

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 concerns are facing metropolitan universities and higher education generally. They have created the need for more effective leadership. This paper describes some of the principal issues confronting faculty and university leaders today, identifies selected leadership typologies, and offers suggestions on improving leadership effectiveness.

Leadership Challenges for Metropolitan Universities: *Issues and Approaches*

Introduction

A decade ago, Richard M. Cyert, President of Carnegie-Mellon University, began the foreword to George Keller's popular and influential book, *Academic Strategy*, with the warning that the next decades will be a time of great change in American higher education. By the 1990s, there will be fewer high school graduates, greater competition for college candidates, higher education costs, difficulty attracting brilliant young people to university faculties, and fewer federal dollars for research and student support. For higher education, it will be a time of "novel threats" but also some "fresh opportunities." In this uncertain future, Cyert reminded us, college and university officers must provide careful, expert management and "decisive campus leadership..." [pp. vi-vii, emphasis added.]

Even with the numerous forecasts of significant changes that were to take place in the 1980s and early 1990s, few of us were fully prepared for the rapidity of the changes nor the magnitude of the challenges and threats to higher education we have experienced in the past half decade. If anything, the forecasts of the 1980s underestimated our current difficulties. Who in the early 1980s, would have predicted the decline in public confidence in universities? What indicators signaled legislative disenchantment with higher education? Why was there no warning that expenditures for prisons and public safety would surpass the investments in higher education? Who was alerting regents, presidents, and deans that higher education was becoming a "discretionary" item in many state budgets?

Nevertheless, American higher education, universally admired for decades as the finest, most productive national

system of colleges and universities, is in the throes of an historic transformation driven by technological, economic and societal forces over which it presently exercises little control.

The major leadership challenge for higher education for the remainder of the 1990s, though enormously complex, can be simply summarized: Higher education must reestablish public confidence and influence with representatives in state legislatures and Congress. Without public confidence and legislative support, higher education cannot hope to sustain the level of quality and provide the programs which have made it internationally admired.

This paper has two purposes: The first is to describe the major tasks associated with these leadership challenges for metropolitan universities. The second is to assess selected leadership models and strategies for addressing these challenges and guiding these institutions into the twenty-first century.

Leadership Tasks and Challenges

Reestablishing Public Confidence

Multidirectional Communication. To argue that one of the major leadership challenges facing higher education and metropolitan universities is to reestablish public confidence may be seen by some as an oversimplification. While that may be true, it is no exaggeration to say that unless we are able to restore public confidence in higher education soon, we will have even less support and be less able to address successfully the challenges and opportunities facing our universities.

There are several popular explanations for the sudden erosion of public support for higher education which has been as rapid as it has been dramatic. Increasing emphasis on research at the expense of instruction, decreasing relevance of higher education's internal priorities to the needs of society, escalating costs, self-serving missions, and faculty work patterns have all contributed to this shift in public attitudes.

The public needs to be assured that higher education is serving *their* interests. However, for universities to adopt serving the public interest as their mission, faculty and administration leaders must first gain an understanding of the public's perceptions, concerns, and needs. The challenge to university leadership is to develop effective mechanisms by which institutions can gain this knowledge in a continuing, systematic, reliable, and usable manner.

Our traditions as well as the stereotypic image of the university as the "fountain of knowledge" have led us to believe that the professoriate is the dispenser of knowledge while the public, business, media, and policy makers are the recipients. Few doubt that we of the academy have something of value to say about the present community condition. However, we must also listen to what the public and their representatives are saying that has value for informing our agenda. In his book, *Thriving on Chaos* (Knopf, 1987), Tom Peters tells corporate leaders that "the listening organization is...the one most likely to pick up quickly on changes in its environment." Metropolitan universities, with their special mission to serve their communities, must be "listening organizations."

