Peter | Nichols | Trout, Raley, Montañó, Witwer & Freeman, P.C. |
| Anna | Noschese | Silicon Flatirons |
| Paul | Ohm | University of Colorado |
| Scott | Peppet | University of Colorado |
| Colene | Robinson | University of Colorado |
| Harry | Surden | University of Colorado |
| James | Thompson | Office of Senator Bennet |
| Keri | Ungemah | University of Colorado |
| Jill | VanMatre | ATLAS – University of Colorado |
| Jana | Watson-Capps | BioFrontiers |
| Phil | Weiser | University of Colorado |