Conrad, Clifton F. and Trani, Eugene P. "Challenges Met, Challenges Facing the Modern University and its Faculty." In Faculty Responsibility in Contemporary Society, edited by Clyde Wingfield. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1990, pp. 1-25.

1

Challenges Met, Challenges Facing The Modern American University And Its Faculty

Clifton F. Conrad
Eugene P. Trani

At the end of the twentieth century, the American university looms as a beacon on the landscape of contemporary American society. While not without its critics, the university is celebrated for its contributions to the quality of life both in the United States and throughout the world. Most especially, the university is admired for its contributions to the advancement of knowledge, which have immeasurably enriched the quality of human life; for its pivotal role in the education of millions of people to engage more fully in cultural, economic, social, and civic life; and for its willingness to assume a vital role—through teaching, research, and service—in the advancement of civilization.

Notwithstanding its stature and influence, the modern American university faces formidable challenges—challenges that strike at its purposes and responsibilities, its quality and integrity, and its basic values. In part, these challenges, both for the institution and its faculty, are rooted in the contemporary environment, but in a deeper sense, they are grounded in the historical development of American universities as multipurpose institutions that have responded vigorously to an intricate web of demands and opportunities presented by the larger society. An inquiry into the current challenges facing the American university and its faculty requires a historical understanding of how universities and their faculties have come to be so deeply enmeshed in the affairs and life of society.

Development of the American University and its Faculty

There were some heroic efforts to build universities before the Civil War, including the initiatives of Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia. But not until the last half of the nineteenth century did the university movement begin to take root. In no small measure, universities were inspired by the German univer-

sities and an "ivory tower" view of the university that emphasized learning and discovery for their own sake. However, as American society became more urban, industrialized, and specialized—in the throes of the industrial revolution—public demand grew for institutions that would provide the trained personnel, knowledge, expertise, and services that would contribute directly to the development of society. Whether through the reorganization of existing colleges or the establishment of new institutions, universities responded energetically to the needs and demands of American society.

The German universities substantially affected the development of American universities during the last half of the nineteenth century. Lured by the reputations of the great German universities—such as Halle, Gottingen, and Berlin—nearly ten thousand Americans studied in German universities during the nineteenth century. Many of these Americans, who were to return to the United States and become faculty members themselves, were impressed with German emphases on pure scientific scholarship that stressed the disinterested search for truth, on specialized training within academic departments, on the centrality of the graduate school, on the university as a haven from society, and on German academic practices.[1] In turn, they sought to adapt the German university model to the American.[2]

Notable among those who attempted to transplant German ideals onto American soil was Henry Tappan who, as president of the University of Michigan from 1852-63, was largely unsuccessful—because of a midwestern distrust of pure learning and research indifferent to utilitarian considerations. Yale University offered the first Ph.D. degree in 1961, but not until the establishment of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 was a major American university dedicated to advanced learning and the training of scholars in the German tradition.[3] Under the leadership of Daniel Coit Gilman, Johns Hopkins offered advanced work in the arts and sciences leading to the Ph.D. degree, developed specialized departments of knowledge, established the Ph.D. as

the preferred credential for the emerging profession of university teaching and, above all, fostered the idea of a university as an intellectual community committed to advanced learning and pure scientific scholarship.

In adapting the German university to America, Johns Hopkins had a widespread influence on the development of the American university in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.[4] Most of the emerging American universities—private and public alike—had a commitment to a graduate faculty in the arts and sciences; to specialized knowledge organized around academic departments; to the academic career resting on the attainment of the Ph.D. degree; and to the "spirit" of a university dedicated to advanced learning and research—all of which characterized Johns Hopkins.[5] And yet, while the university ideal as expressed at Johns Hopkins influenced many institutions and even had a few imitators (notably Clark University), this ivory tower vision did not prove responsive to the immediate needs of American society.[6] The American ideal of a university and the role of its faculty were increasingly shaped more by the demands of the larger society than by the German model.

As American society became less agrarian and more industrial in the last half of the nineteenth century, public pressures grew on universities and their faculties to meet the utilitarian needs of the expanding society. Stimulated by the federal government and increased state support, state universities eagerly sought ways to transform themselves into institutions more responsive to society, especially through developing new fields of study and providing research directly benefiting society.