The challenge for university leadership is to *increase and improve communication* between the academic community and the publics it serves. This communication must be multidirectional effectively linking the university with public officials and agencies, businesses, and health and social services organizations in a

network that fosters the flow of information and encourages interaction and partnerships in addressing important community issues. The *process* of working together is as important as the specific *results* of university-community interaction in rebuilding public confidence.

The communication gap between universities and their communities is becoming so serious — as evidenced by declining community support — that it warrants concerted strategic thinking, planning, and action on a level that parallels our strategic planning efforts in teaching, research and service. University administrators, faculty, planners, and public affairs staff must ask: How and with whom should we be communicating? When and on what topics? How do we know when and if our message is getting out? More importantly, how do we know when our publics' messages are “**getting in**” i.e., that we have a sympathetic understanding of their expectations of higher education?

If information is power, universities, through lack of communication, have not always effectively “empowered” their publics to work on their behalf. Similarly, we in universities need to take the lead by inviting our communities to inform us about their concerns, problems and needs. Community leaders, state policy makers and other influential individuals must be able to argue for their college or university with knowledge of the institution's mission and useful data on programs and program opportunities. Effective two-way communication with the community is essential to restoring public confidence in higher education.

As academics we have developed elaborate, sophisticated mechanisms for communicating among ourselves. We have not, however, developed ways to effectively communicate with the community. University characteristics often act as obstacles to effective communication i.e., the highly specialized language of the academy and our “ivory tower” traditions that value splendid isolation and the solitary scholar. Our tendency is to be inward-looking and focused on the development of our disciplines and professions with little regard for the ways they relate to broader societal concerns.

Communicating is mutually empowering. University leaders, working with community leaders, must devise channels of communication that convey needed information between and among institutions of higher education, business, government and other organizations. University-community forums, databases and clearinghouses, service learning and community-based internships, faculty-practitioner exchanges, industry-education television networks, and other innovations are only the first steps toward developing effective systems for communicating between campuses and communities.

Clarity of Mission and Identity. Faculty and administrative leadership have the challenge and responsibility for effectively articulating the institution's mission and goals as well as fostering an identity that reflects these priorities. Too often, universities attempt to be “all things to all people.” Our historic three-fold mission of teaching, research and service invites overly ambitious and ambiguous institutional missions and goals. Consequently, university missions are not always well understood or agreed to by those charged with carrying them out. This lack of understanding and support of institutional missions is also due to the rapidly changing character of many universities. Faculty members in the early 1960s understood that they were, above all, to teach and teach well. This message was reinforced by workloads of four or five courses each semester. Little time was allocated for research, writing and publication. Those energetic enough to conduct research and publish in addition to teaching and advising were rarely rewarded for their additional efforts.

Many "teaching oriented" institutions were transformed by the need, opportunity, prestige and financial support for a broadened, national research agenda that was in full swing by the mid-1960s. Federal funding and rapid developments in computing technology transformed many university missions from primarily teaching to research-and-teaching with an ever increasing emphasis on research. Reward structures changed accordingly, leaving little uncertainty about institutional priorities.

By the late 1980s, the growing neglect of teaching in favor of research began to capture the attention of state legislators, the public, and education policy makers. At about the same time, new challenges were being heard for a broader university service role in the community. Mayors, city councils, and city managers, desperate for technical assistance and intellectual resources to address the escalating problems of urban America, began turning to their local universities for assistance. For the second time in less than a generation, universities were being called upon to transform their missions to re-emphasize teaching — particularly for undergraduates — and broaden their scholarship to include applied research and professional service to help address growing community and social problems.

The changing goals and missions of many universities, especially those located in large, urban areas, have created confusion among faculty and differences of opinion among department chairs, deans, provosts and presidents over institutional priorities. Needless to say, if universities are unsure or confused about their missions and goals, how can communities and policy makers be expected to understand the priorities, much less support them? One of the major leadership challenges for universities — particularly those developing a metropolitan university orientation — is to clarify and communicate the institution's mission and establish reward, policy, and organizational structures that reflect this mission. Administration and faculty leadership together must convey to their constituents a common sense of purpose which includes responsiveness to their concerns.

