

Reshaping the University for the Metropolitan Area

A new pattern of urbanization, characterized by networks of urban villages, has implications for universities that serve metropolitan regions. This requires new institutional forms and practices. University planning should emphasize community interaction and collaboration to establish new programs and facilities and use a strategy of positioning to seize opportunities in fast-changing environments. The distributed university makes available the full complement of university services to all metropolitan locations. Educational practices and the curriculum should be altered to cultivate a broader range of human capabilities and to accommodate more diverse students. Changes in faculty workloads and reward systems, and modifications in their ways of thinking and acting will be needed.

In the October 1986 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*, Christopher Leinberger and Charles Lockwood observed:

Our cities are becoming groups of interdependent "urban villages" which are business, retail, housing, and entertainment focal points amid low-density cityscape.... Urban villages represent a dramatic restructuring of America's cities and suburbs—one that is already affecting how millions of Americans live and work. Almost every city is swept up in the urban village phenomenon—not only fast-growing Sunbelt cities like Atlanta and Phoenix but also slow-growing older ones like St. Louis and Kansas City, and archetypal cities like New York and Baltimore. (p. 43)

This new pattern of urbanization is driven largely by the impact of new technologies and the information society on the work place, and by life-style and quality-of-life issues important to today's dual-career families and single-parent work force. It seems likely that this emerging structure will become a dominant American mode, requiring increasing numbers of colleges and universities to respond and serve these communities.

The "villages" are reshaping the traditional compact pattern of city and suburb dominant during the industrial era. The process of transformation from city-suburb to village-network involves forces that promote urban sprawl and others that enable metropolitan regions to coalesce into subcenters. Leinberger and Lockwood identify six reasons for the phenomenon:

- shifts in the national economy from a manufacturing to a service and knowledge base;
- changes in business transportation preference from rail to truck;
- continuing personal reliance on automobiles, rather than mass transit;
- advances in telecommunications, including telephone, mail, and computing innovations;
- the lower cost of land available on the periphery for commercial use; and
- the concentration of services distributed to provide easy access for each critical mass of housing and employment. (p. 45)

Each new subcenter contains its own combination of office buildings and industrial parks, closely integrated with a mix of condominiums, town houses, and detached homes. The population mix tends to be highly educated and upwardly mobile, predominantly middle, upper-middle, and upper class. As we move toward a two-tier society of knowledge workers and service providers, they are predominantly part of the upper tier, or striving mightily to get there. They are politically and socially aware, articulate, and know how to use political and economic influence to shape public policies to their own interests. They demand, and provide a market for, a substantial array of educational services, cultural events, and recreational activities.

The new subcenters challenge the dominance of older urban cores, compete with them for resources and population, and take advantage of their opportunities for economic leadership in the advance toward a knowledge-driven economy.

These developments have substantial implications for colleges and universities that would serve metropolitan regions well. The demands of both inner-city residents and the urban villagers for a broad range of higher education services require innovative responses. We need new institutional forms and practices that are not represented by existing models. Land-grant universities responded well to the educational and technical needs of rural agrarian and industrial societies. Selective public and private institutions, with traditional college-aged students in residence, have provided a steady flow of research results, future scholars, political and economic leaders. The City University of New York served admirably successive generations of immigrants and their children, and helped them acquire the knowledge and competence to make their way in this new land, sometimes with outstanding success. But none of these nineteenth- and early twentieth-century models fits the particular needs of the emerging metropolis, with its call for a highly competent, well-educated work force. Nor do those models, in their current forms, with their current disciplinary/department-dominated curricula, serve well the educational needs of active, involved, cosmopolitan adult learners and their college-aged children.

For us, the implications of this new pattern of urbanization seem to be best considered in terms of:

- planning and development;
- organization and governance;
- educational outcomes and the curriculum;
- teaching and learning; and
- the professoriate.

We address these in turn, with emphasis on developments at institutions located in the new urban subcenters. Our thinking draws heavily on a panel presentation and discussion at the 1990 Annual Conference of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). The panel included the authors and Vernon Lattin, provost of Arizona State University, West Campus, and Elliot Mininberg, vice-president for Administration and University Advancement at California State University at Northridge. The range of institutions represented at that presentation suggests the broad applicability of the issues raised. And we think the developments at these universities not only respond to the needs of emerging urban villages, but may be applicable to colleges and universities now located in the inner city.