In 1862, Congress passed the Morrill Federal Land-Grant Act, which provided grants to each state for the support of at least one college "where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts."[7] These grants, coupled with annual state appropriations after the

Civil War, led to the steady growth of the major state universities in the last several decades of the nineteenth century. The most visible of these institutions—Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota—were located in the Midwest, but the state university idea spread throughout the nation.

At the heart of the state university concept was an "all-purpose" curriculum offering the full range of vocations to students from all walks of life. Cornell University—which was only partly a land-grant institution—embodied not only the vocationalism of the land-grant movement, but also the emphases on science, technology, and "spirit of scholarship" of the university movement.[8] From the day it opened in 1868, Cornell captured the spirit of its founder, Ezra Cornell: "I would found an institution in which any person can find instruction in any study."[9] Partly in response to student interest in modern and applied fields of study, Cornell early established faculties and programs in a wide variety of fields—from history and social science to agriculture, mining, commerce and trade, and engineering.[10] In contrast to European universities—with their emphasis on the medieval professions of law, medicine, and theology—the American state universities and many leading private universities gradually introduced the younger professions at the undergraduate level: education, social work, business, agriculture, journalism, and architecture.

The emerging service ideal (indeed, responsibility) of the American university and its faculty further expanded at the turn of the century, when the spirit of Progressivism pervaded the United States. This movement, a massive effort to effect social improvement through government action, led many universities to build bridges to society by expanding their activities beyond traditional campus boundaries. The notion of service to society through outreach was most visibly demonstrated at the University of Wisconsin under President Charles Van Hise. The "Wisconsin Idea," as it came to be known, rested on two key notions: university extension, the idea that the boundaries of the state are

the boundaries of the university; and university expertise, the idea that the knowledge and informed expertise of the faculty should be applied to modern problems. At Wisconsin, for example, university professors applied their research to the improvement of the farming and dairy industries and were heavily involved in the reform of state government. Moreover, through extension work the university and its faculty initiated correspondence courses, sponsored debates, and offered services to people throughout Wisconsin. The success of the Wisconsin Idea stimulated many other state universities and private institutions to reach outward. Both Columbia University and the University of Chicago, for example, developed major extension programs.

There were two major, competing visions of the university and its faculty throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On the one hand were advocates of a German university model, who emphasized pure scientific scholarship and advanced learning for their own sake. G. Stanley Hall, a professor at Johns Hopkins and later president of Clark University, expressed this perspective when he said that a university should promote "the holy fervor of investigation," and "research is its native breath, its vital air."[11] The opposing view was held by the leaders of most American universities—Charles Eliot at Harvard, William Angell at Michigan, William Folwell at Minnesota—who, without rejecting the model of a German university, sought to infuse the notion of service as a dominant feature of the university.

These competing visions continue to inform discussion about the purposes of the university, but the tendency since the turn of the century has been to "blend and reconcile."[12] The American university has assimilated major themes in nineteenth-century German higher education: learning and research as legitimate ends in themselves, the centrality of advanced training and the graduate school, the importance of specialized study within academic departments, and the need for doctoral training for the professoriate. At the same time, in response to the

demands and needs of American society, the model has grown far beyond these concepts to embrace the ideal of the service-oriented university that nourishes society directly through cultivating applied as well as theoretical knowledge; through offering an all-purpose curriculum to meet the needs of persons from across society; and through providing a range of services, such as extension and faculty expertise. The twentieth century has been marked by the continuing expression and refinement of this ideal.

The Growth and Spread of the University Ideal

Notwithstanding the protestations of such men as Thorstein Veblen and Abraham Flexner,[13] who published scathing attacks on the American university as a social service station, the advancing university ideal gained momentum through the first half of this century. The major public institutions—Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and California—and the leading private institutions—Chicago, Harvard, Columbia, Yale, and Stanford—pioneered this movement. But scores of new universities sprang up, in such cities as Detroit and Milwaukee as well as in remote rural locations. Some of these universities were former teachers colleges or were built on existing colleges, while others—such as Wayne University—were completely new institutions.[14]

Many factors spurred the growth of the universities during the first half of this century. The continuing rise of industrial capitalism and the need for better-educated workers with specialized and advanced training; a general recognition that scientific research could contribute markedly to the quality of life; the growing belief in higher education as a vehicle of upper mobility on the part of the middle class; the widespread feeling that higher learning and the future of democracy were closely linked—such trends brought increased federal and state support, and strong private funding, for universities. During the Depression, for

example, the federal government established the College Student Work Program, which provided over 600,000 college students with part-time jobs; and the federal Public Works Administration helped finance construction projects at many universities.

