A Process Guide for Identifying and Cataloging PIT at Colleges/Universities

School for the Future of Innovation in Society
Arizona State University

Introduction

Public Interest Technology (PIT) is an emerging field that is still being defined and operationalized by practitioners and academics. It is therefore important to identify, articulate, and disseminate activities that advance PIT at colleges and universities. This Process Guide reflects a substantial amount of what we learned in our project, "Toward the PIT University." The project, funded by a 2020 PIT University Network Challenge Award, studied what three different types of institutions do in PIT across their missions. We thus hope to advance the idea that colleges and universities can turn PIT from a more ad hoc collection of projects into a more comprehensive and strategic approach.

The three institutions we studied are:

- Arizona State University (ASU, our own institution), a very large state university classified as Carnegie R1 (doctoral university - very high research activity). *US News & World Report* has recognized ASU as one of the top 50 public universities in the country and as the nation's most innovative university (seven years in a row). The *Times Higher Education* impact ranking also recognizes ASU as the top university in the US and among the top in the world in contributing to the UN Sustainable Development Goals. In its charter, ASU "assumes fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, cultural and overall health of the communities it serves."

- Howard University (HU), a private, historical black university (HBCU), classified as Carnegie R2 (doctoral university - high research activity). HU has a strong STEM tradition that includes colleges of medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy, and it is one of the world's most prestigious destinations for professionals in health, science, engineering, art, law, and education. The university is dedicated to its motto: "*Veritas et Utilitas*" - and ensures excellence in "Truth and Service" in all they do. Howard's diverse student population represents 53 states and territories, and 53 nations, and has graduated some of the most prominent Black scholars, including the first Black female vice president Kamala Harris.

- Estrella Mountain Community College (EMCC), in Avondale, AZ, is one of ten Maricopa Community Colleges (MCCCD). MCCCD is one of the largest and oldest community college districts in the United States. EMCC is currently enrolling more than 15,000 students and offers certificates and two-year associate degrees and is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). The newest of the ten colleges in MCCCD, EMCC offers more than 100 degrees and certificate programs, with specialized facilities for training students to enter manufacturing, energy, and healthcare industries.

This Process Guide will lay out how we defined and contextualized PIT for this project, the five themes we developed to categorize PIT activities at the three institutions, and our data collection and analysis process. This Guide is a companion to the three reports on each institution, which contain deeper dives into case studies of PIT activities at ASU, Howard University, and Estrella Mountain Community College.

Defining and contextualizing PIT

To identify projects that qualify as PIT within institutions of higher education, we began by compiling definitions written on various websites from the PIT University Network (PIT-UN) of institutions. Initially, we highlighted the recurring keywords, including: equity, diversity, STEM, emerging technologies, interdisciplinary, data science, innovation, sustainability, community driven, underrepresented communities, and social justice. We then developed a definition for PIT, based on some of the most recurring keywords as well as other definitions created by other scholars. We articulated the following definition:

Public Interest Technology (PIT) is an umbrella term that refers to the study and application of technological expertise - in its design, data, and delivery - to advance the public interest, generate public benefits, and/or promote the public good (See also Eaves et al. 2020; McGuinness and Schank 2021). Technology in this case includes not only "the set of capabilities to create, apply, study, and use new technologies [but also] an understanding of the core ethical, legal, policy, and societal dimensions of technological change" (Eaves et al. 2020, 1). Put perhaps most concisely, the idea behind PIT is to be able to answer, and train people to answer, the question, "how *should* we innovate?" (Parathasarathy and Guston 2019).

PIT includes best practices for human-centered design processes, product development, engineering, data science, and other new technologies that center on solving public problems in an inclusive, iterative manner while addressing inequities that may also be present. PIT activities should match good governance with the tools of technology to truly meet and serve the needs of the public. Such service often means collaborating with public interest organizations and governments to improve outcomes and better serve communities. In colleges and universities, PIT also means supporting faculty and institutional choices so that research responds better to public values and priorities (Parathasarathy and Guston 2019).