Planning and Development

The cornerstone for planning and development is *interaction*. George Mason University, located in the midst of Northern Virginia's rapid, high-tech growth area, calls itself an *interactive university*. It and others such as California State University at Northridge, located north of Los Angeles, and Arizona State University, West Campus in Phoenix, take pride in building programs with a regional rationale, in collaboration with key corporate and political leaders. This interactive approach to program development builds political support and sets a base for local and regional economic assistance as well. At the AAHE panel, Mininberg reported:

We had about 100 acres of land adjacent to our institution. We have joined in a partnership with private industry to develop that land, creating facilities that would be usable for the developer as a commercial enterprise. The proceeds from this enterprise would partially subsidize debt service for the institution's capital expansion, and that way limit expense to the university and to the citizens of the state. About 50 percent of the buildings to be built will be owned and operated by the institution; the other 50 percent will, in fact, have a commercial orientation. But I want to emphasize that none of the occupants of the commercial entities is going to be disassociated with the interests and mission statement of the institution. Almost all of these entities are corporate offices, hotels, conference centers, R&D buildings, media entertainment centers—things that we hope the tenancy of and occupancy for, will all be related to major areas of study at our institution.

Lattin said:

The West Campus was conceived in the community's imagination about 30 years ago. It took that long to get it created because of the resistance of the Board of Regents, Arizona State University, and the other universities.... Originally the master plan called for a campus that was completely integrated so that you could not distinguish the academic community from the private community. You would have an academic building and a private building. There would be shopping opportunities and housing intermingled with the campus. That was the original idea about five years ago, when the campus was first hatched. That did not work out, but now we are looking at 80–100 acres for what we're calling "privatization." The separation between the university, the community, and private businesses has been erased. But from the beginning, this development for the West Campus was resisted by the Board of Regents and by the main campus. Given this resistance and lack of resources, in the face of the high demand that was there, we have to work with local regional communities and businesses and use dollars from those sources to build the institution.

Flowing from the interaction principle is a different way of thinking about planning. At George Mason, it is more the language of positioning than of planning. A useful, metaphorical way to contrast these two terms is the distinction between the ways a hiker and a surfer approach their activities. A hiker has a clear destination, plans a route, and figures what is involved to reach the goal. He or she anticipates how long it will take, what supplies, equipment, and other resources will be needed, tries to get a forecast on the weather, and speculates about other unanticipated things that might be encountered along the way. The hiker then loads a pack and heads down the road.

For the surfer, the process is very different. It does not involve a particular destination. The main task is to recognize the right kind of wave, catch it at the right point—usually on the forefront, out ahead of it a bit—and ride it as far as possible. Staying upright is a key issue, aided by second-by-second, minute-by-minute adjustments to the environment and its shifting patterns and conditions. The surfer's sensing devices are intently focused on that environment; all reflexes are geared to handle it.

Typical five-year plans function much more like a hiker than a surfer. But if you are going to respond effectively to fast-changing urban villages, your posture for planning and development needs to be much more that of a surfer.

Organization and Development

The conventional response to urban development traditionally has been the branch campus. This strategy typically involves an attempt by the main campus to re-create itself at newer sites. Instead, the results usually are pale imitations of the progenitor, the stepchildren of higher education. After the initial excitement of creating a new unit wears off, faculty and administrators usually come to feel like second-class citizens.

Too often, the most powerful administrators and faculty members are not at the new units. The main library and other key resources remain at home base. The branches have higher proportions of junior and part-time faculty, lower proportions of support staff and space for faculty offices. Even though these branches may generate enrollments and local support significantly beyond those of "old main," seldom does their political clout concerning institutional policies and practices carry proportionate weight.