To these and other pressures and incentives, the universities and their faculties responded enthusiastically. Growing interest in the professions led most universities to offer a much greater range of undergraduate professional programs, from the arts and journalism to pharmacy and communications—and to offer highly specialized programs within these fields. And, though the bulk of professional study took place at the undergraduate level through the first half of this century, many universities established graduate professional programs in such fields as architecture, business, and education.

Especially because of the professionalization of the faculty and the accompanying demand for Ph.D. degree holders to fill the faculty ranks, the spread of graduate education left its mark on the landscape of higher education during this period.[15] Whereas there had been fewer than 6,000 graduate students in the United States in 1900, by 1930 there were more than 47,000, and two decades later the figure was nearly 224,000. At the turn of the century, there were about 15 major graduate schools; by 1960 over 175 institutions offered doctoral degrees and more than 9,000 doctorates and 70,000 master's degrees were awarded annually.[16]

As the handmaiden of advanced study, the research emphasis in American universities increased steadily through the first five decades of this century. To be sure, the bulk of it took place at no more than twenty-five leading public and private universities, and there was no massive federally funded research during this period. As Roger Geiger has shown in his history of American research universities from 1900-40, the growth of both pure and applied research was accomplished largely through private sources of support.[17] Individual philanthropy and private foundation support—including corporate-sponsored research—

helped lay the foundation for the rise of American science and advanced research. With such discoveries as vaccines, hybrid corn, and atomic physics, scholars and scientists helped American universities rival the leading European centers of research.

As the twentieth century unfolded, the Wisconsin Idea spread, and most public universities embraced the idea of service in myriad ways. Discoveries in such fields as agricultural chemistry were carried to the people by means of flourishing university extension systems. Undergraduate degree programs and sponsored events were increasingly offered at off-campus locations at times convenient for working adults. University faculty worked closely with local and state governments, labor unions, and public school systems. As the president of a leading land-grant institution observed during the 1930s, "The state universities hold that there is no intellectual service too undignified for them to perform."[18]

Until about 1940, the private universities lagged in service considerably behind the land-grant universities.[19] Since then, however, private universities have been steadily providing more direct service to the larger society. Albeit with a full measure of skepticism, a leading humanities scholar at a major private university (Columbia University) captured the evolution of the service ideal at mid-century:

> The American university of today is best understood as a residual institution. What I mean by residual . . . [is that] the university is the last outpost of help, like the government of a welfare state. . . [So] the university now undertakes to give its students, faculties, and neighbors not solely education, but the makings of a full life, from sociability to business advice and from psychiatric care to the artistic experience. Again, every new skill or item of knowledge developed within the academy creates a new claim by the community. Knowledge is power and

> its possessor owes the public a prompt application, or at least diffusion through the training of others. It thus comes about that the School of Social Work aids the poor, the School of Architecture redesigns the slum, the School of Business advises the small tradesman, the School of Dentistry runs a free clinic, the School of Law gives legal aid, and the undergraduate college supplies volunteers to hospitals, recreation centers, and remedial schools.[20]

The Flowering of the American University

Since the end of World War II, various forces have affected the evolution of universities and their faculties. American universities have not been centrally directed by the national government, as in most of Europe, but the federal government has shaped the university movement in two major ways. First, beginning with passage of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act in 1944, which provided student aid to returning veterans, the federal government has provided a major stimulus to the extension of educational opportunity to new groups in society and to the advancement of social justice. Especially through the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the 1972 Higher Education Amendments, which established student aid programs for needy students, federal financial support has enabled millions of disadvantaged students to attend public and private universities throughout America.