Deregulation of Higher Education. One of the paradoxes challenging higher education leaders is that universities must not only have a clear sense of purpose and mission which requires a certain degree of institutional stability; they also must be able to change, adapt and respond to ever new problems, increasing competition, new technologies, diverse populations, and often conflicting expectations. The phenomenal growth of American higher education and the increasing requests for universities to address community concerns, have been accompanied by increasing state and federal regulations that significantly limit higher education's ability to be responsive.

Among the strengths of American higher education is the variety of institution types and the modalities for coordinating the flow of resources to these varied institutions. As described by Gilley, state higher education coordinating boards have sought to balance growth in university programs with the growth in resources, avoid unnecessary duplication, set standards for quality, and ensure accountability. The principal mechanism for achieving these objectives has been the development of a regulatory environment that, in some states, extends into nearly every facet of public university policy and administration. For better or worse, the character of higher education today is, in many respects, the product of the regulatory environment in which it exists.

While the degree of regulation varies from state to state and the debate over the appropriate role of state higher education coordinating boards intensifies, many university leaders and education policy makers are advancing the proposition that the

time has come for a fresh look at the goals, objectives and outcomes of regulation in higher education in today's economy. New and growing demands for creative partnerships and consortia with other universities to improve the quality of teaching, research, and service functions often go unheeded due to bureaucratic obstacles. State regulatory policies frequently impede efforts to respond to public needs for instructional programs. New technologies for delivering higher education services go unused because of outdated rules and restrictive policies. Program reviews and detailed reports, often duplicated by accrediting bodies, consume valuable resources that detract from instruction and service delivery to communities.

Deregulation in other sectors of the economy has stimulated growth, fostered invention and innovation, provided choices to an increasingly sophisticated and demanding public, and improved the quality of many products and services. Careful deregulation in higher education will produce many of the same results. Community leaders do not know that a university's failure to respond to a request for a program or service is often due to restrictive regulations. The image of the *university* is diminished because it is prevented from providing the desired program by state regulations even when the university is able and willing to be responsive to the request.

The leadership task for public higher education generally and metropolitan universities in particular is to inform and educate legislative bodies and the public about ways our institutions can more efficiently and effectively serve community interests and be more responsive with less regulation. Specific approaches to this effort will vary among states, reflecting the character of regulation, the politics of higher education, the needs of our communities, and our institutions' abilities to respond to these needs in a less regulated environment.

This is a politically complex task and is not likely to be successful while public confidence in higher education is declining. Some argue that there is a direct relationship between the decline of public confidence and the increase in expectations for accountability and regulation. Thus, an important first step toward deregulation of higher education is restoring public confidence that universities are serving the public's interests.

Fiscal Realities and the Metropolitan Mission. The fiscal struggle among institutions of higher education has preoccupied the agendas of nearly every university administrator for the past half decade. Escalating costs, flat or decreasing budgets, increasing competition for students and external funding, as well as strategic reallocations, and program cuts and closures, have been the dominant challenges for university leaders.

The fiscal challenges for metropolitan universities with their broader, more complex missions, and community responsibilities have been significantly greater than those in other sectors of higher education. Students from more diverse populations, many with special learning requirements, are being served. Faculty members are being called upon to invest increasing amounts of time providing needed expertise and technical assistance for social, health and other community issues. Providing needed and mandated educational and professional services to communities exacts higher costs and frequently yields lower revenues than those services provided by flagship and traditional institutions. The task for leadership is to communicate this complex message effectively to legislators, members of Congress, foundations and others who provide the resources needed for carrying out this ambitious mission. More difficult, perhaps, is conveying a vision to the university community of the need for new, cost effective models for integrating and delivering instruction, professional services, and applied and basic research. These three basic functions

— teaching/advising, research, and professional service — are currently perceived, carried out, and rewarded as distinct activities. The separateness of these activities is reflected and reinforced through “formula funding” a university accounting system which provides separate budgets and department accounts against which faculty time is charged, thus reifying, these “different” activities.