The movement toward PIT draws explicitly on the prior movement toward public interest law, which emerged in the 1960s and which fostered the development of approaches in the law to serve the poor and vulnerable and to advocate on behalf of the public. Public interest law translated into a myriad of activities and career pathways such as pro bono legal work, nonprofit law, and public advocacy. PIT also builds on the field of Responsible Innovation (RI), which understands that technology's world-shaping powers require an approach that explicitly incorporates a normative vision of values and responsibility (Guston 2014). RI often emphasizes realistic and sincere societal engagement, ethical deliberation, diversity, and openness (Steen 2021; El-Sayed 2021).

The pursuit of RI can be explicit within a university context. ASU, for example, has made a commitment to institutionalize a reflexive understanding of societal responsibility across the university (Crow and Dabars 2020; Dabars and Dwyer 2022). ASU academic leaders and scholars have institutionalized many of the contours of RI into the organizational structures and governance of the university, bridging some fundamental tensions and contradictory organizational logics that limit the contemporary research university. PIT can and should learn from this process, especially as in this moment, the professional community of PIT operates in a larger and less well-defined space. Furthermore, PIT includes governance and ethics as well as scientific and technological research and design, and thus its activities are spread across the full scope of institutions of higher education, rather than being focused in a single academic unit (such as law) for professional training.

Developing the themes

To hone our definition of PIT further, we laid out a preliminary path for categorizing diverse PIT activities across institutions of higher education. We built on the three traditionally distinguished aspects of academic work: education (broadened to learning), research (broadened to scholarship and innovation) and service (broadened to engagement). To these we added the theme of operations, to hold institutions to walking the talk of PIT, and the theme of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (JEDI), as it is central to most articulations of PIT. We elaborate on the five themes of Learning, Scholarship (research and innovation), Engagement, Operations, and JEDI below.

A. Learning

PIT learning is about training future leaders to tackle the next century's socio-technical challenges while advancing public values like sustainability, justice, human health, and the well-being of the planet and all of the creatures that live on it. PIT learning explores new ways of transmitting knowledge to diverse audiences according to their needs and priorities. It also develops the hard and soft skills needed to bring about positive change - creating solutions that will promote the public good, rather than (or in addition to) the private interest. PIT learning programs may be formal or informal, facilitating ends-oriented academic pathways, and empowering tinkerers to create a rich PIT ecosystem of curricular and co-curricular programs. Key to such programs is promoting interdisciplinarity across STEM, the social sciences, the arts, humanities, and the professions.

We divide learning into three components:

- Academics: Building curricula and structured programs in the form of courses, certificates, minors, or degrees. These programs should be interdisciplinary in orientation.
- Engagement: Creating and facilitating learning environments that engage diverse people inside and outside the institution and collaborating with government entities, non-profits, and businesses for social impact.
- Career: Providing opportunities for students to be exposed to careers in PIT through experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinics, fellowships, apprenticeships, and internships) and enabling students to see opportunities in and the growing demand for PIT (e.g., career fairs, mentorship programs, peer-to-peer learning opportunities, etc.).

Possible activities to catalog include:

- Creating curricula for undergrads/certificates/ minors/graduate programs
- Developing educational modules
- Creating stand-alone courses
- Providing training opportunities
- Conducting PIT skill-building activities
- Developing open-access tools
- Facilitating open tech and open platform access and spaces
- Enabling peer-to-peer learning
- Facilitating PIT career fairs
- Ensuring PIT-related internship opportunities
- Creating mentorship opportunities
- Providing various PIT clinics/workshops

B. Scholarship, research, and innovation

PIT scholarship, research, and innovation can place institutions at the forefront of emerging technologies that serve the public good. PIT research covers broad and interdisciplinary perspectives, from making technologies accessible, to understanding and designing ethics and policy approaches to ensure the justice and equity of the technologies produced. Technologies exist everywhere - in our homes, our workplaces, our cities, and of course in the devices we use to interact with the world around us. Emerging technologies include artificial intelligence, gene editing, smart cities, and other areas where stakes are high, outcomes are uncertain, and in which novelty is contested. Such areas warrant discussions to contextualize them with the public interest and public good in mind. The development of these technologies should also address societal challenges, being cognizant of their specific ethics, impacts, implications, and long-term social and political consequences.