Second, and no less significant, federal support for both basic and applied research has grown astronomically since 1945. In 1940, for example, the federal government provided $15 million in grants and contracts to universities for research and development; two decades later the figure had grown to $462 million.[21] By 1985, the total federal expenditure for university-

based research and development exceeded $10 billion.[22] Most federal research moneys have been allotted for national defense, health-related, and scientific and technological research—and have gone disproportionately to about fifty major research universities. Still, federal research funding has reached most universities and has supported scholarship in myriad fields of investigation.

The federal government has supported programs in areas of national concern, but state governments have been the major providers for public universities. Not only have the states created many new universities in the last forty years, they have also provided the financial foundation for universities to initiate literally hundreds of new degree programs, especially in professional and applied scientific fields; to hire and support faculty members in their research and teaching; to expand their extension and outreach efforts; and to expand their capacity to offer students advanced training at the master's, first professional, and doctoral levels.

The last few decades have also been marked by strong foundation support for both applied research and a wide variety of service activities addressing various social needs and problems. The Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations—among many others—have encouraged universities and their faculties to extend their reach to society. Schools of social work have reached out to the inner cities of America; schools of education have become deeply involved in improving the quality of public schooling; university professors offer technical advice, in areas from engineering to family planning, to the developing nations of the world, and students serve communities in such ways as providing legal advice.

As many American industries began to acknowledge their reliance on university-based research and to recognize the possibilities of technology transfer, American business and industry have also fueled the development of the contemporary university. Especially in the last decade, businesses have sought to develop

new connections with universities. These interactions have spawned many kinds of enterprises, from joint university-industry conferences to increased faculty consulting arrangements with industry to research parks and institutes on a growing number of campuses.

These forces—coupled with growing public support for the university—have cultivated the university movement during the last half-century. The inward-looking conception of a university has given way to a far more expansive view, one that celebrates the diversity of the modern university and its close connections to society. One of its strongest proponents, Clark Kerr, a former president of the University of California, coined the term *multiversity* in the early 1960s to capture the diverse purposes and activities of the modern university.

Although not all institutions can legitimately claim multiversity status, many ambitious academicians, politicians, community leaders, and others seek to bring that ideal to fruition. In the last two decades alone, scores of master's-level institutions have introduced doctoral-level work. Today, over 460 institutions identify themselves as "universities." Virtually all of these institutions have initiated a sprawling web of programs and activities, intended at least partly to buttress their claims as all-purpose American universities.

As universities have responded energetically to society's demands and opportunities, they have also encountered enormous stresses and strains. Perhaps foremost, university faculty have assumed a much broader range of responsibilities. Not only are they expected to conduct research, participate actively in their discipline or field, teach students from varying academic and cultural backgrounds, and participate in the governance of their institutions, but now they are also expected to engage in various service activities—from addressing pressing social problems and disseminating their research findings to providing advice to government and industry. In no small measure, this smorgasbord of Janus-like expectations mirrors the larger responsibili-

ties of the institution and, as such, provides a touchstone for the consideration of challenges facing the modern American university and its faculty.

Challenges

Enhancing the Quality of the Undergraduate Experience

As the university movement has flourished in the last forty years, graduate education has enjoyed immense prestige and prosperity. At the same time, while undergraduate enrollments have multiplied, a growing number of reports and publications from the federal government, the states, national commissions, and individuals have raised searching questions about the quality of undergraduate education in the nation's universities. In particular, two widely publicized books that were severely critical—Allan Bloom's The *Closing of the American Mind* and E. D. Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy*—have heightened concern.[23]

Concerns about undergraduate education have been many and varied. They range from the lack of curricular coherence to the neglect of the humanities; from the failure to establish high expectations for students to the decline of student involvement; from the triumph of the major and specialization over general education to the grip of professional fields at the expense of the liberal arts and sciences; and from the failure to adequately provide students with a common body of shared knowledge and culture to the lack of connectedness in the undergraduate experience. In response, universities have introduced an abundance of undergraduate reforms and innovations over the past few years. Scores of universities are strengthening their undergraduate programs through introducing more rigorous graduation requirements, establishing new interdisciplinary courses, placing greater emphasis on writing, mathematics, and science, and initiating developmental programs to enhance the basic skills of students.