As the demands on metropolitan universities continue to grow, success at even one function, much less all three will require new ways of conceptualizing the role of faculty so that teaching/advising, research, and professional service are more intrinsically connected. Technology can and will, undoubtedly, play an increased role. Job descriptions, evaluations and compensation for faculty must also reflect this integration. Moreover, these increasing responsibilities will have to be carried out at most universities with equal or fewer faculty.

The resulting fiscal challenge for metropolitan university leaders is two-fold: convincing external audiences, such as the public and state legislators, of the need for increased resources to implement the expanding mission and growing public expectations for metropolitan universities, while simultaneously developing new approaches with internal audiences — e.g., faculty, administrators, and staff — for integrated, quality enhanced, lower cost outcomes. Even marginal success in meeting these two challenges will provide the resources and flexibility needed for investments in ongoing faculty development, new technologies, and enhanced interaction with university constituents.

Recreating Community. The loss of community and growing atomization of American society are emerging as our nation’s greatest concerns. The decline of neighborhoods, erosion of normative standards, loss of trust, growing *anomie*, and the sense of meaninglessness in personal lives have forced the American public and its leaders to recognize the harsh, new realities of our existence. Loss of confidence in our institutions is believed by Robert Bellah and many others to be eroding the foundations of society. Our dazzling technological accomplishments and scientific breakthroughs have not stopped the growing sense of an impending crisis in our major urban regions.

A century ago, a similar sense of crisis prevailed as wave upon wave of immigrants sought to find their place, often displacing those who had preceded them by a few years. William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago, envisioned his university playing a powerful, positive role for its city during this period of intense growth and disruption. He saw this new university as a source of knowledge and service to Chicago and beyond. Influenced by John Dewey’s ideas about education and character, Harper fostered a university environment that encouraged professors to be active in community affairs, social welfare, and political reform.

Many faculty members, reflecting Harper’s and Dewey’s philosophies, became deeply involved in and developed their intellectual lives around the problems of Chicago. Midway through the first decade of the new century, forces of academic professionalization began to take their toll on university organization and faculty roles. Faculty community involvement gave way to pressures from the disciplines and professions.

Within twenty years, the effort to create an integrated, community-oriented, democratic university degenerated into what we have come to call the “multiversity” or “research university” reflecting the *disintegration* occurring in the larger society with faculty pursuing their own ends, integrated more by bureaucratic procedures than a shared vision of a useful role in the larger community.

In his insightful and challenging keynote address at the 1993 Conference on

Metropolitan Universities reprinted recently in this journal, Blaine A. Brownell portrayed the role of metropolitan universities in terms that described the early vision of the University of Chicago:

“The most important role of the metropolitan university is to be a facilitator, communicator, convener, and bridge. What other institution – except perhaps government itself – has the capacity to interpret one group to another, serve as a neutral site and forum where problems can be discussed and resolved, bring the latest knowledge and technologies to bear on the problems of the dispossessed, join the vigor and capacity of business with the compelling needs of the public at large, and – perhaps most importantly – help restore a sense of *civitas*, of belonging to one polity and community?”
[p. 19. Emphasis added.]

It is not clear that even metropolitan universities have the capacity to fill these awesome roles. Many who understand the metropolitan university paradigm believe it has the potential, but only if this role is understood and accepted by the faculties, publics, state legislators, and education policy makers. This, no less, is a leadership challenge for faculty and administrators of metropolitan universities.

Leadership Approaches for Metropolitan Universities

The issues outlined above illustrate the complex challenges of leadership facing higher education generally and metropolitan universities in particular. More difficult than identifying issues, however, is the task of matching these challenges with effective leadership models.

