

A re-examination of university leadership is being heard as a requisite to the successful renaissance currently underway in American higher education. The unique opportunities and challenges facing metropolitan universities make the leadership issue especially critical. Who are the leaders of our universities? The articles in this issue argue that there is a crucial leadership role at every position in the institution. The coordination of this shared leadership responsibility is a unique challenge facing every metropolitan university.

Leadership for Metropolitan Universities: *A Shared Responsibility*

As calls for dramatic changes in the conduct of American universities abound over the landscape, an echo calling for a re-examination of university leadership is being heard. Metropolitan Universities are at the forefront of the renaissance in higher education for the 21st century. Our commitment to play significant roles in the communities we serve, our interest in expanding the boundaries of the intellectual disciplines, and our willingness to serve the new populations all argue for significant institutional change. Such change efforts are complicated by growing resource limitations, expanded expectations, and misunderstood missions. These conditions place additional pressures on all involved in the management of our institutions. Old leadership models are becoming ineffective as organizations become flatter. New leadership roles and strategies are required. Future organizational success will depend on a re-examination and understanding of each leadership role in the organization. Interactions, interdependencies and a focus on change, not stability or maintenance, now characterize the leadership role.

Anyone who has spent time on a campus has experienced an organizational notion of shared leadership. Yet, from the outside, some might conclude that all leadership comes from the office of the president. Rarely is a president involved in the core activity of the institution: curriculum and classroom instruction. Faculty leaders, departmental chairs and deans typically exercise independence in such matters, working in constant tension with deans or academic vice presidents over matters of rationale, design, quality assurance, and funding.

Staff members at metropolitan universities go about their daily tasks, seeing the institution from the perspectives of their particular offices and work groups, usually feeling isolated from the larger whole. Yet, the consequences

of their actions ripple across the campus. Administrative and student affairs staff provide critical insights which directly effect organizational outcomes. Many feel disconnected from the core mission of the institution.

Most decisions are made by individuals in a group context. Leadership is often dispersed. The identification of a single leader on a given issue is frequently difficult. Implications for effective institutional leadership are clear. Communication, team building, conflict resolution, negotiation, and other collaborative skills are absolutely essential for today's leaders. Few institutions provide any training for individuals moving into key responsibility positions. Unfortunately, on-the-job training is the most frequent mode of leadership training.

Some institutions have identified individuals who are utilizing creative ways to provide effective leadership. This issue examines the leadership role in metropolitan universities from selected organizational positions.

Barbara Fuhrmann, former President of the Faculty Senate at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, provides the faculty perspective on shared leadership at metropolitan universities. She facilitates a conversation among four faculty leaders from Virginia Commonwealth University. The group defines the role of faculty leaders, while articulating several tensions that define the context within faculty leadership. The job of faculty leaders is to contribute to a unified institutional identity. Fuhrmann and colleagues argue that first, faculty leaders must demonstrate the totality of the faculty role in the university through their own involvement in the common enterprise. Only then will they make effective faculty leaders. Beyond their own contributions, such leaders encourage other faculty, once they have established themselves as teachers and researchers, to get out of their offices and laboratories and to become involved in the common enterprise in whatever manner they are most likely to contribute. Additional roles include nurturing new faculty into the role of a faculty member of an urban institution and assisting in clearly defining the faculty role, especially as it relates to the urban mission of the university. Finally, faculty leadership is needed to encourage all faculty to incorporate the university's urban mission into all interactions with students, so as to engage them in the common enterprise as well.

Tom McGovern, Coordinator of Interdisciplinary Programs at Arizona State University West, examines shared leadership from the vantage point of a department chair. McGovern's comments are organized around three intellectual priorities for most chairs: students, faculty, and the undergraduate curriculum. Within that structure, McGovern argues that the departmental leadership role is about student learning, faculty development, and curricular transformation issues. He focusses on the unique opportunity chairpersons have to set a course for departments in ways that expand traditional, parochial definitions of student outcomes and the academic program of study.

The dean's perspective is provided by Dan Johnson, Dean of the School of Community Service at the University of North Texas. Johnson discerns that American higher education is in the throes of a major transformation. Decreasing public confidence, increasing concerns about higher education from state legislators, growing regulation at the state and national levels, fiscal challenges, and other major issues and problems facing metropolitan universities and higher education, generally, have resulted in the need for more effective leadership. His paper describes some of the major issues confronting faculty and university leaders today, identifies selected leadership topologies, and offers suggestions on improving leadership effectiveness given these circumstances.

Myron Henry, Provost at Kent State University, provides views on shared leadership from that position. Henry suggests a new category of *almost metropolitan universities* to describe institutions like Kent State that have evolved from traditional, residential university roots. This article focusses on a prominent thread: issues emanating from the major metropolitan university issues will require shared leadership if they are to be addressed effectively. Determining and accepting alternate measures of institutional success at universities like Kent need to involve faculty and administrators at all levels, as well as governing boards and state officials. Operationalizing an expanded view of scholarship; emphasizing team work, unit productivity and group rewards; and stressing the importance of the university citizen will require shared leadership from and new understandings among faculty, department chairs, deans, provosts, and presidents. True regional partnerships among institutions call for leadership from local politicians, governing boards, presidents, provosts, and officials of state government as well as less institutional ego. All of these themes are easily stated, clearly relevant, and hardly surprising. But a look to the next century suggests that the issues inherent to these themes will continue to represent challenges and opportunities, particularly to almost metropolitan universities.

Ken Ender and Kathleen Mooney, at Cleveland State University, discuss central administration's perspective on shared leadership at metropolitan universities. Ender and Mooney discuss the challenge of financing metropolitan universities in a time of state budget cutbacks and decreasing private support, and calls for bold and creative initiatives by higher education administrators. By looking at the familiar practices of outsourcing and privatizing within the context of "partnering," or sharing management responsibilities for non-instructional operations with private industry, a new model for financing higher education is articulated. The emerging trend of building institutional alliances, or service corporations, among and between educational institutions which take advantage of the economies of scale in order to more effectively exploit existing resources illustrate new leadership strategies.

Presidential views in metropolitan universities are illustrated by two articles. Betty Siegel, President at Kennesaw State College, proposes that higher education has always been inextricably intertwined with the larger purposes of American society, and that campuses today look very different from the colleges of a half century before. The student body is diverse — the traditional student is no longer the norm. Students and the equally diverse faculty bring a whole new set of imperatives which must be embraced by institutions of higher education. It is to a community of difference which today's presidents must provide leadership. An invitational approach is advocated and requires a four-point approach. This process is adopted to encourage all students to reach their personal and academic goals and to prepare for professional success.

Paul Thompson, President of Weber State University, and colleagues, also provide a president's view of shared leadership in metropolitan universities. Thompson describes how the president of a metropolitan university must respond to many external and internal constituencies. Two cases are described to highlight the importance of faculty-administration collaboration in the decision-making process at an institution which places high value on shared governance. Although collective decisions take more time and may be perceived by outsiders as weakness, Weber State University's experience shows that communication and faculty involvement in decisions results in better and more thorough policies that benefit from greater campus-wide understanding and support.

In sum, these papers argue that strong, collaborative leadership at all levels of the institution is needed to make a difference. Change, innovation, and excellence are brought about by sharing decisions throughout the institution. This is a critical leadership agenda for all institutions. The implications of these papers for metropolitan universities are many. Administration selection needs to be revisited. Leadership development must become central to the conduct of the institution. Information needs to be widely available and support of the leadership functions need to be restructured. The list can go on. Institutional attention to this topic is a needed element if the full potential of the metropolitan university is to be realized.