Given the disciplinary breadth of PIT and its lack of identification with any one particular academic perspective (in contrast to public interest law), we identify three types of scholarship, research, and innovation: one, driven primarily by concerns from the scientific, technological, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) disciplines; two, driven primarily by concerns from the social scientific or humanistic disciplines; and three, intentionally designed as interdisciplinary or bridging the first two.

- STEM-driven: Research that addresses a specific societal problem using science and technology. Such research is often use-inspired or mission-driven by particular goals that emphasize the public interest over simple technical specifications or achievements.
- Social science and humanities-driven: Research that analyzes PIT and its STEM underpinnings from a social, ethical, legal, or cultural perspective to assess the impacts of technology on its community and society as a whole.
- Interdisciplinary-driven: Research that is explicitly designed to include both a STEM and a social/humanistic approach in order, for example, to gain leverage on the public interest, work in a more anticipatory fashion, or create a more human-centered design process.

Possible activities to catalog include:

- STEM-driven:
  - Developing technologies in collaboration with public entities, such as government organizations
  - Creating and maintaining programs along societally-driven goals or missions
- Social science and humanities-driven:
  - Researching the impacts of technologies on the community, and marginalized communities in particular
  - Creating policy briefs to assess technologies for the public interest
- Interdisciplinary:
  - Practicing the integration of social and technological research to introduce greater reflexivity and responsiveness into the development of PIT
  - Creating collectives and consortiums to assess technologies in real-time and to anticipate governing challenges and responses

C. Engagement and collaboration

PIT engagement and collaboration means advancing public values that serve the community by working in close collaboration with that community. Such PIT work ideally can develop activities that improve a community's quality of life while simultaneously cultivating knowledge and scholarship. Institutions should take some responsibility for the social, economic, and cultural health of the communities that they serve. Building extensive networks between the institution and the community will intensify engagement with PIT and will help institutional actors understand how to define public interest or public values in specific circumstances. Institutions can collaborate at multiple levels of organization, and engagements can be driven either by the various communities or by the institution itself.

- Community-driven: Engagement and collaboration occur around needs driven by the community; the institution supports the community and its members in advancing activities and technologies of interest to them.
- Institution-driven: Engagement and collaboration take place through the initiative of faculty, students, and other institutional actors who elicit the involvement of community members in participatory-action or other similar types of research, and co-produce an agenda that leads to the development or expression of public values in technology.

Possible activities to catalog include:

- Providing technical services to local governments
- Ensuring community co-ownership of technologies
- Integrating participatory methods and community consultation in technology demonstration projects
- Maintaining/convening a network of PIT institutions in the community
- Establishing collaborations with PIT-related international organizations/institutions and non-profits
- Experimenting with community-led R&D agendas, science shops, etc.

Such engagement projects can be organized and implemented according to PIT principles both domestically and abroad.

D. Operations

PIT operations provide institutional support for the development of PIT activities and their incorporation into institutional missions by reflecting on the institution as a maker, deployer, and user of technologies. A PIT institution will create PIT-inspired policies and procedures across such operations as IT and technology transfer, working toward PIT ideals along the full spectrum of institutional activities. Institutions of higher education have an important role as developers, procurers, and deployers of technologies, and they should thus maintain internal processes to assure that they protect the public interest. In much the same way that institutions of higher education change their practices as well as their curriculum to address sustainability challenges, they should do the same with respect to PIT. Three components of operations are:

- Policies and procedures: Clear institutional guidelines to support PIT through logistical, financial, operational, and other approaches, as well as metrics that might clarify and improve these approaches.
- Procurement and deployment: Reflexive understanding of what is appropriate to ensure that the interests of the institution's

community - students, faculty, and staff - are supported when the institution makes decisions involving the purchasing and deployment of new technologies and systems.

- PIT ideals: Clear expression of and commitment to PIT ideals across the wide array of institutional functions, working to unify the institution's interest and the public interest.