Leadership is one of the most exhaustively explored topics in the corporate world. A recent survey of leadership research cited over 7,500 studies. The increasing importance of leadership studies also is reflected in its growing acceptance as an object of study in university curricula. In some institutions, entire academic programs and schools are devoted to leadership studies.

Leadership studies focused on higher education, however, constitute only a small portion of the existing literature. Even less attention has been devoted to the unique and more demanding leadership issues that confront metropolitan universities. The unique challenges facing these institutions argue persuasively for devoting more attention to finding effective leadership models for administrators and faculty responsible for developing and directing changes in our missions, goals, strategies, and programs.

The following is a brief summary of selected leadership types. The question is which of these leadership types is most effective in addressing the issues facing metropolitan universities.

Leadership Typologies

Strong Leader/Weak Leader Models. In Birnbaum’s review of the university leadership literature, *How Academic Leadership Works* (Jossey-Bass, 1992), he concludes that most of the writing is descriptive or prescriptive and tends to explicitly advocate or implicitly accept the notion that leadership — and particularly presidential leadership — is a critical component of institutional functioning and improvement. He also points out that this view is not universally held and that, in fact, there are *two* models that deserve consideration, i.e., the “strong” leader and the “weak” leader models [p. 7].

Birnbaum argues that "any comprehensive consideration of academic leadership must be able to accommodate both the strong leader and the weak leader views, because evidence suggests that while both may be incomplete, both are in some measure correct." Evidence for this position is drawn from a number of studies that show institutional effectiveness to be closely related to the strategies of senior administrators. Thus, those who would argue the efficacy of the strong leader model in higher education can do so with some empirical grounding as well as common sense, i.e., "the actions of leaders have important consequences."

Less understood is the "weak" leader model. This model suggests that many important measures of institutional functioning remain unchanged even when the senior leader is replaced. In an earlier publication, Birnbaum pointed out that "institutional fate may not be closely related to who presidents are or what presidents do." Such arguments are consistent with sociological research on bureaucracies in which "institutional cultures" are shown to restrict or predispose members to follow established patterns of behavior. Social and organizational structures place constraints on what is "acceptable" and discourage the unconventional. Accordingly, institutional cultures are more likely to control leaders than leaders are to control their institution's culture.

Similarly, recent management literature asserts that in many new organizations central control will not work. Rather, a form of "weak" leadership is advocated in which employees are encouraged to define tasks they can see and are given the funds and discretion to do them. The role of the manager/leader in this model is to do less defining of tasks and controlling and do more caring for the people. As the literature on "self managed work teams" suggests, the people will manage themselves. Most people in leadership positions would probably agree that they are frequently unable to do as they would like. The "degrees of freedom" in leadership choices often leave little room for decisions that would significantly alter institutional culture. Instead of asking if leadership matters, perhaps, as Birnbaum suggests, it is better to inquire, "Under what conditions or on what issues or problems can leaders make a difference?"

Instrumental Leader/Expressive Leader Models. Early research in group behavior suggested that leadership can also be categorized as being either instrumental or expressive. Instrumental leadership emphasizes the completion of tasks, i.e., getting things done. Relationships with such leaders tend to be formal and rely on "status" rather than personal qualities. Concentrating on performance, instrumental leaders are prone to issue directives and to "discipline" those who frustrate progress towards the leader's goals. Instrumental leaders are not particularly concerned about being "liked" but do desire and, if successful, enjoy a distant respect. There is a tendency among such leaders to employ authoritarian-like management methods and techniques, focus on instrumental issues, make decisions on their own, and expect compliance from subordinates.

Expressive leadership, in contrast, emphasizes collective well-being, i.e., providing emotional support and minimizing tension among group members. Such leaders often cultivate informal, personal relationships and work to keep the group or organization united emotionally and morale high. The desire for respect is usually surpassed by a need for personal affection from the organization's members. Management methods are generally more democratic and are aimed at including all group members in the decision-making process. Some leaders may even downplay their position and power encouraging the group to function on their own if this produces unity and collective well-being.