Those who are reshaping higher education for the future are struggling to find alternatives to the branch model, which fails to provide the quality and range of services needed for the urban village populations. Lattin describes the issues like this:

As a multicampus university, we are part of Arizona State University. There is one degree, one admissions process. And, there has been quite a bit of tension in governance. The organizational structure is in transition. We are trying to create a campus that is distinct from the main campus in organization and governance, and yet at the same time part of the university. That creates some real problems in mission, in goals, in departmental structure. At this time, our plans are not to have departments, but simply divisions and programs. We want to take advantage of international and interdisciplinary dimensions to develop centers and institutes on and off campus that will pull different faculties together, rather than divide them. We are looking at a university tenure at the site—a West Campus tenure as distinct from main campus tenure—but a university tenure. I say "looking," because there is uncertainty at this point between what I think the situation is, what the faculty thinks it is, and what the main campus thinks it is. But we hope to have an organization and governance structure distinct and different from the traditions in Arizona.

Mininberg says:

Centers and institutes give you a better opportunity to become good surfers, if you will. There are ways in which you can create areas of focus without establishing full departments with all the rights, privileges—and headaches—that go along with them. We in higher education tend to mount [new campuses] as innovative, and they end up becoming traditional and never do get dismantled. I think if we had a different context—of institutes and centers, perhaps one more focused on instruction and the other more on research—we could use them to make the transition from what we do now to what we want to do in a longer period of time.

As Lattin put it, "The dilemma is, how do you give it enough strength in core faculty and, at the same time, keep it innovative and moving toward the future?"

George Mason's response to the familiar branch campus dynamic builds on the urban-village model itself, using the concept of the *distributed university*. This approach attempts to cope with the traffic congestion and transportation problems characterizing the urban pattern, acknowledging the demand for localized services and offsetting the heavy demands on time and emotion encountered by the urban villager. It makes use of new technologies—including electronic mail, computer

conferencing, telephone conference calls, interactive video, and phone mail—which can make for speedy and efficient communication among diverse locations. And it strives to make available in distributed fashion the full complement of university support services to all locations.

The distributed university approach establishes *vertical slices* of the institution throughout the region, each with a targeted set of programs from lower-division courses through interdisciplinary research institutes and associated graduate studies. For example, a unit in Arlington, Virginia, ten miles from the main Fairfax campus, is organized around a complex of issues dealing with international studies and the globalization of the economy. Plans for another slice, in an adjacent western county, focus on systems dynamics and urban issues from the freshman through the graduate level.

The George Mason approach, like that of Arizona State, is predicated on challenges to the conventional departmental system of organization. Centers and institutes are conceived as alternative governing units, drawing on faculty from related disciplines empowered by their common research, teaching, and service interests. Each unit is conceived as a *node* in a democratic federation of largely autonomous units, each with a direct claim on institutional resources unmediated by departments. The federation is glued together with machinery for joint faculty appointments, resource exchanges, and distributed support of various curricular alternatives.

*Each unit is a node in
a democratic federation
of largely autonomous
units.*

Planning faculty workloads and associated reward systems for salary increases, promotion, and tenure, becomes complex when faculty have joint appointments in a department and in a center or institute. The problem is compounded when institutions have a separately administered general education program or college in which faculty, also, may teach. If the department is still home base and first-level recommendations for rewards come from that unit, then faculty continuity and vitality for other programmatic entities are difficult to sustain. The history of higher education's experiences with small experimental colleges, as part of large universities, is instructive. These units typically were staffed by faculty members whose home base remained the department. Turnover in experimental units tended to be high, because after two or three years, faculty found themselves losing ground with their departmental colleagues. Sometimes this happened because the quantity or the type of research and publication no longer fit departmental norms. Other times, simply losing touch, being isolated from departmental politics, was a factor.

Many of these units have been shut down despite evidence of educational contributions, because they could not establish a loyal, strong faculty that provided an adequate political base to withstand the budget-cutting onslaughts of the mid-1970s. So new systems for faculty workload planning, evaluation, and rewards will need to be created if vital and responsive centers and institutes are to be sustained, and if *vertical slices* of the university are to be freed from the tyranny of current departmental structure.