Possible activities to catalog include:

- Prioritizing the creation of prominent PIT-related learning and research entities
- Deploying new technologies for public purpose and not solely for commercial or branding purposes
- Enabling technologies that support access to learning and scholarship by marginalized communities
- Ensuring an equal opportunity for students and faculty to pursue PIT (compared to non-PIT activities), especially for members of marginalized groups
- Articulating policies for procurement tailored toward the public interest
- Creating and monitoring of PIT-related metrics
- Including a PIT perspective in technology transfer decisions
- Targeting engagement with public-serving entities through outreach and resources

E. Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI)

Public interest technology JEDI means centering and advancing efforts at justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion pertaining to PIT across the university. By **justice** we mean dismantling barriers to resources and opportunities in institutions, so that students, faculty, staff, and the community at large can live a full and dignified life of learning. By **equity** we mean allocating resources to ensure that everyone has equal access to these opportunities from an institutional perspective. By **diversity** we mean removing barriers to ensure equal opportunities across race, gender, class, religion, disability, LGBTQ+ identity, and other potential differences, and doing more: acknowledging and celebrating such differences. By **inclusion** we mean amplifying the voices and perspectives of those who experience more obstacles due to their identities.

JEDI can be enhanced across the four other categories of PIT by creating a culture of reciprocity to ensure the public good. JEDI can be implemented in **learning** by creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, such as introducing effective strategies and new technologies that support and advance students from underrepresented groups. JEDI can be implemented in **scholarship** by encouraging research that contributes to the advancement of equitable access and diversity within the institution and in the broader society. JEDI can be implemented in **engagement** by facilitating collaborations within and beyond the institution that address societal challenges and address the needs of disadvantaged communities, including developing new tools or approaches to enhance diverse voices. JEDI can be implemented in **operations** by ensuring not just the welfare of the diverse students, faculty, and staff but also their equal opportunities throughout the institution in recruitment, retention, access, and more.

Possible activities to catalog include:

- Understanding and teaching that technologies affect different people differently
- Working with and for marginalized groups to have their voice in technological choices, including those made by the institution
- Facilitating structured opportunities for community co-design of research agendas and strategic investments
- Creating mentorship programs for underserved communities
- Tailoring training programs for underserved communities
- Creating mechanisms that encourage PIT research with a JEDI focus
- Prioritizing investments in education and scholarship that have JEDI outcomes
- Evaluating institutional barriers and finding mechanisms to remove them
- Creating recruitment and retention protocols for underrepresented communities

Data collection process

After the design of the framework articulated above, we then began a systematic review of projects at each institution by examining each college, school, institute or (higher-level) project apparent at the institution. The largest body of research was conducted at ASU, with its 75,000 on-campus students and 16 colleges spread across 6 campuses. Our research at Howard covered activities across 10,000 students and 13 schools, and at EMCC 15,000 students and 9 schools. At each institution, data collection centered on systematically reviewing each college (if a college is present) and within each college reviewing each school and finding degrees, courses, centers, research projects, initiatives, collaboratives, and student clubs that fit into the definition of PIT. To ensure that activities also qualify in the operations category, we contacted the back-end administrators of the university, including the technology office, the office of purchasing and procurement, and the sustainability office. We then assessed "how PIT" the activities are, meaning how closely they fit the values of PIT, and compiled the fitting activities into a database. Finally, we identified key case studies that best represented each institution, while also connecting to the five themes mentioned above. Each case study followed a similar format of linkages to the theme, details of the program, community engagement, JEDI component, outcomes, outputs, and limitations.

A. Systematic review

a. Compiling a database of projects

i. The database was an Excel spreadsheet that included the following categories: theme/s, name of project, school/college, brief description of activity, connection to PIT, current activities, website, director, or principal investigator (PI) and their contacts.

ii. We then contacted the director or contact person to verify that the information on the website was up to date and that indeed the project fit our PIT definition.

iii. Projects that didn't have a response or didn't fit were then archived.

b. Interviews

Follow-up interviews of 30-45 minutes were conducted with select projects that particularly fit the criteria of the themes. The projects that seemed appropriate were then compiled into more in depth case studies.

B. Selecting and compiling case studies

We selected exemplary case studies from each institution to fit each category. Case studies that fit more than one category were preferred over others. At ASU, there are 10 case studies, with two for each category, while at Howard there are four case studies, and at EMCC there are two case studies (El-Sayed and Guston 2022a, 2022b, 2022c).