Team Leadership. Team leadership accepts the view that the increasingly complex, rapidly changing world requires diverse perspectives and multiple talents. Individuals are limited in their abilities to comprehend today's large, complex organizations that are trying to survive and prosper in ever more rapidly changing environments. The notion of the solo leader who can assess these complex situations, consider the options, and make all the right decisions is increasingly unrealistic. Although we hold to the myth of solo leaders and our organizations reinforce the view of the person at the top who is "in charge," the reality is that such leaders rarely succeed, much less survive for any significant period.

Team leadership is, in contrast, a collective action occurring among and through a group of people who think and act together. Leadership viewed as a team effort is seen by some as being more effective than individual leadership for several reasons, including: a team's decisions are more apt to represent a wider range of interests present in organizations; there is a possibility for more creative solutions; and team members will better understand and be more likely to support decisions they helped shape. Team leadership promotes inclusiveness over exclusiveness. The challenge for leadership, however, is how to get people involved as responsible participants, not keep them out of decision-making.

The obvious disadvantages of team leadership are that it can be more complex, time-consuming, and require more compromise. These disadvantages may be more than compensated for if the end product of this approach is superior decision-making and stronger, more effective institutional leadership.

Institutional Leadership. Most of the leadership literature deals with the leadership of persons — individuals and teams. Far less attention is devoted to, nor do we know much about, organizational or institutional leadership, especially in higher education. What literature there is focuses on businesses and corporations and not on academic institutions. While it is not uncommon for us to use phrases such as "X University is one of the leading universities in the nation" and "Y University seeks to be a leader in addressing the social and economic problems in the metropolitan region," more rigorous and systematic attention needs to be devoted to understanding how universities as institutions become leaders in their communities, states, or, for that matter, higher education.

Our notions of institutional leadership as they relate to universities are commonly based on indicators that reflect selected values, including number of students, size of endowment, Nobel Prize winning faculty members, scholarly publications or amount of external funding. *U.S. News and World Report* annually publishes a rating of universities based on the perceptions of leaders of peer institutions. These popular indicators of institutional leadership have produced sizeable followings in which many universities take pride at being in the "top 10" or "top 100" of this or that category.

The challenge for higher education, particularly metropolitan universities, is to continue development of a new model of institutional leadership for addressing and solving some of the pressing problems of our communities. During the past two decades, several urban and metropolitan universities have achieved significant success in playing a leadership role in addressing community problems and improving the quality of life in their region. A few examples are George Mason University, University of Louisville, University of Memphis, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Towson State University, Cleveland State University, Portland State University, and Wright State University. We should study institutions such as these in order to explore what factors contribute to their successful institutional leadership within

their communities and states. How do they view and communicate their institutional values and missions to students, new and seasoned faculty members, community leaders, and the public? What personnel, workload, recruitment, and compensation policies contribute to this success? More importantly, what forms of internal university leadership contribute to successful external institutional leadership in the community and state in addressing and solving problems?

The answers to these questions are important for the general success of the metropolitan university movement and the particular success of individual institutions working to develop a new role in their communities and regions. Metropolitan universities and their faculty and administrative leaders have the added responsibility as participants in this new model of higher education to document and communicate their experiences — successful and otherwise — as they relate to their institutions' leadership performance. This journal and the regular Metropolitan Universities conferences are increasingly effective mediums for this exchange.

Fostering Leadership in Metropolitan Universities

To meet the complex challenges facing metropolitan universities will require effective leadership in all its individual, collective and institutional forms. The table opposite suggests hypothetical relationships between certain leadership approaches and effectiveness in addressing various problems challenging metropolitan universities. For example, certain problems may be more effectively addressed by **strong leaders** who are willing to take risks, experiment with novel approaches, and learn from mistakes and successes. Other issues may be more effectively addressed by **weak leaders**, so called, who are comfortable in allowing their institution's culture to respond without his or her direct intervention.