One approach is to begin each year with individual faculty plans that specify the responsibilities and approximate time allocations for teaching, advising, research, grant-sponsored activities, university and community service. Each faculty member works out these plans with his or her respective unit heads—a department chair, an institute director, and perhaps the director of a general education program, for example. This individual plan, then, becomes the workload expectation for that year, and annual evaluation takes place against the expectations and ambitions laid out in this plan. Each unit head evaluates the contributions made to that unit. The individual's evaluation for merit increases, promotion, and tenure flow out of these individual evaluations. Where wide discrepancies, significant variations in performance, or major long-term decisions on promotion and tenure exist, unit heads meet to arrive at an agreed-upon formulation of their joint and separate views. More intentionality and up-front planning about faculty workload, more specificity about faculty commitments and responsibilities, and more administrative collaboration across units are required.

This approach runs counter to traditional norms, which define each faculty member as an independent professional operating with only limited institutional supervision and accountability. It also creates ambiguities about each person's institutional *home*, the locus for primary identification. Distributing faculty talent among multiple units has its problems. But continuing with a single campus-based unit, or developing discrete branch units, are not appropriate responses. Tackling the problems of multiple or joint appointments seems the better alternative at this point.

Educational Outcomes and the Curriculum

We must change our thinking about the educational outcomes necessary for effective citizenship and work place performance in the knowledge-based society. It is, by now, common wisdom that simple information acquisition is no longer sufficient. As Paulo Freire observed, the deposit/banking approach to education no longer serves. Today's learners are neither vessels to be filled, nor lamps to be lighted, despite the attractiveness of those archaic metaphors. They are already brimful of information, misinformation, and disinformation resulting from steady bombardment by mass media; they are full of prejudices and preconceptions, spurred by plans and aspirations that are more or less realistic.

In recent years, concern has been increasing for the development of "generic" and transferable skills and competence. Concern for fundamental communication and mathematical skills is widespread, triggering programs for writing across the curriculum, reducing math anxiety, and increasing numerary skills. Efforts are being made to develop critical-thinking and problem-solving abilities. There is even, in some quarters, concern for human relations skills and interpersonal competence. These are valid responses to the information age.

But we are still trapped by assumptions that these "generic competencies" will lead to effective citizens and a strong work force in the

absence of developing other human capabilities. In fact, citizenship and work force participation in the knowledge society must tap a broad array of human capabilities and dispositions:

- motivation and self-discipline;
- sensitivity to cultural differences in values, working styles, and communication patterns;
- a sense of self-assurance and worth; and
- a readiness to invest time, energy, and emotion in something larger than mere self-interest.

These are not simply competencies. They are human qualities and characteristics. To shift from a primary emphasis on information transfer to cultivating a full array of human talents, not only requires a change in pedagogy, directed at overcoming the current dominance of lecture, text, and multiple-choice exams. It also requires taking teaching and learning beyond the classroom and campus, to make systematic use of work and life experiences as part of the educational process. Most importantly, it means taking seriously educational outcomes not encompassed by our traditional focus on cultivating the intellect.

Achieving such outcomes also requires curricular changes to respond to the growing diversity of students in the urban villages. Mininberg gave us an example at the AAHE session:

We have the problem of a student population that is not only growing, but different. We have a tremendous influx of Asian students, and their demands for certain curricular offerings are far different from what have been the demands of our traditional students. They want Asian study majors—institutes for the study of Asian culture. They want more Asian professors prevalent in the institution and greater sensitivity to their backgrounds and needs. We have not, in fact, responded to all those things as much as you might think, but we are sensitive to the issues. And of course, that population is increasing, not decreasing. So we are going to have to be much more proactive in response. We also have a great many older students, but we went through that transition perhaps a decade ago. I do not think the age mix of students is much different from what it was ten years ago. We are seeing much more of an ethnic richness in our campus profile than we are age differences.