The recent reforms and innovations in undergraduate education are an encouraging sign, and may go a long way toward reinvigorating the quality of the undergraduate experience for many students. Yet the reform movement has failed to recognize adequately that the problems and challenges in undergraduate education stem primarily from the evolution of American universities and, most especially, the activities most valued by the professoriate. Although most university faculty are expected to teach undergraduates, many place far more emphasis on research, grantsmanship, and other activities that can diminish their commitment to undergraduate teaching and learning.

To begin, many faculty have been lured by numerous opportunities outside the university—from lucrative consulting contracts to invitations to advise the government, industry, and various private agencies. Closer to home, most universities and their faculties place far more value on graduate education, research, and specialization than on undergraduate teaching. These emphases are hardly surprising, since they can pay handsome individual (as well as university wide) dividends: lifetime employment through tenure, access to substantial research funding, hefty salary increases, opportunities for travel invitations to membership in distinguished learned and professional societies, as well as the respect of one's peers. As noted by many observers of American colleges and universities, faculty members often speak of teaching "loads" and research "opportunities."

Although research is not the natural enemy of undergraduate teaching, the time is long overdue for American universities to develop a range of incentives aimed at restoring faculty commitment to undergraduate teaching and learning. Bold initiatives are needed—such as modifying reward structures and placing greater emphasis on the profession of teaching. Without them, the needed reform of undergraduate education will fall far short, and undergraduate education will continue to suffer from neglect. Such initiatives will require the strong support of fac-

ulty—no easy task, given competing pressures and opportunities—but the long-term viability of the American university requires no less.

Revitalizing the Professoriate

In 1968 Christopher Jencks and David Riesman published *The Academic Revolution*, which described the rise to power of scholars and scientists during the halcyon period of the 1950s and 1960s when American colleges and universities enjoyed unprecedented financial support.[24] In a recent follow-up study, Howard Bowen and Jack Schuster concluded that the American professoriate is "a national resource imperiled."[25] What has happened in the last two decades?

Though the reasons for concerns about the professoriate are complex, two factors stand out. First, salaries and working conditions have changed significantly. After peaking in 1972-73, faculty compensation has declined significantly in current dollars. In 1980, for example, real faculty salaries were 20 percent below what they had been a decade earlier largely because of inflation and lessened overall bargaining power as faculty hiring declined.[26] Though earning power has continued to decline in the 1980s, faculty have become increasingly dissatisfied with their work environments.

Overall, Bowen and Schuster found growing evidence that the American professoriate is increasingly "dispirited." Though faculty morale has remained higher at universities than in other types of institutions, it has nevertheless declined substantially over the past 5-10 years. Bowen and Schuster attribute this decline chiefly to the deterioration of faculty compensation and working conditions.[27]

Second, since the 1970s the academic labor market in many fields has ebbed because of declining or plateaued student enrollment patterns and a high proportion of tenured faculty who are not expected to retire in large numbers until the 1990s. A significant consequence of this trend is that many promising new

Ph.D.s—including potential minority faculty—are unable to secure permanent faculty positions. And at the same time, many talented graduates are attracted in greater numbers to high-paying jobs in private business and industry, which has caused a shortage of faculty in such high-demand fields as engineering, computer science, and business. Particularly disturbing is Bowen and Schuster's finding that "fewer and fewer persons, especially highly talented young persons, are opting for academic careers."[28]

These factors have created an urgent need for colleges and universities to develop strategies to recruit and retain talented faculty members. Indeed, many universities have already developed specific strategies for recruiting outstanding faculty within current constraints: paying higher salaries in high-demand fields, hiring top young faculty to tenure track positions while phasing out senior faculty, and modifying doctoral programs with the intent of training and then hiring their own graduates.[29] However, the major challenge for universities is to develop long-term strategies to address inadequate faculty compensation and a deteriorating work environment—the very conditions that have contributed so substantially to the current condition of the professoriate. Increasing faculty salaries and enhancing the infrastructures of universities—including laboratories, libraries, equipment, and facilities—could revitalize the professoriate.

Harnessing Linkages Between Scientific Research and Technological Innovation

In the last several decades, scientific research in universities has been yielding discoveries in many areas—from biotechnology to microelectronics—that have led many universities and their faculties to become heavily involved in translating scientific knowledge into various products. This involvement in technology transfer, which includes new university-industry relationships as well as solo institutional initiatives in the market place, has resulted from several important developments.