Notwithstanding the value of strong, charismatic leaders and tough decision makers in higher education today, the major leadership challenges and opportunities facing metropolitan universities cannot be successfully addressed through the individual, solo actions of the person "in charge." Communication, interaction, collaboration, shared responsibility, and **team leadership** appear to offer the greatest promise for addressing the multidimensional problems characteristic of those challenging metropolitan universities.

I believe that new definitions of institutional success such as those expressed in the Declaration of Metropolitan Universities will take root and flourish only when there is collective **institutional leadership** supporting the mission and implementing the university's goals and objectives. This is indicated in the table, which shows hypothesized levels of effectiveness of the categories of leadership described in this article.

Adopting appropriate goals and objectives is only part of the process. Equally, if not more important, is gaining broad-based, internal commitments to the expanded role of the metropolitan university. This is particularly important in view of the deeply imbedded traditions of faculty governance, autonomous departments, and independent scholarship. Team leadership involving faculty, staff, administration, and students in the development of new missions, goals, and objectives will help ensure gradual, broad-based acceptance. Gaining commitment to the metropolitan mission, however, requires trusted, reliable, articulate spokespersons who understand and can describe the vision and model. It also requires continuing reinforcement in institutional symbols, personnel policies, faculty workloads, reward structures and budget allocations.

Hypothesized Levels of Effectiveness of Selected Leadership Approaches for Addressing Problems Facing Metropolitan Universities*

Leadership Problems	Leadership Approaches					
	Strong	Weak	Instrumental	Expressive	Team	Solo
Communicating Internally	M-L	M-L	M-L	H	H	M-L
Communicating Externally	H	L	H-M	H-M	H	M
Clarifying Mission	H	L	H	L	H-M	M
Deregulating Higher Education	H	L	H	L	H	L
Achieving Fiscal Adequacy	H-L	M	H-L	M-L	H	M
Recreating Community	L	M-L	L	H	H	L

*Hypothesized levels of leadership effectiveness: High (H), moderate (M), and low (L).

Note: The hypothesized levels of leadership effectiveness above are only *suggestions* for further exploration. The leadership approaches are obviously not mutually exclusive and presented only as *illustrations* of a much wider range of leadership types.

Equally important, but more time consuming will be changing external images and public expectations of the university. The image of the traditional university common earlier in this century is so deeply imbedded in our national culture that few community leaders and even fewer ordinary citizens know what they can and should expect from contemporary metropolitan universities. Defining the new university for the community, state legislators, and national leaders must keep pace with internal redefinitions. The community must be informed of the mission, role and resources of the university as it addresses issues and seeks solutions to problems. Further, the community also must be made aware of the university's significant potential for leadership in addressing these problems. This task cannot fall to the chancellor or president alone. To succeed, this task must involve *every* faculty member and administrator as well as each department, school, and college in the university.

Because of the essential differences among disciplines and organizational units — not to mention individual differences — within the university, each will approach this task differently. Flexibility to develop different approaches to achieve institutional goals and objectives must become part of the institutional culture. Junior faculty as well as seasoned senior professors should be encouraged to challenge conventional wisdom in their pursuit of institutional goals. Experimentation will provide the only solid basis for developing more responsive and effective universities capable of meeting the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Conclusion

Many individuals have argued that the American university system is the most successful and adaptable system of higher education in the world. The most commonly used criterion of success is the production and dissemination of knowledge. The positive assessment does not hold, however, if one goes beyond the criterion of "production and dissemination of knowledge" to include the expanded mission of metropolitan universities as stated in their Declaration. We have a long way to go in discharging our "broadened responsibility to bring these functions [of the creation, interpretation, dissemination, and application of knowledge] to bear on the needs of our metropolitan regions" and "to be responsive to the needs of our metropolitan areas by seeking new ways of using our...resources to provide leadership in addressing metropolitan problems."