Another issue for curriculum development flows from the interaction principle. Many students are seeking programmatic alternatives that are not degree oriented and may not involve credentialing. Some may be certificate programs, some may be ad hoc combinations of courses or workshops created to respond to a particular corporate or community need, or to clusters of individual needs. Community colleges have learned to be good at this kind of response. Rockland Community College, in Suffern, New York, created study circles throughout the county, adult groups pursuing particular topics they want to learn—ranging from Hasidic thought, to contemporary theatre, to how-to-do-it skills. The college has an office that facilitates the creation of these

groups. They continue as long as they wish, and when they have had enough, they stop. An interactive university will need to develop a similar responsiveness, creating programs that may have short life spans, that bring together resources across different disciplines and professions, or that employ narrowly focused specialists for clearly defined, time-limited roles.

That kind of responsiveness will raise questions about the typical criteria and processes for both internal decision making and state approval of new programs. If the state is to be well served, there will need to be greater flexibility in those processes and faster turnaround for decisions. The usual tempo of university and state machinery, grinding for two or three years before a program is approved, is out of step with the speed at which local and regional needs emerge, peak, and decline.

Teaching and Learning

Teaching students effectively, particularly adult learners, means responding to their particular motives and agendas. Teachers need to find ways to draw on the energy, emotion, and time these students are willing to put into purposes important to them, directing that investment toward the aims, outcomes, and values of the course. The interactive university is trying to make that connection at the programmatic level. If the university is to be a vital contributor to its local and regional environment, it needs to operate constantly in the tension between its mission, values, purposes, and resources, and the educational needs of the community. But it cannot stop there. That tension needs to be recognized and productively resolved at the level of students and teachers, in relation to the actual learning that is pursued.

At a more pragmatic level, we need to be much more flexible about how teaching and learning times are packaged, freeing ourselves from the factory-based models now extant. Time arrangements, both in terms of the length and frequency of particular class sessions and in terms of total time investments, need to fit the nature and scope of the content and the desired outcomes. Some content requires frequent practice and feedback; other content and outcomes are best served by a more deliberate pace. But our current practices, like the bed of Procrustes, specify a limited range of length and patterns that all subjects and desired outcomes must fit. So many areas of learning that have a natural coherence are either lopped off, or stretched thin, to fit these boxes.

We need to become more thoughtful about tailoring time to learning, and developing the institutional flexibility to permit that. There are a number of well-tested alternatives that have seen limited adaptation. One model brings students together in an all-day, weekend workshop, or for a Friday evening and Saturday morning, every three or four weeks a semester. This model gives large blocks of time for reading, writing, field observations, and other preparatory activities. The longer class-

We need to become more thoughtful about tailoring time to learning.

room format allows time for diverse workshop processes—role plays, simulations, subgroup meetings, and plenary sessions. This pattern increases time on task for commuting students, who no longer have to invest one to three hours fighting traffic, getting back and forth to class each week.

Intensive residency courses are another approach. In this model, students come together for a five- or ten-day residency, usually preceded by substantial preparation. Daily workshops with occasional evening sessions create a powerful educational environment in which diverse resources and activities can be employed. Follow-up activities in the form of an individual learning contract or group project can extend the residential experience to other contexts or to more detailed pursuit of specific subject matter interests.

But creating and implementing new alternatives like these will not always be easy, as Mininberg notes:

We do a lousy job of that, but I think it is difficult not to do a lousy job. You not only have a reluctance on the part of faculty to teach, you have reluctance on the part of students to come to school. Even the adult population wants classes in the 4:00–7:00 P.M.-window, not 6:00–10:00. Our regular daytime, full-time students take almost all their courses between 8:00 A.M. and 2:00 P.M., and almost none of them on Friday.

New technologies may help. Mininberg goes on to say, “People are going to be able to self-progress on preprogrammed materials that will not require their physical attendance in class in the traditional sense.” The defining characteristic of a learning community no longer has to be face-to-face contact. Computer conferencing, electronic mail, and conference calls can create avenues for interaction that can supplement, or substantially replace, group meetings. But they need not totally replace human contact. Face-to-face meetings can begin, and end, semesters. Individual appointments with mentors, advisers, and the teacher can still be sustained and arranged. The advantage is that such contacts need not constitute all the teaching and learning. They can be used judiciously for particular needs as they arise, and not simply as vehicles for didactic information transfer. The interactive, distributed university will need a rich mix of alternatives like these to serve the urban villages and the diverse educational constituencies in its region.