During the 1970s, American business and industry increasingly recognized the potential benefits of developing closer relations with universities. In addition to the overarching benefit of capitalizing on scientific discoveries to develop new products, industries realized that closer ties with scientific research communities could be cost effective: instead of expanding their own research capabilities, they could save money by drawing directly on the work of faculty scientists. At the same time, universities saw obvious benefits to university–industry collaboration: opportunities to secure major research support, to facilitate the rapid transfer of new technological developments to the market place, and to provide employment opportunities for students and faculty alike.[30]

The federal government has played a prominent role in uniting higher education and industry. To begin, the National Science Foundation began to fund university-industry cooperative research centers, where university faculty and corporate scientists work together on common problems, and to provide partial grants to support research projects involving both academic and industrial researchers. In addition, Congress passed a law in 1980 allowing universities to keep most patents resulting from federally funded research. Although a few universities have been seeking profits from their research for many years, this new law was a landmark for universities because the federal government supports much of the basic research in this country. Finally, and not incidentally, many state governments have strongly supported university-business connections, not least through the funding of research parks at major public universities to promote statewide economic development.

In addition to supporting faculty consulting in the industrial sector and to supporting industry-associates programs in which industry scientists visit campuses and develop relationships with their faculty counterparts, many universities have moved closer to the market place in two major ways. First, they have signed contracts with companies in which both parties agree

to collaborate on research programs of mutual interest. One of the most visible of these partnerships was established in 1975 between Harvard University and the Monsanto Company. Monsanto helped identify research needs and provided the financing, technology, and some services to support Harvard's research on the biology and biochemistry of organ development. In turn, Monsanto received exclusive rights for a limited period to commercialize products growing out of the research, with Harvard receiving royalties from either Harvard or Monsanto patents.[31] More recently, a number of universities have established research consortia in which they affiliate with several companies that pay a fee to support research in areas of mutual concern. Examples of such research consortia include the MIT-industry Polymer Processing Program and the Stanford Center for Integrated Systems.[32]

Second, many universities have moved quickly to commercialize patented scientific discoveries by establishing high technology companies to convert these discoveries into commercial products. For example, Boston University has committed nearly $50 million since 1980 to become the majority owner of a biotechnology company that is developing treatments to combat leukemia and other diseases.[33] According to some estimates, nearly 200 universities are now engaged in technology transfer; in the last few months, for example, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Chicago have established "multi-million dollar venture-capital funds to invest in start-up companies based on profitable work emerging from their labs."[34]

Technology transfer can not only benefit the economy but can also bring in resources to support research and scholarship in the university. At present, the benefits somewhat outweigh the risks. However, many universities have embraced technology without sufficient reflection—especially on the dangers of venture capitalism. Some vital issues must be pondered because the stakes are high:

> To what extent will the pursuit of financial reward influence the research agendas of faculty, the disinterested search for basic knowledge, and the free exchange of knowledge and ideas?
>
> Will there be conflicts-of-interest when researchers enact the dual roles of scholar-teacher and entrepreneur-investor?
>
> To what extent will faculty involved in technological development be drawn away from basic research and university teaching?
>
> In what ways will the quest for profit influence faculty hiring, retention, and rewards—and change relationships between universities and professors, as well as within the professoriate itself?[35]

Although a few universities have begun to address these questions seriously, there remains an urgent need for institutions and their faculties to confront these issues. Unless linkages between universities and the market place are harnessed, fundamental values in the university may give way to the search for commercial utility and financial gain. As Derek Bok stated in his insightful analysis of the benefits and dangers of technology transfer:

> With stakes of this size, the nature and direction of academic science could be transmuted into something quite unlike the disinterested search for knowledge that has long been thought to animate university professors. In short, the newfound concern with technology transfer is disturbing not only because it could alter the practice of science in the

university but also because it threatens the central values of academic research.[36]

Maintaining Institutional Integrity

Despite the widespread support enjoyed by most American universities, their integrity has been challenged both from within and without in the last few years. In addition to technology transfer, some of their other practices have come under attack: minority admissions and hiring procedures, employment practices, acceptance of gifts that may threaten academic values, investments in corporations doing business in such countries as South Africa, to local communities, oversight of athletic programs, and treatment of minorities and women. Individually and collectively, these concerns have engaged many faculty, administrators, students, and governing boards. The responses of many universities to these vexing issues has, on balance, strengthened the overall integrity of universities—though the scrutiny must continue.