C. “How PIT” are the activities?

The database and case studies are a first approximation at compiling PIT activities, and not all of these activities represent PIT equally. We therefore created a PIT gauge to determine how much they were both in the public interest and fit the scientific and technological frame. Below are the nine key criteria used, with a total of 20 key questions used to determine the degree of PIT. The key criteria selected were inspired by the metrics used to evaluate projects in the field of responsible innovation (Wickson and Carew 2014; Stilgoe, Owen, and Macnaghten 2013; Kupper et al. 2015), interwoven with the methodology used as part of one of the courses taught at ASU in its Master of Science in Public Interest Technology. The nine criteria help gauge how PIT a project is through our assessment of its: public value, public engagement, inclusion/diversity, reflexivity, anticipation, responsiveness, openness, social impact, and technological impact.

We used the tool to assess activities across our categories of learning, scholarship, engagement, and JEDI by scoring each on a Likert scale - scored as to a great extent, somewhat, very little, and not at all - for each one of the questions. For the operations category, we used the same table but asked two additional questions: in the “openness” criterion we asked, “Do you provide ways for your community to have better access to technologies?” In the key “technology” criterion, we asked the question, “Does your institution have projects that provide broadband or other internet services to the communities you are embedded in?” (See figure 1).

This assessment is an initial gauge of “how PIT” a project is. The total score for each project is the sum of scores (0-3) given to each of nine criteria and their sub-questions, for a total maximum of 63 points. We considered a project *exemplary* if it scored 49 or above, *aspirational* if it scored 33-48, *developing* if it scored 17-32, and *unsuitable* if it scored below 17. We used the gauge to assess two of ASU’s projects, the Center on Narrative, Disinformation, and Strategic Influence and the Center for Gender Equity in Science and Technology (CGEST). The Center on Narrative, Disinformation, and Strategic Influence scored *developing*, while CGEST scored *exemplary*.

Figure 1: Key criteria for gauging how PIT a project is.

Key criteria	Points	Question (score - great extent, somewhat, very little, not at all)
Public Value	2	• Was the problem/project envisioned with the public interest in mind? • Does the project/activity continue to center the interest of a specific community?
Public Engagement	3	• Have efforts been made to give a role to societal values, perceptions, and interests in defining the problem? (Nordmann 2014) • Are there deliberative methods of engagement with the **publics**/beneficiaries? (Kupper et al. 2015) • Do the projects have models of mixed co-ownership with stakeholders/ beneficiaries?
Inclusion/ Diversity	3	• Does the project/activity incorporate issues of justice and equity? • Is the team diverse and representative? • Is the project/activity interdisciplinary?
Reflexivity	2	• Do the **actors involved** develop an awareness of their own assumptions, values, and purposes in relation to the perspectives of others? (Kupper et al. 2015) • Are **actors involved** aware of and open for reflection on their role responsibilities and accountability? (Stilgoe, Owen, and Macnaghten 2013)
Anticipation	3	• Are there mid-term and long-term social, environmental, and economic impacts and consequences of the activity- intended and unintended? (Nordmann 2014) • Have alternative technologies been considered? (Nordmann 2014) • Are ethical aspects/impacts of the practice addressed? (Kupper et al. 2015)
Responsiveness	2	• Is there an evaluation framework? (Kupper et al. 2015) • Is there a mechanism for feedback to be integrated into the project?
Openness	2	• Is the project clearly and honestly presented to the public? (Kupper et al. 2015) • Is the technology developed open source or open access?
Social impact	2	• Are there mentorship programs for students to engage in PIT? • Are there opportunities for students to intern/work in PIT beyond the institution?
Technological impact	2	• Does the project/activity center around a technology/ies? • Do you integrate technologies that serve the community of students? Staff? Faculty?
TOTAL	21	

Figure 2: Example of score for the Center on Narrative, Disinformation, and Strategic Influence