The Professoriate

These changes in organization and governance, in curricular alternatives, in teaching and learning, will have significant consequences for professorial roles and for the character of the professoriate itself. In the interactive, distributed university, where new technologies are increasingly at work, the allocation of time and energy for faculty will be significantly different. As teachers, we will be much less involved with information transfer, as students have increasing electronic access to original materials, journal articles, texts, regional library networks, na-

tional and global data banks. We will be spending much more time as course designers, incorporating the diverse resources made available by these new technologies. We will be much more in the role of resource persons facilitating access to appropriate materials; we will spend more time being mentors, coaches, and advisers. We will invest more heavily in improved assessment and evaluation of learning than in direct instruction. Our institutional service will emphasize program development activities, as we move among different content areas and locations and share our particular expertise with colleagues associated with various multidisciplinary centers and institutes. We will need to become intellectually nimble and be able to shift applications from one context to another.

We will be faced with colleagues from nonuniversity backgrounds who have expertise and direct experiences pertinent to students' purposes and to corporate and community needs. Instead of seeing ourselves as repositories of knowledge, we will come to see ourselves as collaborators. Research will become increasingly a joint enterprise within the university and between the university and others—corporations, community services, governmental agencies. All of this requires a major shift in self-concept and role perception as we move from our ivory tower tradition as fountainhead of knowledge and wisdom, to a role of key player in local and regional development.

The characteristics of the faculty will alter, even as these changes in role definition and emphases occur. Urban villages are filled with rich human resources, available to be tapped. Most of these are practitioners who have not had conventional academic careers, but are heavily engaged with strong subject matter knowledge and substantial experiential learning. George Mason, for example, has access to government officials, engineers, information-technology experts, and business people who can bring much to students and the institution. The university recruited a business school dean who did not bring a traditional academic career, but was the chief executive officer of a successful, nearby high-technology firm. The interaction between the dean and the academy is instructive. He recruited faculty with conventional academic profiles, to enhance the stature of the school. These faculty were dedicated to the traditional values and prestige hierarchies of the academy. Their approach was to educate the dean to these traditions. They succeeded to the extent that what began as a strategy to create a nonconventional business school was threatened, as best evidenced by the school's pursuit of professional accreditation.

To counter this inward-looking approach, the dean has created a "Century Club," comprised of 100 significant corporations in Northern Virginia. Each member pays \$2,000 a year in dues, generating \$200,000, which goes to various projects for the school. In addition, executives from the club take an active role in a broad range of school activities and involve faculty and staff in their programs as participants, advisers, cosponsors, or featured players in club press releases and brochures. A monthly newsletter, published by the club, highlights a different segment of the university in each edition, including departments in the school and other schools/colleges. The Education Committee of the club

is involved in the M.B.A. program, sponsoring a mentor program, contributing to course development by providing case studies based on area companies, and participating in a career development seminar series. The committee also holds breakfasts to provide area companies with information regarding the school's program and the talents of its graduating students. A new executive M.B.A. program is a direct result of the committee's involvement and initiatives. Another new program, likewise, has resulted from this involvement, the Business School Enrichment Program, through which each class within the school's course offerings has a session with a local business person to learn about the firm's issues or problems as they relate to course material.

The Information and Technology Transfer Committee has assembled a faculty skills data base for the School of Information Technology and Engineering. The data base is available to Century Club members and now is being extended into the School of Business. The International Committee offers direct financial support to the university's Center for European Community Studies, an enterprise outside the school, affiliated with the university's Institute for International Transactions. And the Finance, Incubator, Grants and Contracts, and Small Business Development Committees sponsor several programs to improve the area's economic development, including support for start-up firms, review of new business plans, and matching entrepreneurs with venture capitalists.

Ample opportunity will exist to modify the characteristics of the faculty in the next two decades. Mininberg reports, "In the next nine years we will be replacing 41 percent of the professoriate in our system. That amounts to about 8,000 professors and represents an enormous challenge, because there is competition everywhere for quality faculty. It also represents a tremendous opportunity to change the nature of our institutions."