However, the overall challenge to the integrity of universities rests not simply in those concerns that have received high public visibility. More fundamentally, they are rooted in the evolution of universities as service-oriented institutions that have—wittingly and unwittingly—made *service* the lodestar that heavily informs the daily lives of many faculty and administrators.

Lured by the possibilities of attracting outside support and the temptation to escape from routine responsibilities, many university faculty and administrators have increasingly been involved in developing urban institutes, interdisciplinary centers, and applied research think tanks. An intricate web of programs and activities has developed both on and off campuses, aimed broadly at making universities responsive to their various external stakeholders—federal and state government, business

and industry, private agencies, and the like. Moreover, despite guidelines at many institutions intended to limit faculty consulting to one day per week, many faculty and some administrators spend substantial amounts of time advising government and consulting with the private sector.

Although the value of service provided by American universities is clear, too many service commitments are quietly but relentlessly stripping away foundations of the university. For example, in some instances faculty consulting with industry may threaten faculty detachment and objectivity as scholars become influenced more by the economic market place of dollars than the academic market place of ideas. Not insignificantly, the university role of social critic seems to have diminished in recent years as faculty in the social sciences, as well as the sciences and the professions, have received a growing number of invitations to consult with industry and government.

Perhaps more significant, the service commitments of some faculty and administrators have resulted in considerable neglect of the basic purposes and values of universities. Initially, the neglect occurs in small ways: missed appointments, canceled classes, hastily prepared lectures. Gradually, teaching loads are negotiated downward and major commitments to basic research are postponed.[37] Over time, faculty commitments to research and teaching may decline markedly as the delicate cultural fabric of a university is eroded by service opportunities that individuals find difficult to resist.

Service has not undermined the American university—quite the contrary, it is a major strength of our universities—but administrators and faculty need to be more selective in their service activities. In short, administrators and faculty need to make conscious decisions about what is essential and what is peripheral. University integrity is too precious to do otherwise. As noted by the former president of Ohio State University, Harold Enarson:

> The integrity of a poem or plan, of a lawyer's brief or mother's love, of the great ship or the tiny sailboat resides in its wholeness. For a thing to have integrity, it must be sparse and clean, without frills, pretentions, excess baggage. It must be true to its purpose, true in grand design and faithful in minute execution. So it is with women and men and the institutions they either ennoble or weaken by the quality of their daily service. In short, the integrity of an institution resides deep within its daily life.[38]

Bridging Administrative and Faculty Cultures in University Governance

Another major issue has developed in the last twenty-five years: how are universities governed, and what role does the faculty play in that governance? Traditionally, the major vehicle of governance for American colleges and universities has been the single-campus governing board, operating with considerable input from the faculty. Although senior administrators were traditionally faculty members, the political economy of limited resources of the 1970s and 1980s has made state governments become more actively involved in the governance of public institutions. Almost all states have developed multicampus systems of public institutions in which broad, policy-making authority is vested in a systemwide governing board. In fact, cen*tralization of authority* in both public and private institutions is perhaps the most significant trend in colleges and universities today, as all fifty states have in varying degrees become increasingly involved in shaping the direction of higher education.

This centralization and the increasing complexity of education have spurred the development of a cadre of professional administrators at colleges and universities all across the United States. Colleges and universities are now selecting leaders with management backgrounds and proven entrepreneurial skills,

who can introduce new strategies for coping with economic constraints, including controlling enrollments, selectively trimming budgets, reducing the number of faculty, and increasing efficiency. These administrators have also become active in long-range planning mission development, program development and continuance, and resource allocations, all activities traditionally handled by the faculty. Such developments have led to a growing gap between faculty and administration. Many faculty believe that these "new administrators" do not really understand universities and their responsibilities, nor do they value the role of the faculty.