Name of Project	Key criteria and corresponding questions	To a great extent (3)	Somewhat (2)	Very little (1)	Not at all (0)	Assessment of each criterion
Center for Narrative Disinformation and Strategic Influence	Public value - Envisioned with PIT in mind	0	0	0	X	Not public facing
	Public value - Centers a community	0	0	0	X	
	Public engagement - Societal values	0	0	0	X	No public engagement, private
	Public engagement - Deliberative methods	0	0	0	X	
	Public engagement - Mixed ownership	0	0	0	X	
	Inclusion/Diversity - Justice and equity	0	0	X	0	Somewhat diverse and inclusive
	Inclusion/Diversity - Diverse team	0	X	0	0	
	Inclusion/Diversity - Interdisciplinary	X	0	0	0	
	Reflexivity - Awareness of assumptions	0	0	0	X	Little reflexivity
	Reflexivity - Responsible and accountable	0	X	0	0	
	Anticipation - Mid and long-term impacts	X	0	0	0	Somewhat anticipatory
	Anticipation - Alternative technologies	0	X	0	0	
	Anticipation - Ethical aspects	0	X	0	0	
	Responsiveness - Evaluation framework	0	X	0	0	Somewhat responsive
	Responsiveness - Mechanism for feedback	0	0	X	0	
	Openness - Honest presentation to public	0	0	X	0	Not open source or open access
	Openness - Open source and open access	0	0	0	X	
	Social impact - Mentorship	0	0	0	X	No evaluation of the social impact
	Social impact - Internship and work	0	0	0	X	
	Technological impact - Center on tech	X	0	0	0	Clear technology
	Technological impact - Serve community	0	0	0	X	
Total		3 X 3	5 X 2	3 X 1	10 X 0	
Score		9	10	3	0	**22 - Developing**

Figure 3: Example of score for the Center for Gender Equity in Science and Technology

Name of Project	Key criteria and corresponding questions	To a great extent (3)	Somewhat (2)	Very little (1)	Not at all (0)	Assessment of each criterion
Center for Gender Equality in Science and Technology (CGEST)	Public value - Envisioned with PIT in mind	X	0	0	0	Big emphasis on the public value
	Public value - Centers a community	X	0	0	0	
	Public engagement - Societal values	X	0	0	0	Somewhat engaging of the public
	Public engagement - Deliberative methods	0	X	0	0	
	Public engagement - Mixed ownership	0	0	X	0	
	Inclusion/Diversity - Justice and equity	X	0	0	0	Very inclusive/diverse
	Inclusion/Diversity - Diverse team	X	0	0	0	
	Inclusion/Diversity - Interdisciplinary	X	0	0	0	
	Reflexivity - Awareness of assumptions	X	0	0	0	Value reflexivity
	Reflexivity - Responsible and accountable	X	0	0	0	
	Anticipation - Mid and long-term impacts	X	0	0	0	Somewhat aware of being anticipatory
	Anticipation - Alternative technologies	0	0	X	0	
	Anticipation - Ethical aspects	0	X	0	0	
	Responsiveness - Evaluation framework	X	0	0	0	Very responsive and adaptive
	Responsiveness - Mechanism for feedback	X	0	0	0	
	Openness - Honest presentation to public	0	X	0	0	Not very open-sourced and open access
	Openness - Open source and open access	0	0	0	X	
	Social impact - Mentorship	0	X	0	0	Has an important social impact
	Social impact - Internship and work	X	0	0	0	
	Technological impact - Center on tech	X	0	0	0	Clear technology
	Technological impact - Serve community	X	0	0	0	
Overall		**14 X 3**	**4 X 2**	**2 X 1**	**1 X 0**	
Score		**42**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**52 - Exemplary**

The purpose of the gauge is not only to assess how exemplary a PIT project is, but it can also be used to help make projects more PIT. An exemplary PIT project aims to cover all key criteria. A PIT project should equally center **public value** and **technological impact**, and there should be a balance between the public needs and the technology deployed. A PIT project should have a **public engagement** component, where it is co-created and in close collaboration with its stakeholders, and it should also have **diverse** stakeholders and have a clear process of collaboration and community participation that is **inclusive**. The project should aim to have a positive **social impact**. A PIT project should look into the future and have mechanisms of **anticipation** for unintended consequences, as well as have an embedded process of feedback and evaluation, that includes **reflection** on one's role and responsibilities, and then consequently **responsiveness**. Finally, a PIT project should strive for **openness**, to be open source with technologies readily available for open access and re-use.