The issue of minority faculty is especially pressing. Lattin observes: "Every institution has set goals for minority faculty. If you add all those goals together for the 3,500 institutions in this country, no one has planned for the tens of thousands that the goals demand. There are no Ph.D.'s there, because there has been no planning for it." Mininberg adds:

We often hire minority people, but we do a terrible job at providing a supportive environment that makes them feel welcome, that allows them an opportunity to succeed and stay with us. So we need to look at our environment and make sure we are changing who we are and how we operate, and not just those we are able to recruit.

Collaborative arrangements with our communities, corporations, and other institutions can help with minority recruitment and retention. As we strengthen those relationships for teaching, service, and research, and as we involve practitioners more heavily in our interdisciplinary centers and institutes, we create contexts within which the expertise of minority employees in these various organizations and institutions can enrich and diversify our resources.

Maintaining Institutional Integrity

Becoming an interactive, distributed university with strong collaborative relationships and interdependencies with local and regional institutions, raises tough questions concerning institutional integrity. Mininberg puts the issue this way:

We talk about institutional integrity, but I am not sure I really understand what that is. The integrity of an institution is really the collective integrity of various persons that make up the institution. The institution does not have integrity in the abstract. The limits one draws, particularly in the curriculum area, are limits imposed by the willingness of the faculty to do what they think is correct. You cannot legislate that. It has to evolve from faculty interest and commitment.

But often the prevailing norms and predispositions of the faculty are not consistent with urban village needs and expectations; what the faculty thinks is right and what they are willing to do, often is anchored in traditions that do not respond well to current societal needs. One of the authors (David Potter) says:

We are touching on issues that go back to our surfing metaphor and the opportunistic planning that is implied. I think George Mason is so unabashedly interactive, partly because we see more vitality outside the academy to respond and relate to than we often see within. So we see the opportunity to use the pressure from outside to drive change within the university, not only in how we organize faculty, but in how we conduct our instruction. We think we have no choice but to give up "integrity" in that traditional sense, when it seems primarily an expression of faculty self-interest or resistance to change.

Lattin has a similar concern:

My fear is that the academy will retreat from the interaction I think is essential for the twenty-first century. So I'm more worried about that. I do not want to tell tales, but in our search for a new [university] president there was a series of conversations with legislators, community leaders, and deans. Looking at summaries of those conversations, the legislators and community people were much more perceptive of the need, of what an institution had to do, than the deans, in my opinion. The deans wanted to retreat into traditional turf, and pull in their horns.

But the issue of institutional integrity has to be addressed somehow. Mininberg describes Cal State Northridge's strategy for public-private partnership development of one hundred acres of land:

All things on this project, as well as everything else at our institution, are built out of our academic priorities. The project is structured so we can exercise certain rights at any point in time. Although we have facilities that we will partially control the tenancy to, we also have rights of first refusal on the use of all the space. So as a corporate environment is built, if the institution needs swing space or permanent facilities, and if we can afford it, we have the right to occupy that space before it's rented to an outside

tenant, and we do so below market rates. We have a faculty oversight committee, which like most committees is spawning task forces at a great rate. They have an intimate interest in all aspects of the development program, and we are giving the developer some very specific tenancy guidelines. Of course, we cannot give him shackles, because they will restrict his right and his ability to finance the buildings. We are looking for tenants who have an interest in being part of a university setting for advantages that are intrinsic. Rather than what we can give them, we're looking at what they can give us. But it is a continuous process of negotiation and trade-offs. That's what partnerships involve.

Conclusion

Reshaping the university for the urban area is a challenging task. The changes required reach deeply into all elements of the institution—planning and development, organization and governance, desired educational outcomes and curricular planning, teaching and learning, and the roles and characteristics of the professoriate. Such changes continuously raise questions of institutional integrity and mission. They drive all members of the academy—administrators, faculty members, student service professionals, support staff—to reexamine their assumptions, principles, and practices. Some find these challenges daunting and try to deflect or ignore the social forces driving them. Others are excited and energized. They find their intellectual muscles, their capacity for openness, their political savvy, their ability to make things happen, heavily exercised—and they enjoy getting up in the morning for that workout.