Such beliefs, when combined with the faculty members' increasing orientation outside their college and university, have lessened faculty interest and involvement in the governance of American institutions of higher education and widened the gap between the administrative and faculty cultures in university governance. These two cultures must be bridged, to some extent, for American colleges and universities to remain true to their historic purposes and responsibilities.

Charting the Future of the American University and its Faculty

The modern American university faces formidable challenges that strike at its purposes and responsibilities, its quality and integrity, and its basic values. These challenges are grounded not only in the contemporary environment but, in a larger sense, in the development of a distinctly American vision of a university—a conception that places primary emphasis on direct contributions of the university and its faculty to the larger society.

American universities and their faculties need to ponder their missions, social responsibilities, and basic values—and to chart their own futures. They need not turn inward and dedicate themselves solely to learning and research for their own sake—

this would deny the enormous contributions of the university to the well-being of society and lead to the undermining of the distinctly American vision of a university. Rather than following their historic pattern of indiscriminately embracing society's seemingly insatiable demands, universities and their faculties should debate vigorously the ways in which they can make their most important contributions to society. Without such careful deliberation, the modern American university will lose its anchor.

Notes

[1]Richard F. Storr, *The Beginning of the Future: A Historical Approach to Graduate Education in the Arts and Sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 15-29. *Note:* Many individuals have influenced development of this paper, but we have especially benefited from Derek Bok's *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University* (Harvard University Press, 1982).

[2]Alain Touraine, *The Academic System in American Society* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), pp. 33-35.

[3]Hugh Hawkins, *Pioneer: A History of the Johns Hopkins University, 1874-1889* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1960), pp. 3-20.

[4]Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 125-29.

[5]John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976).

[6]Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 129.

[7]Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History,* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 252.

[8]Rudolph, p. 266.

[9]Andrew D. White, Autobiography, Vol. I. (London: Macmillan, 1905),p. 341.

[10]Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 118.

[11]Stanley G. Hall, "The University Idea," *Pedagogical Seminary,* 15:104.

[12]Veysey, p. 342.

[13]Thorstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America* (New York: Sagamore Press, 1957); Abraham Flexner, *Universities, American, English, German* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930).

[14]Fred F. Harcleroad and Allan W. Ostar, *Colleges and Universities for Change: America's Comprehensive Public State Colleges and Universities* (Washington, DC: AASCU Press, 1987).

[15]Bernard Berelson, *Graduate Education in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960); Storr, 1973.

[16]Brubacher, p. 193.

[17]Roger L. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

[18]Lotus D. Coffman, *The State University: Its Work and Problems* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1934), p. 205.

[15]Derek Bok, p. 62.

[20]Jacques Barzun, *The American University: How it Runs, Where It is Going* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 10-11.

[22]William C. DeVane, *Higher Education in the Twentieth-Century America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 26.

[22]Lawrence E. Gladieux and Gwendolyn L. Lewis, "The Federal Government and Higher Education," *Higher Education in American Society*, Philip G. Altbach and Robert O. Berdahl, (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1987), p. 159.

[23]Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987); E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).

[24]Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968).

[25]Howard R. Bowen and Jack H. Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 3.

[26]Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 145.

[27]Bowen and Schuster, pp. 139-42.

[28]Ibid., p. 7.

[29]Clark Kerr and Marian Gade, "Current and Emerging Issues Facing American Higher Education," *Higher Education in American Society*, eds. Philip G. Altbach and Robert O. Berdahl (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1987), p. 146.

[30]David S. Tatel and Claire R. Guthrie, "The Legal Ins and Outs of University- Industry Collaboration," *Educational Record*, Spring 1983, pp. 19-25.

[31]Tatel and Guthrie.

[32]Tatel and Guthrie.

[33]Gilbert Fuchsberg, "Boston U. Gambles on Its Big Investment in Biotechnology Company," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12 April 1989, p. A29.

[34]Gilbert Fuchsberg, "Universities Said to Go Too Fast in Quest of Profit from Research," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12 April 1989, p. B29.

[35]Bok, pp. 136-58; Tatel and Guthrie.

[36]Bok, p. 142.

[37]Bok, p. 68.

[38]Harold L. Enarson, "Seminar on Dimensions of Integrity," unpublished syllabus for graduate seminar presented at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, March 23-27, 1987.