Key Takeaways

- Create a clear definition and context for PIT. Each institution can tailor a PIT definition to match their vision, mission, and goals, while ensuring its alignment with the definition developed by other institutions through the PIT-UN.
- Identify themes or clusters to organize PIT activities at the institution.
- Conduct a systematic review of candidate activities based on the definition and the themes identified.
- Consolidate activities by conducting follow-up interviews to ensure the accuracy of information and develop additional details.
- Assess how thoroughly PIT the activities are by using the above rubric.
- Ultimately, the opportunity lies in creating a larger, more inclusive, and more deeply reflective PIT community in order to encourage each institution to be even more comprehensive and strategic in their support of PIT.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a generous grant from the PIT University Network Challenge, which is funded through the support of the Ford Foundation, Hewlett Foundation, Mastercard Impact Fund, with support from the Mastercard Center for Inclusive Growth, The Raikes Foundation, Schmidt Futures and The Siegel Family Endowment.

References

Crow, Michael M. and William B. Dabars. 2020. *The Fifth Wave: The Evolution of American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dabars, William B., and Kevin T. Dwyer. 2022. "Toward institutionalization of responsible innovation in the contemporary research university : Insights from case studies of Arizona State University." *Journal of Responsible Innovation* 9(1):114-23.

Eaves, David, Ed Felten, Tara McGuinness, Deirdre K. Mulligan, and Jeremy Weinstein. 2020. "Defining public interest technology." *New America*. Accessed at: https://www.newamerica.org/pit/blog/defining-public-interest-technology.

El-Sayed, Sara. 2021. "Book review: *Power to the Public: The Promise of Public Interest Technology*, by Tara Dawson McGuinness and Hana Schank." *Journal of Responsible Innovation* 8(3):478-481.

El-Sayed, Sara, and David H. Guston. 2022a. "Public Interest Technology Case Studies: Arizona State University." School for the Future of Innovation in Society, ASU. Tempe, Arizona.

El-Sayed, Sara, and David H. Guston. 2022b. "Public Interest Technology Case Studies: Howard University." School for the Future of Innovation in Society, ASU. Tempe, Arizona.

El-Sayed, Sara, and David H. Guston. 2022c. "Public Interest Technology Case Studies: Estrella Mountain Community College." School for the Future of Innovation in Society, ASU. Tempe, Arizona.

Guston, David H. 2014. "Understanding 'anticipatory governance.'" *Social Studies of Science* 44(2):218-242.

Kupper, Frank, Pim Klaassen, Michelle Rijnen, Sara Vermeulen, and Jacqueline Broerse. 2015. "Report on the quality criteria of Good Practice Standards in RRI." *RRI Tools: Fostering Responsible Research and Innovation*. Accessed at: http://www.rri-tools.eu/documents/10182/18424/D1.3_QualityCriteriaGoodPracticeStandards.pdf/f7a1d707-5e54-48cb-949b-053dc7c6f36f.

McGuinness, Tara Dawson, and Hana Schank. 2021. *Power to the Public: The Promise of Public Interest Technology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Nordmann, Alfred. 2014. "Responsible innovation, the art and craft of anticipation." *Journal of Responsible Innovation* 1(1):87-98.

Parathasarathy, Shobita, and David H. Guston. 2019. "Colleges must play a role in bridging ethics and technology." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (13 October): B21-22.

Steen, Marc. 2021. "Slow Innovation: The Need for Reflexivity in Responsible Innovation (RI)." *Journal of Responsible Innovation* 8(2):254-60.

Stilgoe, Jack, Richard Owen, and Phil Macnaghten. 2013. "Developing a framework for responsible innovation." *Research Policy* 42:1568-80.

Wickson, Fern, and Anna L. Carew. 2014. "Quality criteria and indicators for responsible research and innovation: Learning from transdisciplinarity." *Journal of Responsible Innovation* 1(3):254-73.

Suggested citation
El Sayed, S. and Guston, D.H. A Process Guide for Identifying and Cataloging PIT at Colleges/Universities. School for the Future of Innovation in Society, ASU. Tempe, AZ, 2022.

School for the Future of Innovation in Society
Arizona State University