True, this is a relatively new mission for universities. A decade is needed within which to develop and test the models, mechanisms, and leadership required for success. Others, however, might question whether this is a mission at which metropolitan universities can succeed. For more than a quarter century, many academics have invested their careers in the proposition that higher education must pursue this new course and that certain strategically located universities with the appropriate mission and resolve can be successful in this expanded role.

If success is possible, charting a course to achieve this complex and challenging objective will require the best leadership in all its individual, collective, and institutional forms. To paraphrase the American philosopher, Charles Peirce, it will require not only carrying on the basic traditions of the academy but also constantly amending and expanding them in active participation. Being responsive to the needs of metropolitan areas is a social enterprise that requires a new and expanded vision of the role of higher education that is understood and shared by faculty, central administrators, higher education policy makers, community leaders, legislators, and the public.

Universities must begin to redirect a portion of their major resources, i.e., faculty interests and expertise, research priorities, and service activities, from discipline-defined issues to community-defined problems. The need for change is urgent. The need for effective leadership in the prevailing academic culture, which seems capable of only gradual change, is essential if higher education is to escape a full-blown crisis. Metropolitan universities have taken an important first step in accepting the need for change and represent a model for much of higher education for the remainder of this century and the decades ahead.

Note: I am indebted to my colleagues at the University of North Texas, Drs. Blaine A. Brownell, Suzanne LaBrequé, David Hartman, David Williamson, and Ms. Lottie Joy Wright for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Suggested Reading

Bensimon, Estela Mara and Anna Neumann. *Redesigning Collegiate Leadership: Teams and Teamwork in Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Birnbaum, Robert. *How Academic Leadership Works*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992.

Brownell, Blaine A. "Metropolitan Universities: Past, Present, and Future," *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*. Vol. 4, No. 3, 13-22.

DePree, Max. *Leadership is an Art*. New York: Doubleday, 1989.

DePree, Max. *Leadership Jazz*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Gilley, J. Wade. *Thinking about American Higher Education: The 1990s and Beyond*. New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991.

Keller, George. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. *The Leadership Challenge: How To Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Lynton, Ernest A., and Sandra E. Elman. *New Priorities for the University*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Peters, Tom. *Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for a Management Revolution*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987.

Williamson, John N. *The Leader Manager*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1984.



Declaration of Metropolitan Universities

A number of presidents of metropolitan universities have signed the following declaration.

We, the leaders of metropolitan universities and colleges, embracing the historical values and principles which define all universities and colleges, and which make our institutions major intellectual resources for their metropolitan regions,

- reaffirm that the creation, interpretation, dissemination, and application of knowledge are the fundamental functions of our universities;
- assert and accept a broadened responsibility to bring these functions to bear on the needs of our metropolitan regions;
- commit our institutions to be responsive to the needs of our metropolitan areas by seeking new ways of using our human and physical resources to provide leadership in addressing metropolitan problems, through teaching, research, and professional service.

Our teaching must:

- educate individuals to be informed and effective citizens, as well as capable practitioners of professions and occupations;
- be adapted to the particular needs of metropolitan students, including minorities and other underserved groups, adults of all ages, and the place-bound;
- combine research-based knowledge with practical application and experience, using the best current technology and pedagogical techniques.

Our research must:

- seek and exploit opportunities for linking basic investigation with practical application, and for creating synergistic interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary scholarly partnerships for attacking complex metropolitan problems, while meeting the highest scholarly standards of the academic community.

Our professional service must include:

- development of creative partnerships with public and private enterprises that ensure that the intellectual resources of our institutions are fully engaged with such enterprises in mutually beneficial ways;
- close working relationships with the elementary and secondary schools of our metropolitan regions, aimed at maximizing the effectiveness of the entire metropolitan education system, from preschool through post-doctoral levels;
- the fullest possible contributions to the cultural life and general quality of life of our metropolitan regions.